

all the information together instead of having a regular question and answer.

My point is only this. My hon. friend said that he is awaiting the decision of the Labour Union in regard to the suggestion made to them for the appointment of a Mediator whose decision is to be accepted by both the parties. Now, are we to understand that this will not prejudice—supposing the workers are unable to accept your suggestion—the reference of the dispute to the Industrial Tribunal which has already been made?

SHRI K. L. NARASIMHAN (Madras) : On a point of clarification. In view of the fact that an adjudicator has been appointed by the Madras State to go into the question, why not Government take back the 813 workers irrespective of the proposal made by the Prime Minister and the formal acceptance by the Labour Union. I think it will help if the Minister decides to take them back in view of the adjudication proceedings, immediately.

SHRI K. C. REDDY: I respectfully submit, Sir, that this occasion should not be utilised for a discussion of the merits and demerits of the issue. I quite appreciate the anxiety of my hon. friend Mr. C. G. K. Reddy to know something about the process by means of which this surplus labour was finally assessed. I may just in one sentence tell him that it was the ultimate capacity of the shipyard that was kept in view before the surplus labour was determined, not the existing quantum of work that the shipyard has, as a result of certain recommendations which have been submitted by the French experts.

With regard to the point made by my hon. friend Prof. Ran?a, we<sup>1</sup>, I cannot definitely say nor 'ommit myself. The Industrial Tribunal is there and in the event of the Labour Union

not accepting the proposal of a mediator on the lines indicated, then certainly the Industrial Tribunal will be proceeding with its work. It is obvious and it does not need any reiteration on my part.

With regard to the point made by my hon. friend Mr. Narasimham I have already covered that in my earlier observations. I do not think, Sir, on the basis of the information I have that there will be any difficulty in regard to accepting this Mediator proposal. Dr. Lanka Sundaram, on behalf of the Labour Union, was expected here yesterday. As soon as he comes in the course of today and tomorrow we hope to discuss this matter with him and I believe there will be no difficulty to proceed on the lines indicated by the Prime Minister in his statement the other day on the floor of the House of the People.

SHRI V. G. GOPAL (Bihar): Will this Mediator be chosen with the consent of the Union?

SHRI K. C. REDDY: I am afraid I cannot go into details as to whether he will be chosen with the consent of the Union or otherwise. But I suppose one will be chosen who will be mutually acceptable.

#### THE CINEMATOGRAPH (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952

THE MINISTER FOR INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (DR. B. V. KESKAR): I beg to move that the Bill to amend the Cinematograph Act, 1952, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

This Bill, Sir, is a very minor one. The Cinematograph Act, 1952 which was passed in that year mainly re-enacted the provisions of the 1918 Act; only it separated matters relating to sanction of cinema films for exhibition from matters relating to licensing and regulation of cinemas, because - the latter is a State subject

[Dr. B. V. Keskar.] and the former is the Union subject. The Act has now been functioning, Sir, for nearly two years, but in carrying out the provisions of the Act certain defects have come to notice which make the Act practically inoperative, and it is for this reason that we have come before the Council for remedying these defects, and that is the sole purpose of this Act.

In the first amendment suggested, it has been made obligatory for any person who sells or distributes a film to furnish the person to whom he is selling the film with all the particulars regarding the film. This was necessitated by the fact that in certain cases which were brought before the courts for infringement of the provisions of the Act, as for example, in the case where an exhibitor showed a film which had certain portions in it uncertified or which had certain new additions, the Court acquitted the accused saying that it was quite possible that they were exhibiting in the picture itself certain uncertified portions but there was no legal responsibility on the accused by which the court can hold him to be culpable. In a recent case the Chief Presidency Magistrate of Bombay held that unless there is, *mens rea* that is, legal responsibility, on the accused, it is not possible for him to convict him. "If there is a lacuna in the Act", that is what the magistrate said, "then the remedy lies in amending the Act and not in trying to interpret it or stretch it in such a way that it will have another meaning." Now after two or three such cases had come before us we had the matter re-examined and we found that there is such a lacuna, and unless the obligation was fixed on the persons concerned who distributed or exhibited a film it will not be possible for us to hold them responsible before a court of law and if we could not do that then it is no use having the Act functioning because the Act becomes practically inoperative. All the provisions of the Act will be there but if there is anything wrong the

Government will not be able to take any action against the person concerned. So in view of the judgments of the courts and the observations of the Magistrate of Bombay, the new Section 6A, which is given here, has been proposed. It says, "Any person who delivers any certified film to any distributor or exhibitor shall, in such manner as may be prescribed, notify to the distributor or exhibitor, as the case may be, the title, the length of the film, the number and the nature of the certificate granted in respect thereof and the conditions, if any, subject to which it has been so granted, and any other particulars respecting the film which may be prescribed."

Now according to the legal advice that we have had this will make it obligatory on them and no exhibitor or distributor can hereafter say that he is ignorant as to whether a film is the one which has been certified by the Board or whether there have been any additions or alterations in the film. This is amendment No. 1.

The second amendment that is proposed is due to another defect that has been discovered in the Act. In the discussion that took place on the floor of the House of the People—I mean what was then the Parliament of both Houses combined when this Act was passed—a proviso was added which was well-intentioned, which really wanted to help the distributors and producers. The proviso was that in any case where the Government wants to uncertify a film or ban it, due notice of 15 days will be given to the producer. Now the proviso, though well-intentioned, has proved to be the main stumbling-block in the way of trying to stop the exhibition of any film which is objectionable.

Recently, a few months back, a very typical case came before us. As hon. Members are aware, there was a film called 'Peking Express' which was going to be exhibited here and at that time we had protests from the Gov-

ernment of China and its representa  
tives here that the film was highly  
derogatory to the people and culture  
of China who were shown in a very  
unfavourable light and that it was a  
libel on the them. Therefore the  
Government of India took steps to see  
the film. We had the film examined  
by competent persons and we also  
came to the conclusion that the filir.  
was really derogatory \*o tne people  
of China. Of course we came to know  
that the film which was produced  
many years ago and which had been  
probably lying somewhere, was being  
exhibited because the person who hail  
got the film here was thinking that  
he might make some money at that  
moment. It was not a film .....

giving is quite all right, but it took us six weeks  
to trace the person who owned or rather who  
had the distributing rights for the film and only  
after that the notice could be served on him. It  
means two months passed before we could, in  
any case, make a notice effective. We had to  
have recourse then to friendly persuasion which,  
fortunately in this particular case, we could do,  
because the local distributor in Delhi was good.  
He said that if the Government thinks that this is  
something which might bring unpleasant  
relations with a friendly Government, he was  
prepared to hold up the release of the picture for  
some time. He did that and, well, that was very  
good on his part, but legally we could not have  
forced him to ""stop the exhibition of that film  
even or a day. Now this brought the fact before  
us that there are occasions when it is absolutely  
essential for Government to have power to stop  
the exhibition of any particular film  
immediately, and, as the Act exists now, it is not  
possible for us to do so. There are a number Of  
other cases in a different category ! where this  
problem comes up in a different way. For  
example, leaving aside these films which might  
bring internationally unpleasant relations, there  
are films which might be considered, morally or  
otherwise, objectionable and it has been found  
that a number of distributors and owners of  
films are untraceable for a very long period.  
Recently we hao an appeal about a particular  
film and it took us more than six months trying  
to trace the person who held proprietary rights  
of that film. Because the notice can only be  
served on the person who owns the film, after  
we find him then only the notice can be served  
on him. Fortunately, such cases have been rare.  
We wanted that persons should be asked to  
come and explain before we took any action.  
The purpose of the whole section has been  
defeated because the process of serving the  
notice has been found to be in a very large  
number of case? dilatory and defeating the  
purpose \*nd object of the original Art

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU (Madras):  
Was not the film censored before it was  
exhibited in the country?

DR B. V. KESKAR: I may say, Sir, the  
film was censored by the old Board of Film  
Censors, I mean the Board existing before  
this Act jame into force and also before India  
became independent. At that particular  
moment the international situation was quite  
different and probably then the censors might  
not have taken the same notice of the question  
as we have since taken.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU:  
illustration does not relate to  
incidents after the passing of  
Cinematograph Act of 1952.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: It would  
better if my hdn. friend put  
question after I had finished my  
servations.

The question then arose that the film which  
really was objected to by a friendly  
Government and which in our opinion also  
was showing that country and people in a  
very derogatory light should be stopped.  
Now, we found, after going through the Act  
very carefully, that there was no nrovlision **By  
which we** could suspend the working of any  
film even for a day without going through the  
process of giving notice. Now, notice

This  
any  
the  
be  
his  
ob

SHRI K. C. GEORGE (Travancore-Cochin): May I know whether constructive service of notice, i.e., serving the notice in his house or place of residence, is not sufficient?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: No, Sir. If you go through the law, for serving the notice, you must trace the person. And if the person is not found then you have to paste it at his residence. But you must know who is that person, it is no use arguing; I am telling you the fact. That fact is, it is not on the exhibitor that we could serve the notice. The notice has to be served on the proprietor of the film. Unless you find out who the person or the company is who owns the film, the question of serving the notice or pasting it on his door cannot arise. It is only when you have found him, that it can be done. That is the main difficulty.

We have consulted the cinema industry in this matter. No doubt they say that a large number of distributors are registered with what is known as the Distributors' Association, but that is not obligatory on the distributors. There are quite a big number who are not so registered. And the sale of the film is not registered in the same way as registering a decree or a document. There is no court record. You can sell a film to me and I can hand over the money to you. Probably you will write a chit that you hand over all the rights in respect of that film to me. That is all what is necessary for a sale. Therefore it takes a very long time for us to find out the owner of a film. The local distributor gets it from a particular distributor who is a sub-distributor. He refers us to another and the process goes on and it takes us a very long time to find out who the person is who is the proprietor of the film. Now, all these things have been examined and we have come to the conclusion that it is essential in certain exceptional cases for Government to have power to stop the exhibition of a film immediately. Especially, as you know, Sir, at present in the midst of what is

called a cold war, we get films of all sorts which might endanger our relations with our neighbouring friendly States or other friendly States far away and if we have recourse to the procedure that has been laid down in the Act, it will not be possible for us to stop the exhibition of films immediately.

Now, after these amendments were published, we had discussions with members of the industry. Amendment (O) as it is proposed here has been put after certain discussions with them. They feel that the suspension of a film in the light of the contracts that the distributors and exhibitors have amongst themselves does not entail so much of loss as a complete uncertification and that would also give them time to make any changes if necessary. It is for this reason that the addition of (c) has been made. Both the amendments are made only to make the Act more effective. In fact, had it not been for the courts, we would not have been obliged to bring the first amendment before the House. The second one also, we feel, is absolutely essential in that unless we have this power, it is possible that Government might get into very embarrassing international complications.

KHWAJA IN AIT ULLAH (Bihar): Why do you take this power only for two months?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Instead of suspending a film indefinitely, we can uncertify it. We use that power only in cases where there are certain objectionable things in a film the showing of which in public might bring certain complications. In such cases we can suspend its show and at the same time think over the matter and give an opportunity to the producer or the distributor to discuss the thing over with Government.

The third point is regarding the punishment that is put here in the amendment to Section 7. You know, Sir, that formerly we had only a fine. Now it has been found by experience

that there are cases in which the exhibitors or distributors, by making certain changes, can attract in their opinion, larger crowds to see their film and the amount of money that they can make out of it is so big that they do not care if you fine them, say, a hundred or a thousand rupees. It makes little difference to them. Therefore it is not a sufficiently deterrent punishment to stop people from indulging in such practices. I might also inform the House that cases of interpolations have been increasing during the last 12 months and that is also one reason why we have had to take very serious notice of this. If such things continue, it is just as well we scrap the Cinematograph Act rather than having it functioning in such a defective and ineffective way. These are the main considerations which have compelled us to bring this small Bill before the House and I request the House to take this into consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill to amend the Cinematograph Act, 1952, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration."

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI (Bombay):

श्रीमती लीलावती मुंशी (बम्बई) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज सुबह की गाड़ी से अने बाद मैंने इस बिल को देखा। इस बात में तो हमेशा से मेरी बड़ी दिलचस्पी रही है क्योंकि दो साल तक मैं सेंट्रल बोर्ड आफ फिल्म सेंसर की सदस्या रही हूँ और फिल्मों के बारे में सेंसर बोर्ड में जो कोई भी आवाज उठाई गई है उसको मैं समझती हूँ कि मैंने ही ज्यादा से ज्यादा उठाया है।

यह तो एक बड़ा छोटा सा बिल है मगर बदन भी चीजें करने के लायक हैं जो मैं आशा करती हूँ कि हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब करेंगे नही। उन्होंने तो कहा है कि इंटरनेशनल

कम्पलीकेशंस (international complications) ]। होते हैं इस कारण यह बिल लाये हैं मगर मैं तो मानती हूँ कि नेशनल कम्पलीकेशंस भी बहुत होते हैं और उसके बारे में मैं कुछ कहना चाहती हूँ।

आप सबको मालूम होगा कि पहले स्टेट्स में फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड थे, जैसे एक बम्बई में, एक कलकत्ते में था, एक मद्रास में था। तो ऐसा होने के कारण कि एक स्टेट सर्टीफाई (certify) करे और दूसरा स्टेट उसको अनसर्टीफाई करे, सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने सोचा कि एक सेंट्रल बोर्ड आफ फिल्म सेंसर की नियुक्ति की जाय जिससे ऐसी गति न हो। अतएव एक सेंट्रल बोर्ड आफ फिल्म सेंसर सात प्रादमियों का बनाया गया, जिसमें एक चेयरमैन है और ६ मेम्बर। सातों प्रादमी बड़े बड़े प्रादमी हैं और दूर दूर रहते हैं, जैसे कोई बम्बई में है तो कोई कलकत्ते में है कोई मद्रास में है। उनको इधर से उधर नेशनल और इंटरनेशनल कामों के लिये आना जाना होता है और फुर्सत नहीं होती है। इसलिये जब तीन महीने में सेंट्रल बोर्ड की मीटिंग होती है तभी सब मिल पाते हैं। एक बार मिलने के बाद फिर कहीं तीन महीने के बाद मिल पाते हैं। नतीजा क्या होता है? होता यह है कि एडवाइजरी कमेटी फिल्म को सर्टीफाई करती है, क्योंकि पहले जो कलकत्ता, बम्बई और मद्रास में सर्टीफाइंग बाडी (Certify-ine BodV<sup>1</sup> एडवाइजरी बाडी (Advisory Body) कर दिया गया है। जो फिल्में सेंट्रल बोर्ड के नाम से सर्टीफाई होती थीं उनका कुछ पता हमें नहीं रहता था। हाँ, अगर कोई सैंकशन न करे और उसके बारे में यह कहे कि वह फिल्म अच्छी नहीं है तो यह बात तीन महीने के बाद हमारे सामने आती थी और एक रिवाइजिंग (revising) कमेटी तीन मेम्बरों की बन जाती थी जो तीन मेम्बर होते थे वे

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]

भी इधर उधर के होते थे, यानी कोई कलकत्ते का, कोई बम्बई का, और वे आपस में सहज मिल नहीं सकते थे। जब तीन महीने के बाद मीटिंग होती थी तब वह फिल्म उनके सामने देखने के लिये रखी जाती थी बहुत वक्त तो ऐसा भी हुआ कि जब कोई फिल्म तीन महीने के बाद देखनी चाही तो वह सर्किट में चली गई और देखने के लिये नहीं आई। ऐसी फिल्म भी ६ महीने और १२ महीने इसी रीति से चलती है और जब तक वह हमारे पास देखने को आती है तब तक उससे सारे देश को जो नुकसान होना चाहिये वह सब हो ही जाता है और जो ब्लेम (blame) है वह हमारे ऊपर, यानी सेंट्रल बोर्ड आफ फिल्म सेंसर के ऊपर आता है। जो सेंसर बोर्ड में मेम्बर होते हैं वे बड़े आदमी होते हैं और बहुत कम फिल्मों को देखते हैं क्योंकि उन्हें फुसत ही नहीं होती। जो देखते भी हैं वह भी बहुत अच्छी अच्छी अंग्रेजी फिल्मों होती हैं। देशी फिल्म तो बहुत कम देखने जाते हैं। मैंने एक बार एक फिल्म के बारे में पूछा कि हम में से कितने आदमियों ने उसे देखा है तो किसी ने देखा नहीं था। मैं किसी की शिकायत नहीं करती सबकी अपनी अपनी इच्छा है। मगर नतीजा यह होता है कि आपने स्टेट गवर्नमेंट से पूरी पावर तो ले ली और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स चिल्लाती रहें कि यह फिल्म हमारे यहां दिखाने लायक नहीं है लेकिन फिर भी उसको दिखाना चलता रहा और जो नुकसान उसके दिखाने से होना था उसको आप रोक नहीं सके। बहुत सी बहकाने वाली फिल्मों चलने दी गईं और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ होते हुये भी चलने दी गईं। कितनी पोलिटिकल फिल्मों भी चलने दी गईं जो कि जब हम परतन्त्र थे उस वक्त के लिये अच्छी हो सकती थीं लेकिन आज की हालत में उसको दिखाना अच्छा नहीं है।

“ला मिज़रेबल्स” (LAW Miserables) का एक वर्शन (Version) बंगलोर में तामिल भाषा में हुआ था। उसके बारे में सुना था, मैंने खुद तो नहीं देखा लेकिन एक देशी फिल्म वहां बनाई गई थी। उसमें खादो वाले रेवोल्युशनरी दिखाये गये थे, खादी वाले लोगों को जो देशभक्त थे पुलिस पीटती थीं। ऐसी फिल्में चलती हैं और इसी रूप में उनको सर्टीफिकेट भी मिल जाता है जिससे जवान आदमी का दिल बहुत बहकावे में आ जाता है। मेरे पास तो बहुत सी माताय और स्त्रियां आ कर कहती थीं, क्योंकि वे जानती थीं कि मैं फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड की सदस्या हूँ, कि आप ऐसी फिल्में क्यों चलने देती हैं। फिर यह भी है कि फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड में बड़े बड़े आदमी बड़ी दया की दृष्टि से फिल्म वालों को देखते थे। मैं तो ज्यादा से ज्यादा लड़ा करती थी लेकिन बाकी सब दया की दृष्टि से देखते थे कि इसने दस लाख रुपया खर्च कर के इस फिल्म को बनाया है और अगर इसको अनसर्टीफाई किया जाय तो उसका बहुत सा नुकसान होगा। मगर मेरा यह कहना था कि उससे जो देश का नुकसान होता है उस के मुकाबिले में वह नुकसान कुछ भी नहीं है। इसके अलावा मनुष्य स्वभाव ही ऐसा है कि आदमी के ऊपर किसी दूसरे का कुछ असर पड़ जाता है, बहुत से आदमी पहुंच जाते थे कि हमारी फिल्म का खयाल रखना और उसका खयाल रखा ही जाता था। रिव्यूइंग (Reviewing) कमेटी में तीन मेम्बर होते थे, एक चेयरमैन और दो मेम्बर। तो अगर तीन में से दो आदमी कह दें कि यहां से या वहां से यह काट दिया जाय तो वह काट दिया जाता था और फिल्म फिर चलने दी जाती थी। इस रीति से फिल्म चलती थी। ऐसा भी मैंने देखा कि कई फिल्मों के बारे में मने बहुत मजबूत राय दी थी कि ये फिल्में बच्चों के लिये, बच्चों के लिये और जनता के

