

RAJYA SABHA

Friday, 10th December 1954

The House met at eleven of the clock, MR. CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE HINDU
MINORITY AND GUARDIANSHIP BILL,
1953

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"I am directed to inform the Rajya Sabha that the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on Thursday, the 9th December, 1954 has passed the enclosed motion concurring in the recommendation of the Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Hindu Minority and Guardianship Bill, 1953. The names of the members nominated by the House to serve on the said Joint Committee are set out in the motion."

"MOTION"

"That this House while concurring in the recommendation of the Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to amend and codify certain parts of law relating to minority and guardianship among Hindus made in the motion adopted by the Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 25th August, 1954 and communicated to this House on the 27th August, 1954:—

(a) recommends to the Rajya Sabha that the Joint Committee be instructed to report on or before the 31st March, 1955; and

(b) resolves that the following members of the Lok Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee, namely:—

1. Shri Narendra P. Nathwani
2. Shri Moreshwar Dinkar Joshi
3. Shri Badshah Gupta
4. Shri Sohan Lal Dhusiya

5. Shri P. Ramaswamy
6. Shri B. L. Chandak
7. Shri Liladhar Joshi
8. Shri Mathura Prasad Mishra
9. Shri Mahendra Nath Singh
10. Shri Bheekha Bhai
11. Shri Raghubar Dayal Misra
12. Shri M. L. Dwivedi
13. Dr. M. V. Gangadhara Siva
14. Shri C. R. Narasimhan
15. Shri H. Siddananjappa
16. Shrimati Subhadra Joshi
17. Shrimati Ya Palchoudhuri
18. Shri Kanhu Charan Jena
19. Shri Bimalaprosad Chaliha
20. Shri Bhola Raut
21. Shri P. R. Kanavade Patil
22. Sardar Hukam Singh
23. Shri S. V. L. Narasimham
24. Shrimati Renu Chakravartty
25. Shri Anandchand
26. Shri Shankar Shantaram More
27. Shri Jaswantraaj Mehta
28. Shri K. S. Raghavachari
29. Shri Bhawani Singh and
30. Shri Hari Vinayak Pataskar."

RESOLUTION RE. STEPS TO BAN UNDESIRABLE FILMS—continued.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI (Bombay): Mr. Chairman, before I begin I must express my thankfulness to the Government for circulating the note about the cinemas this morning. It has made my task easier. Last time when the debate began I had spoken about the influence of the cinemas on the juvenile mind and how as a result of it crime and undesirable behaviour were on the increase. I had given a few instances of such influence which resulted in such behaviour. Last time my remarks were confined more to Indian pictures, but whatever I said last time applies to foreign films equally and even more so because of

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]
 their superior technique and the lavishness with which they produce their films. It is because of the influence of glamorous foreign pictures, which are being imitated by the Indian film industry, that we are getting pictures encouraging crime and sex behaviour. Our Censor Board in the past had allowed the exhibition of foreign films of the most undesirable types. I mean crime pictures—psychological pictures showing different types of murder and horror pictures having many undesirable features, as well as pictures glamorous in many other respects. The argument on the part of the film industry was that “if you allow such foreign pictures in the next door cinema house, how can you prevent us from doing so, because if you allow then we will lose business and they will earn all the money.” There is justification for their saying so. I do not want to describe here what the Censor Board did in the past because it is now reconstituted and members have been changed and they are taking more interest in this matter. It is a long story of the past and requires to be told by itself, but this is not the occasion. In foreign pictures scenes showing human flesh, daring crime, under-world scenes, semi-nude dances and passionate kissing scenes are shown. The same things are imitated by the Indian pictures. Recently I saw two Indian pictures. Formerly in every Indian picture a dancing girl’s house was shown and now they show under-world scenes and scenes of dancing—dancing of a type which one sees only in the low type of hotel scenes in foreign pictures. Now, our films have also started imitating them and probably they will be again imitated by the people, because they may feel that what was shown was the normal life. I also saw crime and horror depicted. Nowhere in decent society in India such behaviour is common. Are we going to allow such foreign pictures? We are admiring so many other countries like Russia and China. So many delegations have gone to those countries. Will they say that

any of those countries admit those pictures which are not good for their own people? This is the only country in which any type of picture from anywhere can come and we allow them to be seen.

Then, there are posters which stare you in the face and wherever one goes those posters are seen everywhere. I do not know whether they have improved now, but one could see those posters everywhere. Then, there are comics which every teenager avidly reads. The pernicious effects of such comics have been found even in the West. Now, England and America are waking up and discussing the increase of juvenile crime on account of the influence of these comics, television and cinemas. They are realising that they are driving the younger generation to rack and ruin. Let us hope that we also will draw back in time before it is too late. There are pictures called “A” pictures—adult picture, and “U” pictures—universal picture. As soon as there is an “A” picture—that is only for adults—even if it is not good for adults, but supposing it is good for them—most of the juvenile people would go to see it. And then in the same cinema the trailer or the documentary will be “U” and the other picture will be ‘adult’ picture. How are you going to prevent anyone going to see them? In England they are cancelling licence of these cinema houses, if they allow younger people to see “A” pictures. But here I have not yet come across any single instance of the licence of any single cinema house having been cancelled on account of this kind of laxity and we find that young people are more and more drawn towards such pictures.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras): The law provides for prosecution.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: But it is not done. It is only in the book; it is not in practice.

I ask, is there any country which allows such pictures which are detrimental to the character of the masses? Such pictures whether they are foreign or Indian, day in and day out, corrupt the mind and morals of the people. We keep open all our doors for these influences to come in and then try to reform the people by speeches and by so-called social work by opening homes and spending lakhs of rupees on them but we do not stop these influences from coming in and prevent the incidence of crime. I quite realise that the customs and manners in each country differ. What is an ordinary behaviour in one country is an extraordinary one in the other. For instance, a father or brother kissing a grown up daughter or sister is unthinkable in our society but it is a common everyday affair in some countries and they do not feel anything unusual about it. Nobody objects to this kind of thing but one can certainly say that the kind of passionate kissing scenes shown in the cinemas excite the immature mind very much. The suggestive love scenes and scenes of first marriage-nights are shown so very openly in the pictures which go to the last extreme and I certainly say, Sir, that they are very exciting to the young minds. They are not at all healthy. The young minds are not fully formed and they got an unhealthy impression from these pictures. In our country there are people—80 per cent. people—who are illiterate but our society has got a code of its own. When one such picture is seen in a village showing the behaviour of young men and women in such a way which is not ordinarily done in our society, the villager thinks that the so-called advanced society—the people in that society—must be behaving like this. He thinks that this must be the code of behaviour of high-ups in society and as he sees more and more such pictures, gradually he begins to think that there is nothing unusual about it and then he also tries to imitate. If pictures have such destructive power, how much they can help to build up society in a constructive way. It is such a big weapon in

the hands of those people who are producing these pictures that they can, as I said in my previous speech, make or mar the whole nation. I do not say that all pictures are bad. There are so many good ones too, both foreign and Indian. We have to build up our country and our cinema industry surely can help much in building it up.

I do not say that there should not be any entertainment. There are so many subjects for entertainment without being vulgar. There was a Film Festival in which I saw some pictures from foreign countries—Japanese, Russian and others—and they had produced pictures—at least those which were sent here; I do not know what they are doing in their own country with subjects which were highly entertaining and highly instructive.

There was one point which was casually mentioned by one friend while talking in the lobby. He said that there was *sringar* everywhere. I do not know whether love is equivalent to *sringar* (सृंगार). There is *sringar* everywhere; where will you stop it? Certainly, *sringar* is everywhere, but it has its purpose. There is a difference between love and lust. One binds human beings; the other destroys them. Everything has two sides. For instance, money can be used for a good purpose as well as for a bad purpose. Food is life sustainer but if you take it in extra quantities, it gives you indigestion and probably disease. When people talk about *sringar*, they only like to see *sringar* of other women, not of their wives and of their daughters. If the same thing is done by their own children or by their wives, they would not like it. They would not like their own sons and sons-in-law going in that gay fashion; but they will enjoy somebody else doing that. I know that love is a binding force but nobody wants that to be exhibited in public and certainly not before children. Within limit everything is good. Everything has a purpose but there is a difference between the earth and the sea. You can walk on the earth; but if you just go on into the sea you will get

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]

drowned. You can admire the sea from a distance but you cannot walk into it. There is a difference between a gentlewoman and a street woman. Both are women. (*Time Bell rings.*) Both have similar purpose in life but in a different way. The difference between a gentlewoman and a street woman is the difference between a good picture and a bad picture. Well, Sir, I have many arguments. But you have already rung the bell. Please be a little lenient and give me a little more time. There are some arguments which I can anticipate from my friends who were talking in the lobby. But I think I will better reserve them for the reply, if they make those points.

My task is made very much light by the note circulated by the Government this morning. In spite of doing all the censoring we are still having the type of pictures about which the public is complaining. Probably today the Censor Board is very vigilant. I was in the first Censor Board; probably it was newly formed and the personnel were not suitable. So many things happened then. However, I may say that I have not brought this Resolution as a kill-joy in this House, but as a person who sees what is happening all around. As a woman, I am concerned certainly with children and their behaviour. Also I had a little experience of Censor Board for two years and I know how the films were passed by the Board. There are excellent directives which are circulated today; only they should be enforced properly. That is my point and the Government should have a definite policy in this matter.

The Minister for Information and Broadcasting has very often said in this House that he has not enough powers to enforce this kind of rules. Sir, the Government has power to put down crime when it is committed but it is very strange that they have no powers to stop those crimes being committed. But I am sure that

if he wants more powers, this House will give them to him willingly, provided he wants to exercise those powers. The individual members should pull their weight in this matter and see that no filthy pictures are allowed to be shown. Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that the moral standards in the country are deteriorating as a result of the exhibition of undesirable films and recommends to the Government that immediate steps be taken by legislation and administrative action to prohibit the exhibition of such films, whether foreign or Indian."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under rule 142, the time-limit is half an hour for the mover and the Minister concerned, and 15 minutes for the other Members.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): Mr. Chairman, while I do not fully subscribe to the views expressed by the hon. the mover of this Resolution, I do congratulate her on bringing up this matter, which is very interesting and important, for discussion before this House. The Resolution, as it stands, takes it for granted that this House is of the opinion that the moral standards of the country are deteriorating as a result of the exhibition of undesirable films. Sir, no evidence has been adduced and no facts and figures have been quoted by the hon. the mover of the Resolution to convince the House that as a result of the exhibition of pictures the moral standards of the country are really deteriorating; except for vague generalisations and certain stray cases that have been quoted, we have heard little or nothing so far as this particular point is concerned. It is not only in this country that this matter has been agitating the minds of the parents. Even in a country like the United States of America, parents are very much agitated about the effect of the pictures,

the television programmes and the radio programmes on the minds of children, and this matter has been the subject also of certain investigation there. I happened to read a very interesting article on this subject just last week. This very question has been posed not so far as the parents are concerned but so far as the children are concerned, and the question asked was: Do children become delinquent after seeing a movie full of violence, or watching a television show of the old wild west? It has been stated that many parents even in the U.S.A. have developed strong feelings and beliefs about the effects of movies and television programmes as well as radio serials and comic books on the minds of their children. But Dr. Marshall B. Clinard, Professor of Sociology, University of Wisconsin, says:

"It is conceivable that were all three media (motion pictures, radio, comics) to disappear from our culture, we would still probably have almost as much delinquency. Certainly, we had delinquency and crime before any of the three were considered of consequence."

Similarly, Nochen S. Winnet, Judge of the Municipal Court of Philadelphia, says:

"A generation or so ago parents worried about the dime novel and its baleful influence. Parents now worry about the so-called comics. They are frightened about the influence of gangster movies. They are fearful of the crime serials that thunder over the air. There is however no real evidence that a considerable part of our delinquency or crime is due to the movies, the radio or the comics."

And there are many such evidences quoted here to show that it has not yet been established that delinquency is due only to these causes. While I stress all these arguments which are particularly in respect of children who are very impressionable, I think

it would not be proper or correct for us to take it for granted and established that the moral standards of the country as a whole have deteriorated simply because of the exhibition of pictures.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Hyderabad): Undesirable pictures.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: There are no undesirable pictures which can be put on the screen, but while I say all this, I do not in the least suggest that there is no scope for improvement, or that the Government has discharged its responsibilities fully, but we need not create the general impression in the minds of the public through this House that the general standards of this country have deteriorated and that the pictures, as they are put on the screen are all of such a type that it has become necessary, so very necessary, to refer to this matter here, because it will have a very devastating effect. It not only reflects against the Government but against the industry as a whole. If this Resolution were to be accepted, I would consider it to be a very serious censure motion against the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. It is nothing short of it. It is a very serious matter and it cannot be construed as anything else but a serious censure motion against the Government. I do not think there is any justification for it.

The hon. Minister has circulated to us certain information today and from this information, though it was received only this morning, I find that the Censor Board has been more vigilant than it need possibly have been. It appears from the figures there that out of 1,028 films submitted to the Censors, only 380 were given clear 'Universal' certificates. From this it would be impossible to say that the Censor Board has not been vigilant. Rather the complaint is on the other side. The complaint is that the producers and the distributors are very much being harassed. As against this, the impression with us is that pictures from foreign countries

[Shri H. C. Mathur.] are far more baneful in their influence, but if you look at the figures, you will find that out of 1,167 foreign films that were submitted to the Censors, 795 were given clear 'Universal' certificates. I do not know if the Censor Board is very partial to the foreign films. Anyway, it gives this impression and also that the films produced in the country are subjected to greater scrutiny and examination. Sir, it has not been suggested what the Government can do in this matter.

From the papers circulated, I find that the Government has got all the powers it needs, though the hon. Minister has all the time been saying that he has not got the necessary powers. Clause 1 of the Appendix 'Central Board of Film Censors', says: "No picture shall be certified for public exhibition which will lower the moral standards of those who see it." This clause, when enforced, gives absolutely full powers to the Government to stop the exhibition of such pictures.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH (Madras): Even after their certification, the moral standard is low. That is why she has moved the Resolution.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I am dealing with the question of the powers of the Government to stop such films. The Government has been complaining that they have not got the powers. My point is that the power is there, and if this power is exercised fully and properly, there need be no Resolution like this, because the whole purpose of the Resolution is that the moral standards of the country should not go down. Sir, in this connection all that the Government can do is to cut out the objectionable part of the pictures. They cannot force the producers to produce a particular type of pictures. It is only in those countries where it is undertaken by the Government that it may be possible that the Government may produce pictures of the type which the hon. Members might approve. It is absolutely open to the producers to produce any pic-

ture which they think is a best entertainer as well as a good instructor. But you cannot force and the Government has no power and the Government will never have the power or the House can never give the Government the power to force the producer to produce a particular type of picture. It is only a Government undertaking that could do that. But in this connection I do wish to emphasise one point that these pictures, objectionable or not objectionable should not be open to boys under a particular age. If you are convinced that these pictures are likely to have a baneful influence, you must stop them but at the same time we must have pictures for children. We all know that Russia, Czechoslovakia, Poland and other totalitarian countries are having excellent children's pictures but we must not forget that these children's pictures are produced by the Government. There is a double purpose in producing these pictures. It is not only to give instruction and entertainment to children but there is a particular type of education which they want to give to the children and particular ideas which they want to put into the heads of the children and so it is undertaken by the Government. It is not at all an economic proposition. Even in America they have produced only very few films and even those that they have produced for children are such that they are very good entertainers even for adults. The only other country is the United Kingdom which has made an attempt in this direction through private enterprise but there are philanthropists who have devoted themselves exclusively for this purpose, who without desiring any profits for themselves, have been prepared to undergo any loss and it is only through those people in U.K. that they could produce really marvellous pictures for children. Here in India we can never expect any good children's picture to be produced by the private producer. I know that the Government of India has even set apart an award for it but that award will be of no avail. It is only deceiving ourselves and the

Government is deceiving itself if it expects that simply because of this award any producer will undertake producing a good children's picture because it is an absolutely uneconomic proposition and it cannot be done and the Government must take the responsibility upon itself. The Information Department in its Films Division should produce good children's pictures and those pictures should not only be preaching morals but they should be good entertainers and only if we could do that can we give something to the children which would be more attractive and where they will be more interested and along with the entertainments and interest they could get instructions even without being told that these are meant for education. Then and then alone we can have some good results and we can save our children and we can really impart good instruction to our children through such films. Otherwise, when you go to the picture, you are not going there simply for instruction and learning morals. The main purpose of seeing a picture is to have entertainment and certainly it should not be obscene or objectionable and to stop that the Government has already been given enough power and I say that the Government is exercising that power. The complaint is of a different nature and that is that our cinemas lack purpose. If you see 100 pictures, you will find that out of them 95 are just the same story of a boy and a girl and nothing beyond that. There is no real purpose or real drama except in certain films which are produced mostly in Bengal and there we find that authors of eminence are there and their works are being put on the screen. There are people for whom we have very great respect even in the film line, who are very seriously thinking about this matter and who are quite alive to their responsibilities. If such films are given encouragement by the Government, not through the Censor Board but by the Government, if such films are taken over by Government and sent and shown in the schools and colleges thereby assuring

them that even if they make pictures of this type, they will not be losers economically, it will greatly help. It is only in that way that the Government can help and encourage and I am sure the industry will play its part well.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, to begin with, I would like to say that there is absolute necessity for a Resolution of this type and I don't understand how it can be interpreted as a censure on the Government if it were to be passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You censure the Government, they will support the Government.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I was contradicting the point he had made. I am not here out to support the Government but only to make a statement of facts. That is what we have been doing on this side. Sir, I would not like to take the time, in the limited time at my disposal, in going over or giving the state of the present cinemas and how they are causing a deterioration in the ways of life and the morals of the children in particular. I would only refer to two films here. When the producers want to attract audiences in the name of religion and want to make a film look in the eyes of the members of the Censor Board like a religious film, they cannot help introducing features like making the wife of Tulsidas look like a modern girl in the film 'Tulsi Das' and also introducing songs with western music in the boating scenes in the same film. Similarly in the film 'Ramajanma' which deals with the coronation of Rama or the life of Rama, the girl Sita who was shown as the bride at the time of Swayamvara—you would not believe that girl to be anything other than a modern girl. So apart from the atrocities and ...

(Interruptions.)

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Carry on.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I have no time, otherwise I would have replied. Apart from the

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.] atrocities on our ideas of our ancient culture and the life of our holy men committed through these films, they have a moral for us with regard to this particular topic today. The producers feel that unless something which will appeal to the taste of the people, which they have been mostly responsible for spoiling, is put in the film, the film will not be attractive. Similarly I would like to point out here that they introduce any kind of dance with any kind of costume in these films which also is highly objectionable to our ideas of propriety. Mrs. Munshi has in great detail given how the western type of customs, as one of the producers of our Indian film said, appealed to our boys. So many college boys will tell their parents that it is useless going to Indian films. The producers say that because a particular type of scenes which make sex appeal to the boys, according to them, are not present there in the Indian films, Indian producers are trying to bring some other types of scenes which can be put in.

Incidentally I would like to make this point that in importing films, we have to exercise very strict control, because some of the films which are banned in other countries, somehow—one does not know how—get imported here and are shown here. There must be some leakage somewhere. If the maxim that a country gets the Government it deserves is true anywhere, it is particularly so in the case of this film industry. Our producers are so dishonest in this respect that very often they have been found introducing the cuts in the films which have been banned by the censors, and the Boards are not able to control because law and order being a State subject, all these matters would come under them and as a result, I feel in a way that perhaps because of possibilities of greater vigilance not being available and lack of co-ordination between the State Ministry in this respect and the Centre by which everybody concerned with law and order in the States could be

aware as to what exact portions of the film have been cut it is not possible for them to see what has been expected by the Centre to be carried out.

Sir, it was stated here that the present powers given to the Board by the existing law are adequate and that nothing more was necessary. I would only deal with that aspect of the case because it is with the second aspect of the Resolution that I feel we are now concerned. As representatives of the people if we give this sanction to the Government to proceed in this matter and ask for further powers when the Constitution is being revised, we can see that the concerned Ministry is able to make suitable suggestions wherever changes are necessary.

Sir, it was not right to say that the cinema has not been responsible for any deterioration in the moral standards of our people. I will later deal with the particular article in our Constitution dealing with freedom of expression. But everybody knows full well that visual education or impression is much more powerful than any impressions conveyed by the spoken or written word or any other kind of instruction. We also know that the illiterate and young minds which are brought into contact with such visual impressions are not capable of deleting from their mind the bad effects of films or other visual things put before them to the same extent as the literate and older people who can think for themselves, and so the result is that cinemas or other visual impressions which they get are causing a great deal of harm on these minds. Of course, in article 19, clause (1) of our Constitution we say that any citizen has the fundamental right of freedom of expression. But in view of the judgements that our High Courts and other law courts have been giving, thus fully establishing their independence of the legislature and the way in which they interpret this fundamental right, one sometimes wonders that it may not be necessary to examine the question whether some better defined powers

are not required by Government. I might here refer to the judgment of the Bombay High Court in the case of an individual's right to maintain brothels. It would be shocking to believe but that right was vindicated and it was held that the person had the right, Sir, in spite of the reference made in clause (2) which says that the freedom of expression is subject to Government's power to make further rules imposing reasonable restrictions on the exercise of the right conferred by the sub-clause in the interest of decency, public order and such other things, morality etc. I need not mention the whole of it, because I have taken up only two points—decency and morality. The stand taken is that just as anybody has the right to produce literature and has the freedom to express his thoughts, so also the cinema producers have every right to this freedom of expression. Therefore it is suggested that the cinema industry, as an arm of education may be classed under clause (g) of article 19(1) and treated as a trade or business and not as a medium of expression. Then under this latter clause, Government will have greater control over this subject, which could be exercised in the interest of the State, just as they have greater power to control trade or industry. Otherwise, I do not think it would be very desirable for Government to pass orders or take stricter view of things, when passing films. I do not think the Film Board has refused to certify many films and it will not be right to say that, as will be seen by taking the proportion of the films released and the total length of films produced. So the law has to be changed or extended, giving greater power to the Ministry or the Board. Freedom of expression or of thought of individuals through cinemas cannot be put on a par with freedom of expression through literature writings and other ways. Otherwise it would not be possible for the Film Board to function more effectively. I know from the discussions that take place at the meetings of the members of this Board, in the

advisory panels, how various points have to be examined and how they feel helpless on certain grounds and find that it would not be perhaps desirable for them to cut out or not pass a particular film and thus create difficulties for the Government, should the producers think of going to court.