लिये अच्छी नहीं हैं उनके लिये भी जब मेजरिटी होती थी तो भी सरकार के पास अपील की जाती थी और यहां से सर्टीफाई हो जाती थी। यहां डाक्टर केसकर साहब बैठते हैं लेकिन सरकार को इतनी फुर्सत कहां रहती थी कि वह यह सब देख सकें और उनका सर्टिफिकेशन (certification) हो जाता था।

मुझे एक बात और कहनी है और वह "ए" और "यु" सर्टिफिकेट के बारे में है। "यु" सर्टिफिकेट वह है जो कि सबके लिये होता है और "ए" सर्टिफिकेट वह है जो कि सिर्फ एडल्ट के लिये होता है, उसमें यह होता है कि जो बच्चे हैं वह नहीं जा सकते। लेकिन मैं ने देखा कि जितने जवान लड़के होते हैं वे सब जाते हैं और अगर कोई लड़का १४ साल का या १६ साल का है तो वह जाता है और उसको रोक नहीं सकते क्योंकि अगर किसी १६ साल के लड़के ने कह दिया कि मैं १८ साल का हूँ तो इस को जज करना बड़ा कठिन है। देखने के लिये तो यह है कि इस के लिये "ए" सर्टिफिकेट दिया गया है लेकिन उसमें खास करके वही लड़के और वे लड़कियां जाती हैं जिन के लिये मना है। तो जब वे सब जाते हैं तो इस "ए" सर्टिफिकेट देने से क्या फायदा है। मेरा तो कहना है कि सब के लिये ही "यु" सर्टिफिकेट कर दिया जाय। अगर किसी में क्राइम (crime) को ग्लोरीफाई (glorify) किया गया हो, और हीरो हीरोइन की सेक्स अपील (sex appeal) हो तो अगर इस तरीके के सीन उस में होते हैं और "ए" क्लास का सर्टिफिकेट मिलता है तो उस में ज्यादातर कालेज के लड़के और लड़कियां जाती हुई देखी जाती हैं।

मैं बताना चाहती हूँ कि आपके कालेज के लड़कों और लड़कियों का क्या हाल हो रहा है। मैं जानती हूँ कि इलाहाबाद में हमारी सिनेमा की एक एक्ट्रेस गई तो उसको

देखने के लिये पांच हजार कालेज के लड़के आये और उसकी गाड़ी को तोड़ दिया।

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh):

**श्री एच० एन० कंजरू (उत्तर प्रदेश) :** सब लड़के कालेज के नहीं थे, उसमें इलाहाबाद के और सब लड़के थे। यह कहना कि वे सब युनिवर्सिटी के या कालेज के लड़के थे नाइंसाफो होगी।

SHRIMATI LILAVATI MUNSHI:

**श्रीमती लीलावती मुंशी :** लोगों पर क्या उसका असर होगा; उसका आप देख लीजिये। ऐसी रीति से वे बर्ताव करने लगते हैं जिससे कि उनका सारा दिमाग खराब हो जाता है। मैंने एक दो ऐसी भी पिक्चर्स देखी हैं जिसमें कि एक बहुत बड़ा खूनी आदमी है और सब तरह के गुनाह करता है। वह खून करे, डाके डाले, चोरी करे और बाद में उसको बहुत आकर्षक रूप में दिखाते हैं। जब वह फांसी पर जाता है तो दिखाया जाता है कि उसकी औरत उसकी इज्जत करती है और उसे प्यार करती है। यह कितना बुरा असर डालती है कि वह सब तरह के गुनाह करता है फिर भी उसका बाप और उसकी होने वाली पत्नी सब उसके लिये कितना प्रेम रखते हैं। जो खेल इस तरह से लोगों पर बुरा असर डालते हैं उन के लिये तो आपको कुछ जरूर करना चाहिये।

आपने परदेशी फिल्म के बारे में कहा। परदेशी फिल्म चाहे किसी भी देश की हों, उन का आप सिनेमाओं में चलने देते हैं। उनमें ड्रिंकिंग (drinking) के, गैम्बलिंग (gambling) के, डांसिंग (dancing) के, और दूसरे ऐसे बहुत से सीन होते हैं जो कि अच्छी रीति से नहीं होते। इस रीति के फिल्म सिनेमा हाउसेज में चलने देते हैं और फिर पीछे कहते हैं कि हमारे बीच में उनका अनुकरण न हो; सिनेमा वाले

[Shrimati Lilavati Munshi.]

कहते हैं कि हम उन का अनुकरण न करें तो हमारा काम नहीं चलता है। स्त्रियों के शरीर को इतनी गंदी रीति से दिखाते हैं कि वह सब चीज हमारे देश के लायक नहीं हैं। जब यहां के लोग उस तरह के फिल्म देखते हैं तो उसी की नकल होती है और यहां भी उसी का अनुकरण होता है और वह बाहर का थर्ड रेट (third rate) अनुकरण होता है। मैं तो समझती हूँ कि जो परदेशी फिल्म हमारे देश के लायक नहीं उनको हम क्यों आने दें? उनको भी नहीं आने देना चाहिये।

हमारे देश में बहुत सी हालीवुड की फिल्में आती हैं, दूसरे देशों की फिल्में आती हैं, बहुत सी क्राइम पिक्चर (crime pictures) आती हैं जिससे कि हमारे देश की जनता पर खराब असर पड़ता है। इसके विपरीत हमारे देश की बहुत कम फिल्में विदेशों को जाती हैं, हमारे देश की फिल्मों का विदेशों में कोई स्थान नहीं है। तो फिर यह बात समझ में नहीं आती कि क्यों बाहर के देशों से फिल्मों को मंगाया जाता है जब कि इनसे हमारे देशवासियों को बहुत ही कम लाभ होता है।

जहां तक सेंसर बोर्ड का सम्बन्ध है वह इस तरीके से बनाया गया है कि उसके जो मेम्बर होते हैं वे हर साल रोटेशन (rotation) से बदल जाते हैं। वह व्यक्ति जो उसका मेम्बर होता है इन सालों के अन्दर जब उसे थोड़ा बहुत ज्ञान इस उद्योग का होने लगता है जिससे कि वह कुछ उपयोगी कार्य कर सके तो उसको बदल दिया जाता है। इसी तरह से जो इसके डाइरेक्टिव हैं वे तो बहुत अच्छे हैं मगर उन को इस रीति से चलाया जाता है कि उनका कुछ असर ही नहीं होता। उनका बहुत ही उदारता से उपयोग किया जाता है। इसलिए मेरा सुझाव यह है कि आप उस आदमी के अनुभव का लाभ उठाने की कोशिश करें जिसने एक दो साल मेम्बर रह

कर कुछ ज्ञान प्राप्त किया है। अगर एक के बाद दूसरे नये मेम्बर आते रहेंगे तो इससे जनता को कोई लाभ नहीं होगा।

हमारा जो सेंट्रल सेंसर बोर्ड है वह अवांछनीय उदारता से काम करता है जिससे देश को बहुत नुकसान हो रहा है। हमारे जो प्रान्तीय एडवाइजरी बोर्ड हैं वे अपनी बदनामी बचाने के लिए किसी फिल्म को अनसर्टीफाई (uncertify) नहीं करते हैं और सेंट्रल बोर्ड पर सब बात छोड़ देते हैं। मैंने इस विषय में डाक्टर केसकर जी से बातचीत की और मैं मानती हूँ कि वह इस दिशा में बहुत कुछ करना चाहते हैं। आज हो रहा है कि जब कोई फिल्म दिखाई जाती है और उसके बारे में अगर कोई शिकायत होती है तो उसकी जांच करने में करीब चार छः महीने लग जाते हैं। इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि जनता में उस फिल्म द्वारा जो खराबी हां सकती थी वह तो हो जाती है। इस चीज को भी हमें बहुत जल्दी दूर करना है।

आज फिल्मों द्वारा जनता में बहुत ही खराब असर पड़ रहा है। जब एक गांव वाला किसी फिल्म में किसी जज के घर में किसी लड़की को गन्दे ढंग से नाचते हुए देखता है तब उसके दिल में यह भावना पैदा होती है कि शहरों में सब जगह इसी तरह की बात होती होगी। मगर जीवन में सचमुच यह चीज नहीं होती है। इसी तरह से बहुत से दृश्य आजकल की फिल्मों में दिखलाये जाते हैं जिनसे जनता में खराब भावना पैदा होती है। इस तरह की चीजों को भी हमें रोकना होगा जिससे कि जनता में खराब असर न पड़े।

जब मैं बम्बई में ज्यूविनाईल कोर्ट में मजिस्ट्रेट थी तो मेरे सामने बहुत से बच्चों के चोरी और डकैती के मुकदमे आया करते थे। जब उन बच्चों से पूछा जाता था कि तुमने यह काम कहां से सीखा तो जवाब मिलता था कि सिनेमा द्वारा।



इस तरह से फिल्मों द्वारा हमारे राष्ट्र के बच्चों की आदतें खराब हो रही हैं। अगर सरकार की ओर से कोई कार्रवाई नहीं की गई तो इससे देश को बहुत खतरा है और हमारे बच्चे जो राष्ट्र के धन हैं, उनकी आदतें बचपन से ही बहुत खराब हो जायेंगी, वे भविष्य में किसी तरह से विकास न कर सकेंगे और समाज के लिये वह भार के रूप में हो जायेंगे।

मैं आशा करती हूँ कि मिनिस्टर साहब इस ओर अवश्य ही ध्यान देंगे और जो यह छोटा बिल उन्होंने रखा है उसी से ही संतोष नहीं करेंगे। हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब इस दिशा में जो कुछ भी प्रयत्न कर रहे हैं उसके बारे में समाचार पत्रों द्वारा और दूसरी जगहों से उनको डराया और धमकाया जाता है। माननीय मिनिस्टर साहब को इन लोगों की सब बातों के बारे में ज्ञान होगा और मुझे पूर्ण आशा है कि वे जो कुछ भी प्रयत्न इस दिशा में कर रहे हैं, उनमें किसी तरह की शिथिलता नहीं आयेगी। मैं अन्त में फिर आशा करूँगी कि जो कुछ मैंने इस विषय में कहा है मिनिस्टर साहब उस पर अवश्य ध्यान देंगे और इस विषय में कुछ न कुछ अवश्य करेंगे।

[For English translation, see Appendix IV, Annexure No. 154.]

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.]

10 A.M.

SHRIMATI RUKMINI DEVI ARUNDALE (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I think it is tremendously important for us to not only think of the amendment that is being proposed today but of the film industry as a whole and its place in the building of new India, because we are now in a transition stage and we have to think of it in terms of its effect upon the public and upon the country as a whole. I therefore think that the rules for our country must naturally be, for the time being, different from those prevailing anywhere else and we have to remember that when we are emphasising education and art,

film industry is one of the greatest forces in the life of the artistic world as well as the educational world. Film industry is a very powerful instrument and I think a very wonderful instrument if it can be well used. Therefore, it has to be worked in co-operation not only with politicians but with artistes, educationists, reformers and so on and unless there is a combined effort, there can never be that perfect expression which a Aim can be. The film has to be a wonderful expression because it is the greatest force for the education not only of the children but of the adults.

Sir, the point has been mentioned about certain films not being fit for those who are not adults, but frankly speaking, I do not know what is meant by the word 'adult', because if you think of a collegegoing girl or a boy of 18 or 20, they are just as much susceptible to the influence of a film as a child which is not able to understand pvpn Vi->if nf what is coine on; and then if you think of the number of the people who go to films, you find that they are not only the so-called educated people but the village people as well. We are giving them adult education. They go to films particularly to while away their time. Many intellectuals—even those who do not like the films—go there in order to while away their time and, Sir, leisure is a very valuable means of teaching. This teaching must not be in contradiction to our ideas of adult education. While we are trying to bring the advantage of literacy to the people, we are at the same time de-educating them because we are changing their mentality by the way films are being made today. There is no doubt about it that the film as a whole today is not expressing the genius of India. From an artistic point of view, very often it is the antithesis of art so much so that love for classical music, love for pure dance, all that has disappeared mainly because of the film. Art has been corrupted as a result. I cannot blame the film industry as it is, because the film corrup-

[Shrimati Rukmini Arundale.] Mon—or rather the corruption by films—began long before the film industry grew into a strong power in India. What the Westerners have left undone, Indians are continuing today; they are continuing the corruption that started to take place long ago. But the Westerners' point of view is different from that of ours in many ways. When a Westerner produces a film, he is presenting his own psychology, his own mentality, his own art, but when an Indian presents a film, he is not presenting his art, he is not presenting his psychology, he is not presenting an Indian point of view. We can therefore see that the Westerner presents life at least somewhat as it is in his world, while the Indian is creating a new and un-Indian type of citizen. He is creating a citizen unknown even to the West, because he does not even produce the cultured Western gentleman or Western lady, but he produces a person who is cultured neither from the Western point of view nor from the Eastern point of view. We are not true to our own genius. Every expression that we have must be true to our own genius. We are producing a new type of person who is a foreigner even in his own land, not only a foreigner in his own land but I can say from experience that he is also a foreigner in the Western countries, because he has a completely wrong idea of Western civilisation, when he goes to the West and when he tries to present himself as a wonderfully typical picture of a modern Indian to the Western person he only seems ridiculous because he is neither Indian nor Western. Take the art in films. We must have our principles fixed first. What is a film for? What is our programme? What is our aim? If we have these principles fixed and clear, and if the film industry co-operates, then arts and our nation will become enriched. If you take our villages, the temple used to be the centre of all arts, dance, music, etc. All the arts came from the temple. If you go to the villages now, not only do you not have an, peace there—

the loudspeakers have destroyed the peace of the villages—but you will find that the temple is no longer the place which people visit daily or from which they derive their inspiration. The cinema has nearly become a veritable modern temple. This is what is happening today. This is really a dangerous thing.

If we can see that the educational value of our films is improved, if there could be beauty in the film, if we can produce films telling the great stories of our history which can produce a healthy effect upon the youthful minds of our country, our schools and colleges will be far happier and they will become the centres for building nobility of character. We must remember all these points when we make our rules and regulations.

I personally would like the word 'adult' to be removed, when a film is marked for adult only, we generally have in mind films based on sex. What about murder stories? gangster stories? Are these fit for children and adults? We must develop a new idea of morality. Immorality is not only that which is sensual or that which stimulates sensuality but that which is cruel and ugly, that which detracts from character. The debasing effect of films containing sensuality, cruelty and ugliness is sometimes very great on adults as well as children, and from that point of view many of our adults who So to films are just as much children as the children themselves are.

Then comes the question about certifying films. Who are the people who certify our films? Who are our censors? Are they chosen from amongst those who represent the real culture of our country? I am a Member of Parliament myself, but I would like to know how many of us have really any knowledge when it comes to a question of art, when it comes to a question of beauty, how

many of us *have got* a clear idea of our background, of our history and of our literature. It is not possible for the modern mentality to censor our films properly, because the modern mentality is based upon the Western outlook. The modern mentality is an unnatural mentality, because if you take the West, the modern psychology in films, advertising etc. is that you must present everything from the sex point of view, from the point of view of sex appeal. In India, there has been a tremendous knowledge about sex, but somehow sex has been taken as a natural law and expression. But what do we find when we imitate the West? We make a natural thing into a completely unnatural thing and therefore we make it completely physical and gross, which is foreign to our nature. Surely we can deglamourise and elevate it. There are a large number of Western people today who are real reformers and who are against, such trends in the films. Therefore we have to think in terms of our own nature, our own genius, our own ideals, of the ideal nation that we want to build, and that is why it is important that, when we choose our censors, we choose people who want to make the films a means of education, a means of building up this country, a means of helping this country once again to become a land of culture for which India once was so famous. If we want to build India, we must build it culturally, and the film itself is one of the greatest forces for the spreading of culture, and we must reorientate the whole thing, our rules and regulations, everything, from that point of view.

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR (West Bengal):  
Mr. Deputy Chairman, the purposes of this amendment have been explained to the House by the hon. Minister. If that purpose is really put into practice, I am prepared to extend my support to the principles of this Bill, because we also stand for the easing of international tension, because we also want that such films should not be exhibited which are 33 CSE>

made for the purpose of throwing ridicule on any country in the world. We may have our differences with the rulers of certain countries, but we have great love and respect for the peoples of all the countries of the world.

Sir, as regards the prohibition or restriction of immoral films, I feel very strongly that it is necessary that some steps should be taken, or should have been taken earlier. While discussing this question I shall have to say something which would not be complimentary to the Government. Whenever the Government comes forward with anything good, they always come forward in a halfhearted and halting manner. This Bill is only a partial remedy. The Government should have gone into the whole question, into the whole problem, of the crisis in Indian film industry. About the crisis in Indian film industry, I do not want to say anything on this occasion, but about the Indian film world, I have to make certain specific points. I was closely following the speeches of the two hon. lady Members who preceded me. I have many points in common with them. I am in complete agreement with them as regards the undesirability of allowing the exhibition of films which extol gangsterism, which extol sex, which extol the beast in man. The Lady Member who immediately preceded me said that the Western films present the Western way of life. I totally disagree with her in this view. These films do not present the Western way of life. Because the real fact today is that the American reactionary influence is deliberately pervading the film world of many countries in order to corrupt the morals of the people. I appeal to all hon. Members, irrespective of party affiliations, to pay some attention to me... I shall show them the real face of things; I am not against anything American; I am not against anything foreign. We must take the good and progressive elements from others. There are American films and American films. There were some American films produced in Hollywood some time ago which were

fShri S. N. Mazumdar.] very progressive. For instance I can cite the example of some films in which Paul Muni and Charlie Chaplain have played the main parts. But what is happening today? Today these outstanding talents, these artists are being hounded out of America because of their advocacy of the cause of the under-dog and because of their strong protest against exploitation and because Charlie Chaplain protested against the Fascist Dictatorship. The reactionary rulers and their ideological propagandist of America have a plan today. They have a plan to bring out the beast in the man and spread the cult of the Blond Beast which was taken by Hitler from Niet-zche and developed into a cult. That cult is being deliberately spread into every country in order to corrupt the morals of people, in order to divert the attention of people from their struggle for a better and brilliant future. Sir, I am in complete agreement with the hon. Lady Members who preceded me that this sort of films which extol gangsterism, which extol the beast in the man are quite repugnant to the Indian traditions and culture. This type of films are an insult to the womanhood, particularly to Indian womanhood, but unfortunately I find that whenever such questions come up, some of my friends here and outside also, in their prejudice against Communism, allow their attention to be diverted to wrong channels. Hon. Members may have differences regarding Communism or as regards the Soviet way of life and they are at liberty to have them. But I say that in none of the Soviet films which were shown in India, there was even the slightest suggestion of sex appeal or the cult of the beast in the man. In this connection I am compelled to say that while I was going through the report of the proceedings of the House of the People, I was pained to see that my hon. friend the Minister for Commerce and Industry went out of his way to bring in the question of political propaganda. There may be difference of opinion regarding the effect of propaganda on the young minds.

Here there is no question of political propaganda. I came across a book in some stall bearing the title "American Capitalism A Classless democracy" which is a huge joke. I have no objection to that book being sold. Let them propagate. We shall fight them out politically but here it is not a question about communism or anti-communism. Here it is a question of degrading man. Against that we should, take a bold stand.

\* Secondly as regards the question of the sort of films which are calculated to increase international tension. I should like to say one thing. I was glad to listen to the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister who piloted the Bill, but unfortunately I have seen in many places that film showing the incidents in the Kojie Prison Camp are being exhibited in the cinemas as news documentaries—the tanks rolling over the tanks crushing the fences and the prisoners sitting with their arms up—these films showing these scenes have been permitted to be shown. But it is a shame that a film like "Road to the Peace was not granted" permission. I had occasion and good fortune to witness that film in a private show. There were many Congress M.Ps. also there. After the exhibition was finished, there was not a single person there who could take any objection to that film from any point of view. Today, whatever differences we may have, if we all are for guarding the best traditions of the Indian culture and our best heritage and if we stand for Peace, then irrespective of party affiliations we should be aware of this problem.

Then a serious attempt should be made by the Government to enquire-into the causes as to why these films are coming to India. I refer to the crisis in the film industry. I confess that I have not much knowledge about it. Still from the little knowledge that I possess about it I can say that this crisis in the film industry is due to two reasons—one is the invasion of

the Hollywood type of films and the second is the policy of the big monopolists in the film industry. They are forcing this sort of films on the Indian people but the Indian people don't like these films. It is true that many go to while away their time, and many fall victims to the way of life shown in those films but it is to the credit of our people that they have not submitted to this sort of propaganda. Not only from this or that section but from many sections people are raising their voice of protest. Not only they are protesting against the films bringing out the beast in man but they have brought out films depicting the glorious traditions of the people of India and the success of those films give the lie to the excuse that the Hollywood type films have to be exhibited here in order to ensure box office success. There are numerous facts to illustrate that films which are really of a good order have a roaring box office success. I shall cite only one example. The film *Jhansi-ki-Rani* has been running in all the big cities of India for 40 weeks. It was opened by the Prime Minister. I had witnessed that film. It is not that I am quite in agreement with everything that is shown in that. Still it was a real relief. When I knew that it was in technicolour and the film had been produced with the help of American Technicians, I had many misgivings but the name of Sohrab Mody drew me there. When I saw the film I found that actually in that film they have not succumbed to the influence of the Hollywood type of pictures. I would have been very glad if the role of the people during the Sepoy Mutiny were shown there in active role. The role of the people in the Mutiny should have been brought to the lime-light. That was not done. Still the great traditions of the Indian people and the anti-Imperialist feelings of the Indian people are there. So it gives the lie to the excuse that because of box office success, the Hollywood type of films have become necessary. So I submit that this amendment is not sufficient. It is necessary to go to the root of the problem. Government should appoint

an Enquiry Committee to go into the causes .....

SHRI GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): Patil Committee was appointed for that .....

SHRI C. G. K. REDDY (Mysore): That was a business enquiry, and naturally .....

SHRI S. N. MAZUMDAR: I shall not take much time of the House but I shall come to some of the clauses. I quite agree with the hon. Lady Member Shrimati Munshi that the distinction between adults and non-adults-defeats the purpose for which the distinction is made. I have also found from my experience that whenever in the advertisement of any film it is mentioned that it is for adults only, not only non-adults rush to it but even adults go in who have a taste for that type of film. Actually it is an advertisement catering to the tastes of the people who go there for this type of films. What step should be taken is to ban these films and Government can come in there. In spite of my differences with the Government I say that in some of the documentaries produced by the Films Division of the Government of India, the Indian cultural heritage etc. have been shown and these are liked by the people and these can be shown in the foreign countries also to show that this is our past. Films produced about our national struggle can be taken and shown, so that these will be a guide to the industry as to what is the type of films that are necessary. So I want that the distinction "For adults only" should be done away with. It defeats its purpose.

As regards clause 2(1) in connection with the tampering question, I would like to say a few words. This power should not be used in a mechanical way, because it may happen that some minor changes are made and the minor changes don't offend the purpose or principles of this Bill. Simply by an arbitrary application of this power».

[Shri S. N. Mazumdar.] the people should not be victimized. I shall give one example. Recently at Calcutta I witnessed a film—"Bansher Kella" or "The Fort of the bamboos". It was all about the revolt of the peasants against the indigo planters. In the film the fighting spirit of the peasantry is shown and it ends with the British planter who was a tyrant being caught hold of and arrested, and j with that scene it almost ended. There were criticisms that this scene should , not have been disposed of like that, that he should have been given at least a good beating and some such thing also should have been included in the scene. And that was added to it later on. If such a thing is done, the film should not be victimised.

Secondly, it will be seen that in the film industry also the small and the medium owners are in great difficulty. Actually they are the people ■who mostly still fight against the invasion of these reactionary type of films, the Hollywood-type of pictures. Formerly I did not have much inclination to go to see Bengali pictures, I thought they were merely melodramatic things, with some tears and melancholy songs. But recently I find a section of them are taking up such films as "Bansher Kella" and they really are a challenge to the invasion of the reactionary type of films and what is more, most of the Bengali films have succeeded in holding their ground" against the attack by these types of films. It is not a question of Bengali or Hindi or Indian or Western films. It is a question of outlook of upholding our traditions, Indian culture or Indian heritage. I agree with the lady Member who said that these bad films are the cause of the deterioration of our national cultural forms they are the cause of the deterioration in the fields of dance and music. But still, it is, if I may say so, a onesided picture I say the Indian people have not submitted to these forces of degradation. They have stood up against this attack and they have successfully revived our cultural heritage.

They have revived our folk-lore, drama, music, etc. There is the People's Theatre Association and I can refer to the name of Uday Shankar who has done much to revive these Indian cultural forms. These people have not succumbed to the undesirable influence. But it is necessary for Government to tackle the problem. They should take the bull by the horns, go to the root of the problem and see that it be solved.

PROF. R. D. SINHA DINKAR  
(Bihar):

**प्रो० आर० डी० सिंह दिनकर (बिहार):**  
श्रीमान् उपसभापति जो, संस्कृति की रक्षा और पालन देवियां करती हैं। मुझे बड़ी खुशी है कि फिल्म की जो प्रतिक्रिया देश के नारी समाज पर हुई है उसकी अभिव्यक्ति माननीया लीलाजी ने और माननीया रुक्मिणी जी ने बहुत ही अच्छे शब्दों में की है और हम सब लोगों को इस मत के लिये बड़ा ही गर्व है। मुझे यह भी आशा है कि जो लोग फिल्म बनाते हैं या जो लोग फिल्मों में काम करते हैं, उनके गाने निखते हैं या अभिनय करते हैं, उन लोगों तक इन दो देवियों की आवाज अवश्य पहुंचेगी और सेंसर (censor) के भय से तटस्थ रह कर वे स्वयं अपने हृदय से यह प्रश्न करेंगे कि जो प्रतिक्रिया आज देश में हो रही है उसका वे क्या समाधान दे सकते हैं।

जहां तक सेंसर बोर्ड (Censor Board) का सम्बन्ध है, जब भी भारतीय फिल्मों की आलोचना होती है तब अक्सर जो कम से कम कहा जाता है वह यह है कि ये बहुत ही खराब हैं। और तब यह बात स्वाभाविक हो जाती है कि आलोचकों का ध्यान सेंसर बोर्ड पर चला जाय क्योंकि फिल्मों के नियंत्रण का काम इसी बोर्ड के जिम्मे है। मेरी आयु बोर्ड के सदस्य के नाते अभी सिर्फ एक सप्ताह की है, लेकिन

जो कुछ मंने देखा है उस के बल पर में कह सकता हूं कि वह बोर्ड आदरणीय है। मैं यह भी मानता हूं कि मेरे सिवा बोर्ड के सभी सदस्य बड़े ही सुसंस्कृत, सुशुचि-सम्पन्न और कलापूर्ण व्यक्ति हैं। मगर, बोर्ड की कठिन स्थिति ठीक से समझी नहीं जाती है। इस स्थान पर मुझे कवि इकबाल का एक शेर याद आता है। जब इकबाल के बारे में कुछ लोग यह समझने लगे कि यह मुसलमान नहीं है, रहस्यवादी है और कुछ लोग यह समझने लगे कि यह खालिस मुसलमान है, तब उन्होंने अपने बारे में एक शेर कहा था जो इस प्रकार है :

“जाहिदे तंगे नजर ने मुझे काफिर समझा और काफिर ये समझता है मुसलमां हूं मैं।” तो बोर्ड की भी यही हालत है। जो कला के आलाचक हैं उन की दृष्टि में बोर्ड कसूरवार मालूम होता है। जो नैतिकता के उपासक हैं वे भी बोर्ड को दोषी मानते हैं। मगर मंने यह भी देखा है कि जो लोग फिल्मों के निर्माता हैं वे भी बोर्ड को शंका की दृष्टि से देखते हैं। उनका कहना है कि “This is a negative Organisation” अब बात यह है कि बोर्ड को नैगेटिव कहना न तो उसकी निन्दा करना है और न प्रशंसा, क्योंकि बोर्ड की रचना ही काटने के लिये हुई है, जोड़ने के लिये नहीं।

जहां तक फिल्मों में सुधार लाने की बात है, मेरा ख्याल है कि कानून काफी नहीं होंगे। फिल्मों की बीमारी का इलाज सेंसर की कैंची नहीं बल्कि, फिल्म व्यवसाय में लगे हुये लोगों के भीतर कला का जागरण और सुशुचि का उदय है। जिस उद्देश्य से सेंसर काम करता है, उसी उद्देश्य को ले कर अगर निर्माता और कलाकार भी काम करने लगे तो हमारी कठिनाई आसानी से दूर हो सकती है। कलाकारों को स्वयं यह देखना चाहिये

कि उनकी जो भी कला जनता में प्रदर्शित की जाने वाला है उसमें कैंची चलाने की आवश्यकता न पड़े। देश क्या चाहता है, इसे निर्देशक और कलाकार समझते हैं और अगर उसी के अनुसार वे कार्य करें तो अवस्था अच्छी हो जाय। इस समय इस उद्योग की जो अवस्था है उसको सुधारने में सेंसर को कहां तक सफलता मिलेगी, सेंसर के सारे प्रयत्नों के बावजूद देश को कितना संतोष होगा इसके बारे में मुझे सन्देह है। इसीलिये मैं जन-शुचि के परिमार्जन पर इतना जोर देता हूं।

जहां तक डाइरेक्टिव (Directive) का सवाल है, आप जानते हैं कि डाइरेक्टिव बनाने वालों का एक काननी नजरिया होता है, कानून की दृष्टि को देखते हुए डाइरेक्टिव बनाये जाते हैं। लेकिन इसका असली रूप क्या हो, यह कहना मुश्किल है क्योंकि कानून की भाषा, कला और नैतिकता की सारी ध्याप्तियों को धर नहीं सकती। उदाहरण के लिये, डाइरेक्टिव में जिस चीज को “gruesome cruelty” कहा गया है कि वह चीज कहां से शुरू और कहां पर खत्म होती है, इस का फैसला करना आसान नहीं है। रोगी को सुई देना भी निर्दयता है और लोहे की शलाकाएं आंखों में धुसेड़ना भी निर्दयता है। ऐसी बातों को ले कर आदमी में मतभेद होता है और जब तक जनशुचि का स्तर ठीक से प्रकट नहीं होता, हम ऐसी बातों पर आखिरी फैसला नहीं दे सकते और न कानून ही पूर्ण हो सकता है।

देश में एक अवाज है कि फिल्मों का असर बुरा हो रहा है और सबकी आंखें सरकार और सेंसर पर जा पड़ी हैं। मगर, सरकार और सेंसर सारे कामों को अंजाम नहीं दे सकते। कुछ थोड़ा ही काम उन के बस का है। बाकी काम जनता को करना है। हिन्दू

[Prof. R. D. Sinha Dinkar.]

देवताओं की फिल्मों में दुर्दशा होती है और हिन्दू जनता इन फिल्मों को देख कर नहीं चिढ़ती। वह सिनेमा वालों को पैसे देती है जिससे वे और देवताओं की भी बेदुरमती कर सकें। जिन फिल्मों की आलोचना हम शिष्ट मंडली में करते हैं, उन्हीं को हम खुशी खुशी देखते भी हैं। इसलिये मेरा कहना है कि जनमत और जनरुचि का शिक्षण आवश्यक है।

हिन्दी के समाचार पत्र जनरुचि के शिक्षण का काम खूब करते रहे हैं और उनका थोड़ा बहुत असर भी हुआ है लेकिन, जनता की रुचि अभी खुल कर प्रकट नहीं हुई है। यह रुचि खुल कर प्रकट हो तो उसका आदर निर्माता भी करेंगे, कलाकार भी, और संसार का काम आसान हो जायगा। जो निर्माता लाखों रुपये गला कर फिल्म बनाता है, उसके प्रति यह सहानुभूति तो रहनी ही चाहिये कि वह बिल्कुल बर्बाद न हो जाय और संसार अपर अपनी कैची कस कर चलाये तो फिर देखने को रह क्या जायगा? यह मनोरंजन हथिया नहीं जा सकता। जनता इसे चाहती है। इसलिये उपाय यही है कि उत्पादन के सिरे पर सुरुचि काम करे और उत्पादकों में यह सुरुचि जगाना जनता का काम है, हंसारा, आपका, समाचारपत्रों और शिक्षकों का काम है।

मेरा खयाल है कि फिल्म के शासन में चार तरह की कठिनाइयाँ हैं। एक कठिनाई तो नैतिकता और कला को ले कर है, जिसका पूरा इलाज कानून नहीं है। दूसरी कठिनाई यह है कि जब फिल्म को सर्टिफिकेट मिल जाता है तब प्रोड्यूसर या डिस्ट्रीब्यूटर (producer or distributor) जो अंश काटा गया है उसको भी दिखला देते हैं। तीसरी कठिनाई है "ए" और "यू" फिल्मों के

बारे में। अर्थात् कुछ फिल्में ऐसी पास होती हैं जिनको सब देख सकते हैं और कुछ फिल्में ऐसी पास की जाती हैं जिनको केवल वयस्क व्यक्ति ही देख सकते हैं। जैसा कि लीलावती जी ने कहा है जो फिल्में केवल वयस्कों के लिये होती हैं उन्हें भी अपरिपक्व बच्चे जरूर देखते हैं और राज्य सरकारों के पास इतने साधन नहीं हैं कि वे इस नियम का कड़ाई से पालन करवा सकें। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस सम्बन्ध में सदन की इच्छा है कि "ए" और "यू" फिल्मों का यह भेद ही उठा दिया जाय।

एक कठिनाई और है। फिल्मों शंकर का मायावाद है जिन में कुछ नहीं में कुछ का भ्रम दिखलाई पड़ता है। इसी तरह यह फिल्म का व्यापार भी और व्यापारों से कुछ भिन्न है। जो आदमी फिल्म बनाता है अक्सर वह अपना स्वत्व बेच देता है। मोहन से सोहन को, सोहन से राम को और राम से कृष्ण को, इस प्रकार जाते जाते, वह स्वत्व इतनी दूर पहुँच जाता है कि एक समय फिल्म के स्वत्वाधिकारी का पता लगाना कठिन हो जाता है। फिर यदि जिसने सर्टिफिकेट लिया था वह व्यापार छोड़ कर बाहर चला गया तो सरकार के लिये बड़ी कठिनाई हो जाती है कि वह किसे पकड़े। इसलिये वर्तमान संशोधन में यह कहा गया है कि जब फिल्म बेची जाय तो उसका सारा विवरण खरीदने वाले के हवाले किया जाय और उसकी सारी जवाबदेही भी खरीदने वाले पर रख दी जाय। यह बहुत अच्छा होगा और मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे फिल्म के शासन में थोड़ा सुधार अवश्य होगा।

एक बात और है। जो फिल्में सर्टीफाइड (certified) हो गई हैं उनमें चाहे जोड़ने की जरूरत हो सकती है और चाहे उनमें घटाने की जरूरत हो सकती है। जहाँ तक जोड़ने की बात है सर्टिफिकेट लेने



के बाद उत्पादकों को यह अधिकार नहीं रहना चाहिये। जो अंश सेंसर ने काट दिया है उसे फिर से जोड़ने की बात नहीं उठती। लेकिन, एक अवस्था और होती है जब कि सर्टिफायड फिल्म को दिखलाने के समय उत्पादक को यह महसूस होने लगता है कि फिल्म का कोई अंश ऐसा है जिसे जनता असन्तुष्ट नहीं करती है और जिस के रहने से फिल्म की बदनामी और उत्पादक को घाटा होगा। ऐसी हालत में उत्पादक चाहता है कि वह ऐसे अंश को तुरन्त काट दे और यह काम वह उसी रोज़ कर लेना चाहता है जिससे फिल्म के विरुद्ध होने वाली प्रतिक्रिया शीघ्र से शीघ्र रोक दी जाय। मेरा ख्याल है, व्यवसाय के हित में यह अच्छा होगा अगर हम अपने रेजिनल अफसरों को यह अधिकार दें कि वे उत्पादकों के अनुरोध करने पर किसी अंश को काटने की इजाजत उन्हें दें। जनता को फुसलाने के लिये मनोरंजन की सामग्री जुटायी जाती है और कभी कभी उसमें इतना रंग और इतनी चासनी भर जाती है कि सेंसर को उसे काट देना पड़ता है। लेकिन, अगर कला की दृष्टि से कोई खराबी मालूम पड़े तो ऐसा इंतजाम होना चाहिये कि स्थानीय अधिकारी, रेजिनल आफिसर अथवा चेयरमैन की आज्ञा से उत्पादक फौरन खराब हिस्से को फिल्म से अलग कर सकें क्योंकि हमको यह सोचना ही पड़ेगा कि फिल्म तैयार करने में बहुत रुपया गलाना पड़ता है और अगर वह फिल्म बदनाम हो गई तो व्यवसाय को धक्का लगेगा।

Dn. P. C. MITRA:

डाक्टर पी० सी० मित्र : कुछ परवाह नहीं।

PROP. R. D. SINHA DINKAR:

प्रो० आर० डी० सिंह दिनकर : "कुछ परवाह नहीं" यह कहने से काम नहीं चलेगा क्योंकि ऐसे भी बहुत से लोग हैं जो इस देश को ब्रह्मचर्य आश्रम नहीं बनने देंगे। यह देश

आजाद हुआ है और उसके हर नागरिक को चलने, फिरने, कूदने और नाचने की पूरी आजादी है। देश में जो स्वतन्त्रता की भावना है उसको संयम की भावना के साथ मिला कर चलाना चाहिये, इसी में कल्याण है। हमारी भारतीय स्वतन्त्रता में स्वतन्त्रता भी बहुत है। और संयम भी बहुत है। तो समझता हूँ कि फिल्म में भारतीय दृष्टिकोण प्रश्रय पाये इसकी बहुत कुछ जवाबदेही जनता पर है, फिल्म देखने वालों पर है, कितने दुख की बात है कि धार्मिक देवताओं को जो फिल्में बनाते हैं उनमें देवताओं का मजाक उड़ाया जाता है। निर्माता समझता है कि हमने देवताओं को खूब दिखाया लेकिन धार्मिक दृष्टि से वह बहुत भद्दा होता है। मगर जनता उसे देखती है और हंस कर चली जाती है। इससे निर्माताओं की हिम्मत बढ़ती है और वे फिर उसी तरह की फिल्में बनाने की कोशिश करते हैं। मेरा ख्याल है कि जनता जरा अपनी रुचि को ठीक करे और कुरुचिपूर्ण फिल्मों पर कुछ विरोध भी प्रकट करे। इस विरोध का जितना असर होगा उतना कानून का नहीं। कानून से हम कुछ गिनी गिनायी खास चीजों को रोक सकते हैं, रुचि का मार्जन या निर्माण नहीं कर सकते। यह काम जनता का है। सुना है कि अमेरिका में हाई कोर्ट या सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने यह फैसला दे दिया है कि जितनी आजादी प्रेस को दी जाती है उतनी ही आजादी फिल्म को भी दी जानी चाहिये। और कानून की दृष्टि से यह बात गलत भी नहीं दीखती। मगर, ध्यान दे कर देखने पर यह बात मालूम हो जायगी कि यह समानता उसी देश में चल सकती है जहाँ उत्पादक और दर्शक के बीच मतभेद नहीं हो, जहाँ जनता की उस रुचि का स्तर स्पष्ट हो और उत्पादक उसका आदर करते हों। देश की सांस्कृतिक रुचि की फेहरिस्त बनाना आसान नहीं है और न हम केवल कानून से उसकी रक्षा ही कर सकते हैं।

[Prof. R. D. Sinha Dinkar.]