There is another feature or attitude shown by the producers. It is difficult for me even to think how anybody who is interested in the future of our country, particularly people who are parents and grandfathers, whether they are producers or legislators or whether they are people who sit outside, how anybody can look on with complacency at the state of affairs and at the effect which these films have on our children and how they can take objection if strict action is taken in that connection. So many women's meetings and so many representative bodies have sent in representations to Government asking the authorities to do something in the matter of the exhibition of these films, these films which are causing harm to the younger generation and also to see that censorship at all stages, even in the States at the time of exhibition of the films is more strictly exercised.

Sir, the attitude of some of the film exhibitors in the South is also an example in this connection and one is not surprised when people think only of their own private gain that they should put every objection in the way of Government's efforts which would curtail their profits that they should proclaim a boycott over showing of the Government's documentary films. These people should realise how much money Government has spent on these documentaries and how useful they are for the education of our children and they should exhibit them in school and other institutions and also help Government in every way not only by exhibiting them during the other cinema shows, but even by giving free shows in schools etc. on off-day

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

But instead of cooperating in these ways, the producers only think of their own gain and try to see that Government's efforts in this direction do not become popular. Perhaps they are afraid that one day, if the documentary section of the Films Division should become successful, then Government may come forward with a plan for the nationalisation of the film industry. But I feel that if the producers do not cooperate in this matter and if they continue in their present harmful manner, conducting the industry to the detriment of the nation a time will come when the Government will have to consider seriously why this industry should not be nationalised.

Sir, I would like to give, in this connection, the example of the people who deal in liquor.

(Time bell rings.)

I am concluding, Sir. Even when these people know that wine is not good for the health of the people, they do not mind giving them all sorts of suggestions to stop prohibition and they also give some people special concessions for distilling liquor. But I feel, Sir, that if we are really going to build up a welfare State, a socialistic State, everyone of us, irrespective of the personal factor involved should in the interest of the country, and in the interest of the younger generation, do everything that is necessary, and particularly those things that are directly connected with the education of the children to conduct in such a way that the best results that Government want to achieve are achieved in the shortest possible time.

Sir, I would conclude with this sentence, that in view of the fact that the clause dealing with freedom of expression in our Fundamental Rights is not interpreted in the liberal manner it should be by our courts, it is necessary to give powers to Government and ask them to examine

the question of what extra powers they would require in the present situation to cope with this question of controlling the right of producers to produce any type of films in the name of art and freedom of expression and keeping an effective check.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Mr. Chairman, I am in full agreement with the principle behind the Resolution of Mrs. Lilavati Munshi and I find myself today in disagreement with some of the observations made by Mr. Mathur. Mr. Mathur has no doubt advanced some reasons but if we examine those reasons—time will not permit me to examine all of them but I shall touch upon a few of them—we will arrive at a different conclusion. Firstly, Mr. Mathur said that after a perusal of the note which has been supplied to us by the Government, it is found that only a few foreign films—lesser in number than Indian films—have been refused certificates. That is no argument for taking it for granted that certain types of foreign films have nothing objectionable in them. The Central Board of Film Censors has an idea that those films which depict the manner of living in other countries should be allowed here and on that assumption,—quite a wrong assumption,—some of the Hollywood films are exhibited here.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: I would clear one misunderstanding. It is not as if they are partial to the foreign films but my point was that only local films have been scrutinised fully.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I shall come to that. However, my point is that the way of life depicted in some of the Hollywood films is not what actually obtains in that country. That is my contention. My main criticism against Government is that it does not see things in its proper perspective. While supporting the Resolution of Mrs. Munshi, I want to go one step further than Mrs. Munshi and put my finger on the right spot.

What is that spot? I do not think that the only cause of moral deterioration among men or child delinquency is the exhibition of films. Social causes are there and that is the main reason. But, it is undeniable that the influence of certain type of films is having a very pernicious reaction on the children and on the morals of the men. It is also true that some of our Indian films, in the name of providing entertainment and in the name of box-office success, cater to that type of entertainment. Let us come to the main thing; the main thing is that Hollywood is producing mostly films which are objectionable and immoral. While I make this observation, I do not mean to say that all the Hollywood films are bad; there are some good films produced there but it is also undeniable that Hollywood today is not the Hollywood of ten or fifteen years ago. Hollywood and the rulers of America could not accommodate eminent artistes like Paul Muni, Charles Chaplin or Catherine Hepburn; they are driven out of America. What is the main reason? The main reason in my opinion is that the reactionary section of the country has developed a particular technique of propaganda and that propaganda is not only sex appeal in the name of entertainment; there is something behind it. What is it that is behind it? It is the exaltation of all that is base in men in order to debase the minds of men in other countries. Sir, many hon. Members may disagree with me but in this connection I would like to point out to my friends that we used formerly to see films even in our country produced in Imperialistic countries showing the people of Africa not only as barbaric but as so many cannibals and beasts who deserve only extermination. The theme of the supremacy of the white man was in this way enforced on us and the people before whom these films were being exhibited unconsciously and unintentionally had the impression that Africa was full of cannibals, demons and monsters who deserved extermination.

Behind all that was the cunning propaganda in favour of the white man and white supremacy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Talk about our films.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I am coming to that. Today also, if some of the hon. Members take care to see they will find that in some of the feature films produced in Hollywood there is an attempt at the exaltation of the superman not in the sense we understand the word in India. In India we understand the superman as one who elevates himself to the position of Gods above humanity, by means of his actions, while there we find the superman doing everything impossible. Behind that also is the cunning propaganda. That is why we should not blind ourselves to the fact that eminent artistes like Paul Muni and Charles Chaplin who, in some of their films, had risen to artistic heights, had portrayed the struggles of people fighting for liberation as we found in film depicting the case of Mexico where the people were fighting for democracy and for reform, had to go away from Hollywood. We should not blind ourselves to that fact.

Coming to our country, I must mention another fact; I am taking objection to the type of influence which Hollywood is exerting on our films on two grounds; one is the moral one; from the moral aspect I find that behind all this there is a cunning political aspect also. Then there is the business aspect; Hollywood films are exported to other foreign countries and by various methods they try to capture the film industry of such countries. It is true not only of India but of other countries such as Great Britain, France and Italy. There has been reaction against this fact in Great Britain, France and Italy. Some of the film producers and magnates there took the warning and have now come to the side of progress. They are producing certain films which are showing

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.]

all that is best in their respective countries. We have seen some of the Italian films; we have seen such type of French films and we have also seen that recently there has been a revival of Shakespearean films in England. That appeals to their patriotic sentiments and that also helps them fight against that type of pernicious influence. Here, when the big capitalists invest their money, their first object is to get as much profit as possible and with that in mind the film industry has been catering to that type of base instinct. This was latterly accentuated and aggravated by the influence of Hollywood films but I should say to the credit of our film industry and the film critics that not all sections of the film industry have succumbed to this. There are, even among our film producers, people who have not succumbed to that. There are artists among us who have not succumbed to that. Here is my hon. friend Mr. Prithviraj Kapoor sitting with us; I have seen some of his films and even though I do not agree completely with the theme of some of his films, still I shall say that he has not succumbed to that type of influence. There are many people like that who have not succumbed to that type of influence. There have been attempts from different sections of the film industry and film critics to resist both the financial and the moral—it would

be correct to call it immoral influence of the Hollywood films. They require help. At the same time those people who cater to the baser instincts in order to get money should be curbed a great deal. In this connection I like to say that Mr. Mathur has pointed out that when we go to see a film we go there for entertainment, not for morals, and some such opinion has been expressed also by the present President of the Film Federation of India, that we produce only for entertainment. But there I have to make a submission, Sir. It is true that I do not like that in the name of good things we shall be given sermons or people will be given sermons. Enter-

tainment is also necessary, but I wish to draw your attention Sir, and of the House to the fact that all our great artistes, past and present, had a social message in their artistic creations and the greatness of those great artistes consisted in the fact that the social message was conveyed not in the manner of sermons, but it came out automatically as a natural product from their own creations. And, Sir, even it can be mentioned—let us take the case of Kumarasambhavam by Kalidas—that if we take some isolated portions of it, it may be described by some as obscene or pornographic but if we take the whole thing, what do we find there, what is the message? It is triumph of love over flesh. We find a dignified approach and it gives us pride to recall those ancient traditions. So it is not necessary that in the name of entertainment simply lectures will be given or sermons will be given, but it is our duty, it is the duty of the representatives of the people, and it is the duty of the Government also to show the correct path.

Now, Sir, I shall come to some other points.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The last point.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: How many minutes more, Sir, have I got?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Two minutes.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: Only two minutes! Then I shall say, Sir, that it is true that from many sections of the film industry there have been many complaints against the Government. They should be gone into. Of course I do not say that all these complaints are correct. There are many complaints coming from those sections of the film industry against whom I am directing my attacks. But many complaints have also come from other sections which do not cater to that type of entertainment or that type of thing. Sir, as I have no time to dilate in detail on the policies of the Film Censor Board I have simply to say that they have not been consistent because on many occasions

there have been many complaints that it is not consistent; it has been on many occasions doing things rather mechanically. I shall give just one example that a particular type of word was objected to in a Bengali film but that same type of word was allowed in another film. That word itself is not very objectionable; it is 'churel'. It was allowed in a particular Hindi film but it was not allowed in a particular Bengali film. Then, secondly, Sir, I have no time to speak on the directive principles of the Film Censor Board which I have gone through. I have studied the whole thing very recently. Formerly there were many complaints against the directive principles of film censorship framed by the Film Censor Board. Only those relating to subversive activities or violence or incitement to disorder, etc. were to be taken more into consideration and in the name of these things films like '1942', films like 'Bhuli Nai'; which shows the struggle of the immortal revolutionary youth of Bengal, were also restricted for some time, but later on, of course they were shown after some sort of adjustment and some sort of conciliation. And so, Sir, the main thing is this. The Government, I do not think, will take it as a censure resolution, but we have the right to criticise the Government and we have the right also to draw the attention of the Government that really let us put the finger on the right spot and let us, if necessary, take recourse to some surgical operations to remove the gangrenous spots.

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर (नामनिर्देशित): माननीय सभापति महोदय,

AN HON. MEMBER: Speak in English.

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर : पहला दुःख यही है कि बोलते समय पहली आवाज आती है "स्पीक इन इंग्लिश"। हम जिन्दगी भर इतनी बातें कहते हैं, किन्तु अभी हमें दश में यह देखने की फुरसत नहीं मिली कि "स्पीक इन इंग्लिश" की बात पुरानी हो गई। वह इस दश से चली गई।

अब उसके पीछे जाने की जरूरत नहीं है, नहीं तो कल यह कहा जायगा कि अंग्रेजों को फिर ला करके बिठला दिया जाय। इस लिये कोशिश कीजिये और मैं भी कोशिश कर रहा हूँ हिन्दी सीखने की। यहां इतने धुरंधर विद्वान बैठे हैं। मैं इनकी किताबें पढ़ रहा हूँ और हिन्दी सीख रहा हूँ। मैं यहां कुछ सिखाने नहीं आया हूँ।

इस रंजोल्यूशन पर मेरा समय है १५ मिनट, जिस में से कुछ या तो ही निकल गया। गां मैं चाहूंगा, मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा, मैं कह नहीं सकता, न दावा है, न जबर है—कि मुझे अगर २ घंटे बोलने दिया जाय, चार घंटे बोलने दिया जाय, दस घंटे बोलने दिया जाय, बीस घंटे बोलने दिया जाय तब मैं आपके सामने सही चीज ला करके रखूँ कि सही फिल्म क्या है, वह लोग क्या बना रहे हैं, क्या वजह है कि वे दबे हुए हैं किस वजह से उनकी आवाज सही नहीं निकलती, किस वजह से उनसे गलतियां होती हैं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि उनसे गलतियां नहीं होती हैं, लेकिन इतना समय नहीं है कि मैं सब बातें बतला सकूँ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

जब मैं इस रंजोल्यूशन को पढ़ता हूँ तो तकलीफ होती है, कष्ट होता है, दुःख होता है। दुःख इस बात से नहीं हुआ कि उसमें फिल्म के बारे में कहा गया है; दुःख इस बात से नहीं हुआ कि फिल्म वालों के बारे में कहा गया; दुःख इस बात से नहीं है कि मेरा सम्बन्ध फिल्म से है; दुःख इस बात से नहीं है कि मेरा तमाम खानदान उसमें काम करता है। मैं उसमें काम करने वाले सभी को एक परिवार समझता हूँ, वैसे मैं तमाम दश को एक परिवार समझता हूँ, और मैं कभी कभी इससे भी आगे बढ़ जाता हूँ और सारे ब्रह्मांड को एक परिवार समझता हूँ। लेकिन दुःख इससे हुआ कि जिसको देखिये वही पत्ता हवा देने लगा। जिन पर भरोसा था कि हमारी अगुआई करेंगे, हमारा पथप्रदर्शन करेंगे, हमें आगे ले चलेंगे—मैं उन्हीं को आज देखता हूँ कि वे अंधेर में जा

[श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर]
 रहे हैं, पीछे जा रहे हैं, डर रहे हैं, सहमे हुए हैं, उनके मुँह में शब्द रुक जाते हैं। हम कहाँ जायें, किस के पास जायें? जो स्वयं धुरंधर विद्वान हैं, जो एक धुरंधर विद्वान की पत्नी हैं, सहचरी हैं, जिन से उम् भर प्रेरणा मिली है, वे ऐसी बातें कहें तो हमारे लिये कोई जगह नहीं है, कहाँ जायें, किस के पास जायें, किस का दरवाजा खटखटायें? यही बड़ी विचित्र सी बात नजर आ रही है कि जिन्होंने स्वयं अपनी जिन्दगी में बहुत से कार्य दृढ़ता से किये, वे ऐसी बातें कहें। क्या उस जमाने में लड़कियाँ बाहर आती थीं और बाहर आ करके काम करती थीं, जिस समय आप बाहर आई थीं। उस जमाने में लड़कियाँ पर्दे के पीछे छिपी हुई थीं, लेकिन आप हिम्मत करके बाहर निकलीं, भाषण दिये, बातें कहीं। उस जमाने से आज के जमाने के बीच के समय में आप बलवान, बहादुर, शेरनी की तरह पुरानी प्रभुओं से लड़ीं। उस पीछे के जमाने में जब हम अंधकार में थे, तब जो औरतें बाहर निकलीं उनकी आप अगुआ थीं। आपने बाल कटवाये, बहुत बड़ी बात आपने की। मैं इसकी हंसी नहीं उड़ाता। लेकिन हिन्दू धर्म की दृष्टि में कोई हिन्दू स्त्री बाल कटवाये, लांग कहते हैं कि विधवा हो गई। फिर भी आपने इतना बड़ा काम किया क्योंकि आप को दंड की सेवा करनी थी। आपने हर चीज के लिये जो कदम उठाया, उसमें किसी बात की परवाह नहीं की। लेकिन अब आप ऐसी बातें कह रही हैं। इस रंजोल्यूशन का पहला सेंटेंस ही ले लीजिये। दिल कांप जाता है कि क्या हो गया है।

"This House is of opinion that the moral standards in the country are deteriorating"

हो गई कि हमारा स्टैंडर्ड गिरता जा रहा है, हम अंधेरे में जा रहे हैं। मैं कहता हूँ कि आप हमारे साथ चलीये, हम आप को दंड के कानों कोने में दिखायें कि क्या हो रहा है। आपने सारा दंड देखा होगा, लेकिन एक और रूप में देखिये। मैं एक नट की हैसियत से

जाता हूँ। गांव के लोग भी मुझसे मिलते हैं, बड़े बड़े विद्वान भी मिलते हैं, शास्त्रकार भी मिलते हैं, मुझ जैसे जाहिल भी मिलते हैं। जिन स्ट्रीट्स के लिये कहा जाता है कि उनमें प्रास रहती हैं, मैं कहता हूँ कि उनमें दीवियाँ रहती हैं। मैं उनको नतमस्तक होकर प्रणाम करता हूँ जिन को स्ट्रीट गर्ल कहा गया। काश, आप उनको देखतीं तो ऐसी बातें नहीं कहतीं हद् हो गई, इतना अंधकार कि हम डिमारेलाइज हो गये। उनका मारल देखिये कि कितना ऊँचा है। अगर मैं एक एक किस्सा बयान करूँ तो मुझे दस घंटे का समय दीजिये तो मैं आप को बतलाऊँ कि क्या उनकी शान है। अगर आप कहते हैं कि दंड डिमारेलाइज हो गया तो बात खत्म हो जाती है।

कहते हैं कि हम डिमारेलाइज हो गये हैं और फिल्में डिमारेलाइज हो गई हैं। क्या बात है? इतनी आफतें आई, इतने तूफान आये फिर भी हमने कुछ न कुछ काम किया और हम कायम हैं। गालिब ने लिखा है, चूँकि वक्त थोड़ा है इसलिये मैं उसको भूल रहा हूँ और मैं उसको नहीं कहूँगा। लेकिन इतना कहता हूँ कि कितनी आफतें आई और कितने ही तूफान आये फिर भी हमने अपने को कायम रखा। इतने बड़े साम्राज्य को हटा दिया फिर भी कहा जाता है कि हम डिमारेलाइज हो रहे हैं। हम तो दुनिया भर को मारल सिखाने वाले हैं और फिर गजब यह कि हम अपने आप को ऐसा मान रहे हैं कि हम डिमारेलाइज हो रहे हैं। समझ में नहीं आता कि यह सवाल उठा क्यों। मुझे कुछ ऐसा महसूस हुआ कि क्या अब वक्त आ गया है कि इन सभाओं में जितने बड़ी उम्र के लोग हैं उनको हटा दिया जाय और लड़कों को ले आया जाय।

इसमें 'अनडिजायरीबल फिल्मस' शब्द रखा है। मतलब यह कि रंजोल्यूशन एक नेगीटिव चीज से शुरू होता है, कोई पाजीटिव चीज इसमें नहीं है। जिन लोगों ने पाजीटिव स्टेप लिया और जिन लोगों ने अपने हर कदम को आगे उठाया है उनके लिये कहा जा रहा है कि वे

निर्गोपित होते जा रहे हैं। न मालूम क्यों और किस चीज का भय समाया जा रहा है। भय क्यों है, समझ में नहीं आता, भय किस बात का है। अजन्ता और एलारा की कैंस के जो सुन्दर चित्रण हैं वे हमें डिमोरलाइज्ड नहीं करते हैं। पंजाबी में कहते हैं कि “रोती क्यों हो मैं नू घर आवो”। औरत रो रही थी कि उसका स्त्रीविन्द बुरा है तो एक दूसरा आया और उसने कहा कि रोती क्यों हो मुझे ब्याह लो। बंचार फिल्म इंडस्ट्रीज वाले तो पहले से ही सेंसर के तूफान और आफत से सहमे हुये हैं और सिकुड़ चुके हैं और जो सहमा हो, सिकुड़ा हुआ हो उसके दिल में प्रेम का ख्याल नहीं हो सकता। ये जो यहाँ कविगण बैठे हैं उनसे कहा जाय कि तुम डर कर कोई कविता करो तो वह नहीं कर सकेंगे। आखिर ये लोग भी कविता के कलाकार हैं। जो शायर हैं, जिसके अन्दर कल्पना है, इमैजिनेशन है उसके ऊपर अगर हम सेंसर लगा देंगे तो वह कुछ नहीं कर सकता है। इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि फिल्म इंडस्ट्री वाले पहले से ही डर चुके हैं। क्यों? किस बात से डर है? डर यह है कि बीमारी और है और इलाज और रहा है। हमारी गवर्नमेंट के सदस्यों ने देखा कि देश भर में बड़ी हलचल है और उन्होंने इलाज करना शुरू किया लेकिन इलाज कुछ का कुछ शुरू हो गया है। मैं मिस्र मुंशी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि क्या गत ३५ वर्ष में कोई एक फिल्म भी ऐसी बनी है जिसमें यह कहा गया हो कि हिन्दू और मुसलमान एक दूसरे से लड़ें। क्या वह कह सकती है कि एक भी फिल्म ऐसी बनी है जिसमें यह दिखाया हो कि प्रान्तीयता की लड़ाइयों को लड़ो। क्या एक भी फिल्म ऐसी बनी है जिसमें यह कहा गया हो कि हरहर महादेव कर के मुसलमान औरतों को रंग कर दो या अल्ला-हो-अकबर कहते हुये हिन्दू औरतों को रंग कर दो। लेकिन ये चीजें मुल्क में हुईं। तो क्या इसके जिम्मेदार फिल्म वाले हैं। नहीं। इसके जिम्मेदार वे लोग हैं जो कि अपनी बात को बढ़ाना चाहते हैं और इधर उधर भागते हैं। कभी एक बात कहते हैं और कभी दूसरी बात कहते हैं। कभी कहते हैं कि धर्म