मेरा याल है कि यह संोधन बहुत अच्छा है और इस को स्वीकृत हो जाना चाहिये। मैं यह भी मानता हूँ कि कानून कुछ और आगे तक हमारी सहायता कर सकता है। लेकिन, जन र्वि के विकास के बिना फिल्मों की कुरूपता नहीं मिटेगी।

[For English translation, see Appendix I% of Annexure No. 155.]

SHRIMATI MAYA DEVI CHETTRY (West Bengal):

श्रीमती मायादेवी छेत्री (पश्चिमी बंगाल) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यद्यपि मैं फिल्म और कला के विषय में बहुत ही पीछे हूँ फिर भी एक दर्शक की हैसियत से यहां पर बोलने का थोड़ा शौक हुआ। हमारी दो बहनों और भाइयों ने यह सब बता दिया है कि फिल्म में क्या क्या दोष हैं और उनमें क्या नये नये परिवर्तन करने हैं। मैं तो समझती हूँ कि समाज को उन्नति के रास्ते पर ले जाने का हमारे लिये फिल्म एक आकर्षक मागं है। सिनेमा का शौक आजकल हर एक आदमी को हो गया है। शहरों में तो लोग सिनेमा देखने के लिये बेचैन हो जाते हैं और एक हफ्ते में एक बार देखना जरूरी सा समझते हैं। चाहे बड़े हों या छोटे हों किसी तरह से अपना सब प्रोग्राम काट कर के सिनेमा जाते हैं। छोटे घराने के हों या बड़े घराने के हों सब को सिनेमा का शौक है। मैं तो देखती हूँ कि शहर के लोग ही नहीं बल्कि कस्बों और बस्तियों के लोग और ग्रामों के लोग दूर से अपना सारा कारबार छोड़ कर भी और बहुत खर्च कर के भी सिनेमा को देखते हैं। यही नहीं कि यदि उनकी अवस्था थर्ड क्लास में देखने की है तो उसमें ही देखें बल्कि सेकेंड क्लास, फर्स्ट क्लास या ब्राक्स जो भी मिलता है उसमें देखते हैं। उन लोगों के पास जो भी पैसा होता है उसको खर्च कर के देख कर चले जाते हैं। तो हमारे समाज में सिनेमा इतना आवश्यक हो गया है कि यदि

हम प्रयत्न करें तो लोग इसके द्वारा अपना शौक पूरा करने के साथ साथ अपना सुधार भी कर सकते हैं।

सिनेमा देखने के बाद उनके मन में क्या प्रतिक्रिया होती है उसका हमें पूरा ध्यान रखना है। जो खेल व सिनेमा में देखते हैं वही उन लोगों के दिल में रह जाता है। अगर कोई धार्मिक खेल होता है तो उसे देखकर वे उससे अपना चरित्र भी घर छोड़ परिवर्तित कर सकते हैं। हमारे हिन्दुस्तान में नकल करने का ढंग बहुत है और जो कुछ वहां लोग देखते हैं उसी का अनुसरण करते हैं और उस से प्रभावित होते हैं। छोटे छोटे बच्चे जब सिनेमा देख कर आते हैं तो वैसे ही बातें करने लगते हैं जैसी वहां देखते हैं, सुनते हैं।

आज कल जो फिल्म होते हैं वे अमेरिकन फिल्म "काऊबॉय" (cow boy) के ढंग के होते हैं। जब छोटे छोटे बच्चे देखते हैं कि वह चोरी करता है, पिस्तौल चलाता है तो वह भी उसी तरह सीखना चाहते हैं और घर के कोने कोने में दौड़ दौड़ कर पिस्तौल चलाते हैं और सिनेमा में चोरी करना देख कर उसे सीखते हैं। तो ऐसी ऐसी फिल्मों को हिन्दुस्तान में आना बन्द कर देना चाहिये। देश में जो फिल्म हम प्रोड्यूस करते हैं वह भी उसी की नकल कर के करते हैं। इसी तरह का मैंने एक सिनेमा देखा था जिस का नाम "संग्राम" था। उसमें एक छोटा लड़का था जो बदमाश था। वह स्कूल नहीं जाता था, पढ़ना नहीं चाहता था, चोरी बदमाशी किया करता था, आलसी बहुत था और यह कोशिश करता था कि दूसरे लड़के भी बदमाशी करें। बाद में वह सुधर गया लेकिन जो बच्चे देखते हैं उनको यह बुद्धि नहीं होती। इसलिये वह यही सीखेंगे कि किस तरह से स्कूल में न जायं, स्कूल से फांकी दे कर घर बैठना, चोरी करना और बदमाशी करना, यही सब सीख लेते हैं। यह तो "संग्राम" सिनेमा में था कि बच्चों

को ले कर मत जायं लेकिन अगर बच्चों को मना किया जायगा कि मत जाओ तब वे जरूर जायेंगे, वह इसलिये जाना चाहेंगे कि देखें उसमें क्या रहस्य है। इसलिये ऐसे फिल्मों से हमारी जो सन्तानें हैं उनको छुटपन से ही नुकसान होता है और उनका मोरल नष्ट हो जाता है। अगर उनका जो कि हमारी सन्तानें हैं, और जिन पर हमारा भविष्य अवलम्बित है मोरल नष्ट हो गया तो फिर हमारे समाज का और देश का क्या हाल हो जायगा ?

अगर हम इस रीति से चलेंगे तो भविष्य में हमारी सन्तानों का मोरल नष्ट हो जायेगा और हमारा देश तरक्की नहीं कर सकेगा। इसलिए यह बहुत ही आवश्यक है कि इस तरह के फिल्मों को हमें बन्द कर देना होगा। हम यह भी नहीं चाहते हैं कि जब फिल्म बनकर तैयार हो जाता है, जिसमें काफी रुपया खर्च किया जाता है, उस को यों ही बन्द कर दिया जाय। होना यह चाहिये कि जो भी निर्माता फिल्म बनाना चाहें वह पहिले उस प्लॉट (plot) को, उसकी पुस्तक को, उसमें जो गीत हैं उनको एक कमेटी के सामने रखें ऐसी कमेटी सरकार को बनानी चाहिए। सेंसर बोर्ड यह कार्य बहुत अच्छी तरह से कर सकता है। जब कभी उसके सामने इस तरह के फिल्म जांच के लिए आये तो वह उस बात को उस फिल्म में से हटाने के लिए कह सकता है जो देश के और समाज के लिए उचित नहीं है। अगर इस तरह की व्यवस्था कर दी जाय तो अच्छे फिल्म भी देश के अन्दर तैयार होने लगे और बाद में जो फिल्म बन्द कर दिये जाते हैं उनका रुपया भी बरबाद होने से बच जाये। अगर इस तरह की व्यवस्था कर दी जायेगी तो हमारे देश की जनता का और हमारी सन्तानों का मोरल (moral) बढ़ जायेगा।

इस के साथ ही साथ हमारे देश की कला को भी प्रोत्साहन मिलेगा।

दूसरी बात जो मुझे सेंसर बोर्ड के सामने रखनी है वह यह है कि हर प्रान्त की रुचि के मुताबिक फिल्म बनाई जानी चाहिए जैसे बंगाल में बंगाली फिल्म वहां के लोगों की रुचि को ध्यान में रख कर तैयार की जाती है। इस तरह से मद्रास वालों के लिए मद्रासी रुचि की तस्वीरें बनाई जाती हैं। इस तरह से लोगों के दिल में अपनी देश की संस्कृति और कला को देखने की इच्छा होती है। जब कभी कोई बंगाली फिल्म दार्जीलिंग में आती है तो सारे परिवार के लोग फिल्म देखने का प्रोग्राम बनाते हैं ताकि वे अपनी संस्कृति और कला के बारे में ज्ञान प्राप्त कर सकें। तो मेरा सरकार से यह कहना है कि जब भी इस तरह की फिल्में बनाई जायं उनको पहिले स्टेट सरकार द्वारा पास कराया जाना चाहिये, बाद में सेंट्रल सेंसर बोर्ड के पास मंजूरी के लिये भेजा जाना चाहिये। स्टेट सरकार अपनी जनता की रुचि के बारे में पूरी तरह से जानकारी रखती है और सेंट्रल सेंसर बोर्ड को इस बारे में बहुत कम ज्ञान होता है। अगर स्टेट सरकार किसी फिल्म में किसी तरह की खराब बात पायेगी तो वह उसको अलग करने के लिए सेंसर बोर्ड से सिफारिश कर सकती है। इस तरह से सेंट्रल बोर्ड की भी बहुत दिक्कत कम हो जायेगी।

इसके बाद मुझे एडल्ट और बच्चों के सिनेमा देखने के बारे में कुछ कहना है। हमारे एडल्ट्स के लिए अलग फिल्में होनी चाहियें और बच्चों के लिए अलग फिल्में होनी चाहियें। बच्चों के लिए शिक्षाप्रद फिल्में होनी चाहियें जिससे कि उनकी मानसिक तरक्की हो सके। अक्सर उनके माता पिता भी उनके साथ जाते हैं और वे जो भी शिक्षाप्रद बात उस फिल्म में होगी अच्छी तरह से उनको बतला सकते हैं। एडल्टों

[Shrimati Maya Devi Chetty.]

के लिये जो फिल्में होती हैं उनको बच्चों को दिखाना रोक देना चाहिये। इस तरह की फिल्मों में जिनमें बच्चों को हानि पहुंचने की सम्भावना है उसमें माता पिता को बच्चों सहित जाने की इजाजत नहीं होनी चाहिये। बच्चों के लिये तो अलग ही स्पेशल सिनेमा होने चाहियें, अगर इस तरह की बातें सरकार की ओर से की जायें तो देश के बच्चों की बड़ी रक्षा हो सकती है।

अन्तिम बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह यह है कि देश में जितने भी सिनेमा हाल हैं उनमें हर दर्ज में स्त्रियों के लिये ५ परसेंट जगह रिजर्व होनी चाहिये जिससे कि वे बगैर किसी अड़चन के वहां पर जा सकें। अक्सर होता यह है कि औरतों को मर्दों के साथ या बच्चों के साथ जाना पड़ता है। अगर इस तरह की सुविधा कर दी गई तो औरतें भी आसानी के साथ सिनेमा जा सकेंगी।

इसके साथ ही साथ मैं यह भी कहूंगी कि सेंसर बोर्ड में औरतों को अधिक संख्या में लिया जाना चाहिये क्योंकि औरतों को चरित्र के बारे में पुरुषों से ज्यादा ज्ञान होता है। इतना ही कह कर मैं अपना भाषण समाप्त करती हूँ।

I. For English translation, see Appendix IV, Annexure No. 13CJ]

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: Sir, while welcoming this amending Bill inasmuch as it aims at removing the defects noticed to the Act, I am very doubtful whether it will have the desired effect. Of course the Act and the amendments lay down the obligations on the part of the producer, distributor and the exhibitor and also the punishment if they violate the obligation. But there is something missing in the middle, and it is this. Who is to detect whether a producer or an exhibitor or a distributor violates his respective obligation? As at present when a picture is censored it is sent

to the Chairman of the Central Board who issues the certificate with the endorsement of the cuts that have been recommended by the Board. And then the details of the films censored in a particular month are sent in a consolidated list to the State Governments who in their turn see that it is sent to the District Magistrates so that they can keep a watch whether the producer, distributor or the exhibitor violates the provisions. As at present I understand the Government have already made a provision that the cuts made in a film should be published in the Gazette of India. But then the publication takes at least a month so that the excisions in the picture come to the notice of the public or the State Governments only after a month. Now once a picture is certified, it is shown to the public immediately in many places simultaneously and no picture, unless it is extraordinarily good, runs more than a month. So by the time the cuts in a picture come to the notice of the State Governments or the District Magistrates or to the public, after their publication in the Gazette of India, a month would have passed and the film with the cuts might have been shown to the public in the meantime and any action after a month might be ineffective. So the purpose of the censoring of the film itself is lost because unless a film runs more than a month or two, things would not be detected and rectified.

Even if it is detected, the procedure adopted all this time has not been effective. Now, the one good thing in the amendment is that the delay that would have been caused in taking action is being minimised. But there is no provision to detect these violations which are normal happenings in the industry. The producers generally do not co-operate with the Censor Board. They think that the Censor Board is a useless organisation which tries to sit over them and control them. They just try to find out in which way they can escape the eyes of the Censor Board or of the Government. They al-

always try to put in things at a later stage, after it has been censored. These things have been brought to the notice of Government and they are taking action only to see that action is quickened, but they are not taking any action to see how these things can be detected quickly. I hope Government will consider this question in all its importance and take a decision in this matter.

I suggest that a statutory provision must be made so that the Regional Offices can have direct contact with State Governments and once a film is certified and the Censor Board recommends an excision, it should be circulated to the State Governments directly by the Regional Officer so that the State Government can immediately circulate it to all the District Magistrates and Police officers who could be asked to keep an eye on it. Or else, the Government of India must create a non-governmental organisation—a voluntary organisation—in each district or mofussil centre, and distribute to them the excisions that are made in a picture so that they can see the picture and report to the Regional Officers to take action if there had been any violation. Unless these things are done, merely saying that they should do this thing and that and if they do not do it, they will be punished, serves no purpose. There must be some quicker and effective method of checking and seeing that violations do not occur.

The second point I have to make is about foreign films imported into this country. As you know, Sir, many of these foreign films do propaganda against some other foreign country or speak derogatory of other countries. It is beyond the scope of the ordinary members of the Censor Board to see whether it affects the sentiments of any other foreign country or not. It is always "better that the Foreign Affairs Department of the Government of India goes through these pictures and then sends them to the Censor Board to see whether they offend against the morals of the people. Only the latter thing could be looked

into by the censors; but the question whether it really offends the sentiments of other foreign countries which, in turn, will affect our relations with that particular foreign country is a thing which should be for the Foreign Affairs Department of the Government of India to see and to decide. It should not be thrown on the shoulders of the members of the Censor Board because they cannot be always in touch with foreign affairs. Whether those pictures try to indirectly say something derogatory to some other foreign nation should be carefully looked into only by the Foreign Affairs Department.

Then, Sir, we are importing a large number of Information films from foreign countries. I think it is absolutely no use hereafter importing them. We are producing Information films here in India—not only of Indian news but foreign news also. These foreign Information films generally carry something against some other country. If it is American, it carries something against Russia; and if it is Russian, it carries something against America. We can do very well with our own Information films which are very good and I congratulate the Minister for producing good Information films in this country. They should be more popularised and we should not allow the import of any of these foreign Information films—Paramount, M. G. M. or any such thing.

11 A.M.

Then, Sir, the Embassies import certain films on certain occasions which are shown privately. These do not come under the purview of the Censor Board. They show them at private shows or in some studios. I had drawn the attention of the hon. Minister to a particular instance. A year ago two films were brought from Russia by the Russian Embassy to show to the Cultural Delegation. Each picture had four reels, that is, on the whole there were eight reels. They showed 2 reels of picture No. 1 and two reels of picture No. 2 in

[Shri G. Rajagopalan.] Bombay and the other two reels of each picture in Madras and further the picture was in Russian language so that both the pictures could be easily passed, without the censors knowing what it contains. They split up both the pictures. If they had been shown it together in a particular place, it might have been possible to censor and delete objectionable portions. They showed four reels of two different pictures in one place and the other four reels of those two different pictures in another place. Fortunately, it was brought to the notice of the Censor Board from Madras but I do not know what action was taken to regularise this. Afterwards they showed that film without censor certificates to only a select audience of invitees in a theatre which has been licensed only to exhibit certified films. These private shows can only be in their Embassy or in a studio other than those which are permitted only to exhibit certified films, but these were shown in a theatre. The Madras Government took action and the theatre-owners apologised for it

So in order to rectify such things, I hope the hon. Minister bring in a morj comprehensive Bill, and not merely just bring an amendment to say that the punishment will be enhanced or they must do such and such a thing. There must be provision to detect such things and there must be provision also to see that it is done quickly.