खतरा में है, और उनके लिए कभी कोई चीज खतरा में है, कभी हिन्दू धर्म खतरा में आ जाता है और कभी सिख धर्म खतरा में आ जाता है। जरा फिल्म इंडस्ट्री के इतिहास को देखिये कि जब फारन गवर्नमेंट थी तो अगर किसी ने जरा सा भी नेशनल काम करने के लिये हाथ बढ़ाया कि उसका हाथ काट लिया गया। फिल्म प्रोड्यूसर्स के दिवालें निकल गये लेकिन फिर भी शान्ताराम ने “पड़ोसी” फिल्म बनाई। क्या आपको याद नहीं है कि उस जमाने में भी शान्ताराम ने इस फिल्म को बनाया। क्या कुछ नहीं हुआ। कभी भिंडी बाजार में तो कभी लाल बाजार में रोज झगड़ा होता था और लोग डर चुके थे, सहमे हुये थे। लेकिन फिल्म वालों ने भिंडी बाजार में जलूस निकाला था। २ अक्टूबर १९४७ को निकाला था और उसमें फिल्म एक्टर्स और एक्ट्रेसें निकली थीं, उस वक्त जब कि सब लोग खौफजदा थे। Call a dog a mad dog and shoot it. मालूम नहीं कि खामखाह क्यों फिल्म वालों को दोष दिया जा रहा है।

मैं तो यह उम्मीद रखता था कि आज ऐसा रंजाल्युशन आयेंगा कि इस देश के उत्थान के लिये इस महान यन्त्र की जरूरत है और इसलिये यह चाहिये कि हम उनका उत्साह बढ़ाये क्योंकि वे देश के उत्थान में अगुआ रहे हैं और देश के उत्थान में लगे हुये हैं।

श्रीमान्, अगर आप इजाजत दें तो मैं बोलता जाऊँ, आप मुझे कम से कम पांच मिनट पहले बता दें कि कब खत्म करना है।

अच्छा, अब मैं आपको बताता हूँ कि अभी हाल में दो फिल्में रिलीज हुई हैं जो कि एक ही स्टूडियो से आई हैं। उन दोनों के लिये पब्लिक का जो पैसा जाना था वह एक ही स्टूडियो को जाना था, एक ही घर में जाना था। एक ही इंडस्ट्री थी और उसने एक बहुत बड़ नावेलिस्ट के नावल को पूरा पूरा उतारा। उसका नाम है आनन्द मठ, महान् बंकिम चटर्जी ने जो पुस्तक लिखी है, क्योंकि उसको नावल

[श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर]

कहना ठीक नहीं है इसलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि जो पुस्तक उन्होंने लिखी उसी से आनन्द मठ बनाया गया। तो एक फिल्म आनन्द मठ है और दूसरी अनारकली है। दोनों एक ही स्टूडियो से निकली हैं लेकिन अनारकली में न तो अकबर अकबर है और न सलीम सलीम, हाँ कुछ सिसकियाँ जरूर हैं और कुछ गाने हैं, आनन्द मठ में सब कुछ है, यह पूरा का पूरा ला कर रखा गया है लेकिन यहाँ बैठे हुए आदीमियों से पूछ लिया जाय तो पता चल जायेगा कि कितनों ने आनन्द मठ को देखा है और कितनों ने अनारकली को। तो फिर जब कभी स्टूडियो वाले ऐसी चीज बनाते हैं तो उनकी आफत हो जाती है। तो हमको देखना होगा कि क्या कारण है। यह कोई बहुत आसान बात नहीं है कि यहाँ रंजोल्युशन मूव किया और जा कर अपने आराम से सो गये, एयर कंडीशंड रूम में अच्छे अच्छे फर्नीचर वाले रूम में जा कर सो गये। इस तरह से तो फिल्म वालों का सत्यानाश हो जाता है। जब उनकी फिल्म नहीं चलती तो उनकी मदद के लिये कोई नहीं आता। अभी हमारे पूज्य राष्ट्रपति के हाथ से हमारी गवर्नमेंट ने कुछ इनामात दिलाये हैं लेकिन जरा उसके साथ सिक्के भी दिये जायें तो वाकई वे कुछ कर सकते हैं। जिस शस्त्र ने फिल्म बनाई और जिसको इनाम मिला वे लोगों को तनखाह भी नहीं दे सके। आज आप देखें कि फिल्मों के ऊपर इतनी आफत बढ़ती जा रही है कि वे डरते हैं और जब डर होगा तो चोरी होगी, वह चोर होते जायेंगे।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two minutes more.

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर : सिर्फ दो मिनट। बड़ी मुश्किल है। मैं सिर्फ इसी लिये बम्बई से आया हूँ और फिर चला जाऊंगा। फिर भी दो ही मिनट हैं।

श्री आर० च० अग्निभाज : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि इस हाउस में श्री कपूर ही ऐसे व्यक्ति हैं जिन्हें सिनेमा संसार से

विशेष दिलचस्पी ही नहीं है बल्कि उसका विशेष अनुभव भी है। मैं इस हाउस से प्रार्थना करूंगा कि यदि उनको अपना अनुभव व्यक्त करने का मौका दिया जायें, तो अच्छा होगा। मैं प्रार्थना करूंगा कि यदि दिया जा सकता है तो उन्हें अपने विचार व्यक्त करने के लिये अधिक समय दिया जाय।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will not be a precedent. Yes, go on Mr. Kapoor.

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर : क्या हुक्म हुआ, श्रीमान्।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You may take five minutes more.

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर : धन्यवाद। तो मैं अर्ज कर रहा था कि इस रंजोल्युशन का पाजीटिव रूप होना चाहिये, नेगीटिव रूप नहीं। अगर इसी रंजोल्युशन को पाजीटिव रूप में कर दिया जाय तो इससे गवर्नमेंट को भी मदद मिलेगी और सिनेमा इंडस्ट्री को भी। आज बहुत से बड़े बड़े रूल्स बने हुये हैं तरह तरह के रूल्स हैं कि यह न हो वह न हो, मैं कहता हूँ कि अगर इन रूल्स को पढ़ कर पक्कर बनायें तो वह बन ही नहीं सकती हैं। मैं दावे से कह सकता हूँ कि ये ही रूल्स हमारे हाथों में पकड़ा दीजिये, और किसी भी फिल्म निर्माता के हाथ से या अपनी फिल्म डिर्वीजन की बनी हुई पक्कर मेरे सामने लाइये मैं सारी पक्कर को काट के फेंक दूंगा। मैं कहता हूँ कि फिल्म निर्माताओं के ऊपर जुल्म हो रहा है, हम लोग जिन्दगी का सच्चा चित्रण करना चाहते हैं। मगर यहाँ औरतें भी बैठी हैं, मर्द भी बैठते हैं। हम लोग सच्चाई को सुनने से घबरा रहे हैं, क्या होता जा रहा है समझ में नहीं आता। मैं कहता हूँ कि इस देश का मॉरल इतना कच्चा नहीं है जो हाथ लगाने से टूट जाय, यह हिमालय की तरह स्थिर है। यह वह घर है जिसने बड़े बड़े गुरुओं और ऋषियों को पैदा किया। जवाहरलाल जी और महात्मा गान्धी जी जैसी महान् आत्माओं को यह देश पैदा कर चुका है। मैं इस जमाने की बात

करता हूँ। इसकी धरती में वही चीज है जो पहले से चली आ रही है और हम लोग ख्वामखाह घबराये फिरते हैं कि अरं हम फलां तरफ देखते नहीं हैं। बाहर वाले कोई बात कहते हैं तो हम उसे मान लेते हैं; हमारा ध्यान ही बाहर की तरफ है। वे जैसा कहते हैं हम मान लेते हैं। सात बरस हो गये, हमारे कानों में तब से यह आवाज गूँज रही है कि हम अब आजाद हो गये हैं, हम स्वतन्त्र हैं। स्वतन्त्र देश में हमें चाहिये कि निगेटिव चीज से पोजिटिव बनाने को लोगों से कहें, तब वे अच्छी चीजें बनावेंगे। उनको प्रोत्साहन दीजिये, सहूलियतें दीजिये और कहिये कि अच्छा काम करने पर हम तुम्हारे टैक्स वर्गों का माफ कर देंगे। अनीडजायरब्ल पिक्चर्स को आपको डिफाइन करना पड़ेगा। यह नहीं कि किसी में शरीर के कोई अंग दिखाई दें गये तो कह दिया कि इससे लोगों के चरित्र पर असर पड़ेगा, आदमी बिगड़ जायेंगे।

श्री आर० पी० एन० सिनहा (बिहार): आदमी नहीं बिगड़ जाते हैं, इम्पेच्योर माइन्ड पर बुरा असर पड़ता है।

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर : मैं कहता हूँ कि क्यों नहीं यह सवाल बड़े बड़े साइकॉलॉजिस्टों के सामने रखा जाय। वे इस चीज को गलत साबित करेंगे, जिस तरह से कोई बच्चा अच्छी से अच्छी चीजों के सामने आता है वैसे ही बुरी से बुरी चीजों के सामने भी आ सकता है। हम अपने दिल में भय रखते हैं। इसीलिये मैं कहता हूँ कि हमें भय कम करना चाहिये। आप बनने दीजिये बुरी पिक्चर्स को, पब्लिक उठा कर उनको फेंक देंगी। शायद आपको पता नहीं कि प्रोड्यूसर्स का दिवाला निकल रहा है क्योंकि वे यह नहीं सोच पाते कि कौन सी पिक्चर अच्छी समझी जायगी और दिखाने योग्य समझी जायगी और फिर उसके पास इतने साधन भी नहीं हैं। पच्चीस वर्ष पृथ्वीराज को सिनेमा में काम करते हो गये, एक मुरब्बा फुट जमीन वह नहीं खरीद सका। दस वर्ष से थियेटर चला रहा हूँ, कभी कभी बड़े बड़ों से टक्कर हो जाती है। मेरा

लड़का राज है—मैं कोई पर्सनल बात के तौर पर नहीं कह रहा हूँ—उसने अगर मकान नहीं बनाया तो पहले एक स्टूडियो जरूर तैयार कर लिया। वह रशा और दूसरे मुल्कों को हो आया है और वहां के फिल्म व्यवसाय का उसने अध्ययन किया है। वहां के फिल्म व्यवसाय के साजों सामान को देख कर वह भी चाहता है कि तरह तरह की चीजें जिनकी अच्छी स्टूडियो को चलाने के लिये जरूरत पड़ती है उनके लिये आर्डर दें, लेकिन वे आर्डर पड़े हुये हैं क्योंकि उसके लिये पैसा नहीं है। बड़े बड़े स्टूडियो की जरूरत है, कहां से वे लाये जायें, कैसे कोई पोजिटिव स्टैप ले। हम लोगों की हर चीज पर रुकावटें खड़ी हैं। यह काम किसी एक आदमी के बश का नहीं है। बिना रुपये पैसे की मदद से फिल्म व्यवसाय चल नहीं सकता। मैं इसीलिये कहता हूँ कि निगेटिव रूप को सामने से हटा दिया जाय, उसे निकाल दिया जाय क्योंकि उस पर जिदगी का आधार नहीं होता, बहुत से लोगों ने आर्टिस्टों के बारे में जिक्र किया। आर्टिस्टों में भी अपने फर्ज को पूरा करने की कितनी हिम्मत होती है, इसकी कहीं कहीं मिसाल नहीं मिलती, मैं एक फिल्म आर्टिस्ट कज्जन को जानता हूँ, वे बड़ी मशहूर कलाकार थीं। पहले कलकत्ते में थीं, वहां से बम्बई आ गई थीं। जब वहां काम करती थीं तो एक मर्तबे बीमार पड़ गईं। डा० वालिगा जैस इमिनेंट सर्जन ने डिक्लेयर कर दिया कि "The lady should be kept in the steel Jacket for nine months." उनको टी० बी० हो गई थी और उनके बोन का एक नम्बर गायब हो गया। डाक्टर के कहने पर भी वह लड़की उठ कर स्टूडियो में काम करने जाती है। मैंने उससे कहा ऐसी हालत में काम कैसे आओगी तो मर जाओगी। उसने कहा चाहे मैं मर भी जाऊं फिर भी मैं अपने काम को अंजाम जरूर करूंगी जिससे कोई यह न कहे कि कज्जन मर गई और अपना काम खत्म कर के नहीं गई। बुखार की हालत में जब कि सीने में दर्द हो रहा है वह वारिश की एक सीन में शूटिंग के लिये जाती है। मुझे उसे देख कर दुख हुआ। मेरे लिये वह बुजुर्ग है, मैं उनकी हमेशा इज्जत

[श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर]

करता रहूंगा । हमको हर चीज को साइकोलॉजिकल नजरिये से देखना चाहिये । हम देखते हैं कि जब कभी कोई बड़ी हस्ती कहीं ठहरती है तो उसे देखने के लिये सैकड़ों आदमी इकट्ठा हो जाते हैं । उनकी बातों से, नसीहतों से हम लोग फायदा उठाते हैं । तो मैं स्टुडियो की बाबत आपको बता रहा था, कोई भी स्टुडियो फुली इन्क्विपमेंट नहीं हो सकता है क्योंकि उसके लिये बहुत ज्यादा पैसा चाहिये, इतना पैसा जितना कि एक आदमी कभी पूरा नहीं कर सकता । उसके लिये इकट्ठा हो कर काम करने की जरूरत है । मगर उसमें भी कुछ बुराइयां हैं । मगर जो लोग इंडीविजुएली काम कर रहे हैं उनको इमदाद दी जाय ।

फिल्में एक बड़ी भारी शक्ति हैं जिसको हम देश के उत्थान का एक जरिया बना सकते हैं । फिर एक चीज मैं कहता हूं कि इसके जरिये हम हिन्दी को, राष्ट्रभाषा को सब जगह फैला सकते हैं । आज हम जगह जगह हिन्दी में सिनेमा के पोस्टर और बोर्ड लगे हुये देखते हैं । मैं इस सिलसिले में आपको बताता हूं कि आर्टिस्ट लोग

श्रीमती लीलावती मुंशी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं पूछना चाहती हूं कि इस बिल में आर्टिस्ट की इज्जत करने का कोई सवाल नहीं आता है । आर्टिस्टों की मैं हमेशा इज्जत करती रही हूं । इसमें उनका सवाल कहां से आता है, मेरी समझ में नहीं आता ।

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर : पिछली दफा आपने खुद विलीप कुमार हेयर कट, और दूसरे कलाकारों का जिक्र किया था । आपने कहा था कि कुछ लड़कों ने ट्रैवल करती हुई किसी औरत को घेर लिया क्योंकि फिल्म वाले इस तरह से ट्रैवल करते हैं

श्रीमती लीलावती मुंशी : मेरा मतलब सिर्फ यही था कि फिल्मों को देख कर बच्चों के ऊपर क्या असर पड़ता है, वे कैसे चुराने लगते हैं । मैं आर्टिस्टों की हमेशा इज्जत करती हूं ।

(समय की घंटी)

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर : मैं अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि हमारा देश दूसरे देशों से भिन्न है, हमारे अंदर हमारी सभ्यता कूट कूट कर भरी है, सिर्फ उसे हमें अपने खून के अंदर देखना है, हमें अपने खून का इस देश की धरती से, मिट्टी से सम्बन्ध पैदा करना है । तब हमारे अन्दर यह साहस अपने आप आ जायगा कि हमें दुनिया की खराब से खराब फिल्में या किताबें बिगाड़ नहीं सकेंगी । मैं उस आत्मा के बारे में कहता हूं जिसके बारे में कृष्ण जी ने कहा—

“नैनं छिन्दन्ति शस्त्राणि नैनं दहति पावकः ।”

उसी तरह हमारे देश का मॉरल ऐसा मॉरल है जिसको कोई काट नहीं सकता, गिरा नहीं सकता, और न नष्ट कर सकता है । देखना यही है कि किस तरह से पॉजिटिव रूप की तरफ हम उसे आगे ले जायें ।

(समय की घंटी)

कितने मिनट मेरे अभी बाकी हैं ?

श्री उपाध्यक्ष : दस मिनट आपके खत्म हो चुके । वाइंड कीजिये ।

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर : अच्छा पांच मिनट और लूंगा, धन्यवाद ।

तो हमें चाहिये कि हम भय करना छोड़ दें । आजकल रोमांस के बारे में कहा जाता है कि इसका बच्चों पर असर पड़ता है । मैं कहता हूं कि रोमांस के नुकसानों के बारे में बर्नार्ड शां की पुस्तकों को पढ़िये, डी० एच० लॉरेंस की किताबें जो इंग्लैंड में बैन कर दी गई थी उसको पढ़िये । बर्नार्ड शां ने तो यह कहा है कि शादी से पहले पूरी जानकारी पाने के लिये इन्तहान पर इन्तहान पास करने चाहिये, तब जा कर लड़का या लड़की शादी के लायक समझे जायेंगे ।

हम हर चीज को छिपाने की कोशिश करते हैं । मुझे पंशावर की एक बात याद आती है ।

हमारी तरफ पठानों में यह आम रिवाज है कि चद्दर ले कर चलते हैं। पठान मर्द और औरतें चद्दर ले कर चलती हैं।

जब मैं स्कूल में पढ़ता था तो मैंने एक तांगे में चादर पड़ी हुई देखी, मैंने यह समझा कि इसमें कोई औरत जा रही होगी। मैंने अपनी साइकिल उस तांगे के पीछे छोड़ दी। गर्मी का जमाना था, हवा के झोंके चल रहे थे, रास्ते में उस तांगे की चादर हवा से ऊपर हो गई, अचम्भे से मैंने यह देखा कि उस तांगे के अन्दर एक पट्टान बैठा हुआ है और यह अपनी दाढ़ी को छिपाये हुए है। कहने का मतलब यह है कि अगर हम किसी चीज को छिपाये रखेंगे तो लोगों के दिल में स्वामस्वाह शक पैदा हो जायेगा और वह चीज सत्यानाश हो जायेगी।

जब मैं पिछले दफा जनेवा गया तो मुझे वहाँ पर बहुत करीब से नैकंड डांस देखने का मौका मिला। स्टैंज पर जो औरतें नाच रही थीं, जब उनका शरीर देखा तो दिल में श्रद्धा पैदा हुई कि कितना अच्छा शरीर है। क्या इतना अच्छा शरीर भी हो सकता है। नाचते वक्त उन औरतों में किसी प्रकार की कोई घबराहट नहीं थी। वे अपनी कला बहुत अच्छी तरह से दिखा रही थीं और जनता भी शाँक के साथ देख रही थी और उनकी कला की तारीफ कर रही थी। इसलिए अगर हम किसी चीज को, चाहे वह शरीर हो, कला हो, अगर हम उसको छिपाते हैं तो एक घुटन पैदा हो जाती है। इसी तरह से फिल्मों में जो नृत्य होता है, वह कला की दृष्टि से किया जाता है। अगर हम कला की दृष्टि से इस चीज को देखेंगे तो हमारे दिलों में किसी तरह के बुरे ख्याल कभी आ ही नहीं सकते हैं। जब हम किसी तस्वीर में पिता और लड़की को आपस में मिलते हुए देखते हैं तो उससे हमारे दिलों में प्यार की भावना आनी चाहिये, किसी बुरी भावना के बारे में हमें नहीं सोचना चाहिये। मैं आप से यह प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि हमें अपनी मोरल्टी को ऊँचा करना चाहिये, अगर हम इसको ऊँचा करेंगे तो हम हर चीज को उसी शक्ल में देखेंगे।

अगर हम अपनी मोरल्टी को नीचा गिराते हैं तो हम हर चीज को नीची नजर से देखेंगे। इसी तरह से आपको फिल्मों के बारे में नैगैटिव ख्याल से नहीं सोचना चाहिये, अगर हम ऐसा करेंगे तो इससे बुराई पैदा होगी और देश की मोरल्टी भी नीचे गिरगी। हमें इसके पॉजिटिव साइड को देखना चाहिये और उसी तरह से सोचना चाहिये। अगर हम ऐसा करेंगे तो हमारे देश की मोरल्टी भी बढ़गी।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken half an hour. You finish now.

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर : मैं चन्द मिनटों में खत्म किये देता हूँ। तो मैं यह कह रहा था कि हमें पॉजिटिव साइड की ओर भी देखना चाहिये। हमारे फिल्मों में जो सीन होते हैं, उनमें आपको इल्म भी मिलेगा, मजहब भी मिलेगा और बुजुर्गी भी मिलेगी। अगर हम उन्हें पॉजिटिव साइड से देखेंगे तो हम उन से ज्यादा से ज्यादा फायदा उठा सकते हैं। मगर हमारे देश में कुछ खुदगर्ज लोग हैं जो कि नैगैटिव साइड को लेकर अपनी तरफ खींच लेते हैं और जनता में उनके खिलाफ बातें फैलाते रहते हैं इस ओर हमें ध्यान देना चाहिये। इसलिए मेरी प्रार्थना यह है कि इस रंजोल्यूशन में यह बात रखी जानी चाहिये थी "दिस हाउस....."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken half an hour. You have not given any amendment.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR: I am not giving any amendment. मैं तो सिर्फ यही कह रहा था कि इस रंजोल्यूशन में यह रख दिया जाय कि.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can leave it to the other Members.

श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर : मेरे कहने का मतलब यह था कि जो फिल्म बनाते हैं, वे उसमें धन लगाते हैं, महीनों तक उसमें मशगूल रहते हैं, दिन रात काम करते रहते हैं, इस ख्याल से नहीं कि वे उससे पैसा ही कमायें बल्कि वे जनता को भी ऐसी चीज देते हैं जिससे वह कुछ

[श्री पृथ्वीराज कपूर]

कायदा उठा सकें। आप यह बात याद रखिये कि जो चीज सत्यं, शिवं हैं, वह सुन्दरम् भी हैं, उसमें सुन्दरम् मौजूद हैं। अगर किसी फिल्म में बाप बेटी का सीन दिखाया गया है तो आप अगर उसका थोड़ा सा हिस्सा देखेंगे तो उसकी सत्यता की बात का पता नहीं लगा सकेंगे अगर आप उस पिक्चर को पूरा देखेंगे तब ही आप उसकी सत्यता को देख सकेंगे। एक सीन को देखने से किसी चीज की सत्यता का पूरा पता नहीं चलता है। अगर आप पूरी पिक्चर देखेंगे और यदि वह अच्छी और खूबसूरत होगी तो उसका अच्छा असर होगा और वह "शिवं" होगी। कोई पिक्चर जो कला के लिहाज से अच्छी है अगर उसका कांट छांट दिया गया है तो वह जलील हो जाती है, खतरनाक हो जाती है।

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, although I do not quite approve the language of the Resolution, I am in general sympathy with its purpose, and the principle underlying it. The fact that some undesirable films are being shown, or that such films are shown from time to time, cannot be gainsaid. The note circulated by Government itself bears testimony to the fact that some films are objectionable. On page 7 of the note, in the section relating to general remarks, it has been pointed out that the Board of Film Censors is not empowered to take objection to certain cheap features of low taste in movies. The Film Enquiry Committee itself also has admitted that the present state of things requires to be looked into carefully and remedied as early as possible. It admits that general deterioration has set in, and has expressed the view that there is sufficient justification for intervention. This does not mean, Sir, that all the films are of an undesirable character, or that even a majority of them deserves to be condemned. But it means only that there are some films, not negligible in number, the exhibition of which is undesirable in the public interest. But we have to consider, Sir, how his subject should

be dealt with. Mere legislation will not serve our purpose. I firmly agree with my hon. friend, Shri Prithviraj, that this matter should not be dealt with in a negative way. It should be approached in a constructive spirit, and such measures should be recommended as would encourage the production of films of a better type.

Before I deal with this subject, I should first like to draw the attention of the House to the amount of work that the Regional Committees have to do. According to the Government note, the number of Indian films, including shorts and trailers, certified from the 15th of January 1951 to the 30th of November 1954, was 12,132, which means, every year about 3,000 films. I think there are three Regional Committees. We suppose that each committee has to do the same amount of work. It means that each committee had to see about 4,000 films. Now, of these films, Sir, the Indian feature films numbered 1,028, or about 250 every year. I think I have made a mistake with regard to the general figure. The number of films certified in about four years was 2,000 and, as there are three Regional Committees, each Committee would have to deal with about 750 films. Of them, the feature films amounted to 1,028. We have also to take into account the feature films imported from abroad. The note to which I have referred tells us that the number of imported feature films certified during the past four years is 1,167 and the number of rejected imported films was 90, but we do not know the number of shorts and trailers examined by the Regional Committees in the same period. If we add up all these, we find that the work to be done by the Regional Committees and the Regional Officers is very heavy, and I seriously doubt whether they can discharge their functions properly. The note shows what pains have been taken by the Regional Committees to excise undesirable features of films. Nevertheless, I venture to think that, in view of the volume of work to be done by the Regional Committees, too much of work has been thrown on them. Their work must be

lightened, and how is this to be done? A lady connected with children's films came here a short while ago. She made certain suggestions on this subject which I venture to place before the Government. One is that following the English precedent, educated people should be employed in order to read the scripts and also to help in the examination of the films. The utilisation of non-official agencies to the largest possible extent is undoubtedly desirable, but if we find that our purpose is not fully achieved by this method, I think there should be no objection to the utilisation of paid agencies. I think that educationists and social workers might be paid for their work. Thus, the work that the Regional Committees have to do will be better done, and if the scripts are carefully examined, it will become quite clear whether the story itself is desirable or not.

Another suggestion that I venture to place before the House is that something should be done to prevent pictures being shown which inculcate a wrong sense of values and a distorted view of life. This too was suggested by Miss Mary Field. I think the Board should be empowered to allow its Regional Committees to look at the films from this point of view. The entertainment value of the films is not sufficient justification for their exhibition. We have also to see what kind of ideas are generated in the minds of those who see these films. It is, therefore, a matter of great public importance that films which give a completely distorted view of life or a wrong sense of values should not be allowed to be exhibited. This does not mean that we should allow the adults only to see what we consider is proper for them. I have been told that a good many of these films that are certified as universal are not fit to be seen by little children and by adolescents. It is therefore necessary that the films should be censored a little more carefully than they are censored at present. I have during the last two or three years laid great stress on the necessity for the production of suit-

able films for young people. I am glad that the Government is not merely in sympathy with this idea but has publicly announced its intention to establish a Council for the production of such films. I think that steps should be taken to encourage the production of such films as early as possible and children should be familiarised with films which will enable them to have a proper appreciation of art. The films are a very important educational agency. It is therefore necessary that we should use them to the largest possible extent in order to develop the faculties and tastes of our children and adolescents. What I have said should not be regarded as an indiscriminate criticism of the film industry. To do justice to the film industry, it has done a great deal of work without any help from the Government, either technical or financial. In spite of this lack of help, the industry has developed its technique and has produced films which are worthy of being shown.

What is to be done to deal with the present state of things? I have already said that mere criticism or the imposition of restrictions will not do. The Film Enquiry Committee considered this subject at length and suggested certain methods for ensuring that the stories were good, that the artistes were properly trained, that adequate finance was available and that steps were taken to encourage the producers and exhibitors of good films. I shall not detail their recommendations because they are well-known to the Government, but it is, I think, necessary to point out that, if the question to which Mrs. Lilavati Munshi has drawn attention, is to be dealt with properly, the recommendations of the Film Enquiry Committee must be carried out as soon as possible. The subject was discussed about two years ago in this House but I am not aware that any measures have been taken by Government to give effect to any of those recommendations. Apart from this, I have a suggestion to make. I made this suggestion about two years ago publicly. I thought that the Government was in general sympathy with

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

It but so far no effect has been given to it. My suggestion is that the producer of the best films for children and adolescents should not merely be given awards but should also be allowed a refund of the entertainment tax collected on these films and this refund should be made to the producers. Then indeed the production and exhibition of children's films will be encouraged in an impressive way. I know that the desire of the Government now is to bear the entire cost of production of the first good film, 75 per cent. of the cost of production of the second good film and about 50 per cent. of the cost of production of the third good film. But will this be enough? I don't think so. We must have a continuing stimulus and the acceptance of the suggestion that I have made will provide that stimulus.

Sir, really if this subject is to be dealt with properly, attention should be paid to the recommendations made by the Film Enquiry Committee and certain suggestions that have been publicly made during the last two or three years for the encouragement of good films should be taken into account. If all this is done and the Finance Department does not insist unduly on economy, then I have no doubt that within a short period, say 5 to 10 years, we can appreciably raise the standard of the films that are being exhibited in our country at present.

प्रो० आर० डी० सिंह दिनकर (बिहार) : श्रीमान्, नारियां जाति के शील और संस्कृति की रक्षिका और पालिका होती हैं। इस दृष्टि से लीला जी का मैं बधाई देता हूं। यद्यपि माथुर साहब ने एक मीठा-सा विरोध किया और भाई पृथ्वीराज जी ने थोड़ी झड़प दी है, लेकिन, मेरा ख्याल है कि इन बातों से लीला जी निराश नहीं होंगी।

अब तक जो विचार विमर्श हुआ, उससे ऐसा लगता है कि लीला जी ने फिल्म व्यवसाय को सामाजिक व्यवसाय मान कर उसके निचले

धरातल पर विचार किया है। चूंकि यह सामाजिक व्यवसाय है इसलिए इसको नियंत्रित रहना चाहिये। लेकिन, पृथ्वीराज जी के लिए यह स्वाभाविक ही था कि वे फिल्म को कलात्मक कृति मानें, आर्ट क्रियेशन (art creation) मानें और उन सभी स्वाधीनताओं को चाहे जो स्वाधीनता कवियों, अभिनेताओं, लेखकों तथा पत्रकारों को दी जाती है। उन्होंने बात को खींच कर कला के स्तर पर स्थापित किया, क्योंकि, इससे अच्छी चादर वह फिल्म व्यवसाय पर नहीं डाल सकते थे। फिल्म व्यवसाय की बदसूरतियों को, कुरूपताओं को ढकन के लिए भाई पृथ्वीराज जी ने स्वधर्मानुकूल, जिसका कि उनको पूरा अधिकार है, कला की चादर उस पर डाली है।

मैं मन ही मन सोचने लगा कि भारत वर्ष में कला की क्या परिभाषा है, भारतवर्ष में कला के क्या अलामात हैं। और मुझे याद आया कि आचार्य मम्मट ने काव्य-प्रकाश में एक जगह लिखा है :

“काव्यं यशसैर्यकृते व्यवहारीवद् शिवेतरक्षतयं सद्भूयः परिनिर्वृत्तयं कान्तासिम्मततयाप-
दंशयुजे ।”

कविता यश के लिए है, one writes for fame,
कविता अर्थ के लिए है, one writes for wealth,
कविता अमंगल के नाश के लिए है, one writes towards evils,

कविता सद्भूयः आनन्द के लिये है, one writes to enjoy instantaneous pleasure himself and import the same pleasure to others और कविता इसलिए लिखी जाती है कि उससे कान्तासिम्मत उपर्दश मिलता है। कविता उस तरह का सिखावन और उपर्दश देती है जो उपर्दश नारी दे सकती है, पत्नी दे सकती है, सखी दे सकती है।

मेरा ख्याल है कि कला की जिस ऊंचाई पर यह परिभाषा है उस ऊंचाई पर पहुँचने वाले कलाकार के लिए न कानून है, न सेंसर है, न

गवर्नमेंट हैं। सिद्ध कलाकार किसी की भी नहीं सुनता। यह ठीक भी है, क्योंकि कला की सिद्ध कलाकार के आचरण में होती है, उसके हृदय में होती है और सिद्ध कलाकार जो कुछ बोलता है वह सत्य भी होता है। शिव भी और सुन्दर भी। और ऐसा कलाकार चूंकि जनता का प्रतिनिधि होता है इसलिए जनता उस पर प्रतिबन्ध लगाना नहीं चाहती।

भाई पृथ्वीराज जी ने बार बार "सत्यं शिवं सुन्दरम्" का उल्लेख किया है। इस उक्ति का सच्चा अर्थ क्या है, यह जानना कठिन है। बहुत दिनों से मैं सोचता आया हूँ कि कोई तो सत्य है लेकिन वह सुन्दर नहीं है, शिव भी नहीं है, और मृग मरीचिका और मरु में दिखाई पड़ने वाली मिररज बड़ी खूबसूरत चीज है लेकिन वह बड़ी गलत चीज है उसका अस्तित्व ही नहीं है। इसी तरह कुनाइन शिव होती है और सत्य भी, किन्तु सुन्दरता उसमें है ही नहीं। तो फिर "सत्यं शिवं सुन्दरम्" का समन्वय कैसे हो सकता है? समन्वय हो भी सकता है या नहीं? एक बात प्रत्यक्ष है कि इस समन्वय के साधन मशीन के पुर्जे नहीं हो सकते। समन्वय होता है उत्पादक, प्रोड्यूसर और आर्टिस्ट के हृदय में और वह बड़ी साधना के बाद होता है। Every artist cannot claim that licence. यह लाइसेंस हम किसको देते हैं? उसको जो सिद्ध कलाकार है जो सत्य को सुन्दर और सुन्दर को सत्य बना सकता है और दोनों को शिवत्व भी दे सकता है। कालिदास ने कुमारसम्भव में घोर शृंगार लिखा है, लेकिन कालिदास सर्वश्रेष्ठ कवि हैं। बिहारी लाल ने भी शृंगार लिखा, परन्तु बिहारी लाल पर हम तलवार नहीं चलाते क्योंकि सत्यम् शिवं सुन्दरम् का समन्वय उसके भीतर हो चुका था। जयदेव ने भी घोर शृंगार की अश्लील कवितायें लिखीं लेकिन उनकी कविता के भीतर भी शिवत्व है। इन लोगों के बारे में वही बात कहूंगा जो मैथ्यू आर्नल्ड ने शेक्सपियर के बारे में कही थी : Others abide our questions, Thou art free.

किन्तु बाकी कलाकारों पर हम प्रश्न करते हैं, उन पर नियन्त्रण रखते हैं। कलाकार तभी तक स्वाधीनता का अधिकारी है जब तक कि वह कला की साधना करता है, किसी दूसरी चीज की नहीं। जबी वह प्रोड्यूसर बन जाता है, उस पर वे सभी प्रतिबन्ध लागू होने लगते हैं जिनके अधीन दूसरे व्यवसायी काम करते हैं। जिसका उद्देश्य कला नहीं धन हो गया, उसे प्रतिबन्धों पर द्रोभ नहीं करना चाहिए। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि प्रोड्यूसर कलाकार कलाकार नहीं हैं। मैं सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि प्रोड्यूसर को वह आजादी नहीं दी जा सकती जो कलाकार को दी जाती है।

मैं इस दृश को अयोध्या जी बनाना नहीं चाहता। दृश स्वाधीन हुआ है इसलिए लोग खुशियां मनायेंगे, गावेंगे, नाचेंगे, कूदेंगे और कभी कुछ नंगे होकर भी नाचेंगे। क्योंकि नृत्य हृदय की उमंग को व्यक्त करता है।

श्री टी० पांडे : तां क्या दिल्ली बनाना चाहते हैं ?

प्रा० आर० डी० सिंह दिनकर : दिल्ली और अयोध्या के बीच में कहीं रखेंगे।

श्री टी० पांडे : प्रयाग में ?

प्रा० आर० डी० सिंह दिनकर : दृश अगर प्रयाग बन जाय मुझे कोई उज्र नहीं होगा। क्योंकि प्रयाग में दिल्ली की नकली हवा नहीं है। मेरा ख्याल है कि भारतवर्ष में जो फिल्में बनी उनमें से कला की कसौटी पर भी कुछ फिल्में जरूर खरी उतरी हैं और आज भी उतर रही हैं। ऐसा नहीं कहा जा सकता कि १९५५ में अच्छी फिल्में नहीं बनेंगी या १९५४ में अच्छी फिल्में नहीं बनी। जिस रुचि का डाइरेक्टर आता है, जिस रुचि का प्रोड्यूसर आता है उसी रुचि की फिल्में बनाई जाती हैं। डाइरेक्टर या प्रोड्यूसर अपने व्यक्तित्व को छिपा नहीं सकते जैसे संपादक पत्र में अपने व्यक्तित्व को छिपा नहीं सकता। यह हो नहीं सकता कि वे आदमी कुछ और हों और फिल्में कुछ और बनायें। कला तो कलाकार के शरीर का पसीना होती है और यदि कलाकार व्याज

[प्रो० आर० डी० सिंह दिनकर]
खाता है तो पसीने में उसकी बद्बू आयेगी और
यदि केशर खाता है तो फिर खुशबू आयेगी।

एक बात और है कि जनता क्यों सिनेमाओं
का नियन्त्रण चाहती है। देश में यह मांग क्यों
नहीं की जा रही है कि कवियों की वाणी को
बन्द करो, क्यों नहीं यह मांग की जा रही है
कि उपन्यासों पर नियन्त्रण करो? मैं इसे भी
बुरा कहता हूँ कि हम लोग अखबारों पर किसी
प्रकार का नियन्त्रण करने वाले हैं। मगर जनता
को सिनेमा से निराशा हुई है और वह उस पर
रोक लगाने के पक्ष में है।

जब से मैं फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड में गया हूँ सारा
देश में जिन लोगों से मैं मिला, वे झूठ बांध
कर मुझ से कहने आये कि सिनेमा के सम्बन्ध
में कुछ न कुछ जरूर करो। नहीं तो बड़ा भारी
उत्पात हो रहा है। मैं उन्हें बार बार समझाता
रहा हूँ कि यहां तो प्रजा सत्ता है, कानूनों का
राज है, हम कर क्या सकते हैं? कोई उपाय
नहीं स्फुटता। यह आशा व्यर्थ है कि सेंसर से
फिल्में अच्छी हो जायेंगी।

भाई पृथ्वीराज जी ने कलाकारों की बात कही
है। कलाकारों से कौन नाराज है? कौन
कहता है कि वे बुरे हैं? भारतीय सिनेमा के
जो कलाकार हैं, उन कलाकारों के प्रति हमारी
अनास्था नहीं है। कलाकारों के प्रति हमारी
अनास्था तब हांती है जब वे प्रोड्यूसर हो जाते
हैं क्योंकि तब उनके लिए रुपया सर्वाधिकार हो
जाता है। वैसे सिनेमा में हमारे जितने कलाकार
हैं और देश के जो बड़े बड़े कलाकार हैं, वे इस
भारतीय राष्ट्र के सांस्कृतिक पुष्प हैं, वे हमारी
कला-गंगा की तरंगों के समान हैं। मैं चाहूंगा
कि पृथ्वीराज जी इस सभा की प्रशंसा उन
कलाकारों तक पहुंच दें। पॉलियामेंट अपने
कलाकारों पर अभिमान करती है, अपने
कलाकारों को वह दुनिया के बड़े से बड़े
कलाकारों से कम नहीं समझती।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you
are likely to take more time, you may
continue in the afternoon.

श्री बी० के० धंगे : खाना खाने के बाद आप
शुरू करेंगे।

प्रो० आर० डी० सिंह दिनकर : धन्यवाद।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The
House stands adjourned till 2-30 P.M.

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

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

प्रो० आर० डी० सिंह दिनकर : श्रीमान्, मैं
यह बतला रहा था कि जनता लेखकों और
पत्रकारों पर नियन्त्रण नहीं चाहती है, क्योंकि
लेखक और पत्रकार की जीविका सुयश पर
अवलम्बित है, और जनता के बीच सुयश नहीं
रहने से उनकी जीविका में भी बाधा पड़ सकती
है। जनता को विश्वास है कि ये लोग हमारे
रक्षक और सैनिक हैं, इसलिए इन पर प्रतिबन्ध
नहीं लगना चाहिए। लेकिन, जनता का मत
है कि फिल्म के व्यवसायी किसी न किसी के
नियन्त्रण में रहें। कारण यह है कि लेखकों
में थोड़ा सा दायित्व ज्ञान है, थोड़ी सी जिम्मेदारी
है। लेकिन फिल्म वालों के ऊपर दायित्व का
हम कोई भी लक्षण नहीं देख पाते। ऐसी भी
फिल्में निकली हैं जिनकी मैं तारीफ करूंगा—
दो बीघा जमीन, भांसी की रानी, परिणीता और
श्यामची आई, ये फिल्में अच्छी हैं, लेकिन
ये फिल्में अपवाद हैं। बाकी फिल्में तो बहुत
ही गन्दी निकलती हैं। इन फिल्म व्यवसायियों
का तरीका हो गया है कि वे संकश अथवा काम
की सामग्री का अधिक से अधिक उपयोग
करके अपने को लाभान्वित करना चाहते हैं।
इकबाल ने कलाकार पर एक शेर लिखा है :

नजर इंसा से छिपाते हैं मुकामाते बुलन्द,
करते हैं रूह को खावीदा, बदन को वेदार।

आत्मा को सुला कर और मांस को जगा कर
फिल्म व्यवसायी अपना पैसा बनाते हैं—यह जग
जाहिर बात है—और यह धन जनता की जेब से
जाता है। मैं एक दो ऐसे लोगों के बारे में जानता

हूँ जो कवि थे और सिनेमा में काम करने गये थे, लेकिन प्रोड्यूसर ने कहा था या किसी दूसरे से कहलवा दिया ऐसी बातें नहीं; ऐसी बातें गाने में लिखनी होंगी। वे बँचारे वहाँ से चले आये। यही नहीं, प्रोड्यूसर लोगों का यह भाव हो गया है कि संकश का जो रूप पहले दिखाया जा चुका है वह पुराना हो गया है, उसमें जनता को रस नहीं मिलता। इसीलिए अब संकश को उस रूप में दिखलावेँ जिसमें नवीनता हो। कहते हैं, दो चार लड़कियाँ जो फिल्मि इन्डस्ट्री में थीं, वे स्टुडियो को छोड़ कर के भाग आईं। क्योंकि वहाँ के वातावरण में वे ठहर नहीं सकती थीं और अपने अंगों को कुरीतिपूर्वक दिखलाना नहीं चाहती थीं। नग्नता की प्रतियोगिता में ठहरना सचमुच ही कुछ लड़कियों के लिए कठिन होता होगा।

भाई पृथ्वीराज जी को मैं खाज रहा हूँ वे यहां इस वक्त नहीं हैं। उन्होंने सभा के सामने एक चुनौती रखी है कि इस प्रस्ताव के साथ यह भी बताना चाहिए था कि अन्डिजाइरीबल (अवांछनीय) फिल्में होती क्या हैं? जवाब मैं जानता हूँ। अवांछनीय चित्र उसे कहते हैं जिसमें पार्वती जी नाच करती हैं और शिवजी ताल दते हैं। अवांछनीय फिल्में वे हैं जिनमें सीता और सावित्री का चित्र दिखलाया जाता है, लेकिन सीता और सावित्री के अंग पर से खास कर वक्ष दृश से बार बार अंचल हटा दिया जाता है। अवांछनीय फिल्में वे हैं जिनमें १९४२ के क्रान्तिकारी फरार जंगलों में रहते हैं और वहाँ रीडियाँ नचाते हैं। और अवांछनीय फिल्में वे हैं जिनको देख कर सारे दृश के बच्चे “आवारा हूँ, आवारा हूँ,” के गाने गाते फिरते हैं।

SHRI R. P. N. SINHA (Bihar): May I add this for my hon. friend's information that I received a Diwali card this year from a friend in Bombay which contained a picture, not of Goddess Lakshmi, but of Nargis.

PROF. R. D SINHA DINKAR: Sir, this adds to my time another thirty seconds.