SWAMI KESHVANAND (Rajasthan) :

**स्वामी केशवानन्द (राजस्थान) :** आज इस सदन में जब हिन्दी में भाषण हुए तब मुझे यह बात विदित हुई कि इस कार्यक्रम पर आज बहस हो रही है। यहां पर मैं देखता हूँ कि अंग्रेजी में ही सब कार्यवाही चलती है और इस बात का ज्ञान नहीं हो पाता है कि क्या कार्यवाही चल रही है। हमारे पास दफ्तर की ओर से जो कुछ भी पत्र प्राप्त होते हैं वे भी सब

अंग्रेजी भाषा में ही होते हैं। यह एक बहुत ही दुखदाई बात मालूम होती है।

आज सदन में जिस विषय पर बहस हो रही है उसके सम्बन्ध में दो तीन बातें कहना चाहूंगा। पहली बात जो मुझे कहनी है वह गीतों के सम्बन्ध में है। आज हम यह देख रहे हैं कि रेडियो द्वारा, ग्रामोफोन द्वारा गांवों और शहरों में भेदे और अश्लील रिकार्ड बजाये जाते हैं जिनसे जनता पर बहुत ही खराब असर पड़ रहा है। आज गांव में जो गीत बच्चों और नौजवानों द्वारा गाये जाते हैं उनका उनकी जिन्दगी पर बहुत ही खराब असर पड़ रहा है। मैं पिछली सर्दियों में अपने यहां के किसी गांव में गया हुआ था। जब मैं रात्रि के समय सोया हुआ था तो मेरी नींद अचानक ही गानों की आवाज से टूट गई। मैंने वहां पर यह देखा कि बहुत से नौजवान लड़के और छोटे बच्चे बहुत ही खराब गाने गा रहे हैं।

मैंने वहां पर यह अनुभव किया कि रात्रि के समय हमारे देश के नौजवान इस तरह गाने स्त्री समाज के सामने गा रहे थे जो कि गाये नहीं जाने चाहिये। इस तरह के भेदे गाने बनाने वाले हमारे देश के अन्दर मौजूद हैं जो कि देश की जनता में एक विषैली भावना फैला रहे हैं। रात दिन इस तरह के गाने रिकार्डों और दूसरे यंत्रों द्वारा गाये जाते हैं और उनका प्रचार किया जाता है। जिस प्रकार के ये गन्दे गाने होते हैं उनके बारे में मैंने एक दो बार जिला अधिकारियों से भी शिकायत की मगर उनकी ओर से भी कोई संतोषजनक जवाब नहीं मिला। अगर हमारे देश की यही स्थिति रही और इस तरह के गन्दे और अश्लील गानों का प्रचार होता ही रहा तो जनता का चरित्र बहुत ही गिर जायेगा। हमारी सरकार ने जो पंचवर्षीय योजना शुरू की है वह पूर्ण नहीं हो सकेगी। आज यह देखा जा रहा है कि गांववाले अपने

काम से निबट जाते हैं तो उनका ध्यान इस तरह के गानों की ओर चला जाता है जो कि आजकल गांवों में रेडियो और दूसरे यंत्रों द्वारा गाये जाते हैं। हमारी सरकार को इस ओर विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिये और जिस तरह के गन्दे गाने आजकल प्रचलित हो गये हैं उनको बन्द किया जाना चाहिये।

इस बात का यहीं पर अन्त नहीं हो जाता है। मैं जिस जगह रहता हूँ वहाँ अक्सर लड़के ३० और ४० की टोली में पास के स्थान में रात्रि के ८। बजे सिनेमा देखने जाते हैं और रात्रि के करीब २ और ३ बजे वापस आते हैं। वह वहाँ पर भट्टे गाने सुनने के लिए और दूसरी तरह की बुराइयाँ सीखने के लिये जाते हैं जो कि आज हमारे देश में सिनेमा द्वारा फैलाई जा रही है। मेरा सरकार से अनुरोध है कि वह इस विषय को फैलने से रोके। अगर इसका प्रभाव बढ़ता गया तो यह सारे देश के नौजवान लड़कों को, जो कि हमारे देश के धन हैं, नष्ट कर देगी। मुझमें पूर्ण आशा है कि सरकार इस ओर अवश्य ही उचित कार्यवाही करेगी।

[For English translation, see Appendix IV, Annexure No. 157.]

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, while supporting this Bill, I would like to make a few observations. The object of the Bill has been stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons and has also been ably explained by the hon. Minister in charge, and so I will confine myself to other matters that arise out of the subject.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: And also avoid repetition, please. There are 12 speakers.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I will try and avoid repetition. With regard to this Bill, I would like to say that if the hon. Minister

had made it more comprehensive, it would have been more satisfactory. The film Enquiry Committee submitted its report in 1951, and in 1952 an Act was passed, to which this Bill is an amendment. Even that Act is not comprehensive enough. There is a feeling in the country about the urgency for reform in the cinema, and many deputations have met the Government and put forward a plea for the redress of certain grievances not only about the character of the films but about the hours of showing of films which affect the morale of the younger generation and distract them from schools and colleges. Although representations were made to the officers in charge, unfortunately it is difficult to get any redress, because there seems to be some technical difficulty which comes in the way of better co-ordination between the Ministries. For instance, if the hours for showing films have to be changed, this Ministry has to say that this is a subject for the Ministry of Law and Order. I will not go into details in this respect, but I do think that if the hon. Minister in charge would like to make the best use of this most powerful educative weapon, the cinema, for the improvement of conditions in the country, he should bring a more comprehensive Bill which would meet the wishes of the people.

The procedure about introducing these Bills also seems to be somewhat defective. I would mention one thing. Supposing Members of this House, in order to make useful suggestions or remove incompleteness from the Bill, were to make certain amendments, obviously the Bill would have to go back to the other House, and this would meantime. So I would ask the hon. Minister whether, when a Bill of this nature comes before this House from the House of the People it is not intended that any amendment should be made. If that is the case, there is no point in discussing the Bill in the floor of the House, if everything that is put in the Bill is to be dittoed.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: May I say that there is no constitutional bar against

[Dr. B. V. Keskar.] this House making any amendment it likes.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House has got every, right.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: If the amendments are accepted, what happens?

SHRI K. S. HEGDE (Madras): It goes to the other House.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I will proceed to the other point. A better way out of the difficulty, I think, would be that, especially in such an important matter where a committee such as the Film Enquiry Committee has made recommendations, Government should invite suggestions from representatives of the people through both Houses before they decide to bring in comprehensive legislation. That would really enable Government to make the best use of this powerful weapon of education as I have already said, and change conditions in the country quickly.

With regard to the film industry, I would like to point out, as has been already done to some extent by Shrimati Lilavati Munshi, that the industry has in its report submitted that it has suffered heavy losses on account of the various taxes and restrictions imposed by Government. The film industry has unfortunately copied Hollywood methods of expenditure, namely, of paying actresses heavily and also of carrying on propaganda in order to attract more customers by saying that so many thousands or so many lakhs of rupees have been spent on the film and so many days have been taken in shooting the film, as if that could be the only merit of the film. So, if certain restrictions could be put on the expenditure that can be incurred on films at least for a period of five years, that would help Government to get the best advantage from the films and of the money spent on foreign exchange in buying raw films

for the benefit of the country. The Film Federation of India is a powerful body, and in submitting its report it has put forward its difficulties before Government from various points of view. But it has unfortunately not given a single thought to the way in which it is not serving the country in educating the younger generation on right lines. The only object which this Film Federation usually have before them is to make money in the best way, even if it is to the detriment of the country as a whole and even if it lowers the morale of the people. For that reason you would always find, Sir, that the films that are advertised stress on the points which appeal to the common man, namely, there is lot of dancing, lot of music and perhaps lot of fighting. Whether these features are in good taste or not, they do not care about that.

It has been said here, Sir, that to put any restrictions on films and thus make them suffer a loss is unreasonable. I would like to point out, Sir, in this connection that in the Report which the Enquiry Committee has submitted, it has been made necessary that the text of the film, before it is produced, would be submitted for inspection by the Film Board and from that point of view, Sir, it would not be a loss to these film producers if they were to proceed honestly in this matter.

Sir, the last point which I would like to make is with regard to the influence of films and which the film industry, the Government and the public have to take into consideration and co-operate with each other in making this industry the best method of educating people. Sir, it is well-known that film industry is the most powerful instrument for educating the masses and the untrained mind and from that point of view, if Government were to earmark some of the theatres for films which can be called 'universal', it will serve a good purpose, because children could be sent there and those theatres could be put under certain restrictions to which the other theatres cannot be put.

J



would, Sir, in this respect read a few lines from a book to show the way in which this powerful weapon of cinema could be used for improving the social conditions according to a certain Government ideology in a country. This is about children's education in the U.S.S.R. Sir, it is said that the children cinemas are always crowded with youngsters. Children naturally go to the pictures shown in their own cinemas where adults are not allowed unless accompanied by a child. This is to be remembered that adults are not allowed in those cinemas if they are not accompanied by a child. At these cinemas the last performance is ever by 7-39 P.M. and the children can easily go to bed early. Also at frequent intervals the producers of children-films give special showings with the intention of discussing these films with them. It is found that criticism by the children is extremely sound and very helpful. Film producers realise that they must consider the taste of their young audiences if they wish to make good films. Sir, I would suggest therefore that such cinema theatres could be opened by the Government here at least in three or four big places like Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and even Delhi. They could ask the teachers in charge of their students to take them to the children-shows even at reduced rates and also the teachers could be given some concession for going to these films. This would, Sir, be one of the ways in which we could, by providing some of the amenities, improve their lot by giving them a cheap entertainment and also by making if possible for *Them* to improve cultural standards and also. Sir, this would establish better relations and understanding between the students and the teachers.

Sir, in conclusion, I would again appeal to Government, before I sit down, that they should soon—already a year has passed since this Parliament has come into existence—bring in a comprehensive legislation to meet all the popular demands made by the representative organisations mainly of

women, and bring about all the necessary changes in the Cinematograph Act, which would make films the most powerful weapon, as they deserve to be, in The sphere of education of the country.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA (Bihar):  
Mr. Deputy Chairman, we have heard a lot of criticism in this House in regard to the functioning of the 'A' and 'U' certificate system. -Sir. I was going through the debates when an amendment in connection with 'A' and 'U' Certificates was introduced in the original Cinematograph Act some time early in 1949, in which this classification of 'A' and 'U' was introduced with regard to the issue of certificates in the film producers. Sir, at that time also, hon. Members of the Provisional Parliament raised the same doubts and levelled the same criticism that have been levelled, today. Again, Sir, towards the end of 1949, when a Bill was introduced to make this a Central sublet, criticism in respect of these 'A' and 'U' certificates was levelled. On both the occasions, Sir, the then Minister in charge of this portfolio promised to give a report as to how this was working. We have heard from the hon. Members their views as to how, the system of issuing certificates for adults and non-adults has been working. I do not know, Sir, what is the information of the Government and what the Government has to say on this point. As a matter of fact, Sir, when this Bill was introduced and particularly with regard to the amendments of the clauses concerning these certificates and making those violating the provisions to suffer greater penalties, it was only proper for the hon. Minister to have given us a review of the working of the system. Not only that, Sir, but we wanted to know what has been the Government's views on the different points that have been raised by the hon. Members of this House. It has been pointed out that once a film was certified for adults only, it became all the more attractive and that the exhibitors found it very difficult and impracti--

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.] cable to restrict the entrance of non-adults into such shows. It has been rightly pointed out by all the Members who have spoken today that, it was very difficult to differentiate between a fourteen year girl or a boy and an 18 year girl or a boy. I would like to know how the Government would like to implement these restrictions. Sir, it becomes very difficult for the exhibitor in the chang-

ed circumstances to show a film under these restrictions, when anybody could come and say that a particular boy or a girl was below the certified age and therefore, Sir, before the exhibitor was punished, we must see how it was possible for the exhibitor to differentiate between the ages of the different persons coming there. It is very difficult to decide as to who is an adult and who is not. Does it mean, Sir, that the exhibitor should have a medical officer present there to decide this age question before the tickets are issued?

And then, Sir, the other point which is very important and which I would like to make out here is that there are persons in this country who may not be eighteen but who may be fathers and mothers of children. Are

We going to debar them also from going to such pictures? It is rather very difficult, Sir. So, I would have wished the hon. Minister to say some thing on this point as to how they are going to enforce this provision

of the Bill. And I agree with my other friends who have suggested that differentiation between 'A' and 'U' films and certificates should be done away with. Instead, as my learned friend, Dr. Seeta Parmanand

has rightly suggested, we should have children's picture houses and we should insist on children going only

to such houses but I do not know how in the present circumstances this is going to be enforced.

Then, again, Government promised on both the occasions in 1949 and again when the present Act was passed in

( 1952, that they would bring forward a very comprehensive legislation to tackle the problems of the industry as a whole. Sir, we have heard the criticisms with regard to the working of the industry as a whole and it is quite apparent that not only members of this House but also the public at large are very much dissatisfied at the present moment with this industry and the manner in which it is being run. Therefore, a very insistent demand was made on the different occasions when this Bill came before the Provisional Parliament that a more comprehensive legislative measure should be brought forward in order to control this industry from A to Z. But we find that the hon. Minister has not said anything on this point, I would refer you to the assurances which were given by the Minister who was then in charge of this Department on the 1st March, 1952. He said:

"It was the intention of the Government to see that some of those recommendations which could be accepted should come before the House in the form of a Bill, where legislation was necessary in order to put those recommendations into force. But that matter has been delayed, because we had to consult all the State Governments about the report and I am glad to say that many of the State Governments have taken keen interest and sent us their reports which we are at present studying. It may require some time before the relevant Ministries in the Centre also studied the report of the Film Enquiry Committee. Only then we can formulate legislation after fully considering all the reactions both of the State Governments and the Ministries concerned here."

Sir, the Film Enquiry Committee reported in March 1951. The Government not only at the Centre but also

those in the various States have studied this report and it is now more than two years, and we do not know in what stage we are, what is the mind of the Government, whether they intend to bring forward any comprehensive legislation or whether they have no such idea. We do not know these things. I should have expected "that the hon. Minister would make some statement on this point. As my learned friend, Prof. Dinkar, said, the use of scissors only would not help to achieve the desired ends, and he rightly emphasised that we should control this industry at the stage of production. The Film Enquiry Committee also recommended the establishment of a Film Council and a Production Code Administration which will go into the details of production. It was the intention of the Film Enquiry Committee that before a film was produced, its script should be scrutinised by the censor and then alone it should be allowed to be filmed. I think this is the only method by which we can improve the morale of the film industry as a whole. The Film Enquiry Committee appreciated the difficulties of the Government in bringing forward a comprehensive legislation and so they have said at page 194 of their report with regard to the Production Code Administration:

"We envisage the Production Code Administration as an adjunct to the Film Council just as we visualise that in course of time the Council would be able to take up the functions of the Board of Censors. But whether the Council is set up or not or whether there is any delay, we would recommend that the Government should set up the Production Code Administration as soon as possible."

Again it says:

"Action for the setting up of a Production Code Administration

can be initiated immediately and until the enactment of legislation giving the Production Code Administration statutory powers over film production, the possibility of the Censor Boards insisting on films securing initial approval of the Production Code Administration should be utilised fully."

‡ \* \* \* \*

"We would emphasise that in this as in most other matters of reform in this country time is of the essence and, with the experience of the last Committee before us, we are naturally apprehensive lest similar delay should again result. Our study of the conditions in the industry convinces us that while the industry could somehow muddle through in spite of that delay, now there is no time to be lost and the progress of the industry downhill must be checked as quickly as possible for the benefit of all the interests concerned."

Sir, Government have been studying this report for more than two years now. There was insistent demand whenever an occasion arose on the floor of the Provisional Parliament and also in this House that the Government should take immediate steps with regard to the controlling of production of films. Here is a suggestion of the Film Enquiry Committee which could have been easily accepted and enforced by the Government even without legislative enactments. I would have liked to hear from the hon. Minister what was his reaction to this, whether the Government was contemplating the enforcement of this recommendation regarding the establishment of a Production Code Administration as suggested by the Film Enquiry Committee, and if they are not going to do it, what are the valid reasons for delaying such an important measure as this.

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.] The Film Enquiry Committee says that about 60 crores of people visit film shows every year, and about Ks. 40 crores are invested in this industry. This is a big amount of money which we cannot allow to be wasted for encouraging ideals and morality which are not suited to our genius. We have now—I do not exactly remember the title—the Industries Development and Regulation Act for controlling the different important industries. The film industry is a very vital industry and should come within the purview of this existing law. We have invested a large amount of money in this and we cannot allow this industry to go its own way, and it must be made to subserve the national interest, and the recommendations of the Film Enquiry Committee should be immediately enforced without ; any further delay.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken fifteen minutes.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I will take a few minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are twelve more speakers.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: The Opposition Members should get more time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Every Member thinks what he says is very important.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: The Members who have served on the Board.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Sufficient has been said about the Board.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: They have said that they are not performing a very useful function. I find that they are incapable of doing so as has been suggested by many friends. We are producing about 275 films every year and Members of the Board are mostly honorary Members and they have their own occupations and they hardly find time to do full justice to the job entrusted to them.

I would submit that we should have a" paid Board, a full-time Board. which should carry on this work.

Then I would plead the case of the educational institutions and would request the hon. Minister to use his good offices to get a refund of the customs duties' charges on projectors sold to educational institutions. I have been associated with educational institutions and I know they find it extremely difficult to find the huge sums required for purchasing the projectors and it has been recognized now beyond all doubt that film is a very good media of education and I would therefore request that it would not matter much if the customs duty levied on the projectors are waived, on such of them as are sold to educational institutions.

Then I would like to submit for the consideration of the hon. Minister that while he considers the recommendations of '(the Film Enquiry Committee with regard to the constitution of the Film Councils, he should see that some representation is given in it to the Story Writers. I don't know why the Film Enquiry Committee have not given any representation to Story Writers when they have given representation to all other interests. So I would request the hon. Minister to consider this point and I can support my argument by the statistics given in the Film Enquiry Committee Report. They say:

"We may in this context quote the findings of public opinion research in the United Kingdom. The percentage of people choosing to visit a picture for any one of the reasons set out below is given against each:—

Story	..	37 per cent-
Stars	..	34
Reviews	..	19 "
Title	..	16
Theatre	..	9
Friends' recommen-	..	2 "
dations	..	2
"It is British"	..	1

So. the importance of the story writer can be judged from this statistics. Story has got the maximum attraction. Therefore I would submit that they should have representation in the Film Council. One thing more.

(Time bell rings.)

I would emphasise that public opinion should be organized in favour of producing good films. I wholeheartedly support the suggestion of Prof. Dinkar and I would, in this connection, suggest a large number of Film Clubs to be started all over the country so that people should be guided by those Clubs and right opinions should be built up. I would request that these Film Clubs should have representation on the Film Councils.