कला के आधार पर भाई पृथ्वीराज जी ने सिनेमा व्यवसाय के पक्ष में दलील देनी चाही है। कला के दो पक्ष होते हैं। उसके एक पक्ष की व्याख्या क्रोसे ने की है और दूसरे पक्ष की व्याख्या गांधी जी और टालस्टाय ने। यह सच है कि क्रोसे का कहना है कि कला की कृति में कहीं से दस्तन्दाजी नहीं होनी चाहिए। किसी ने क्रोसे से पूछा कि जनता का आचार बिगड़ता है उसका क्या होगा? उसने कहा, आचार की रक्षा करना पुलिस का काम है। मगर कठिनाई यह है कि आचार और शील की रक्षा करने वाली जो पुलिस है उसका नाम गांधी और दयानन्द होता है। जो लोग यह कहते हैं कि फिल्मों के लिए या कला की कृतियों के लिए पूरी छूट होनी चाहिए वे असल में यह कहना चाहते हैं कि समाज बिगड़ता हो तो उसे बिगाड़ने का कलाकारों को पूरा अधिकार है। इसके मानी यह हुए कि आप चाहते हैं कि गांधी जी और दयानन्द की कठिनाइयाँ बढ़ती जायें। किन्तु आपका यह अधिकार अक्षुण्ण रहे कि आप चाहें तो समाज को बिगाड़ते चलें। यह एक ऐसी बात है जिस पर दृश को विचार करना है। मैं समझता हूँ कि भारतवर्ष ऐसी मूढ़ा में नहीं है कि ऐसा काम करने की छूट वह कलाकारों को देगा।

सिनेमा के दुष्परिणाम बहुत हैं और उसकी तफसील में जाने का समय नहीं है। अगर सरकार कभी कुछ करना चाहेगी तो उस समय तफसील की जरूरत होगी।

मैं एक बात और सोचता हूँ। क्या कारण है कि बंगाल में फिल्में खराब नहीं बनती हैं? खराब बनती भी हैं तो दो चार फिल्में, ज्यादातर फिल्में अच्छी ही बनती हैं। मराठी में भी फिल्में खराब नहीं बनती हैं लेकिन हिन्दी राष्ट्र भाषा है और उसे बिगाड़ने का अधिकार सारा दृश रखता है। संभारने का काम चाहे वह कम ही करे। मुख्य कारण यह है कि दिल्ली से देवघर तक जो प्रान्त हैं उनके प्रतिनिधि सिनेमा व्यवसाय में नहीं हैं। इन प्रान्तों के प्रोड्यूसर सिनेमाओं में शायद नहीं हैं। असल में फिल्म का व्यवसाय उन लोगों के हाथ में

[प्रो० आर० डी० सिंहा दिनकर]
चला गया है जिन लोगों का सांस्कृतिक ज्ञान बहुत ही न्यून मात्रा में है और जिनको इस दृश की जनता के रक्षार्थ काम करने की इच्छा ही नहीं है। नतीजा यह हुआ है कि हिन्दी फिल्मों में आप देखियेगा कि दहात की लड़की दहात में है, घर के बाहर गोबर है मगर भीतर ड्राइंग रूम मौजूद है। ऐसा भी देखियेगा कि वह लड़की गरीब बाप की बेटी है मगर सोने चांदी से लदी हुई और कीमत्ता के कापड़ उसके शरीर पर हैं। इसीलिए ये चित्र नकली मालूम होते हैं, अवास्तविक मालूम होते हैं।

एक बात में और कह कर अपने छोट से वक्तव्य को समाप्त करता हूँ कि सिनेमा में सब से बुरी गत भारतीय संगीत की हुई है। अभी चीन का सांस्कृतिक मंडल आया हुआ है। थोड़े से गीत में उनसे सुने और मुझे निराशा हुई कि चीनी कलाकारों ने पश्चात्य ढंग का संगीत स्वीकार कर लिया है। हम लोग तो यह जानते थे कि चीन में जो शास्त्रीय संगीत विकसित हुआ था और मूलतः ताल में भी वह भारतीय संगीत के समान होगा। (समय की घंटी) सारं संसार में भारतवर्ष ही एक देश है जो संगीत और कला में यूरोपीय प्रभावों को रोकना चाह रहा है। जो मंत्रालय सिनेमा का काम कर रहा है, उसकी बड़ाई में इसीलिए करता हूँ कि इस घनघोर पतन और भ्रष्टाचार के युग में उसने शास्त्रीय संगीत की मर्यादा कायम करने की कोशिश की है और जब तक शास्त्रीय संगीत की मर्यादा कायम है तब तक मैं समझता हूँ कि भारतवर्ष के हाथ में एक ऐसी उपलब्धि है जो ठोस है, जो हजारों वर्षों में तैयार हुई है और जो दो एक दिन में तैयार नहीं हो सकती।

मुझे इसमें पूरा सन्देह है कि अगर सारा अधिकार हम डा० केसकर के हाथ में दे दें तो उस अधिकार को लेकर वे सिनेमा की बुराई कैसे दूर करेंगे। लेकिन, मैं इस दलील का खंडन नहीं करना चाहता कि सिनेमा को नियन्त्रण में रखने के लिए कुछ न कुछ काम

किया जाना चाहिए। कुछ कानून भी जरूरी हैं, कुछ प्रोड्यूसरों में सुरुचि जगाना भी जरूरी है और कुछ जनता में क्रोध जगाना भी जरूरी है। चाहे तो बुरी फिल्मों के प्रोड्यूसरों को शर्म आये या जनता को क्रोध कि वह परदे को फाड़ दे, प्रोजेक्टरों को तोड़ दे और ऑपरेटरों को पीटें। तब जाकर यह बात सुधर सकती है। सिनेमा के सुधार की समस्या काश्मीर की समस्या से अधिक कठिन है।

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Sir, I am in general sympathy with this Resolution, but my difficulty is how to interpret this Resolution. There are two points brought out in it. One of them relates to moral standards and the other to undesirable films. Both these things are highly controversial. What is good to one man is bad to another. Fish is good, flesh is bad.

But here moral standards are observed according to a double conception i.e. a double standard of morality. That is exactly what is happening in this country. You can have a conception based on the moral conceptions of the Government but then the Government's conception of morality is a double one. When that is so it is natural that the people also will have double standards. What is morality after all? What is good to my friend is bad to me, as I told you. I went to Europe recently and wanted to see some theatrical performances. I went to theatres in London and so many other places. I avoided the Movies. This art has been developed to a high technical perfection. If you go and sit in a theatre there you will see a dozen women coming and standing stark naked on the platform. That is considered to be perfectly moral. If you go to Paris, and get into a theatre, you will see these dozen women still kept on the platform but the difference is that they move about. The difference between the morality of the English people and the French is the difference between standing still and moving about; in one place the women stand as statues and in another place, they move about. Having seen the con-

ception of morality of the West, let us see what conception of morality is ours. Certainly there will be riot and civil commotion in our country if a man is to declare his intention of bringing twelve women and making them stand stark naked in a theatre. Therefore, I say, it is a highly controversial subject in this sense that morality is a double edged weapon. What is a desirable film to many may not be a desirable film to my friend sitting here. I will tell you the instance of a gentleman of Madras who wanted to produce an excellent film free from all the sins of the modern films. He produced it at a cost of Rs. 10 lakhs but, believe me, Sir, it did not run for more than three days in any theatre. The man became broke; he had to file an insolvency petition and go home, completely weeping for the morality he wanted to preach to the world by producing such a highly perfect film. At the same time, look at the double standard of the Government. I shall show how the Government behaves. In an Indian picture house—if you go and see—you will find that a hero and heroine are standing at a distance of one mile from each other and making love. They will not be allowed to come anywhere nearer or closer in order to do something which is amounting to making love. This is passed by a Board of Film Censors and it is the same Board which gives a certificate to an English picture where you will find the heroine falling on the hero, kissing him in such a tremendous way that we have to shut and shake our eyes. This is allowed in the same theatre, in the same show and in the same platform. What is the kind of morality then that is observed? In the same way in an Indian picture you will find a scene depicted where a man, a big hero, takes a sword and stands fighting against 150 soldiers, jumping from place to place and fighting all the people and trying to escape the law. The people applaud such scenes. Then again you will find the American cowboys—such undesirable features—

teaching how to shoot, how to kill, how to kidnap women and how to take them from place to place go yet scot free. Such undesirable films are exhibited in our Indian theatres on a large scale. What is the Film Censor Board doing with regard to these films? Is this not observing a double standard of morality? If you have such a pattern, how are you going to set a standard pattern throughout the country? Sir, the difficulty is that we are neither East nor West; we are hybrid or heifers, cross-breeds in our thoughts. We will not go by our civilised culture and civilised manners nor will we go the whole hog and adopt the absolutely free and independent way of life of the Westerners. Sir, Paris is the home of freedom and if two people sitting in a garden do not kiss each other, it is an offence. Here, if you go anywhere near a woman or even touch her, you will be sent to jail for six months because you have committed an act of immorality. Therefore, Sir, this is a matter which requires close scrutiny and it requires proper appreciation of the facts and the life of our people. Not only that but it also requires you to set things in the proper way consistent with your liberty, your freedom and your democratic concept of life.

Now, Mrs. Munshi referred to two points: one was that money is necessary and that it should be put to good use. It is also capable of being put to bad use. Money is used for good purposes as well as for bad purposes but what happens to a man who has no money? To which use would he be put? In the same way, she referred to the gentlewomen and the street women. It is only a comparative thing in the film industry. I have known personal instances where the street woman has become the gentlewoman and a gentlewoman has become a street woman because of the interplay of forces. The interplay of emotions and other ideals of life are such that you cannot make a distinction between the street woman and the

[Shri H. D. Rajah.]
gentlewoman, especially when one's social concept is as it is today. It is all a question of economics; you must go into the root cause of all trouble. The respectable high-class gentry who pays Rs. 2-8-0 per seat will be one hundredth of the total number of people who visit a cinema and the producer cannot simply pamper to the wishes of the high-class gentry, the so-called bourgeois but he has to look to the tastes of everybody. Recently, Sir, there was a religious picture produced by one of the producers in Madras; it was called AVVAYAR and it had such a tremendous appeal among the masses that they encouraged it and they went to see it hundred times all over again. We are deep-rooted in our religion and the peoples' concept is such that you have to act in such a way that the masses are pampered, they are given some chance to understand and appreciate, their aesthetic sense is satisfied and their culture is lifted. On the other hand, there was a tremendous riot that went on in Madurai recently; a certain group of people who do not believe in Ramayana, wanted to stage a drama; they had caricatured Ramayana as Keemayana and they wanted to stage this drama. A large section of the whole city rose in revolt and they wanted to have that Keemayana banned but our benevolent police lathi-charged the crowd mercilessly, put 50 of them into decrepit condition. Now, after that, they opened their eyes and the Government of Madras banned Keemayana being staged and the Inspector-General of Police of my State, Shri V. R. Rajaratnam has gone there to investigate on the spot. One of the men who was so thoroughly mauled by the police is the son of a distinguished Congressman of Madurai. No doubt morality must be decent; no doubt our public morals must be excellent but where do you come into the picture? You have a Constitutional guarantee guaranteeing my liberty, my equality and my right to do as I like so long as it does not offend public

morals. Recently there was a decision of the Supreme Court when one of the cinema producers of Madras took up the matter that these Information Films should not be exhibited because they offended the fundamental rights guaranteed by the Constitution. There was such a provision because you are a square peg in a round hole. You have produced a Constitution and yet you have adopted all the wretched, stupid, one-sided acts of the British Imperialists who were running this country for many years, when this Constitution was not there. Either you swear by the Constitution and give up these laws or become the followers of the British Imperialists and take up their Western culture, their civilisation and their way of life. You cannot do things in such a way that I am half here and half there. Therefore, what is the policy of the Government on these fundamental issues? I join issue with the Government and demand for a proper enunciation of policy.

Anyhow I am happy, Sir, that Mrs. Munshi, one of the members of the ruling party, has brought this Resolution. It at once opens the eyes of my comrade, Dr. B. V. Keskar, who is in charge of Information and Broadcasting. Now he says he thought it fit to issue that circular to the Members of this House this morning so that we can digest the whole lot and come here and finish our observations in 15 minutes. And what is it that he says? Our Film Board is excellent. There were a thousand pictures which were sent to them. They certified only 350. What does it matter? If even the 350 are so bad according to Mrs. Lilavati Munshi, what would have been the fate of our morality if the thousand films were shown in this country, you can imagine. You can scrap your Film Board. Now you have done one thing. What have you done? You have banned film music, this light music. You know the result? All the radio owners in India switch on very religiously between 6-30 and 7-30 P.M. to Radio

Ceylon and if they are not satisfied with that kind of music that they get for that half an hour or fifteen minutes, they switch on to Pakistan Radio. There is the grand alliance between Pakistan and Ceylon in order to attract the people in India, coupled with their stupid nefarious propaganda, for making the people hear that sweet light music. Why do you thrust upon me such heavy music the A, B, C of which I cannot understand? I want to relax in my chair after the hard labour of the day and hear some light music in the evening and you have banned it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are now concerned with films.

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: Yes, film means music, all together. A film cannot run without music in it. Therefore in the matter of even manufacturing the film, most of the films in our country are flops if they are not having film music. I think our Deputy Chairman has not had occasion to see such a film now-a-days and it may be because he is so busy, in office that he finds it difficult to go to a theatre. There is what is called musical comedy or comedial music or whatever you call, I have no objection. The point is this. Now when a film is taken the film is taken in such a way that it must have some songs. Without songs no film is attractive in our country, and when the songs are created, naturally they are of a light order. It cannot be a heavy technical Maharashtra type of music or South Indian Carnatic music. This Resolution Sir, (*time bell rings*) should have been all right if it had also shown some positive suggestions.

It should have shown the positive side of it. Now the negative aspect is again highly controversial. If you say something is good it must be qualified. If you say something is bad, again, it must be qualified. In the absence of both of them I am certain the Government will find it difficult to accept this Resolution. As such I do not think it is worth-while for this House to adopt this Resolution.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, before proceeding with my speech may I ask if I shall get more time?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: 15 minutes maximum. If you could cut it down I will be very thankful.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: Then, Sir, I shall keep to my own remarks. This Resolution of Mrs. Munshi is worthy of attention though it may be very difficult to accept it for the simple reason, as the other speakers have said, that it is vague. It is not only vague but it is not comprehensive enough. Nevertheless it does focus attention on a problem with which most of us are concerned to-day. Film music and the pictures that we see are coming up again and again as a matter of debate in the family with your children, in the legislature, in the other spheres of social work it is becoming a debating point and surely we need to do something more than what is done to-day. The screen to a large extent has become a celluloid dope. It is a celluloid dope. Even where the pictures are supposed to have morals, the whole technique of crime and sex is so fully shown and only in the closing scenes the moral comes in. Since various speakers have mentioned so many films by name I could mention a film that was recently shown in Delhi "Bahut Din Huay". It was so difficult to recover from that film. The first half of that picture was so excellent that we all thought that the children should be sent, but the second half of the picture was so horrifying that at the end of it when we went home we said that after we recovered from this film we shall decide whether it is good or bad. I do not know why Indian producers and Indian directors should make such a mix, up of themes, such a hotchpotch. If the film could bring more realism on the screen it would be good for society and here I want to suggest that the revival of the stage alone will help us to get what we want on the screen. It is only revival of the drama that will help to clean

[Shrimati Violet Alva.]

the screen. I may be wrong but I feel that it is a necessary weapon that we revive the stage. If we revive the stage the screen will be cleaned up and to that effect we should see that the cinemas give one night every month to enable recognised drama societies to give their shows. With proper emphasis on the development of drama we could enable the producers and the directors to keep on the right line. The other point that I want to emphasise is that we must not forget that the producers and the directors and the film industrialists run away with their attention focussed on the box office. They do so because the screen remains the major entertainment. To-day in this country we find that the screen is the only major entertainment for people of all age groups. If we could divert the attention of the people and if the State could help us to develop other kinds of entertainments, the emphasis could be diverted and the film would lose its value to a great extent and therefore it could automatically be cleaned up.

Then, Sir, I also want to lay stress on the screen periodicals that are flourishing in this country; how far these periodicals help to keep a clean screen or help to give us, what other speakers have said, something that brings down the moral standards. Mr. Rajah has talked of the moral standards of the West. We talk to-day of the moral standards that are deteriorating in this country and I congratulate Mrs. Munshi for having brought this Resolution. They are certainly deteriorating. Who can deny that moral standards are going down? But the screen is not the only cause of it. The screen is the major contributory factor, but there are several other factors that are bringing down the moral standards in the country. There are the screen periodicals. There is the comic strip. Sir, you may say I am beside the point. There is crime literature; there is pornographic literature; there are advertisements which are certainly not worth appearing in our papers, and

here, if I may say so, more than one Ministry would be involved, if they want to do their task well. When I talk of literature and the screen, we come against, what shall I say, against a rock. It involves the Information and Broadcasting Ministry; it involves the Railway Ministry because of the rubbish that we see on the railway book stalls. It involves the Home Ministry; it involves the External Affairs Ministry; it involves many other Ministries. It needs a concerted effort if we want to raise the moral standards of our people. Now who is to raise the moral standards of the people? This is a democracy; freedom of expression is a fundamental right. As an actor legislator has said: "Give complete freedom of expression to artistes and they will give you works of sublime art." I do not agree with him at all, not to-day when the film industry keeps its eye on the profit. I do admit that we have great directors, great producers and great actors. One cannot sully one's conscience for anything that would not be called sublime and which would not contribute to the raising of the moral standard of society. But it does concern men and women to-day. All types of films we see—and I talk here with a sense of responsibility. We have not yet succeeded in laying down uniform standards for the foreign pictures and for the 3 P.M. Indian pictures. Sometimes certain dual standards are

adopted. The time has come when the Government must decide that if there is no constitutional provision, an amendment be made by which we could enforce a uniformity in the standard of censorship. Today, I am happy to note that more pictures are rejected, especially foreign, that were not rejected until a little while ago. We are going ahead, but not going ahead fast enough. The directive contained in the note distributed today will give every member exactly an idea as to how much the Censor Board can do and cannot do. If we are to nationalise the industry, you will say, well, this is a democracy.

Freedom of expression is the fundamental right and you have no right to interfere. But I want to bring before the House some inconsistencies that prevail in the cinemas today. There was a picture shown in Bombay recently called, 'The Conquest of Everest'. But along with this picture—that was in nature educational and universal in certification—was shown a trailer and I think it was the trailer of "The Pickpocket" or "The Prisoner of Zenda"; I am not sure. But these inconsistencies of Government must be rectified. You take children to see this picture "The Conquest of Everest", something very instructive, something very entertaining to youngsters with a spirit of adventure and all that, and along with that picture you show a trailer of "Pickpocket" full of crime and kissing. Now, how does this help you to raise the moral standard in the country?

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: How did the Censor Board allow it?

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: If I refer this point to the hon. Minister, he will say, 'you better refer this point to the Home Department of the Bombay Government'. That is why I say that there has to be a single-minded effort on the part of all concerned to clean up the screen. Very often children are sent where the certificate is universal and there they are shown something of a picture that would get a certificate of Class A, that is, For Adults Only. This is a great handicap today.

Another point I would like to emphasise is about the posters. Very often you will see posters of just those scenes that are excised. In "House of Wax" in Bombay in the Eros Theatre, there was a huge poster of women with naked legs. That scene had been excised in the main picture but that poster was allowed to be shown all over, including the Press advertisements. These are the discrepancies that have to be put right and I do submit that the hon. Minister

will take note of these. And the sooner we act on these little details, the better we shall be able to go ahead rather than come down with a heavy hand on undesirable pictures, because we do not yet know what is desirable and what is undesirable. If an "A" trailer is desirable for the children along with a "universal" picture, then I do not know whether there is co-ordination at all.

Then, Sir, I also want to emphasise once again that we have in our country directors and actors like Mr. Prithviraj Kapoor. We have producers; we have stars who have kept a noble standard and will not allow that standard to go down even for the temptation of money. We are grateful to these people and these people give us an indication that the emphasis should be laid on the studio, on the producer and on the Director. By the name of the studio, by the name of the producer and by the name of the director a film should be known. There is so much emphasis laid on actors and actresses. If a studio could be known by its directors, then certainly the emphasis would go away from the stars. Not that I do not want the stars to be lionised. It is a good thing. Mrs. Munshi mentioned the case of another lady being mistaken for a star in a railway compartment. There is no harm in our stars being lionised. No one lionises Mr. Kapoor here but see him travel or see him on the stage and you will realise that he is and there is no harm in it. But even our stars could be trained up in a manner that they will give their talents to a studio of worthy reputation. Likewise, if we could build up that character in our actors and actresses, we shall be helping to clean up the screen.

Then, Sir, I come to the foreign films. Foreign films flow in so freely. The main place from which they are imported is Hollywood. No one can deny that. The number of rejections of these films is increasing. There is

[Shrimati Violet Alva.]

no secret about it. Nevertheless, we can still restrict these films coming in through another Ministry, the Commerce and Industry Ministry. (*Time bell rings*). After they are imported, they are shown to the censors and then they are rejected and all that long-winded process has to be gone through and a lot of energy and expenditure is incurred. If our cinema owners in this country could realise that the synopsis should be sent first before the film comes in, it would certainly help a great deal by way of time and energy as well as of cost.

The other thing that I want to say is that the Government must see that in future no foreign film producers are allowed to build theatres in this country. They own their own theatres in this country and they show what they like. They bring in so many films. I do not know why it should not have struck the other speakers as to why we should give so much Dollar exchange for Hollywood films. Why can't we cut it down? I emphatically say that we should not give so much Dollar exchange. Not that Hollywood does not produce good pictures. Then, it is not the screen alone; I am coming to horror comics also. And here I want to say that Mr. Winston Churchill has himself felt impelled to get some samples of these comics to see for himself the kind of horror stuff which thousands of British children are being fed upon. These comics go along with the screen. When we talk of the screen, we must talk of all kinds of entertainment including these comics that are on the bookstalls. I wanted to develop two or three more points, but I have no time.