SHRI B. D. CHATURVEDI (Vindhya Pradesh):

**श्री बी० डी० चतुर्वेदी (विन्ध्य प्रदेश) :**  
श्रीमान् उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं तीन चार मिनट में ही अपने कथन को समाप्त कर दूंगा। विन्ध्य प्रदेश में, जिस प्रदेश से मैं आता हूँ, चार या पांच प्रतिशत से अधिक शिक्षा नहीं है लेकिन वहाँ भी कितनी ही फिल्में पहुँच चुकी हैं और दो दो, तीन तीन हजार की आबादी वाले ग्रामों में भी फिल्में दिखाई जाती हैं और उनके गाने लड़कों में प्रचलित हो गये हैं। वे प्रायः एक गाना गाते हुए सुने जाते हैं :

इस दिल के टुकड़े हजार हुए,  
कोई यहाँ गिरा, कोई वहाँ गिरा।

इस कविता का अर्थ तो हमारे कविदर दिनकर जी और राष्ट्र कवि मैथिलीशरण जी ही बतला सकेंगे क्योंकि हम लोग गद्य लेखक

दिल की पुकार के बारे में ज्यादा अनुभव नहीं रखते हैं।

SHRI MAITHILISHARAN GUPTA  
(Nominated):  
SHRI B. D. CHATURVEDI:

3

**श्री बी० डी० चतुर्वेदी :** मैं श्रीमान् मंत्री महोदय डाक्टर केसकर से निवेदन करूंगा कि आप पिछड़े हुए प्रदेशों में जा कर देखें कि सिनेमाओं ने वहाँ पर कैसा गजब डाय़ा है। कुछ दिन पहले मैं एक दुकान पर गया और चित्र देखने लगा तो वहाँ नर्गिस, सुरैय्या और कामिनी कौशल इत्यादि के चित्रों की भरमार थी लेकिन महात्मा गांधी के चित्र थोड़े ही दिखाई पड़े। इस बात से मुझे अवश्य ही खुशी हुई कि हमारे नगर में सौंदर्य के प्रति ज्यादा जिज्ञासा बढ़ रही है लेकिन साथ ही दिल में कुछ खेद भी हुआ कि हमारे यहाँ सुन्दर पुरुष भी हैं, सुन्दर कवि भी हैं, लेखक भी हैं, उनके चित्रों की मांग इतनी अधिक क्यों नहीं होती है। कुछ दिन पूर्व जब “लॉडर” के सम्पादक कृष्णाराम जी मेहता जीवित थे तो उन्होंने मुझ से कहा था कि चूंकि हिन्दी प्रदेशों में पर्दा अधिक होता है इसलिए जब फिल्में चला करती थीं तो हिन्दी वाले उन्हें घूर घूर कर देखा करते थे, क्योंकि स्त्रियों को देखने का मौका उन्हें प्रायः कम मिलता था। वह हालत अब भी विद्यमान है और मैं अपने मंत्री महोदय से कहूंगा कि वह अन्य प्रान्तों के लिये चहें जो भी करें और जो कुछ करना चाहत है वह अवश्य करें लेकिन हिन्दी भाषा भाषा प्रान्तों में अच्छे फिल्मों को फँलाने के लिये कुछ न कुछ विशेष प्रयत्न अवश्य वह करें।

कुछ दिन पहले मैंने “क्युवन कज्जाक” नाम का रूसी फिल्म देखा था। रूसी



میں جو خرابیاں اس وقت دیکھے  
میں آ رہی ہیں ہم کو ان خرابیوں  
کی جو تلاش کرنی ہوگی۔

ابھی میری ایک بہن نے کہا کہ  
جب تک ہم یہ نہ فیصلہ کر لیں  
کہ ہمیں دیہوں کے اندر کس تھلک  
کی فلمیں بنانی چاہئیں اور اس  
میں کیا کیا چیز ہونی چاہیئے تب تک  
ہم اس کے سدھار میں کوئی کامیابی  
حاصل نہیں کر سکتے۔ ہم کو یہ  
دیکھنا ہوگا کہ جب کوئی فلم بنانی  
جاتی ہے تو اس کا پلاٹ کس طرح  
کا ہے اس کی استوری کس طرح کی  
ہے۔ اس میں کوئی ایسی چیز تو  
نہیں ہے جس سے کہ جتنا پر کوئی  
برا اثر پڑ سکے گا۔ اگر ہم نے اس  
طرح سے کیا تو جو بڑے بڑے  
انڈسٹریاسٹ ہیں جو بہت کافی روپیہ  
فلم تیار کرنے میں لگاتے ہیں وہ  
خراب کھیل بنانے سے بچ جائیں گے  
اور اس طرح ہمارا روپیہ بوی ضائع  
نہ ہوگا۔ اور ہم جس طرح جتنا  
کی بھلائی و بہتری اور اصلاح کے لئے  
فلمیں بنانا چاہتے ہیں بنا پائیں گے۔

جیسا کہ ابھی میرے ایک لائق  
دوست نے کہا کہ ہمیں جتنا کو ہی  
ٹھیک کرنا چاہیئے کہ وہ اس طرح  
کی خراب فلموں کو نہ دیکھے۔ تو  
یہ کام بہت ہی مشکل ہے اور اس  
میں ہمیں کامیابی نہیں ہوگی۔  
بلکہ ہمیں خود ایسی فلمیں بنوانی  
چاہئیں جسے جتنا مجبور ہو کر

دیکھے۔ اس میں ایک سیکشن ایسا  
بھی ہے جو اسٹینڈرڈ کی اچھی  
فلمیں بنانا ہے لیکن اسے صرف چند  
پڑھے لکھے اور سمجھدار لوگ ہی  
دیکھتے ہیں اور عام طور پر ہمارے  
نوجوان اور جتنا اسے دیکھنا پسند  
نہیں کرتی تو فلمیں بنانے والے  
مجبور ہو جاتے ہیں کہ وہ ویسی  
ہی فلمیں بنائیں جسے ہم نہیں  
چاہتے کیونکہ وہ جتنا کے اخلاق پر  
برا اثر ڈالتی ہیں۔ میرے خیال  
میں ہمارے انٹرپرائز منسٹرو صاحب اس  
بے لگے ہر سال سوچتے رہیں گے اور  
جیسے جیسے یہ ایکٹ کام میں آتا  
رہے گا ویسے ویسے اس کی خرابیوں  
کو دور کرنے کی کوشش کریں گے۔  
مگر مجھے اس اسٹینڈرڈ کے بارے  
میں جو بات کہنی ہے وہ یہ ہے

"Portions ordered to be removed have  
been reinserted. Such interpolations are  
all too easy in the case of films".

اس ایکٹ کو چلانے میں بھی  
خرابی معلوم ہوتی ہے اور اسی کو  
دور کرنے کے لئے ایک ڈیلا کلاز ۶ اے  
سرکار لانا چاہتی ہے۔ اس میں شک  
نہیں کہ اس کلاز کو لانے سے ان کی بہت  
سی دقتیں درپور ہو جائیں گی مگر  
میں انٹرپرائز منسٹر صاحب سے یہ  
درخواست کرتا ہوں کہ جس طرح انہوں  
نے ایسی دقت اس اسٹینڈرڈ کے  
ذریعہ دور کرنے کی کوشش کی ہے  
وہ یہ ہے کہ

[Khwaja Inait Ullah.]

"Any person who delivers any certified film to any distributor or exhibitor shall, in such manner as may be prescribed, notify to the distributor or exhibitor, as the case may be, the title, the length of the film, the number and the nature of the certificate granted in respect thereof etc. etc."

تو اس کے ذریعے انہوں نے تین چیزوں کو ضروری قرار دیا ہے جس میں ٹائٹل اور فلم کی لمبائی اور سارٹیفکیٹ ہوں۔ مگر میرا کہنا ہے کہ اصل چیز جو فلم میں ہوتی ہے وہ کہانی ہے۔ ٹائٹل میں تو بہت سی باتیں آجاتی ہیں جیسے کسی فلم کا ٹائٹل 'پیار کی بات' ہو مگر اس میں دشمنی کی بھی بات ظاہر کی جاسکتی ہے۔ چہاں تک فلم کی لمبائی کا سوال ہے کہ چودہ ہزار فٹ تک لمبائی ہونی چاہئے تو دو سو پانچ سو فٹ تک گھٹایا جا سکتا ہے۔ مگر کہانی ایک ایسی چیز ہے جس میں ساری فلم میں سے کچھ حصہ جب چاہیں گھٹا ہوا سکتے ہیں تو اس طرح فلم پاس ہونے کے بعد جب اسے سارٹیفکیٹ مل جاتا ہے تو وہ اکثر سین بعد میں چوز دیتا ہے جسے ہماری گورنمنٹ نہیں چاہتی۔ تو اس طرح کی باتیں فلم انڈسٹریز میں چل رہی ہیں اور یہی چیز ہم نہیں چاہتے۔ لہذا میں آنریبل منسٹر صاحب سے یہ کہنا چاہتا ہوں کہ اگر اس طرح کی کارروائیوں کو وہ روکنا چاہیں تو وہ اس میں ٹائٹل اور فلم کی لمبائی کے ساتھ ایک لفظ

فلم کی کہانی، بھی بڑھادیں یا کم سے کم

"any other particular respecting the film which may be prescribed"

کے ذریعہ کہانی کو اسی میں ضرور شامل کر لیں تاکہ اس طرح کی جو باتیں ہوتی ہیں وہ نہ ہو سکیں۔

ابھی یہاں پر بہت سے آنریبل ممبران صاحبوں نے کہا کہ اے اور یہ سارٹیفکیٹ کہا معنی رکھتا ہے۔ یہ بات میری سمجھ میں بھی نہیں آئی۔ جب ہمارے ملک میں ایک فلم چودہ برس کے بچے کے دیکھنے لائق نہیں ہے تو وہ کس طرح سے ہندوستان کے بوس اور اکیس برس کے نوجوانوں کے دیکھنے لائق ہو سکتی ہے یہ اکیس اور بیس برس کے ہمارے جو نوجوان ہیں یہی ہمارے دیس کو آگے بڑھانے والے ہیں۔ ان کے کیپرکٹر اور ان کے کلچر اور ان کی زندگی پر ہی ہندوستان کی ترقی کا دارومدار ہے۔ تو آپ جو یہ چاہتے ہیں کہ ہمارے نوجوان اس طرح کی فلم نہ دیکھیں تو ان فلموں کو آپ کو ہون کر دینا چاہئے اور ان کو سارٹیفکیٹ بھی نہیں دینا چاہئے۔ مگر آج ہوتا یہ ہے کہ اگر کسی کتاب کو سرکار ضبط کر لیتی ہے تو اسکی خریداری بہت بڑھ جاتی ہے۔ اسی طرح اگر کسی فلم کو اڈالٹس کھلے مخصوص۔ ک دیا جاتا ہے تو وہ فلم مت زیادہ چلتی ہے۔ اس کا اثر



یہ ہوتا ہے کہ ہمارے جو چھوٹے  
چھوٹے بچے ہوتے ہیں وہ بھی چوری  
سے چھپ کر اس فلم کو دیکھنے کی  
ضرور کوشش کرتے ہیں۔ اس سے  
ہمارے دیش کو بہت زیادہ نقصان  
پہنچ رہا ہے اور ہمارے نوجوانوں کے  
اخلاق اور کیپرکٹر دن بدن بگڑتے جا  
رہے ہیں۔ لہذا سرکار کی طرف سے  
ایسی فلمیں بننی چاہئیں جو صرف  
یونیورسل ہی ہوں اور جن کو میں  
میڈری ماں، میڈری بیوی اور میڈری  
بہن ایک ساڑھ دیکھ سکیں۔

میں اس بارے میں ان باتوں  
کو دوبارہ نہیں کہنا چاہتا جو کہ  
ہمارے بہت سے ممبران کہ چکے ہیں۔  
میں آنریبل منسٹر صاحب سے یہی  
زور دینا چاہتا ہوں کہ وہ صرف  
ٹائٹل اور فلم کی لمبائی کا ہی  
دھیان نہ رکھیں بلکہ اسکی اسٹوری  
کا بھی خاص طور سے دھیان رکھیں۔

[For English translation, see Appendix IV,  
Annexure No. 159.]

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Hyderabad): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir while wholeheartedly supporting the speeches delivered by several hon. Members in this House, I beg to draw your attention to the fact that the film industry should not become a moralising industry should not be trying to depict ideal moral characters. It is, after all, a place of entertainment and as long as entertainment is healthy, it should be permitted and it should be encouraged. It is a place where art has to be exhibited, not moral theories. I submit, that there is likelihood and danger that some lady Member of this House and of the general public may

so direct the film industry that it is convs-  
ted from being a place of entertainment to a place  
of moralising.

Coming to this amending Bill and  
restricting myself to it, I beg to submit, that  
the amendment of section 6 by completely  
altering the wording is unnecessary and it may  
give rise to several loop-holes which the hon.  
Minister has not probably visualised. I submit  
that the original section 6 was quite all right  
and we had only to alter it in the proviso by  
saying—

"Provided that before notification of  
such direction, the exhibitor shall be given  
a fortnight's notice to show cause\*why  
such a direction should not be notified, and  
tthe film be not exhibited till a decision is  
taken on the matter."

By some such simple alteration of the  
present provision and by making the exhibitor  
who is the person making the largest amount  
of profit and really coming in contact with the  
public, responsible for it, it will be much  
easier to attain the objective than completely  
altering the section and raising other questions  
of discretion about two months and all that.  
The suggested wording is going to make it  
more complicated and give more arbitrary  
powers to Government. The hon. Minister has  
explained that the feelings of neighbouring  
Governments or other countries are often  
wounded and the film has to be banned. If this  
is permitted, this will become a simple handle  
and every film depicting any country except  
our own may be objected to and immediately  
it will be banned by Government. I submit,  
that this should be done entirely by our Board  
of Film Censors. They should see in certifying  
a film whether it is fit for our country or not. If  
a Board of our country thinks that a film is fit,  
I don't think that there is any justification for a  
foreign Government to interfere. There have  
been cases where films derogatory to Indian  
interests have been shown in Europe and  
America and in spite of protests lodged by our  
Government no notice

[Shri Kisiiien Chand.] has been taken because other countries believe that their Board of Censors should be the final authority. The hon. Minister should not alter this amendment in such a way that every whim and fancy of a foreign country wii) dictate the policy of our film industry.

Secondly, Sir, regarding the words 'Adults' and 'Universal' I submit that the hon. Members have not understood the underlying idea differentiating between these types of films. A film certified for adult exhibition means a film which shows from a medical point of view certain phases of human life connected with sex and reproduction. If the Board of Film Censors restricted the grant of permission of this certificate of exhibition to such films which are prepared from a medical point of view for exhibiting the sex life then there will be no objection if we change the definition of the word 'Adult' to all those persons who are not teenagers, that is above twenty. Any person of twenty and above should be allowed to go and see a film which is certified for adults, thereby meaning a film which exhibits the medical point of view of sex life. Sir, our underlying idea should always be that apart from healthy entertainment, the film should have educational value. If for films of educational value on medical science we introduce other sorts of restrictions we will be defeating the purpose for which a section of the cinema industry is catering. Therefore, Sir, with my suggestion that this section <! should be reworded by simply altering the original section and that the definition of adults should be changed from the age of fourteen to the age of twenty. I feel this Bill should be passed.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA (Bombay): Sir, this amending Bill has not come a day too early. A number of observations have been made on the amendments. The amendments to this Bill had to be brought because of the factor of time, the time-lag that made the culprits escape. I do not personally **feel** that this Bill also is going to be

of great help. What we actually want in the film industry should be our main analysis. We have two categories ns going round in this country: One is imported and the other is our own. that is those produced in this country. When I talk of the imported films. Sir, we have to make up our minds as to what we want. It is a well-known fact that films have come-to stay as the main source of recreation and what do we look for in a film, what should we, this young democracy, look for on the silver screen? When we import films we get all kinds of films from Hollywood mainly; we do get a certain quota from other countries like Japan or Russia or England or other Continental countries. Sir, very fine films have been shown like, "Yukiwarisu" from Japan, "Bicycle Thief" from Italy, "Winslow Boy" from Britain but the Hollywood type of film generally does harm to us a, a nation. Sir, I may quote here, opinions of certain people in America itself. When somebody suggested here

19 TJnnivr<sup>^3\*</sup> we s<sup>^ou^</sup> have a non-Governmental vocal and militant organisation in this country to clean up the silver screen and that it is very important that this should come into existence in every State, in every district, in group of villages, it shall not be out of place if I read here the opinion in America itself: "In Dallas where such Hollywood rooters as Producer David O. Selznick and Cinemactor Ronald Reagan tried to cheer up some 1,000 low-grossing movie exhibitors at a morale meeting, Evangelist Billy Graham popped in with an idea for curing the industry's ailments. Cried Graham: 'Take sex and crime out of the movies. We've had so much sex in this country till we are sick to death of it. That's why people stay away. Decent people are ashamed.....'" This is an opinion from America, a land which creates these pictures and sells them to us and we import them and we freely show them. This is where the hon. Minister must look into. What are the type of pictures that must come? Have we really made up our minds that a picture must be recreational as well as

educational and, it need be, even propaganda should come in? Russian pictures, I say, may not be suitable to this land because propaganda preponderates in those pictures, otherwise, I am a very strong advocate of Russian pictures, where men and women are shown on the screen unsophisticated, in their youthful form, where there is no sex, there is no crime, where there are no revolvers and where no shooting goes on in the scenes. In the Hollywood pictures, they abound with murder and crime and shooting half a dozen people often in the opening scenes itself. Is it not time that we clean up this type of films that come into the country?

Then, there is so much said about adult and about juniors, 'What is good for adults' and 'what is good for juniors'. Juniors have become very much adults as far as cinema going is concerned and they will not listen either to their parents or the Minister in charge of the Bill or anybody. They will see the "cow-boys" and "Tarzans" and for the rest of the week in the house there will only be "cow-boys" nuisance.

There is one more thing that I want to bring to the notice of the Minister in charge and that is that I do not know whether there is any source that certifies films that are shown in the different schools and colleges in India. Sometimes, I feel that morally unobjectionable films are too freely distributed in India. You will permit me here again to draw the attention of the Minister in charge to the Motion Picture Guide which is run by a Church paper in America called the 'Messenger'. I took great interest in reading through these three categories: They are (a) morally unobjectionable for general patronage, (b) morally unobjectionable for adults, and (c) morally unobjectionable in parts for all. I wonder if the attention of the Minister in charge has been drawn to these catalogues because some two years ago I considered it from my point of view that I should keep on sending these sheets to Sir Clifford Aggarwala, the Chairman of the Cen-

tral Board of Film Censors. I do not know what action was taken. I am now pleasantly surprised to see that this paper has now drawn up a list exclusively for India as the foreign pictures come to India. We have some of these categories here and it is done by one of the priests, namely Father John Humbert of St. Xavier's College, Bombay and he has drawn up a list of the pictures classifying them into "morally unobjectionable for general patronage", "morally objectionable for adults" and "objectionable in part for all and why".

PROF. G. RANGA: Give us the titles of the pictures

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: I shall however give you some. I shall hand over the papers to the hon. Minister. I shall read out a few "morally unobjectionable for general patronage" pictures. One is 'Forest Path'. It is too big a list to be read out. I can hand it over to Prof. Ranga if he so desires. But here is a Pledge that is printed here every month. Why should we not have a Pledge like this in India? Here is the Pledge according to the Legion of Decency. "I condemn indecent and immoral motion pictures, and those which glorify crime or criminals. I promise to do all that I can to strengthen public opinion against the production of indecent and immoral films, and to unite with all who protest against them. I acknowledge my obligation to form a right conscience about pictures that are dangerous to my moral life. As a member of the Legion of Decency I pledge myself to remain away from them. I promise, further, to stay away from places of amusement which show them as a matter of policy."

It is not my point that you and I should stay away completely for I think it is sometimes good for us to go and see them first so that we can know what is good for the children to see. Speaking personally in respect of every American picture that is to be seen by my children I have to go and see it first so that I can see and certify

[Shrimati Violet Alva.] whether it is suitable for my children to see it.

Why should not this certification be the job of the Film Censor Board and why should not a bad picture be scrapped at the time it is imported? Why should you allow this to be at all shown on the screen as it becomes very difficult for the parents to check their children from going and seeing it? As you know, children are very adamant. Some of these pictures even go to the schools and on this I do want to say with all the emphasis at my command that the Minister-in-charge of these films must see that, every picture is properly certified by an Advisory Board as to the educational make-up before it goes to any school or college in this country.

Then, Sir, why not we encourage clean Continental pictures? Most British pictures are very clean. I may here mention that the Beverbrook group of papers in England have lost advertisement contracts to the tune of some millions from Hollywood because they criticised Hollywood pictures. When are you going to do this in India? These amendments are all right. We bring in amending Bills every now and then and get them passed. AU right. But where do we go? We are not striking at the root.

I now come to the pictures made in this country. In this country of course our taste is seen in what we make. There are so many profiteers, racketeers and blackmarketers in the film industry today specially in Bombay and they show all sorts of films with a view to earn money. We are not vocal enough to rise against them. What is the fate of our sound producers? The well-known case to support this is the picture 'Jhansi-Ki Rani' and Shri Mazumdar mentioned Sohrab Modi With all its technicolour, with all the efforts and the work that was put in and the money that was thrown in, I think it has not succeeded as it should. I think it was because crime and sex were absent. This is exactly

the reason. Producer-Director-Actor V. Shantaram had brought out a clean film Admi'. We have men like V. Shantaram, Sohrab Modi and Barua (now dead) in Bengal. As against that we would like to have a list from the Minister-in-charge as to the mushroom producers who have come into being.

We have in this very House great poets like our friends Shri Maithili-sharan Gupta and Prof. Dinkar, great writers and it is a proud thing that we have them in the Parliament and many more also in the country outside. All the same we have not been able to check undesirable pictures. You may turn round and say, "It is too early to nationalise the film industry and we might be charged that we are following totalitarian methods if we interfered with the film industry." It may be too early but certainly we have to make a beginning if we are desirous of giving a good background to our younger generation and for the generations after us, as Shrimati Arundale has pointed out in her excellent speech that you have to make a beginning and you will have to make a beginning very soon. I say you will have to classify the imported pictures separately from the Indian pictures.

I may here make bold to say that there are persons on our Censor Boards who have ceased to be useful since they do nothing but go from Bombay to Delhi and Delhi to Calcutta and so on from Board to Board. That is not the way of running a clean, good and efficient Censor Board. Let me make it clear that I have nothing against them personally. They must know and contact the people who are artistes, who can really propound a theme, who really see and set up a situation on the silver screen and can say whether it is good for juniors or seniors in the family. The existing Film Censor Board should be scrapped and remodelled, if you want anything clean on the silver screen. I am only making a briid suggestion and it is for vou to accept it or not. But I personally feel that there are some pictures which

should be banned. For example regarding the picture "Peking Express" which was banned it was my paper *FORUM* that first wrote against its exhibition and suggested that that picture should be banned. Then when I tried to see casually a film censor, one of our Censor Board Members in Bombay, about this picture, and what I had written on it, I was told that this was not the place nor the time to discuss about it. Now these are the sort of things that are going on.

Whenever the attention of any film censor is drawn to any film, it may be on the streets or anywhere else, they must be ready to accept the suggestions and they should give time to anybody to come and say what they have to say and they should themselves call for objections from those who have seen a picture.

These are very practical suggestions which may be considered. We should strike at the root of the evil.

Coming to Indian pictures I will say that some of our politicians themselves are associated with the evil ventures of these racketeers and profiteers who want to make bad pictures. What are we going to do with them? Should it be so difficult for any ministry to clean up the whole field?

It is a very happy thing to know that there is a Women's Organization which has now taken up cleaning up the silver screen. They have just begun but they have to go on raising their vocal protest and they must be so militant that the Government must take note of it.

We have very often read letters in the Press drawing attention to all sorts of horrible things that are shown on the silver screen, we must take note of it. because at a certain age you lose interest even for the best of the pictures. At a certain age you prefer a book to the best pictures on the screen. I am speaking of the objectionable pictures that find their way to the schools and colleges. It is for them

I am raising these things. What about our masses? The pictures go round; all kinds of pictures go round to all our villages and it is there that we have to be more careful. I must bring here, rather I must draw the attention of the House and the hon. Minister to some letters that had appeared in the Press against the trend that is seen on the silver screen. Some of them run down our old mythological gods and goddesses. I shall read out a few passages:

"Years of mercenary vandalism by different producers have completely changed the face of Hindu Gods and made them look like so many monkeys and monsters performing impossible miracles at the slightest nod of the film directors and selling millions of tickets for the gold diggers. Never before has the epic history of any nation been so mercilessly raped and distorted as has been the case with Hindu Mythology."

India is to be found not in its few cities but in its hundreds of thousands of villages.

"Thousands of foreigners and millions of Indians are seeing these pictures every day, pictures which vividly portray easy virtue and crime."

Yet neither the censors nor the women themselves seem to realise the vile slander on a free nation.

How true this is! There are so many observations and so many letters in the Press, and those who are interested could collect them. This is the real view; this is the real picture that they place before us. It is for us here as legislators to demand something more than this amending Bill if we are to clean up the industry which is thriving in this country. In this country you must see that clean pictures are made. To help really good producers you must set up finance corporations and by so doing the profiteers and the racketeers who are ruling the film industry today should be thrown out of

[Shrimati Violet Alva.]  
 their business. What is the comprehensive measure that the hon. Minister will bring before this House with all these ends in view and how long will it be before such an all-embracing Bill is passed and placed on the Statute Book? Then alone will there be no need for such 'amending Bills to be brought every now and again. We have first-rate writers but the writings of those writers are thrown away; the scripts are twisted and mutilated, the songs they write are sometimes changed and film people give a new lewd version. They are on the lips of all our young men and women. When ever our young women walk on the roads these songs are sung by loafers and scoundrels who pass by them on cycles. Gandhiji has said so much about this type of people in his *Young India* and what are we doing here? We are having these two amendments and we think we are going to clean up the film industry. We are not going to clean up the film industry. The people in this profession are so clever that , they will obviate even this law though you have rightly touched the time lag and whatever we do they will merrily go on. Then, Sir.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I see a long list is there. Already it is past twelve.

SHRIMATI VIOLET ALVA: Then, Sir. India is thp second largest country in producing films. Why should we remain the second largest? I have always been a student of politics interested in different countries. To me it does not matter whether I speak of Russia or America as some of the Members here feel that their mouths should be shut. I was told by Mr. Pudovkin, the great actor who came here to India that in Russia they made only two films in seven years. I was all admiration for that remark of his: "Why do you go fast?" Make a few films which are good for the country. Of course, we are a democracy. We have the freedom to spend: we have the freedom to loot; we have the freedom to preach crime and sex appeal.

We have the freedom to project through foreign films • sadism and nudism. And what do we do? We just translate these pictures in our languages. We have one picture which is a translation of the "Corsican Brothers". Why should these things happen? It is a very good suggestion that if you must clean up the screen, you must set up a new Censor Board which will go through the scenario scripts, stories and the songs. Appoint on that Board new members, as the All-India Radio is trying to do to get rid of the filthy songs—they are trying to have a new set of artistes. We want a new Board of Censors that will begin scrutinising the Alms before the producers have a chance of telling you: "We have spent so much money, why are you jumping on our throats?" You tell them that they cannot get away with certain types of angles that they are going to give to the picture. Unless you are prepared to set up such a Board it is no use making any laws, because no law is going to function as. we want, and they will go on.

Sir, it is not wrong here, when we talk of films, to go into the question of what we are reading. What you read makes you just as what you see makes you. So reading also is very important. I have many more things to say, but I have no time. I would therefore appeal to the Minister in charge to set up a Board to examine the scripts, scenario, songs and everything that is to be put up on the screen.

We must also examine what is on our bookstalls. Cinemafare is rising and every good paper has a by-publication of cinema—a weekly, monthly or fortnightly. Why? Because there is money in it. Why is there money? Because we love to see our semi-naked actresses reclining on the coloured pages. Sir, it is time we go into these aspects. I shall here mention the sort of things that are displayed in a bookstall in a Government hostel in Delhi where some of our M.Ps stay.' A correspondent with a sociological turn of mind went to see what was in that stall. He found,

besides Parisian magazines and the ubiquitous American 'comics' which are anything but comic, copies of a book entitled 'Sex Anatomy Atlas' and a host of American magazines with lurid cover-page pictures and even more lurid captions. These are some of the titles which caught his eye: Crime -Detective—Slasher and Lonely Woman; Real Detective—Nude in the Highway; Headquarters' Detective— Darling You can't Live; Uncensored Detective—Fatal Affair of the Black Negligee; Another Headquarters' De-teccive—Naked Beneath the Rocks; PIX—Back-stage Photos; Man to Man—How Sex Scandals Affect Politics; Picture Fun—See this Photo Being made; Mr.—Why do Women Write Hot Diaries? Sir—Unusual Love Life of Eva Peron.

Sir, we have instances of such obscene literature being thrown into -girls' hostels and other educational institutions. We have brought these things to the notice of Cabinet Ministers, but nothing is being done. Do we mean business? Are we cleaning up the Augean stables? Somewhere it was said that books on Communism should be stopped. Communism is an accepted political ideology. If you want democracy, why don't you remove this filthy literature first? We shall then be better ready to fight Communism. We shall be able to fight Communism if this sort of literature is removed along with the picture posters mainly appearing in film magazines, which are absolutely not to the taste of this country, which are absolutely not, suited to the culture of this country, nor to its background, nor to its art. I strongly feel that we are making no effort to put it down. If we do not bestir ourselves, these racketeers will go on making these pictures, and we shall all be seeing the prostitution of the screen; we shall always see our village belles sex-starved—*paniharis* going round the well singing love songs. These films showing sex-starved village belles will be shown to foreigners. What a picture you are presenting to foreigners! It is high time we called a spade a spade and began work.

I must here pay a compliment to the Marathi pictures and some of the Bengali pictures. I do not know about others, but some of the Marathi pictures are very, very clean. Some of the small language films are made very clean, because they are made with a purpose by a particular producer to whom business is important, but the moral behind the story also is very important, and that is why pictures in small languages are cleaner than those in Urdu or Hindi, not that all Urdu and Hindi pictures are bad. The racketeers in the industry show to the foreigners something which is unnatural in Indian life. I have never seen village belles going round a well singing love songs as we hear them singing in our films. It is time these songs were scrutinised before being recorded and released on the screen. The time has come to strike at the root and not at the branches first.

BEGAM AIZAZ RASUL (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I rise to support this Bill. On the face of it this is a very small Bill seeking to amend a certain clause by which Government wishes to have the right to ban any picture immediately and has given the right to the producer to make a representation within the prescribed period. The order of Government will not remain in force for more than two months. As I said, seemingly it was a very small Bill and one should have thought that it would have been passed without much debate. But the full dress debate that we have had on this Bill since this morning and the strong feelings that have been expressed are a clear indication of the sentiments and the feelings that people have as regards the film industry in our country. I think it is high time that something was done about, it.

I shall not go into the details of this question because I feel that since this morning the whole area of the film industry has been traversed and explored and I think that the hon. Minister in charge has had an indication of the feelings of the public and knows

[Begam Aizaz Rasul.] what they think about it. Therefore I will not repeat what has been said. I will only say that it is high time that Government did take cognizance of what is happening in the film industry. It is true that Government appointed the Film Enquiry Committee, but as has been pointed out, it was more from the business point of view than from the cultural point of view, and even the recommendations of that Committee have not been implemented. I think that the whole question of the film industry should be gone into and we should try and make up our minds as to what should be taught through the films and what ideals there should be. I also believe and I agree with those hon. Members who say that everything should not be on a moralistic plane but there should be a certain recreative and light side to it also. As a mother I should like to say that we should be satisfied that our children going to the pictures come back not with wrong ideas about the cultural and social aspects of our country but with a glowing feeling of having seen good acting combined with high social ideals and a realistic expressions of our old cultured society.

Sir, as has been very aptly remarked, there are two aspects of the film industry. There are foreign films and there are Indian films. We must see that the films that we import from outside are not those which leave an impression of purely passionate love scenes or crime on our children and the films that we produce in our country should be such which should really not only have an educative value but should be inspiring and should be able to build up the country culturally, educationally and socially. So, Sir, I think that the Films Censor Board should either be reformed or should be given adequate power—I think they have got very great powers but should use them properly—to see that the pictures that are allowed to be shown in India, foreign as well as Indian, do resort to some ideals and some standards.

Now through this amendment, which has been brought about in order to remedy certain defects in the original Act, the Government has taken the power of immediately banning **any** picture about which a complaint has been made. But as has been very rightly pointed out by one of the hon. Members here, by the time that complaint comes to the Government and by the time some order comes out for the ban of that particular picture, most of the harm has been done and therefore I suggest that some quick machinery should be devised by which this sort of thing could be adequately and efficiently managed. In my opinion the main responsibility lies on the part of the Central Board of Film Censors which, in the first instance, allows a particular film to be shown and gives the permit. Therefore, we must see that the Board of Film Censors is more careful and it should see that the films that it allows are the proper kind of films, and consort with standards of efficiency, morality and art.

Sir, before this Act of 1952 came into force, there were, I believe, in all the States of India, Cinema Advisory Committees which functioned as advisory bodies to the State Governments and if any complaint was made from any part of a State about a particular film or a part of it, that Cinema Advisory Committee was immediately called and it reviewed the film and gave its recommendations to the Government which banned it for the time being, if they agreed with the recommendations of the Committee. But these Cinema Advisory Committees have been abolished since this Cinematograph Act came into force in 1952. I think that public opinion and non-official opinion should be sought to be associated with these regional committees that have now been appointed in place of the Central Advisory Committee which mostly consisted of non-officials and I am sure that the hon. Minister in charge of this Ministry will consider this point very seriously.

Then, Sir, there is one more point that I would like to say and that is this. The power to ban a film should



be exercised very carefully because it has been observed that if a picture is banned for a short time on the recommendation of some agency and the Government asks the producer to show cause why it should not be banned entirely or why a particular piece should not be cut off, well, if that decision remains, it is all right; but if that decision is later on amended or rescinded and the picture is allowed to be shown, then the producer and that company get a great deal of propaganda value and publicity and by saying that the picture was banned the public is more attracted to that picture and flock to see it in greater number. I remember that when the picture 'Barsat' was being shown the Kashmir Government complained that the picture, depicted the Kashmir people in a very wrong light. The picture was banned for some time but afterwards the Government rescinded its decision, and the picture reappeared and the producer actually got a lot of advertisement by the ban order. So, my point is that in the very beginning, at the very inception, the films should be gone into and the Censor Board should see that pictures that are from any point of view objectionable are not allowed to be shown, instead of complaints coming to the Government later on and the Government then taking action. There is no doubt that there is a very strong feeling in the country about the quality of the pictures now, and I think that Government should take immediate steps to see that something is done about it. Of course, the fact remains that we have so little recreation in our country, we have so little opportunities for enjoyment, that poor people go in very large numbers to pictures as will be evidenced by the long queues before any cinema house before a picture begins. There is no doubt that because people have no other diversion they go to pictures irrespective of whether the films are culturally good or not, and therefore the responsibility of the Government is all the greater to see that the right kind of pictures are shown to the people and that the people have not flnly the best value for

their money but come back mentally richer. It is during the last ten years, during and after the war, that the standard of our pictures has gone down.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Madam, you are going back.

BEGAM AIZAZ RASUL: .....because the producers are only concerned with making money and do not think of the great responsibilities that rest on them. Therefore it is the duty of the Government to see that the right kind of pictures are produced in the country and that our people are shown what is proper and right from every point of view.

PROF. G. RANGA: Mr. Deputy Chairman, I shall take as little time as possible but in the few minutes that I will take I will lay my charge at the doors of the hon. Minister himself. If we had a superannuated man like so many other Ministers, tired of\* this life and looking forward to the next life, it could have been different, but we cannot however excuse the present Minister for the manner in which he has been neglecting his duties, regarding the recommendations made by the Film Enquiry Committee. When he took charge of this Ministry, it raised great hopes indeed in many of his friends including myself that he was going to clean the Augean stables. Instead of that, as a result of the hot response that he got for one or two speeches that he made in the very beginning of his career as the Minister in charge of this Department, he seems to have given up all efforts at reconstruction. The one complaint that has been made repeatedly in this House as well as in the other House is, not that his Ministry has not got a very good programme or very good intentions but that it lacks the will to translate those intentions into actual achievements. That I should have to lay this charge at the doors of this young Minister is the tragedy of it all and this industry is growing very fast. Information is given in this report itself. I will put it very briefly this way. In 1928 you.:

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

had only 346 cinemas and 80 per cent, of the films then were being brought down from U.S.A. When this report was being drafted, possibly in 1950-51, there were 2,400 cinemas and 850 tents. The people who visited them were 60 crores. The amount that was put into it was Rs. 24 crores. The working capital was Rs. 9 crores and employment was being given to not less than 70,000 people. The net revenue every year that this industry derives is Rs. 20 crores. Surely, can anyone point out any other industry which has made such giant strides within such a short time and absorbed so much of our own national revenues and which is yielding such heavy revenue to the people who invested their money in this industry and yet, is there any other industry which has received as little attention from the Government as this has done? That is my charge against my hon. friend. He has 24 hours every day and he does not have even the cares that many of the others have because he has simplified his own life -and has become a *sanyasi* and therefore there is much less excuse for him to be neglecting his duties in regard to this industry than would have been the case with so many other Members in this House. He need not be afraid film producers, industrialists and other people who are in it because as he must have seen from the speeches that have been made here and the speeches that must have been made in the other House also that both the Houses of Parliament are on his side. Some of our friends have been suggesting that there should be Film-goers' Clubs and so on. My lady friend Mrs. Alva said that we should have an oath-taking section and all that. Therefore even long before we have to develop these things, it ought to be possible for my hon. friend really to go ahead and control this industry effectively in the light of the recommendations made here and even to a greater extent than this because both the Houses of Parliament are entirely behind him but if he were to tarry over this, then what is likely is this. This industry will become more power-

ful with all its vested interests and it is quite possible they may come to

>] not only a number of Members of Parliament but also the Minister a little later judging from the speedy manner in which this is growing. Then it would become more difficult for him to control it.