We should augment more the disciplinary power of the schools. Parental authority is getting loose. Merely Mrs. Munshi coming here to say that undesirable films should be checked or should be rejected is not enough. The question is too vast. I compliment her for bringing this Resolution to focus attention but certainly this Reso-

lution does not go far enough to be accepted.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRMAN: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is with a certain amount of reservation that I rise to support the Resolution that is before the House. It is very well, it is very wonderful to place such a Resolution before the House for its approval but I would like to know whether the Government has not already done its duty by discharging its function as envisaged by the Resolution. Sir, it is very easy now to take the cudgel and beat the Government for its failure and for its omissions, but I would like to place most of the responsibility on the existing Censor Boards and I feel that the Censor Boards have not done their duty properly. There is no use blaming the Government. The Government has given a code of conduct to find out where the films exceed the limits of decency and just like a school-book syllabus they have given a big note on what is decent and what is indecent and what is to be prohibited. In spite of all these, Sir, we find in this country a lot of pictures being screened not only for adults but also for children, but still no mention of the Censor Boards has been made here at all. My own feeling is that the Censor Boards have not done their duties properly. If they had cared to go through the picture completely, if they had gone to the pre-review show and had seen it carefully, if they had gone through the script and if they had discharged their duties properly, much of the criticism that had been levelled against the Government would not have been heard today.

Sir, I would like to say one thing. The Resolution is very pious in its nature. But one factor that we can never forget is that after all people do not go to entertainment just like a cinema, they do not go to a cinema with the same feelings as when they are going to a "Bhajana" or "Katha Kalakshepam". When they go to a

"Bhajana or "Katha Kalakshepani", they go there for spiritual food, but when they go to a cinema, they go for entertainment, just to forget the day-to-day worry and we should not make it completely religious or we should not make it completely drab. I say this not because that I want to encourage obscene and undesirable films to be shown in this country. I am one with the mover of the Resolution that all sorts of undesirable films should be banned in this country and should not be allowed to be screened anywhere in this country. But what is undesirable and what is desirable? The difference that is made is very little. What appears to be indecent to one person may not be indecent to another. There is also very great difficulty in determining their food of thought that is required by the population of cinema goers. It is very easy for all of us in this House to say that the cinema should keep up a certain standard, it should be of a very high level morally, it should be very very ideal. But one thing we essentially forget is this. Those people who produce films have to invest lakhs and lakhs of rupees and what about their future? Suppose they spend lakhs of rupees and produce a picture of our ideal character which can be classed as an ideal one will the box office return be sufficient will the people patronise it sufficiently so that the producer and the industry may thrive? So we must also see to it that the people's requirements must be met by the picture. It is not merely the religious picture or the pictures of the ideal that are necessary, of barring undesirable pictures. The pictures must be of entertainment value. That is why I say that in this secular State we should not become almost an ascetic and say that none of the pictures should contain anything of love or of lighter vein. It should not be prohibitive. In this respect, I would like to point out one thing, that is, the Censor Board has been very very partial towards foreign films. They have got a very great standard or code of ethics for Indian films. For example I am told that in Indian

films especially if the man and woman are shown within one foot distance then they are allowed to be screened. If they are shown nearer it is not allowed and kissing is not prohibited on the screen. But, on the other hand if you see the films of the Western type imported from foreign countries you see nothing but obscenity. For example, I can quote for the information of hon. Members "The Loves of Carmen" and "Hotel Sahara" are the most obscene pictures that a man can ever see. They clearly show to you that vice pays and they have also proved that prostitution is a very very jolly thing. These pictures are full of this immoral act and also the low character and code of jokes are shown throughout the country. I want to ask the Censor Board what they have been doing? They are very strict about indiscriminate use of the scissors on Indian films. Why have they allowed all this nonsense? Sexual films of English origin or of Hollywood origin or French origin to be shown in this country? My humble submission is that the Censor Board has been very, very partial towards the foreign film. As a result what happens? Indian films lack that box office character and as a result people do not go to Indian films. But rather they go to see foreign films and swell the box office collections. There indirectly the Censor Board is helping the foreign films and foreign firms to reap a rich harvest.

Another feature that was referred to by hon. Members was that horror films should be forbidden and they should not be shown in this country. I would like to ask some of the hon. Members who spoke here and also I would like to ask the Censor Board a simple question whether they have seen a three dimensional film called "The House of Wax". It is a horror right from beginning to end—and also mummies are being made of human dead bodies by putting them in a vat of melting wax. It is all arson, loot and murder right from the beginning. Why should the Censor Board allow it

[Shri T S Pattabirman]

to be screened in this country? It is all very pious to say: "We want the Government to do this, we want the Government to do that." I want to ask one question of the hon Members of the Censor Board whether they have carried out the instructions of the Government. Whether they have done their duty to the satisfaction of all concerned. My submission is that they have not done it.

Another point that I would like to mention is about the films that depict one community or one caste as ridiculous or bring it into contempt. This is very prominent especially in South India. It is almost natural for every film to ridicule a particular community or to preach violence or to insult one section of the people, and also carry on atheistic propaganda. In spite of the extraordinary directions contained in the code of conduct that has been prescribed by the Government, I would like to know how all these films have been shown in the South. Especially, Sir, I would like to point out one thing. There is a danger of disrupting the unity of this Nation. Some South Indian pictures preach not only class hatred but also communal hatred also, north versus south hatred. All these films are having a jolly good time and are running throughout the country. I would point out that the Censor Board has completely failed in the discharge of its duty and they deserve condemnation, and not the Government.

Another thing that I would like to point out is that some of the films are allowed to be shown for some time and one fine morning the Censor Board wakes up and bans it. What is the fun of banning a picture that has run for sixteen weeks or twenty weeks? For example the film called "Chacha Choudhury" ran for several weeks. Suddenly they woke up and banned the picture saying that it was obscene.

There are thousands and thousands more of obscene pictures running in the country and I do not know why such fine pictures like "Shinshinak, Buba Boo" should be banned. I have seen the picture myself. It was a creation of art. The photography was good. Except that it was in a lighter vein it was good. I have seen nothing objectionable therein but it has been banned. How did the Censor Board allow it to run for several weeks in the country and one fine morning found that it was objectionable? Similarly the film "Chacha Choudhury" ridicules the entire South India—certain mannerisms and habits of the South are shown in it. But I am told it is running to crowded houses. What is the fun in allowing these pictures to be shown in the country and then blaming the Government for all these things? I would like to state only one thing and that is we should not blame the producers if they produce bad pictures. For example, the production of a film costs several lakhs of rupees. One way of clearly prohibiting such things will be not to encourage those people to produce on such lines if they are objectionable. The film producers have told me that they do not know what is bad enough to be objectionable. What is the point in the Censor Board banning a film after the entire processing has been done and finance has gone into the production of the film? It is very difficult for the Censor Board to find out what is objectionable and what is not. I would submit that the Government should consider whether it will not be possible for them to insist that a script of the film should be submitted to the Government for approval before a film is shot. Otherwise a lot of foreign exchange will be wasted. We have to depend on foreign countries for raw films. Sometimes 18,000 or 20,000 feet of films are taken and then the Censor Board apply their scissors. So all the amount is lost and the country is put to loss of foreign exchange. I would suggest to the Government to see whether it is not possible for them to frame some rules by which they can make the producer submit the script so that much money can be saved.

I would conclude by saying one thing. The foreign films that are shown in the country are in the nature of propaganda sometimes. There were a number of films showing the country of origin, showing its leader, May Day parade, and all things connected with the glory of the country or the leader. I have no objection, but that particular leader—whose leader happens to be the leader of an ideology—is the leader of a country and one party is trying to exploit it. I want to know how the proceeds of the film were utilised and the hon. Minister would know what foreign films come here and are used for political propaganda to undermine the sovereignty and the safety of this country. Particularly when those films were shown lakhs of rupees were collected in this country and not a pie left the country, but the entire money was used by a particular political party for sabotaging the independence of our country, I would like the Ministry to have greater and stricter control over these foreign films, and distribution of films so that the collections from them shall not be made use of against us. Sir, the film industry is in a difficult state. There is no use blaming it. We are to be blamed. The blame is also partly on the people. If the people want better production they will be able to get it. The film industry is in an infant stage. We should not curb or kill it. I am for reasonable restrictions. We should also see that the film industry is put on the right path, the film industry is also encouraged to produce good films. Then only the industry and our country will prosper.

श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव (राजस्थान) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह जो प्रस्ताव हमारे सामने श्रीमती मुंशी ने रखा है, मैं इसके शब्दों पर विशेषकर जाना नहीं चाहती। मैं इसके शब्दों से बहुत सहमत नहीं हूँ परन्तु इसके विषय से सहमत हूँ। इसीलिये यह न कह कर कि इसके शब्दों को बदल दिया जाय या और अधिक सुन्दर रूप दे दिया जाय, मैं इस प्रस्ताव के विषय पर कुछ कहूंगी। किसी भी राष्ट्र के निर्माण पर

चलचित्रों का जितना प्रभाव पड़ सकता है मैं नहीं समझती कि किसी और चीज का उतना पड़ता हो क्योंकि चलचित्रों में जीवन की कहानी सब सी मालूम होती है। मनुष्य चाहे बुरे रूप में हो चाहे अच्छे रूप में हो उसको ग्रहण कर लेता है। इसीलिये मेरा कहना यह है कि चलचित्रों के द्वारा हम अपने राष्ट्र निर्माण में भी लाभ उठा सकते हैं।

हम यह भी जानते हैं कि हमारे देश में चलचित्रों का इतना प्रचार है कि चाहे कोई बड़ा हो, चाहे जवान हो, चाहे बच्चा हो, चाहे वृद्ध हो चाहे सिपाही हो, चाहे आफिसर हो, चाहे गरीब हो, चाहे अमीर हो, हर व्यक्ति मनोरंजन के लिये अथवा खाली समय को अच्छे रूप में बिताने के लिये सिनेमा चला जाता है। सिनेमा का आज हमारे देश में ही नहीं बरन् सारे संसार में बड़ा प्रचार है। उससे अगर हम चाहें तो बहुत फायदा भी उठा सकते हैं और बहुत नुकसान भी। कहने का मतलब यह है कि जिस चीज को रोज हम अपने जीवन में देखते हैं, उसका पूरा प्रभाव हमारे ऊपर पड़ता है। हमारे साहित्यकारों ने कहा है कि किसी साहित्य को पढ़ने से उतना प्रभाव हमारे ऊपर नहीं पड़ता है जितना जीवन की किसी घटना को देखने से पड़ता है और वह घटना सिनेमा या नाटकों में ही देखने को मिल सकती है। अतः सिनेमा हमारे जीवन में बहुत महत्व की वस्तु है। जैसा कि श्रीमती मुंशी और अन्य माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा, चलचित्रों का जो अच्छा प्रभाव पड़ सकता है वह तो पड़ ही रहा है लेकिन इसके अतिरिक्त चलचित्रों में कुछ ऐसी खराबियाँ हैं जिन की वजह से बुरा प्रभाव भी बहुत पड़ रहा है। मेरा ही नहीं बल्कि अन्य लोगों का भी यह माना हुआ विचार है कि आजकल के चलचित्रों में एक विशेष बात रहती है और वह है प्रेम प्रदर्शन। अधिकतर चित्रों में आप यही देखेंगे कि जो मुख्य अभिनेता और अभिनेत्री होते हैं वे चित्र के प्रारम्भ में ही किसी प्लैटफार्म पर या किसी रेल में या किसी बस में या किसी मींदर में या

[श्रीमती शारदा भार्गव]

और कही मिल जाते हैं और उनमें आपस में प्रेम उत्पन्न हो जाता है। इसके बाद सार चित्र में यही दिखाया जाता है कि जब तक उनका विवाह नहीं हो जाता है वे इसके लिये लड़ते रहते हैं। इस प्रकार कही उनकी जिन्दगी में उतार आता है कही चढ़ाव आता है। जब उतार आता है तो रोना या रोने के गाने होने लगते हैं और जब चढ़ाव आता है तो खुशी मनाई जाने लगती है। अन्त में यह होता है कि या तो दोनों का विवाह हो जाता है या यदि उसमें सफलता प्राप्त नहीं हुई तो कोई न कोई आत्म हत्या कर लेता है। अधिकतर चित्रों में यही बात रहती है।

हमारे भाई पृथ्वीराज कपूर ने कहा कि जो प्रकृति की चीज है उसको सब के सामने रखने में कोई बुराई नहीं है। उन्होंने यह भी कहा कि उनसे किसी मित्र ने कहा कि अगर मेरे लड़की होती तो मैं उसे विवाह करने के पहले विवाहित जीवन की सब बातें बताता। लेकिन मैं समझती हूँ कि यदि उनके लड़की होती तो शायद वह ऐसा न करते। उस समय उनका विचार ही भिन्न हो जाता क्योंकि न हमारे यहां की ऐसी संस्कृति है और न हमारे यहां कोई स्त्री पुरुष जिस के लड़की है, यह सोच सकता है कि जब तक उसकी लड़की सब बातों को समझ न ले तब तक उसका विवाह करना बेकार है।

मैं यह कहना चाहती हूँ कि चलचित्र हमारे राष्ट्र के निर्माण में एक बड़ी शक्ति हो सकते हैं। सुन्दर चित्रों का प्रभाव सदा अच्छा पड़ेगा। जो हमारे बड़ा राष्ट्र निर्माण के कार्य हो रहे हैं उनका भी प्रचार हम चलचित्रों के द्वारा बहुत अच्छी तरह से कर सकते हैं। हम विद्या का भी प्रचार चलचित्रों के द्वारा कर सकते हैं। हमारी गवर्नमेंट चाहती है कि इस प्रकार के चित्र बनाये जाय जिन से लोगों के ऊपर अच्छा प्रभाव पड़े। हर एक मनुष्य के हृदय पर चलचित्रों का बहुत असर पड़ता है। छोट-छोट बच्चों का हृदय इतना टैंडर होता है कि वे जो बात देखते हैं वह तुरन्त उनके

हृदय पर अंकित हो जाती है और उसी के अनुसार वे कार्य करने का प्रयत्न करते हैं। मैं जानती हूँ कि जब छोट-छोट लड़के रामलीला देखते हैं तो वहा से लाट कर घर राम और लक्ष्मण बनने की कोशिश करते हैं। फिर जब हम चित्र देखते हैं तो हम कैसे कह सकते हैं कि चित्रों को देख कर हमारे ऊपर अच्छा या बुरा प्रभाव नहीं पड़ेगा? उनका प्रभाव हमारे ऊपर अवश्य कुछ न कुछ पड़ेगा।

दूसरी बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि "फार अडल्ट्स ऑनली" जो चित्र आते हैं उनसे जो अडल्ट नहीं हैं, उनके हृदय में यह काँतहल पैदा होता है कि देखें क्या चीज है जिस के कारण कि चित्र हमारे लिये वर्जित हैं। जब पहले स्त्रिया पर्व में रहा करती थीं और घूँघट में बाहर निकलती थीं तो लोगों की यह इच्छा होती थी कि देखें कैसे हैं सुन्दर हैं या बदसूरत हैं। इसी प्रकार "फार अडल्ट्स ऑनली" जिन चित्रों के लिये लिखा रहता है उनके लिये मैं यह नहीं मानती कि लड़के उन चलचित्रों को नहीं देखते हैं। लड़के अपनी उम्र बढ़ा करके या और किसी प्रकार ऐसे चलचित्रों को देखते अवश्य हैं। इस प्रकार ऐसे चलचित्र बना करके एक क्लास को वर्जित कर देने से कोई अच्छा प्रभाव होने वाला नहीं है।

इसके अतिरिक्त जैसा अभी एक बहन ने कहा मैंने भी बहुत दिन हुये एक चित्र देखा था जिस में ऐसा प्रेम दिखाया गया था जो हमारे हिन्दोस्तान में कभी नहीं होता है। आज चलचित्रों में ऐसा दिखाया जाता है कि जरा देखा बस प्रेम हो गया और उसको जो देखते हैं वे यही समझते हैं कि यही आदर्श है इसका कितना अच्छा नतीजा निकला कितनी अच्छी उनकी लाइफ बन गई। सेंसर बोर्ड को चाहिये कि वह इस प्रकार की फिल्म को पास न करे। मेरा यह ख्याल है कि सेंसर बोर्ड के सामने कही ऐसा न हो जाता हो कि उस के सामने कोई फिल्म सेंसर के लिए आती हो और उसके बनाने वाले यह कहते हों कि हमारा इतना रुपया लगा है, आप कहिये तो थोड़ा बहुत हिस्सा निकाल

द्वे और फिर कुछ हिस्सा निकाल देने के बाद वह फिल्म पास हो जाती हो। पर कई बार थोड़ा बहुत हिस्सा निकालने से कोई विशेष अन्तर नहीं पड़ता है। मैं चाहती हूँ कि सेंसर बोर्ड को पूरी तरह से ज्ञान कर लेना चाहिये कि अमुक चलचित्र को जो आदमी देखेंगे उनके ऊपर क्या प्रभाव पड़ेगा। सेंसर बोर्ड में ऐसे मजदूर होंगे आदमी होने चाहिये जो अच्छी तरह से हर बात पर विचार कर सकें। यदि किसी फिल्म का बुरा प्रभाव किसी क्लास पर पड़ने वाला हो तो उसको पास न किया जाय।

डाक्यूमेंट्री फिल्मों को देख करके मुझे बड़ी प्रसन्नता होती है। वे बहुत ही सुन्दर और उपदेशात्मक होती हैं। यह भी नहीं है कि उनसे मनोरंजन नहीं होता है। मैं वास्तव में डाक्यूमेंट्री फिल्मों को ही देखने के लिये सिनेमा जाती हूँ। मेरा कहना यह है कि उस प्रकार की उपदेशजनक तथा मनोरंजन फिल्मों को अधिक बढ़ावा देना चाहिए और जो गन्दी फिल्में हैं उनको पीब्लिक में न आने दिया जाना चाहिए। इसके अलावा गवर्नमेंट को चाहिये कि वह खुद अच्छी फिल्में बनवायें और उनमें जो दृश्यों में उन्नति के कार्य हो रहे हैं उनको दिखाया जाय। जो काम गवर्नमेंट करती हैं या जो काम राष्ट्र निर्माण के लिये हो रहे हैं उनकी पीब्लिसिटी की भी बहुत जरूरत है। इस प्रकार के डाक्यूमेंट्री फिल्म ज्यादा बनवाये जायें या अगर गवर्नमेंट स्वयं इस कार्य को करे तो ज्यादा उचित होगा। बनिस्वत इसके कि गन्दे गन्दे फिल्म आयें और उनका प्रचार हो। बस इतना ही कह कर मैं इस प्रस्ताव का समर्थन करती हूँ।

SHRIMATI K BHARATHI (Travancore-Cochin). Mr Deputy Chairman, if we travel from one end of the country to the other, we will see picture palaces and cinema houses every where, even in the remotest villages. If you pass by these cinema houses just after the first or second show is over, you will see huge crowds emerging out. They will be of all ages and

of both the sexes. That will be almost a cross-section of the society, a large section of peasants, a good number from the working classes and a sizable number of the teen agers who have already become veritable addicts to the cinema-going habit. It is the small coppers that come from the meagre income of the millions that contribute to the opulent living of the cinema stars. But in return for the money that they spend, what is it that these people get out of the cinema houses? What is the taste to which our film magnates cater? In fact, are the cinema houses any better than mere toddy shops or liquor houses? Mostly the picture palaces are maintained in that spirit. Most of the producers are like brewers who distil cheap and intoxicating liquors. Just as a man would drown his sorrow and misery in a cup of wine or alcohol, millions of workers and peasants might forget their sorrow for a while in the cheap films that are exhibited in our theatres. The young will go and have a little excitement in the film houses. Just as liquor undermines the health of the people, cheap films to a very large extent undermine the mental health of the people. The deleterious effect of alcohol is immediately manifested in the victim and may not be very lasting, but the films corrupt the mind and morals by penetrating into the innermost strata of the mind. How the films influence the mind of the young can be seen if we watch the youngsters in the villages. On their lips will be the latest cinema songs that they pick up from the local theatres. You can see young college girls imitating the vulgar fashions of their favourite stars. If you go to a jeweller, you can see ornaments named after the latest glamour girls in the films. You find the pictures of cinema stars dominating the advertisement columns in newspapers. Wherever any actor or actress of any repute goes, they attract large crowds.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR. It is true only in the case of leaders and not of film stars.

SHRIMATI K BHARATHI This shows the tremendous hold the films have on the mind of the people. Is this in fact exercising a wholesome influence on the nation? I don't think. But I don't want to make a wholesale condemnation of all films. There are a few which uplift the soul of the people and ennoble their minds. There are stars also who live noble lives. But the producers who enter the profession with any sense of purposefulness are very few and far between. Today, most of the people enter the profession as a business which gives them easy money and a life of easier morals.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR Is it your personal experience?

SHRIMATI K BHARATHI In the name of freedom, can we afford to give these gold diggers the licence to work havoc on the mind of the people especially on young and immature minds?

The film is the mightiest weapon with which you can mould the minds of the people. It is the greatest audio-visual educational system and today our picture houses are places of cheap entertainment *par excellence*. Bearing these things in mind what is it that we should do? We have to control and utilise this powerful medium for the betterment of the nation.

Today what is done to curb unhealthy films is by censoring them. That is a wasteful and painful affair. After lakhs of rupees and a good deal of effort have been spent to produce a film, to censor it is not a very happy affair. Instead of that, it will be desirable to have a properly constituted Board in which representatives of the film industry and a few eminent educationists, literary men etc. are there to control the production of films. They can scrutinise the scripts and control production from the very beginning. As far as producers are concerned, there is the conflict between patriotism and profit. It is only natural that very often

the latter feeling gets the ascendancy. So, it will be good for the educationists and others to see if proper pictures are produced. Today, it seems that all the theatres have stopped exhibiting documentaries in the wake of the decision of the Supreme Court declaring *ultra vires* the rules making it obligatory on the film houses to exhibit documentaries. This is a sad commentary as to the attitude of the film houses and the men in the film industry.

As far as national development is concerned, the Government must devise ways and means to see that films are produced which give emphasis to the great nation-building activities. It is essential that the people at large must know what we are achieving and what we have set out to achieve. People talk about the great enthusiasm in China and the Communist countries. That is due to the centralised control there and the great purpose to which they use films and other means of education and mass entertainment, to whip up popular enthusiasm and set their mind in the way of constructive thinking. Unfortunately in our country in the hands of private producers, more often it is the instrument for scoffing at our efforts. So long as this is allowed to continue, we cannot create any faith or confidence in our people about our efforts. So what I would say is that it is not enough that we control harmful films but we should also make use of this medium for creating enthusiasm for national development. It must be used to tell the people what our social and economic goal is and how we are planning to achieve it or what our programme is to achieve it and how we are working towards that goal.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad). Mr Deputy Chairman, I wholeheartedly support the spirit underlying this Resolution. There have been only two speeches against this Resolution. Mr Dinkar of Bihar has given a very good reply to them. I think he has given answers to all the points raised by Mr Prithviraj Kapoor, and yet I

think one or two points have not been answered. I personally think that the film should be mainly for entertainment. The object of a film should not be a sermon on morality. Yet, it does not mean that in entertainment we should make an appeal to the baser nature of human beings, that under the garb of entertainment we should appeal to the grosser impulses of the men and women going to see a picture. I submit, Sir, that Mr. Kapoor has enunciated a very curious principle of psychology. He said that our young men and women are models of virtue, are so many *devas* and *devis* and that they should be given opportunities of coming across all sorts of evil and then resisting them. I think it is a new way and a new approach to psychology. All psychologists are agreed that people should not of course be brought up in hot houses that they should see temptations and then overcome them, but that we should not put too much temptation in the way of young men and women. It is only a question of degree and even in this Resolution it is stated that in the lowering of moral standards, films are making a great contribution.

I admit that besides the films, there are other factors. We are not giving any religious education in our schools; then there is unemployment. There are so many other causes which are really leading to the deterioration of moral standards but one of the principal causes is the cinema, the film shows that they go and see. I submit that apart from the lowering of moral standards, there is a growing feeling of frustration among our young persons when they see that in the film, the life is so different from their everyday life, the unreal life of the film where the hero and the heroine have plenty of money, have a nice place, a nice house, nice cars, nice clothes and plenty to eat and generally a five rupee note to give as tip to the waiter who services them, etc. When they come back to their homes, they see that life is so different, that it is a drab life and they get frustrated. They feel that

their parents are an obstacle in their progress, that their parents have not provided them with that type of life which they see in the films.

As I said in the beginning, I want the film to be entertaining. I want the film to depict some part of the real life,—the life that is prevailing in our country. I want them to show something of the past history of our country, not in a glorified form but in the true and real perspective in which it was lived by the people of those time. Prof. Dinkar has already pointed out that there are a large number of brilliant dramatists of repute against whom nobody can raise a finger. He has already mentioned the name of Shakespeare, the name of Kalidas and so on. The ideal of our film should be a picture which is entertaining, which ennobles human nature apart from entertainment; and for that, as has been pointed out, the villain of the piece is the producer because he thinks that by appealing to the lower elements and by appealing to the lower instincts of man he is going to attract larger number of people. Therefore even though a film may be good, but in every film one or two dance scenes are always introduced and such scenes do not care very much about the art of dancing; it is mostly hip-dances where the bare formation of the lower part of body is given prominence and the appeal is made not by the art behind it but by the movement of certain parts of the body. I submit that this is not art or entertainment. If Mr. Kapoor thinks that this has an element of entertainment, I beg to disagree with him.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR: I never said anything about it.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, for half an hour I heard his speech and I felt throughout the speech the whole theme was that our young men must see temptation, that if you keep them hidden up in an atmosphere of piety, they will fall an easy prey to any sort of temptation that will come in their way . . . (Interruptions.)

[Shri Kishen Chand,]

My contention is that this film industry can do a great service. It can really convey a great message of the culture of India.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR: Sir, will I be given a chance to say something about all that has been said against me?...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR: Because they are all referring to my speech without understanding it. It is a pity—just like Dr. Johnson saying that 'I can supply you with arguments, but I cannot supply you with brains to understand them'.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Kishen Chand, please finish soon.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Sir, I want to say that the fault really lies with the censors, that if the censors are stricter, they will really disqualify a large number of films but probably what happens is that almost all the films that come before them are upto fifty per cent. unfit to be shown and therefore out of practical difficulties before them, they certify some of the films. Sir, I fully endorse this Resolution and I support it.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Sir, I entirely agree with the spirit and purpose of the Resolution. By the note which the Government have very kindly supplied to us it is made clear that although not immediately after the Independence, at least in the year 1951 they took care to see that a Film Board of Censors was appointed and they were invested with powers to screen the films. Sir, the Government, in my own humble opinion, is not absolved of their duty and sense of responsibility by the mere fact of having had a Central Film Board of Censors. We must all remember that our goal is a Social Welfare State and in a Social Welfare State, as I conceive

it, it is the duty of the Government to mould the outlook of the people to form correct habits in them, to eliminate wastage and to reduce distinctions of class and creed. As Mr. Kapoor was saying and as some other hon. friends were saying and as it has been universally recognised, the film is a tremendous propaganda machinery. It is a very potent force in our life. Anything that we want the people to be inculcated with could easily be done through the films. No number of lectures would be as useful, as effective, as a single scene which is seen. We are apt to forget what we hear but we never forget what we see, because it is such a potent force that all over it has been recognized as the best medium even for education and it is being made use of freely though not in our country, but in other countries. I do not understand really why our Government has not realized this potent force that this film world has. It is true, as the Government say, that no obscene films are exhibited. It is true that no violence as would be repugnant to the sense of the commonman is exhibited on the screen but there are other aspects to be considered. Why should we get a film which serves no purpose, which does not teach us any lesson, which does not give us any education? I will give an instance. I saw a picture that was a western film, not ours. In that picture there is a hotel and in the hotel there are two flights of steps going up. One gentleman and one lady who were residing there are getting down, their dogs coming behind them. The dogs come and get down the staircase first and they greet each other in the way of dogs and in the fashion of dogs. The gent points out to the lady and says 'Your dog loves my dog' and the lady replies 'My dog loves your dog' and both of them together saying 'If our dogs love each other, why not we?' as though we have to take a lesson of love from the dogs. I don't know whether Dr. Keskar ever goes to films. I am a sinner in this respect. Honestly I doubted whether the money wasted by me in seeing such a film was of

any use at all and whether I derived any benefit out of that film. Well, in this way crores and crores of rupees are going out of our country—for what earthly purpose I want the hon. Minister to tell me. Why not ban these films? Who objects if you ban these films? The hon. Mr. Kapoor gave at length the difficulties under which the film world is suffering. I really appreciate that position. I myself was concerned with floating a movie concern and I as a director for a short time in that concern until at last, out of disgust, I got out of it. Of course the producers have their difficulties. And the actors, the artistes, they all are working under great sacrifice. But it must be said to the credit of our artistes here that although socially it was a stigma to begin with, particularly for ladies to come and act on the screen, still many volunteered and came and developed the industry. But that does not justify many of the films which are coming out here... The Government Note here says that no obscenity is shown on the screen. But, Sir, there are several ways in which obscenity can be shown. When half the bosom of a female is exposed and shown on the screen, what do you call it? According to their language, is it obscenity or not? Obscenity is there. The appeal is made to the sexual feeling in the man. We certainly are appealing to the baser feelings in him and it offends our sense of fairness and our morals. There are several such things in our films. Of course, the Government do realise that these things should be prevented. But they are hoping and they are relying on the Censor Board. That is no good. Mr. Pattabiraman placed the entire fault at the door of this Board. But I completely absolve the members of the Board. What powers have they? How are the Boards constituted? All the members of the Board need not be idealists. They themselves may not have adequate ideas. Some of them may themselves be open to the influence of vested interests. All these things are there. May I therefore, make one suggestion to the Govern-

ment? Why not control this industry? I will give them an example which I saw in China which we must emulate. There in China, they have got a very easy and definite method. They combine all the artistes in a group. Government themselves take the initiative and bring them all together into a union, all the artistes, the high and the low, the good artistes and the ordinary artistes, the poor artistes and the rich ones, they combine them all. Government puts experts with them and pays them their salaries. And these experts along with the artistes—the entire union—elect the directors. They then plan how to train the people, the actors and others. They conduct schools in China to train young boys and girls in acting, in writing scripts, in writing out plays. And they also draw up performances. The Government experts themselves draw up the screen script, they actually write out the plays. And then they enact them. By this method, they take care to see that no useless material is given to the public but only useful, instructive and educative material is given. I myself saw one such film there. Many think that if you do not exhibit a beautiful female form on the screen, if you do not exhibit dancing on the screen, if you do not display love scenes on the screen, the public would not pay. This, Sir, is a wrong idea. Of course, in the circumstances prevailing in India today even if my hon. friend Shri Prithviraj Kapoor were to produce an ideal film, I bet that it would not be a success, not because the people do not appreciate an ideal film, but side by side with that good one, you will have the lewd films also and they attract away the crowd. But when we have all good films, and no lewd ones, then the people will certainly pay and appreciate them, as they do in China. In China the tickets are sold two or three weeks ahead. There are only two classes, corresponding to an 8 as. class and a 12 as. class. And these tickets are sold two or three weeks in advance. They take care to see that only films which are cent per cent. of educative

[Shri Govinda Reddy.] value are shown. The picture that I was referring to a few moments back can with profit be narrated here in this House. In that picture they wanted to show how they exploit the oil resources, how the oil industry grows. This was the purpose of the picture that I saw. They show how the oil well is developed, how it is drilled, how the oil is pumped up, how it is purified and all that. And along with that a small story is woven, how an ordinary worker goes there to join the labour gang that drills the well, how he tries to get a job there, how he by his sacrifice and honest work succeeds in working his way up and how the oil concern prospers and how the State benefits. Such films should be developed here also in our country. I congratulate the Government of India on their efforts in making the information films.

(Time bell rings.)

I will end in a minute or two, Sir. I have seen many information films, including those of the West, and I can without fear of contradiction say that ours are the best in the world. Then why not develop these information films? Why not the State controls the entire film industry? Take all the artistes together and form them into a union or association and through them produce good films on the lines in which these information films are produced.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR: May I ask one question of my hon. friend since he says he has been to Russia?

AN HON. MEMBER: Not Russia but China.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR: All right. But may I know why one of our Indian films took Russia by storm—a film which was recently shown there in 52,000 theatres—“Awara”?

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY: I don't know about that. But the people in China are also emotional and are much

more artistic than ourselves and still they appreciate those films even though they have no sensual features about them. This is a work which in my opinion, the Government should undertake. It may be said that the Constitution comes in the way of Dr. Keskar taking any step in that direction. But then is anyone willing to oppose a move to modify or amend the Constitution for this purpose? I think the Government is hesitating. They are like Barkis in David Copperfield who though he loves the woman Peggotty is too timid to propose. Every time he looks at her he says “Barkis is willin’”, but he is too shy to declare his love to her. In the same way, the Government, though they want to amend the Constitution they do not have the courage to do it. I assure the hon. Minister that if he comes tomorrow with a Bill seeking full power to control this industry nobody would object to it....

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY:no, not even my hon. friend Shri Prithviraj Kapoor.

THE MINISTER FOR INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (DR. B. V. KESKAR): Sir, I am intervening in this debate in order to put before hon. Members certain points from the Government side. I have very carefully listened to the points made in the debate here and though it is not for me to reply to the debate—the initiator of the debate herself will do it—still most of the points raised concern the Government and therefore, it is necessary that from the Government's point of view I should make the position clear.

Instead of trying to reply to individual points raised, may I with your permission, Sir, refer to one or two fundamental principles raised here in the debate? I do not say that these questions were not raised before. They probably had come in this House and in the other House also before, but it is necessary for me to deal with them

now because unless we are clear about these fundamental points first, it is not possible to draw conclusions as to what we want to do.

Firstly, the question of censorship. Mr Kapoor, a distinguished producer and actor, has taken upon himself the task of expressing the point of view of some of his colleagues, other friends have also spoken but I would like to say regarding censorship that there is some misunderstanding regarding this. First of all censorship is not done by the Government as a legal process. It is neither a legal process nor a judicial process, if I might say so, it is a social process. The Censor Board that we appoint and the panel of Censors who work on the Board do not work from the purely legal point of view, they do not see the films from the point of view of what is legal and what is not legal. They view the films only from the point of view of what society would consider as objectionable and what society would not consider objectionable in general. This has to be made clear, because many friends think that the Censor Board should work like so many Judges or Magistrates. Our stand and our approach to censorship is that it is not a very pleasant business; the kind of a negative work of trying to cut things and argue out things is not at all, at any time, a pleasant duty but we have to do it for two reasons, the first is that cinema has become, during the last so many decades, one of the most tremendous mediums not only for the expression of ideas but for the expression of whole set of ideas to the public. I think I will not be wrong if I say that this is probably the most important mass medium at present existing side by side with the radio and, therefore, it would not be proper to treat the cinema just as an industry; it would not be proper to treat the cinema just as an art also. I heard with great sympathy the passionate appeal of Mr Prithviraj Kapoor for the cinematographic art. I would like to go even further than

Mr. Kapoor and say, "art for art's sake" but unfortunately this is not an art only. It is so, whether you call it fortunate or unfortunate, depending on the angle of your vision, but it has developed as one of the most potential mass mediums by which you approach lakhs and lakhs of people who are educated uneducated or semi-educated. These people are by seeing this visualisation of things and actions affected and are influenced in many different ways. At present there is no country in the world which does not realise the importance of this medium. Cinema has become an almost social medium which approaches practically society as a whole and therefore it is that it is incumbent on Government to see that this medium does not put things before the public which the public in general would consider objectionable.

Now, take the question of moral conditions, practically every speaker today has referred to it. I have tried to make it clear many a time that when the Censor says a particular thing is objectionable, that it should be deleted, it is not the view of the individual Censor. We have tried to impress on the Censors that they are there as the representatives of the great public; they are not there representing their own views. For example if I were to see a picture tomorrow, I would say that the picture is bad and that socially it should be much more advanced but realising that it is my personal view, I have to see whether the picture, which would be seen mostly—and I am talking of Indian pictures first—by people who are illiterate, who do not know probably the latest ethical authors or the moral authors, who have not read Aristotle or Plato or the latest moralists, those people who have their prejudices—however much we may dislike or disparage these people who will be seeing—would be considered objectionable. Those people will have their own views, about the film, the producer and the way in which society has been depicted

[Dr. B. V. Keskar.]

in the film and it is there that we have to take care to see that things objectionable from that point of view are not allowed to be exhibited. You might criticise that but we are here to represent the public and we have to see that what the public in general considers to be highly objectionable is not generally shown through this mass medium. There might be two opinions about that matter but I personally think that society is certainly entitled to say what it considers prejudicial—may be you might consider this very bad but we are here representing the public and the society and we have to see that what is shown is not something which society in general would consider very objectionable.

Now, I would take only one instance—I will not dilate upon this matter—and that refers to what Mr. Kapoor was talking about kissing. He was explaining very eloquently mother kissing the daughter, the daughter kissing the father and so on. I would say that it is a very symbolic illustration of the whole approach. We in India, and we in the whole of the East—I am not saying only about India—consider kissing in public as very heinous. I do not know of any country in the East where it is considered to be good or even laudable or even tolerable to be seen kissing in the public. I remember when I was reading the Penal Code as a student long ago, reading a very interesting case in which a gentleman was accused of kissing a lady in public without her consent. The High Court Judge very rightly pointed out that “in this country this is a very serious offence” and punished him with six months’ imprisonment, while in England he would have got off with a fine of £1. The difference is in the approach. You might say that the Indians are a foolish people, very backward, and all that. We may be backward but the Indian society, even if it is backward, is entitled to see that its views are respected in that country by its Govern-

ment and by its people. It might be that personally I would like to go much farther than Mr. Prithviraj Kapoor. (*Interruption.*)

I am not here representing the High Court Judge; I am quoting a case. If my hon. friend likes, he can refer to the High Court and he will get even much more adequate information than I could give. What I am saying is whether you, myself or Mr. Prithviraj Kapoor likes a certain thing or not is not the question.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR: Pardon my interruption, Sir. I seem to have been misunderstood on this point. Take the question of the mother kissing her son. I said that in Japan they do not kiss at all; that is the highest point of morality in the East but it is also a fact that in India a mother does kiss a son.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: I am sorry I am not going to get into an argument over kissing. I maintain and I am sure that the majority of the House will support me that in this country and in every country in the East, kissing is not allowed in public. I am taking this as a typical case because there are many other similar matters. What I am saying is that the Censors are trying to do a very difficult and unpleasant job and I think the criticism levelled on the Censor Board by the House in general has been a little unfair. If our friends will only see how they are trying to work, they will have sympathy for them rather than criticise them. I have no doubt that the Censor Board's work can be sometimes open to criticism that they have not been consistent, that they have allowed a particular thing in a particular film and in a particular language but that they did not allow it in another place. That might be true but it is possible to explain that. You have to remember that the Censor has no rigid or fixed standards; it has to judge everything in the con-

text; a particular phrase or a talk or a gesture has to be judged according to the context and it is possible that the Censor, being human like all of us, is not foolproof and sometimes it may make mistakes but on the whole the Censor tries to follow certain directives which have been issued to him. I must say here and say it very firmly that the Censor Board has been trying to do its duty well and I do not think that the criticism levelled against them here is justified. You can criticise the Board for doing the work it is doing; for that matter, the very question of censorship may not be liked by all. That is a different question but they are doing a certain job and I am all admiration for all those ladies and gentlemen who, in an honorary capacity, are trying to do this work on behalf of society and rather than criticise them our friends should sympathise with them. The Censor Board, as far as I know, does not dislike faults being pointed out. It is possible to do that and I would certainly be the first to convey whatever defects in censoring that you bring to my notice but to say that censorship is not being done rightly, or to say that those who are doing it are not doing it properly is, in my opinion a very unjustifiable accusation against the Censor Board

SHRI LALCHAND HIRACHAND DOSHI (Bombay): On a point of information. May I ask if a number of films are not causing deterioration of morals? Is the hon. Minister in agreement with that statement in the Resolution?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: I am coming to that if my hon. friend will allow me to speak. The fundamental point is the point of censorship, because if all films can be allowed—we need not consider whether they are good or bad—the question of morals or other things does not arise or the question of control itself does not arise. The second point regarding censorship, is that the work of censorship is in our opinion essential.

Now I would like you to consider two approaches to social problems. There are countries where, as Mr. Prithviraj Kapoor said, *laissez-faire* is the law in everything, whether it is in economics, whether it is in social matters—in everything. Society there is ruled by *laissez-faire*, and let everybody, every individual do as he likes and probably the best will come up by itself; Now, no doubt we in this country have established a Constitution which recognises certain fundamental rights but I would like to invite the attention of hon. Members to it and say that the objective which we have placed before ourselves is that of a welfare State and not of a *laissez-faire* State. Now when there is the question of a welfare States it is not only in economics; economics and society cannot be separated. It has its impact on society as a whole. A welfare State means to a certain extent a 'controlled State', and if it is a controlled State it will not have simply control in economics; it will have control in social matters and all other matters which we the people as a whole consider beneficial for the progress of our society and of our people. And therefore when Mr. Kapoor raised the question of allowing complete freedom to the artistes and let art take its course, why do we try to teach morals to the people? Morals can take care of themselves; people will learn morals by themselves, I do not object to it, but I say that this probably might be very good in a country where the supremacy of the individual is recognised and there is no other limitation. As I have said, we have placed before ourselves an objective and we recognise that by that we will guide society towards the goal of a welfare State, and guidance and control, if it is necessary, will be practically in all fields and not only in the economic field. To that extent I feel that when we deal with such a tremendous and important medium like the film, it is not possible for Government to say. Let the artistes do as they like; let art take its course; the beautiful will be appreciated by the public and the ugly will be rejected by the public. I am not able to agree to

[Dr. B. V. Keskar.]
this conclusion. Of course people like Mr. Kapoor will have their own ideas. I have sympathy with their ideas, but I do not think that in the construction of society that we have taken in hand it can fit in with our objective. There is the...

SHRI H. D. RAJAH: On a point of information. If control is to be effected by Government for the social welfare of the State, that control also must be uniform. It cannot be one code for the Indian film and another code for the foreign film. What has the Broadcasting Minister say to this?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: I do not know why Mr. Rajah is so impatient. I am taking the points one after another, in a logical order so that he may not raise it backward again. That question will be answered.

Now, Sir, I feel I have to make it clear that as far as censorship is concerned, we consider it essential to have censorship. Now a question will arise to what extent censorship should be there. Now there, as you know, Sir, we are bound by certain constitutional limitations. Mr. Rajah says we have a Constitution which is contradictory. That might be so, but I in the Government have to follow the Constitution for the time being. The Constitution can be changed by this House. If Mr. Rajah carries the day he can have the Constitution changed, but now I have to follow the Constitutional limitations, and the Constitutional limitation, according to the best legal advice that we have got, is that we have to follow Sub-clause (2) of article 19 of the Fundamental Rights, by which reasonable restrictions can be put as far as decency, morality, law and order and international relations are concerned. More than that we cannot go. Now what is reasonable restriction, Sir? Well, of course it may be different in different cases, but there are certain broad things which

we have tried to outline in consultation with the best legal opinion and the Censor Board and Government try to go by that. Now I do realise the number of criticisms that were made and the instances that were quoted by friends here. There are categories which do not come in. For example, a case was quoted by Pandit Kunzru. He said for example that films which might be considered of a low character and which might be considered crude cannot be banned. That is true, Sir, and we find that constitutionally at least that is our interpretation, that it is not possible for us to ban such films. It is not possible for us to ban anything unless it is specifically objectionable or specifically indecent. Now that is a very negative approach, I do agree, but, as I said, the constructive approach of trying to produce better films can only be tackled if there is control as a whole; otherwise simply by cutting I do agree that we will not be able to get better and better films produced. But that does not mean also that we should not take out objectionable things simply because we are not able to improve specifically and positively the standards of films. So this limitation being before us, we have to work within that.