Secondly we are all in agreement with almost every point that has been made not only by our lady Members but also by the other Members, and especially on the administrative side, by Shri Sinha as well as by Mrs. Alva. I need not go over all that except that I am not in agreement with one Member who said that he does not want any regimentation for this industry in this country. If there were to be any industry where any kind of regimentation is necessary, this merits that regimentation, because this affects not only the morals but also the minds of our people. Many lady Members were talking about children. I talk about the adults also. I am glad that Shrimati Rukmini Devi has drawn our attention to what is happening in our own villages. I am glad that cinemas are growing up in the villages. These films also contain a lot of music also. But about the kind of pictures that are to be shown in those villages, should there not be any control or regulation on them? I want my hon. friend to consult at an early stage as many Members of this House as are interested in this kind of thing and have a series of consultations with these friends on this side and even in company of his own experts and then develop his own plan of action and go ahead with it. Then he may later on call in consultation those of this House who are interested in this business, in this industry. I am one of the frequenters of cinemas, I see cinemas and I am very fond of seeing pictures. It is a kind of entertainment and as one hon. Member put it, they provide not only entertainment but also inspiration and education. But very rarely do we come across any scene of happiness or good entertainment. Look at a picture like "Anand Bhawan". The title reminds one of Motilal Nehru. But when

you go and see it, what a picture! There was another film of the name "Anand Math" and that was indeed a fine one. But when I went and saw this picture, hoping to get pleasure, I found that I had only purchased displeasure by going there. It is a kind of exploitation of our people, because of their need not only for entertainment but also for inspiration and education, and this is going on in our country unchecked, condemning them to see this sort of thing.

Sir, I do not want to take much time on these things, but shall close this portion of mine in this debate by suggesting to my hon. friends that they should produce more and more of these information films; and indeed, they float a kind of a separate cor—the major shares of which may be with the Government itself. Let my hon. friend be prepared to even lose one crore of rupees, it does not matter; but let this corporation be made responsible for producing better and better pictures year by year. Let them place these good films before our people, in competition with the stuff that we now get. So many people speak about these foreign films; but they are coming down like anything. It is your own films that are so bad, most of them are a shame upon us and upon our social life. They don't show our real life. They do not depict the real life of our masses, our own people. Even if it is shown, it is shown only for the purpose of ridiculing that life. If a common man is depicted it is only for the purpose of ridiculing him because he is poor. If a villager is depicted, it is for ridiculing him because he happens to be uneducated. Why do we not have good pictures produced by the Ministry itself? Why should they not produce, under the aegis of the corporation that I have suggested, pictures showing the work that is being done in all these multipurpose projects and the various things that we are developing in our country? Take the Chittaranjan institution, and make a good picture of it for our people as Soviet Russia is doing. Even if we are not prepared to learn anything 33 CSD

from Soviet Russia for various other reasons, let us learn from that country the way they dramatise their industrial and agricultural achievements in their country. Let our people learn to love the plough—the plough that produces all the things that we eat. Let us learn to love the loom because the loom helps us to produce our Dacca muslin, and so many other things like that. If you go to the sereet you should fall in love with the weaver, the agriculturist, the kisan, indeed with every butterfly in our own country. That is the way you should produce your pictures. It is no good finding fault with the producers. Let us find fault with these gentlemen here who come here on behalf of the Government, on behalf of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru himself. As we all know, the hon. Minister is a favourite of Pandit Nehru and I am glad it is so. Therefore, he should be having no trouble at that end; and he has nothing to fear, no trouble, at this end either. I am sure he will have the whole country with him on his side. But if he carries, in two or three years' time all these millions of people will get corrupted by these pictures and will be ranged against him, by the sort of pictures that they have been producing showing so many ghosts and pillories in our own Government, spreading so many scandals about our own Ministers. This sort of thing will grow and then it will be more and more difficult for my hon. friends to control the industry. For this reason I want the Minister, I want the hon. Minister himself, to proceed quickly to achieve the needed social atmosphere.

Cinema is one of the most important things, as important as schools, if not more; because the school we leave off; but even after so many years, until we are aged, even a little before we die, we would like to visit a cinema, for there is fun, pleasure and happiness in it, and there ought to be inspiration in it also. Therefore, I say, this Ministry is very important, according to me, much more important than any other Ministry in this country; and if

[Prof. G. Ranga.]

this Ministry is going to fail, then God save us from this Ministry.

SHRIMATI SAVITRY NIGAM (Uttar Pradesh):

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सिनेमेटोग्राफ एमेन्डमेन्ट बिल का हृदय से स्वागत करते हुए मुझे बड़ी प्रसन्नता हो रही है। सचमुच इस बिल द्वारा फिल्म कम्पनियों के तानाशाह निर्माताओं के ऊपर कुछ रोकथाम लगाई जा सकेगी। हालांकि मुझे यह अनुभव हो रहा है कि इतने बड़े अपराध के लिए जो आज हमारे फिल्म निर्माता कर रहे हैं जो दंड अमेन्डमेन्ट (amendment) द्वारा दिया जावेगा बहुत हल्का सा प्रतीत होता है। इसके अतिरिक्त मुझे यह भी भय है कि पूर्जापति फिल्म निर्माता बड़ी आसानी से थैली के बल पर इस अमेन्डमेन्ट कानून की भी अवहेलना कर के महत्माने अश्लील टुकड़े जोड़कर वैसे ही आजादी भोगने लगेंगे जैसा कि अभी तक भोगते आये हैं।

श्रीमन्, यह बात कौन नहीं जानता कि हमारे जैसे देश के लिये जहाँ अशिक्षा का अन्धकार फैला है, जहाँ अन्न, वस्त्र और हर वस्तु की कमी है जनसाधारण को सामाजिक तथा नैतिक शिक्षा दिलाने का फिल्म से अधिक उच्चतर कोई साधन हो ही नहीं सकता है। क्योंकि सिनेमा ही एक ऐसा साधन है जिसके द्वारा हम मनोरंजन के साथ साथ ही शिक्षा भी दे सकते हैं। लोगों में सद्भावना उत्पन्न कर उन्हें निर्माण पथ पर बढ़ने के लिए प्रेरित कर सकते हैं। सफाई, स्वास्थ्य, सामाजिक शिक्षा, नागरिक शिक्षा, सभी सिनेमा द्वारा ही दी जा सकती है। पर श्रीमन्, खेद है कि हमें शिक्षा देने की कौन कहे, हमारे फिल्म निर्माता आज देश में कुत्सित वासनाओं और धृष्ट विचारों से भरी हुई प्रेम कहानियों का प्रचार कर रहे हैं। शायद ही कोई ऐसी फिल्म

होगी जिसमें अश्लीलतापूर्ण वार्तालाप न रहते हों या वासनोद्दीपक गाने न रहते हों। इसके साथ ही चोरों, डकैतों और जेबकटों की तिकड़म, चालाकियाँ और भद्दे मजाकों से भरे हुए सिनेमा देख देख कर हमारे देशवासियों का जो नैतिक पतन हो रहा है वह किसी से छिपा नहीं है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must avoid repetitions.

SHRIMATI SAVITRY NIGAM:

श्रीमती सावित्री निगम : यदि मैं यह कहूँ तो अत्युक्ति न होगी कि ये फिल्मों अनैतिकता तथा अनाचार सिखाने का और हमारी आने वाली पीढ़ी की भावनार्यों कुत्सित करने का ही काम कर रही हैं। श्रीमन्, इसका मुख्य कारण यह है कि सेंसर बोर्ड में स्त्रियों की संख्या और शिक्षकों की संख्या बहुत कम है। मेरा माननीय मंत्री जी से अनुरोध है कि सेंसर बोर्ड में प्रयोग रूप से सारी स्त्रियाँ ही रख कर देख लें तो मेरा विश्वास है कि शीघ्रता से ही फिल्म निर्माताओं के रूख बिल्कुल ही बदल जायेंगे।

श्रीमन्, यह बताया जाता है कि फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड के द्वारा जिन जिन फिल्मों पर कंट्रोल किया जाता है उसके पहले ही वे कितनी ही बार जनता के सामने आ चुकती हैं। ऐसी बातों में जो लापरवाही बर्ती जाती है उनका दूर किया जाना अति आवश्यक है।

श्रीमन्, मैं एक और सुझाव देना चाहती हूँ कि बजाय इसके कि फिल्मों का सेंसर करने के लिये सेंसर बोर्ड बनाया जाय, हर कम्पनी को चाहिये कि अपने फिल्म की स्क्रिप्ट (script) यहाँ मिनिस्ट्री को भेज दे और मिनिस्ट्री एक ऐसा सेंसर बोर्ड बनाये जिसके द्वारा स्क्रिप्ट का सेंसर किया जाय और केवल उन्हीं स्क्रिप्ट की फिल्म बनाने की इजाजत दी जाय जो कि मिनिस्ट्री द्वारा

स्वीकृत हों। यदि ऐसा किया जा सके तो यही नहीं होगा कि तमाम फिल्म निर्माताओं की वह पूंजी जो कि गलत फिल्म के बनाने में लगती है वह बचेगी बल्कि उसके साथ साथ उन तमाम लोगों का परिश्रम भी बेकार नहीं जायेगा जो कि फिल्म बनाने के कार्य में लगे हुये हैं।

इसके साथ ही साथ इंफार्मेशन मिनिस्ट्री को एक ऐसी प्रतियोगिता भी प्रारम्भ करनी चाहिये जिसमें बच्चों के लिये, स्त्रियों के लिये तथा दूसरों के लिये सब से शिक्षाप्रद और उपयोगी फिल्मी कहानियां देश तथा विदेशों से आमंत्रित की जायं। इससे अच्छे अच्छे लेखक और कहानीकार इस ओर आकर्षित होंगे कि वे सृचनात्मक, कलापूर्ण तथा शिक्षाप्रद फिल्मों का निर्माण करें। इसके पश्चात् सबसे उच्च कोटि की जो फिल्मी कहानियां हों उन्हीं को मिनिस्ट्री खरीद ले और खरीदने के बाद फिल्म निर्माताओं को दे दे और जो धन उससे आवे वह उस कहानीकार को दिया जाय जिसने कि कहानी लिखी हो। इससे यही नहीं होगा कि देश को अच्छी फिल्में मिल सकेंगी बल्कि कहानीकार और लेखकों में एक नवीन उत्साह भी आ सकेगा और बिना कुछ अधिक खर्च किये हुये ही अच्छी फिल्मों को निर्मित करने में देश समर्थ हो सकेगा।

इसके अतिरिक्त यह भी आवश्यक है कि एक कांफ्रेंस ( conference ) कर के फिल्म निर्माताओं को यह बताया जाय कि देश की वर्तमान परिस्थितियों के लिये किस प्रकार की फिल्में बनाना आवश्यक है। जैसे महापुरुष की जीवनियों अथवा पंचवर्षीय योजना के किसी अंग को दिलचस्प कहानियों के रूप में बना कर यदि कोई फिल्म दिखाई जाय तो मुझे विश्वास है कि उससे जनता में नया उत्साह और नया जीवन फूँका जा सकेगा।

जैसे चम्बल की योजना है। चम्बल को परसानीफाई ( personify ) करके उसे एक नदी की रानी के रूप में दिखाया जाय और उसमें यह दिखाया जाय कि चम्बल नाम की नदियों की रानी बड़ी उदार और अच्छी थी और सबको खूब अन्न और धन देना चाहती थी। निर्धन होने के कारण तथा उन का खजाना जमीन के अन्दर बहुत गहरा गड़ा हुआ होने के कारण लोगों को अन्न व धन देने की इच्छा होते हुए भी लोगों को अन्न, हरियाली और पानी नहीं दे पाती थी परन्तु जब लोगों ने उनकी सहायता की और उनको गड़ा हुआ खजाना मिल गया तो उन्होंने देश को हरा भरा कर दिया और सब लोग सुखी और सम्पन्न हो गये। इस प्रकार की कल्पना द्वारा छोटी छोटी योजनाओं की फिल्में बना कर दिखाई जायं तो इसमें कोई सन्देह नहीं है कि लोगों को योजना को कार्यान्वित करने और सफलीभूत बनाने के लिये नया जीवन, नया उत्साह और नई प्रेरणा मिल सकेगी।

इसी प्रकार यदि फिल्मों में ऐसी तमाम चीजें जो कि जातीय गौरव और देश प्रेम को जाग्रत करने वाली हैं दिखा सकें तो आजकल जो जनता में फ्रस्ट्रेशन ( frustration ) है उसे हम निस्संदेह बहुत ही शीघ्र देश निर्माण की ओर उकसा सकेंगे और उन्हें इस योग्य बना सकेंगे कि वह निर्माण पथ पर सीधे कदम बढ़ा सकें।

[For English translation, see Appendix IV, Annexure No. 160.]

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, while supporting this amending Bill I have a few observations to make. We have to see how far the amendments proposed serve the purpose for which this amending Bill has been brought

[Pandit S. S. N. Tankha.]

forward. The hon. Minister, while giving his reasons for bringing forward the present amending Bill, has said that the first necessity for this amending Bill is that Government had at times found it necessary to stop the showing of a particular film because of the fact that either certain States in India or countries outside objected to its show because it hurt their feelings or showed them in a wrong colour and that the necessity for stopping the exhibition of such films was immediate, and hence Government required certain powers under the Act. I recognise, Sir, that clause (c) which is being added to section 6 of the principal Act serves the need which the hon. Minister stands in need of, but I am afraid, Sir, that the period of suspension of exhibition of the film mentioned in the proviso which is added to clause (c) of section 1 of the amending Bill namely, "Provided that no direction issued under clause (c) shall remain in force for more than two months from the date of the notification", is too short a period of suspension surely for taking of decisions on the objections taken to the exhibition of the film. Within this short period of time I am afraid, it will not be possible for the authorities to go into the validity of the objections raised and to determine whether or not a particular film should be allowed to be exhibited or not. The hon. Minister has himself said that it takes the authorities several months—I think about six months' time—to find out the owners of the films upon whom notices have to be served regarding stoppage of films. After all, Sir, when clauses (a) and (b) of section 6 of the principal Act are allowed to remain, namely, "notwithstanding anything contained in this Part, the Central Government may, of its own motion, by notification in the Official Gazette, direct that (a) a certified film shall be deemed to be an uncertified film in the whole or any part of India, or (b) a film in respect of which a 'U' certificate has been granted, shall be deemed to be a film in respect of which an 'A' certificate has been granted". It will, in any case,

be necessary for the authorities to give some sort of notice to the owners of the film before they decide upon un-certifying a particular film or changing the character of the certificate that is granted to it. And as such if it takes the authorities about six months' time to trace the proprietors and to take action in the matter, then a provision of two months only for stopping the exhibition of a film is too short a period and I would therefore like to have this period extended up to at least six months.

Then, Sir, to ascertain who the proprietors are, I would suggest that the hon. Minister should provide in this Bill, or may provide hereafter that as soon as a particular film is produced and made ready for exhibition, it should be registered in the same manner as the ownership of a motor vehicle is registered. Further if there is a transfer of ownership, at any later date, that also should be registered in the same manner as the change of ownership of any motor vehicle is registered. If this is done, it will be very easy for the authorities to trace the owners of films within the shortest possible time.

Then, Sir, the hon. Minister told us that the owners and producers of films at times add or alter certain portions of the films after they are certified and it is only when such additions or alterations are detected or objection is taken to certain parts of the film that the authorities come to know of these additions or alterations and it is only then that they take action against the producers or owners of the films. In this regard I find, Sir, that the hon. Minister has made provision in the present Bill by the addition of clauses (b) and (c) to section 7, and I think, Sir, that the provision made by him will meet the purpose. But, Sir, I have to submit that the fine which the hon. Minister has proposed for non-observance of the provisions of the Act, namely, the provision of punishment with imprisonment which may extend to three months, and in the case of a continuing offence with a further fine which may extend to one thousand

rupees for each day during which the offence continues, is a proper penalty for this offence and I am in entire agreement with it. But, Sir, I have to suggest that, instead of the provision of a fine of Rs. 1,000 only it should be a fine extending to at least Rs. 5,000. The cinema industry, as we all know, is a very prosperous industry and can flout the wishes of the Government and defeat the purpose of the Act by paying the small fine of Rs. 1,000. It is true that there is a further fine in the case of a continuing offence, but that continuing offence will only be detected after the culprit has once been fined Rs. 1,000. Therefore, I suggest that a fine extending to Rs. 5,000 for the initial offence should have been stipulated. It does not mean that when a fine of Rs. 5,000 is provided for, the magistrate would be compelled to award that fine; he can award a smaller fine, but that should be the maximum up to which the courts can fine, if they consider it necessary to do so. Now, Sir, in order to put a stop to the malpractice of altering the film after the Board of Censors has certified it, I have to suggest to the hon. Minister that provision should be made in the Act that a copy of the film should be deposited with the Government or the Board of Censors as soon as a film is produced, or as soon as it is certified for exhibition, so that whenever an occasion arises as to whether or not any portion of the film has been altered, it will always be possible for Government to find it out from the copy deposited with it or the Board of Censors. It is not a very difficult matter, and I think the owners or the distributors of films too will not find it too expensive to furnish a copy to the Government.

Then, Sir, as regards the amendment of section 7 of the principal Act as proposed in clause 4, of the amending Bill I do not see any reason why subsection (1), clause (a), sub-clauses (i) and (ii) of section 7 of the principal Act are provided in the amending Bill, because I find on a comparison of the principal Act and the amending Bill

that the wordings of this clause and the sub-clauses thereof referred to are exactly the same both in the principal Act and the amending Bill and hence no necessity for any amendment of these clauses arises. The only need for the amendment was the addition of sub-clauses (b) and (c) and the wordings thereafter. Therefore Sir, there was no need for the change of the first portion of this section in the principal Act and its amendment is wholly unnecessary. With these words, Sir, I support the Bill.

MAJ.-GENERAL S. S. SOKHEY (Nominated): Mr. Deputy Chairman, today's debate, though on a very minor Bill, has been very interesting in more ways than one. It has been heartening to hear the deep sense of appreciation of the House about the important place which cinema should occupy in the life of our country. But we seem to be generally not satisfied with the situation at present. But as regards the solution of the problem, we have had multiplicity of suggestions offered and that multiplicity of solutions can not but confuse the hon. Minister who is in charge of this Bill. What I have heard reminds me of the problem of the supply of milk in the city of Bombay some years ago. Then we allowed a thousand people to produce adulterated milk, and employed a thousand others to catch them. We seemed to lack intelligence in dealing with our problem. Instead of letting first a thousand people produce adulterated milk and then employing a thousand people to catch them, why could we not act directly and produce the milk ourselves as a community? After a number of years of debate, ultimately the Government of Bombay undertook to produce the milk itself and the results have been very happy and encouraging. We do not have to complain about bad milk. The same is true of drugs which are of vital importance to us. We first allow people to produce fictitious and spurious articles and then we try to set up a very complicated mechanism to catch them. But of course, we can never catch up. But suppose we took a more