There is another rather important category of films which we are not able to deal with and about which many times on the floor of the Rajya Sabha and also Lok Sabha Members of Parliament have raised the question, that is, regarding the wrong depictions of the lives of great personages, heroes and heroines, who have inspired the lives of our people or other countries also. For example I remember some time back there was a question raised regarding the film of Sardar Bhagat Singh in this House. Some people raised questions regarding 'Jhansi ki Rani' and there is at present a controversy going on about 'Mahatma Kabir'. Such questions do come up and I had had to inform the House that it was not possible for me, under the present

Constitutional limitations, to take any action. I cannot take action if I consider that a particular film does not show the great hero or heroine in the right light because I have got no powers to do it.

Now I am coming to the inconsistency in censorship to which Mr. Rajah referred and some other friends also referred and rather severely came down on us that we try to discriminate in favour of foreign films against Indian films. Sir, the fact is not so. First of all, may I tell you that the original approach regarding foreign films and Indian films was this that a film should be judged by the social standards of the society which it depicts? If in an Indian film we try to show the social manners which are American, that will not be an Indian film; it will be an American film and with some Indian clothing. Now when we censor a particular picture coming from a country like Russia, America or any other, the manners and customs prevailing in that country will have to be taken into some consideration because the manners and customs are so different. If you apply identical standard to American or Russian pictures, then sometimes you probably will have to ban the picture saying that most of the manners and customs are such that they are completely incompatible with our society. Now that is not possible, but I might say that we are trying to diminish the gulf between the censorship of foreign and Indian films and we are going to see that there is little difference between the standards of one and the other. What Mr. Rajah was referring to was that large numbers of films have been allowed; on the other hand probably he does not know that Government has been flooded with protests at the very large number of films which we refused to certify and which were coming from foreign sources because we consider that these films are such that they might lead to incitement, to crime and violence. Unfortunately most of the

films come from the United States of America.

I am just referring to the salient points because the time at my disposal is not much. So regarding this Mr. Rajah can rest assured that there will not be such a difference, or as he considers discrimination between the judging of foreign and Indian pictures. I would like to refer to the question of art raised by Mr. Kapoor, an important point which would leave a wrong impression on the House. For example, he was referring to the question of Ellora and Ajanta and the great art that existed in the olden times. Now, it is not right, neither relevant, to refer to statues and paintings and depict as if the cinema is like the statues or painting of Ajanta or Ellora. If anybody thinks that the statues in Ajanta or Ellora represent the dress that people used to wear then, he is vastly mistaken. If you go to the great art galleries of Europe and see the magnificent paintings of Leonardo de Vinci and of the great painters of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, you will come away with the idea that nobody wore dresses in those times, that everybody went nude; while the real fact was that in those times the people of Europe dressed more heavily than they used to at any subsequent period of history. This is because the painter who paints a picture is trying to symbolise something and he is not trying to have a photograph of the dress of a particular type.

A great man like Rodin has made statues which have no connection with reality. He is trying to symbolise something. There is a famous statue of his, the "Thinker". The "Thinker" is a man who is completely nude and who is bending his head down and thinking. That is not depicting the dress of the French people, not at all. It is quite the contrary. It is quite wrong, therefore, to try to draw conclusions from the statues of Ellora and Ajanta or the paintings of the middle

[Dr B V Keskar]

ages of Europe Even in regard to the paintings in India, if you see them sometimes you will get a wrong idea of how the people lived and dressed and carried on their work So, I would suggest that it will not be right to draw conclusions from the great works of art and imagine that people lived in a particular way then

I want to say one more thing I refer to one of Mr Kapoor's remarks I do not want to let it pass unchallenged Mr Kapoor referred to the hon Members of this House and said "Oh, what do they know of how the poor artistes or producers live They are living in air conditioned rooms" and all that I think that it is an unfair reflection on the Members of this House and it is an unjust insinuation to say that they live in air conditioned rooms I ask how many people live in air conditioned rooms? I think that the number of those in the cinema industry who live in air conditioned rooms is much larger than from amongst Members in this House and I think that it is not fair on his part to refer to Members here in that fashion That is all I would not like to dilate on it any further

My hon friend here had made one or two other criticisms Mr Pattabiraman was very severe on the Censor Board He thought that the whole fault is that of the Censor Board As I said, the Censor Board functions under certain limitations and in view of that I really do not think that the Censor Board is at all in the picture in general Of course, I repeat that there might be faults here and there and it is for the Censor Board to have their faults pointed out and they should certainly rectify them But if you know the background of the whole thing and see under what limitations they have to work, you will see that their difficulties are enormous They are trying to do a difficult and what Mr Rajah said a negative task and that is not always easy

Now, I come to the Resolution, after this preliminary background that I sketched and may I say, Sir, that I want to know one or two things from the hon Mover about which I am not very clear? One is that there is a reference in the Resolution to moral standards in the country and there is the question of undesirable films Now, of course 'undesirable' is rather a vague word If it is purely from the moral point of view, then I can understand it But it is possible that everybody would interpret the word 'desirable' and 'undesirable' from his own point of view and to that extent I feel that there is a slight vagueness I would like to know from the Mover as to what exactly she means by referring to 'undesirable films' and 'moral standards in the country are deteriorating' I was asked a question as to what my opinion is regarding this matter I cannot give a categorical opinion because to me it is a very difficult task and I would not like to be specific unless I have made a thorough investigation of the problem in all its complexity and vastness But I do agree that vast numbers of people, more especially the younger people, are or have been having a sort of influence which, in my opinion, is not at all desirable in the sense that it creates in the younger generation an uneasiness and unsettled state of life which I do not consider is good for their future For example, the tendency to juvenile crime and adolescent crime is increasing not only in this country, but many other countries and educationists all over the world think that a large part of it is due to the trend in films—not only in this country but outside also Recently, I have had interesting articles from American educationists and public men in which they definitely feel that scenes of violence increasing in the films has led to a very large increase in juvenile crimes and adolescent defiance of law and order, and there is a controversy going on about it in the United States I am referring to the United States for the simple reason that it is a country which produces the largest number of

films, and where there is the greatest freedom of production from most points of view. There and I feel here also, on the adolescent and the juvenile, the films are not having a very happy effect; probably it might be that we are not able to cater for their taste, produce films which would be good for the adolescent. A very large part of the audience of cinemas are adolescents and that is a very impressionable age at which the film is likely to create a very strong impression, a greater impression than it will have on a hard boiled adult. It is likely also to mislead the adolescent mind. In this connection I would like to draw attention to the fact that there is no country in the world which does not recognize the need to control and censor films. In some countries it is less: in some countries it is more. Even in the United States of America, the American film industry has its own self-imposed censorship, which is not so loose as some people think. American standards may vary from our standards. You will be surprised to hear that the first directive that was issued to our Board of Censors was a copy of the self-imposed code of censorship by the American film producers. In other countries it is different. In England and continental countries it is done by the State itself. In England it is done by the industry, but the industry employs retired officials of the Home Office and others who have much experience of public matters and law and order. In other countries, it is different. In countries like Russia and China, which consider that the film is such an important medium for moulding public opinion and society, they consider it too important to be left alone to private initiative. The State tries to produce films which it considers beneficial and good for the progress of the society. I am just mentioning all these in order to emphasise that even in the freest of countries, some kind of check on the production of films is considered necessary and is being carried out. Now, I do not see that there is any question of our copying this country or that

country. Our needs are different and in the light of those needs we have also to fashion out something and certainly in that light I consider that censorship is necessary.

Now, coming to the second part of the Resolution, I would like to say this. The question of bringing legislation to improve films is capable of a two-fold character. One part was referred to by Pandit Kunzru, that is, by trying to produce better films, children's films, educative films, for example informative films that we are producing. There may be other ways to produce on large scale, but it would be very costly and would require a large amount of money. The other aspect is by trying to see that the films produced privately maintain a certain standard. When I say that we are not trying to be moral, we try to see that certain standards are not transgressed. We are not trying to dictate: "look here, you will go this way; you will dress that way; you will behave that way." But we rather see that certain general standards which society as a whole holds very strongly to are not transgressed. We do not go beyond that.

This, Sir, is the Government's case. I do not want to say anything more. As I said, I want clarification from the Mover of the Resolution as to what exactly is meant by 'undesirable films' and the second point is that as far as the question of legislation and other things are concerned, it is not such an easy process as we think. Certainly, I would like to remind the House that when the Cinematograph Amendment Bill was passed in this House, a very good debate took place in which most of the hon. Members of the House, including my distinguished colleague, Pandit Kunzru, participated and reminded the House of the constitutional limitations under which the Government is functioning. I also said that if the House thinks that it is desirable in the public interest that films be controlled much more than they are, then it is for them to come forwards and say

[Dr. B. V. Keskar.]

so. Government will not take any step unless it thinks that the House, which represents the people, thinks so, because, as I said, the question of censorship or control is a question of public opinion. It is not a question of legal judgment. There are all these limitations which I have placed before you. It is for you to form up your opinion. I would like to say nothing more regarding this matter. One thing more. In order to put before this House the vast amount of work conscientiously done by the Censor Board, I propose to lay, with your permission, on the Table of the House this book which contains all the details of the films which have been certified and excisions made therein by the Central Board of Film Censors from September 1953 to September 1954.

(Copy of the Book entitled "Details of Films Certified and excisions endorsed on certificates by the Central Board of Film Censors from 19th September 1953 to 18th September 1954 was laid on the Table of the House.) [Placed in Library. See No. IV G(a) (3) (9).]

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: I will not take more than a minute, Sir. Having listened to the various speeches that have been delivered in the House and the speech made by the hon. Minister just now, the criticism that has been offered against the Resolution is that the operative part of the Resolution is rather negative in character and there is no positive aspect of it. I will, therefore, with your permission place before the House this Resolution in an amended form and I hope that the hon. Mover will be good enough to accept it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Unless the hon. Mover and the Government are prepared to accept that amendment, I am not going to allow any amendment at this stage.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Sir, I will read out:

"This House is of opinion that the moral standards in the country are affected to a considerable extent as a result of the exhibition of undesirable films and recommends to the Government to take such steps as are necessary, either by legislation or otherwise, to prohibit the exhibition of such films, whether foreign or Indian;

This House further recommends that the production of such films as are instructive as well as entertaining should be encouraged and assisted."

I would, therefore, request the hon. Mover and also the hon. Minister to accept my amendment.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: This is not an amendment, Sir. It is an alternative Resolution.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: The latter part is an addition. In the first part there seems to be amendment of a few words.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: First of all, I should like to know whether both of you agree; otherwise, I am not going to allow this.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: If Government agrees, I will not stick to my wording. I should like to know whether Government is agreeable.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: I might make the position quite clear. Government would have no objection to the Resolution or rather the alternative resolution that has been put up. I am making it clear that we are not giving any opinion on the Resolution and also clarifying that if the Resolution implies censure of the Censor Board, then Government cannot allow it to pass. Otherwise, Government's attitude is neutral. Government certainly will give careful consideration to any opinion expressed by this House.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Sir, it is obvious that the Government has no

objection to the wording of the Resolution as laid down by Mr Dhage and the hon the Mover accepts it.

DR B V. KESKAR. I have no objection to the Resolution as it is proposed now

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And you have no objection if it is to be in that form?

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: If Government has no objection, I am not sticking to my wording because after all I am only concerned that my idea is accepted by the Government. In the first part, there is little difference, the wording is almost the same.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Unless you both agree ...

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: As Government agrees I agree.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARNANAND: Sir, on a point of order, is it permissible to bring in amendments at this stage?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN. By agreement it can be done. This House is a sovereign body. If the House accepts it, the whole thing is accepted. The amendment is allowed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: So, I think the House has accepted it. That is a positive Resolution. There would not be any objection. So, I will put it before the House.

Motion moved:

"That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:—

"This House is of opinion that the moral standards in the country are affected to a considerable extent as a result of the exhibition of undesirable films and recommends to the Government to take such steps as are necessary, either by legislation or otherwise, to prohibit the exhibi-

tion of such films, whether foreign or Indian;

This House further recommends that the production of such films as are instructive as well as entertaining should be encouraged and assisted."

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Sir, I wish a little more time had been allowed to me, because I am very anxious to oblige my friend, Mr Mazumdar, so that he should at least be able to introduce his Resolution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You seem to have pre-arranged the whole thing.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: If he gets at least three minutes, he may be able to read out his Resolution.

Sir, first of all, I am very grateful to the Members, and to Dr Kesar, for the support that has been given to me. I find that the Government has shown great sympathy for the Resolution, as it certainly wants to do something in this matter. And I hope, Sir, that this Resolution will be able to strengthen them. I find, Sir, that except one or two speakers, everybody has agreed with the Resolution. It has, however, been said that the Resolution is vague. I wanted to make it more specific.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The amended Resolution is more specific now, and more positive.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: It was specific, but your office had removed the specific words. Really the fault is not mine.

SHRI H P SAKSENA: Even those who did not speak or who did not get an opportunity to speak support your Resolution.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: Thank you for all that. And I am very thankful to all the Members for their generous support. My misfortune was, Sir, that I had to make my speech on two different days, today and a fort

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]
 night before. Probably, many Members who heard my speech a fortnight ago did not hear it today, or probably those who are here today were not here then. And so they may be missing the thread of my argument. That is probably why my hon. friend, Mr. Mathur, may have found the Resolution as a vague generalisation. I could have said so many things today, but due to the limited time at my disposal I could not finish my arguments. He read from some American papers which supported my argument.....

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: No American paper; the *Hindustan Standard*.....

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: It was an extract from something which really supported my argument. However, he had to say something in support of the indefensible. But I need not go into all that. The Censor Board has now become very vigilant, and in my speech I have not said anything to blame the Censor Board. The Central Censor Board just started in 1951, and probably it was groping in the dark, and the members were not suitable. Now the members are changed. So, it is not a question of the Censor Board as such. It is a question of the personnel, or whoever is there. That makes a lot of difference. And you will see that in my whole speech I have not made any criticism of the Censor Board. I have only cautioned myself to this particular matter. But after so much vigilance, so many things have been allowed and so many undesirable pictures have been passed. That shows that there is something wrong in the system itself. I did not say that anything is wrong in the Censor Board. If at all there is anything wrong, it should be looked into. And I am sure—two members of the Board have spoken today and judging from the trend of their speeches—that they will try to mend the matters.

My friend, Shrimati Seeta Parmanand, was quite right when she said that visual instruction is more powerful than anything that one reads or

hears about. In every matter the question of fundamental rights is brought in, to get one's point. But I really cannot understand how the question of fundamental rights comes in here. Then it might also be said that to corrupt the whole nation is also a fundamental right. If that is the fundamental right, there is certainly something wrong somewhere. Sir, I also thank Mr. Mazumdar who gave his very able arguments in support of the Resolution. Now, the time is so short—I want to give Mr. Mazumdar time also—but I will just reply to my friend, Mr. Prithviraj. He was replied to by so many hon. Members, but still, I cannot help but saying something. He knows that I hold him in great esteem. Leaving apart the personal remarks that he made—I do not want to go into them—he knows very well that I am not against artistes. I respect them, I honour them. It was a wrong point that he made that I was against art. He knows that during our whole life we have done something to promote art. But I am certainly against the exploitation of artistes by producers who use them only for the box office and money. They do things in the pictures which are harmful to our nation. When I said something about a street girl, I did not mean any disrespect to any street girl. There are some types of women here and some types of women there. There may be economic reasons. They are exploited because of our social conditions that are prevailing today; and so they may have been turned into street girls. I have **absolutely no quarrel with them**. On the contrary, we must try our best to help them as far as we can. They are the victims of our society. But nobody would be happy if our children take to the mode of life that they are leading. There may be some justification for it. But that does not mean that we should imitate it. It is not a thing just to be imitated or honoured. Sir, he asked me whether I could claim to preach morals to the world. No, Sir. Who am I to preach morals to the world? But should we shut our eyes

to what is happening all around us? Are we not concerned with the morals and the behaviour of our younger generations, who are the citizens of tomorrow? Nude pictures about which he spoke did not always inspire bad feelings. For instance Samson, Venus, Delilah and Appollo Belvedere. We do not find anything bad in that; we do not feel anything bad about that. And we can certainly admire the beauty of their body. But, Sir, there are suggestive eyes and certain other parts of the body shown in pictures. They do not always inspire that kind of a right instinct. I feel, Sir, that he will understand what I mean.

SHRI PRITHVIRAJ KAPOOR: I am only against generalisation. For the last 35 years films have been produced. And.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: I do not say that all films are bad. There are good films, and there are bad films also. I have already said that in my opening remarks. (*Interruption*).

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only one Member can speak at a time.

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI: But, Sir, as I said, it is a question of exposure of certain parts of the body, and suggestive eyes, and all that. That is done with a view to inspire a particular instinct in man. And I dare say that that instinct is inherent in man. It is like electricity. It all depends upon how you use it. You can use it for lighting purposes, and you can also use it to put a man to death through an electric chair. So, that primitive force in man is there. But the point is, in what way we are going to use it. He also said, Sir, that I was brave to have fought many social and political fights. If that is so, then why should I not fight to save the nation from this kind of a destroying influence? After all, if I am brave, I should be brave here also. But it does not suit him to say that.

I never said, Sir, that cinema encourages communal riots. That was not at all the theme of my speech. I also believe, Sir, that cinema can be a great boon which can help a great deal in the building up of our nation. That was the theme of my speech, and I want them to help the nation, to build up the nation, not to destroy the nation. वह कहते हैं कि सत्यानाश हो जाता है जब फिल्म नहीं चलती लेकिन जब सारं देश का सत्यानाश हो जाता है तब आप एक आदमी के सत्यानाश का विचार करेंगे या सारं देश का विचार करेंगे ? Shall we allow the whole nation to be ruined in order to save a few producers? And certainly ordinary films are not for the purpose of giving sex education. He said, Sir, "Let us give sex education." In this connection, I may suggest that this question about education should be left to the people who are giving education, rather than leaving it to the film industry..

Well, Sir, before I go to the remarks made by other hon. Members, I must reply to Dr. Keskar. He asked me a few questions about undesirable films, and what I meant about them. Sir, I might point out to him that undesirable films are those which encourage crime and a certain kind of sex behaviour which is harmful to the nation as a whole. And that was my meaning, Sir. There was no other meaning. I do not want to curtail the liberty of anybody. I simply want that there should be some check on undesirable films. As to how it should be done, that is for the Government to decide. Sir, there was some mistake in typing also. I had said ".....immediate steps be taken by legislation or administrative action.....". I had suggested this or that, but here it is this and that. That is how it reads. I meant this or that. I do not know, it may be my mistake also, but that is what I intended—legislation or administrative action.

Then, Sir, my hon. friend, Mr. Kunzru, also gave me very good suggestions. I am not able to go into

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]
 details, because I am rushing against time, and I cannot read them. There were also rambling speeches from the hon. Member, Shri Rajah, and from other hon. Members. Mrs. Alva also gave a good many suggestions which I had also mentioned in my speech. There are several causes.

Well, Sir, it is very difficult for me. If I go into one argument I must go into all the long arguments which I cannot do for want of time. So, Members will excuse me. I thank the House very much for giving its generous support and I hope it will pass the amended Resolution. Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I will put the amended Resolution to the vote. The Mover and the House have already accepted it. The question is:

"This House is of opinion that the moral standards in the country are affected to a considerable extent as a result of the exhibition of undesirable films and recommends to the Government to take such steps as are necessary, either by legislation or otherwise, to prohibit the exhibition of such films whether foreign or Indian;

This House further recommends that the production of such films as are instructive as well as entertaining should be encouraged and assisted."

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE. APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE OF M.Ps. TO ENQUIRE INTO COMPLAINT ABOUT INTERFERENCE WITH TRADE UNION RIGHTS IN PLANTATIONS.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I move the following Resolution:

"This House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament should be appointed to enquire into the complaint by certain labour organisations in the plantations about interference by the management with their right of trade union activity."

Sir, this subject is not altogether new to the House, but still I have given notice of this Resolution. I shall explain the reasons why I considered it necessary to move this Resolution. That is to say, I shall explain why I have asked for a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament to enquire into the complaints of interference with trade union rights in the plantations by the management. The background is already known that these plantations for decades and decades were the feudal estates of the planters. They still are. There was no question of trade union rights there. Moreover, it is well-known that even the public was not allowed access into the gardens or through the gardens. 'Through the gardens' means through the highway and roads leading through the gardens. Even the public was not allowed access to these roads. Anyone wanting to visit friends or relations inside the gardens was not allowed to go there. A member of the public could not ride on a horse or a palanquin through the roads leading to the tea gardens. Even now, this prohibition has not been completely abolished. If they dared to do it, then the management would be coming down heavily on them in various ways. All these things were recognised as long ago as 1929-30 by the first Royal Commission on Labour. At that time the Royal Commission recommended that these things should go and that there should be right of access to the workers' residences. We do not want that we should go into the Manager's bungalow or into his office or into the factories. Nobody made that claim. All that we claim is that the trade union organisers must have the right of access to the bustis, i.e. the living quarters, of the