

SHRI H. C. MATHUR (Rajasthan): Sir, I wish to invite your attention to the notice which I gave.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are considering it. We have sent it to the Ministry.

SHRI H. C. MATHUR: Thousands of families are suffering.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is quite true, but we are taking action.

THE CINEMATOGRAPH (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952—continued.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We resume discussion on the Cinematograph Amendment Bill. Maj-General Sokhey.

MAJ.-GENERAL S. S. SOKHEY (Nominated): Mr. Chairman, with your permission I should like very briefly to summarise what I said yesterday, before proceeding with my speech.

Sir, yesterday the debate showed that the House was deeply conscious of the cinema as a cultural and educational medium of very great value, and of the part which it should play in the life of the country. The debate also brought out the fact that at present at least the cinema industry's productions are rather poor, that they lower the taste of the people and that if anything they deepen still further their ignorance of historical, cultural and social aspects. Reasons were offered for this state of affairs; but by and large they amounted to the greed of the investors in the industry and the low moral and cultural level of the other fellow who works the industry. I am afraid, Sir, the subject is far too complex to be resolved in any such simple way. Any such effort would really prevent us from understanding the problem and finding suitable remedies to set matters right.

I would like the House to consider two aspects of the problem. When the cinema came on the scene in Europe, Europe had already developed a very vigorous cultural, educational and artistic life. This active life was of very great assistance to the cinema industry. But in spite of that, for reasons I shall presently narrate, quite a large percentage of the productions of the cinema in Europe and America are far from good. But in our own country, when cinema burst on us, we were culturally and artistically a dying people. Under foreign domination we were forsaking our own cultural heritage and were trying to make ourselves Europeans, with most disastrous results. In this confusion, when cinema burst on us, all that we could do was to imitate European and particularly Hollywood producers when an imitation is attempted, it always means imitating the lowest. As regards the higher reaches of art, they have to be created and cannot be imitated. That, I think, is one of the most important aspects of the cinema industry to be considered.

Then again, we have got to appreciate that we work in a capitalistic state of society. In that social order, it is an imperative necessity to make profits. In fact no one who engages in an industry, including the cinema industry, has any chance of survival unless he makes economic gains—not only economic gains, but economic gains on a short-term basis. Thus every film should if possible be a success. With this very important requirement of economic order, the producers take every step possible to make every film a success.

Thus these two factors have fashioned our cinema industry. This lack of background of cultural traditions and of the necessities imposed by the economic order requires a very careful handling by the State. But we must not deceive ourselves and say that our pictures are bad because our producers are bad or our artistes are bad. I can without any fear of contradiction say

[Maj.-General S. S. Sokhey.]
that our producers are as good as any one of us in this House and I am deeply happy to be able to say that in spite of the very difficult conditions in which this industry is operating, we have produced a galaxy of good artistes and producers.

We cannot expect laws to rectify fundamental defects in the situation. I was glad to see the good sense of the House to not attach importance to the punitive clauses of the Bill. But I was rather disagreeably surprised when I heard some of the Members recommend and advocate still stricter censorship. One Member went so far as to introduce a new type of censorship, censorship to censor scenerios, dialogues and what not before the work was even begun. I think this recommendation stems from ignorance of the nature of creative art. If censorship was put on that basis, it would destroy even the little art that we are producing. It is a matter of great necessity that the artistes should be able to work in a fairly free field.

Censorship is at least a negative act. It can do the films art no good. What is needed is something very much positive. I think I would be supported by all Members in this House when I say that all those of us who have worked for the theatre, worked on the stage, have always been fighting and wishing to get censorship abolished. And I want to be very clearly understood that censorship can be of no use to a creative art, especially like cinema and the theatre. The better way of course is to create in society good taste and good art criticism. No censorship is a solution of the problem. It is really negative and the best way that censorship can be used is merely to prevent the showing of films which might inflame racial or communal hatreds and which used really to screen foreign films.

KHWAJA INAIT ULLAH That is the censorship

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MAJ.-GENERAL S. S. SOKHEY:
And therefore what is the solution to this problem? I should personally like to see the industry nationalised. This may not be necessary in highly developed countries, but here we are in a different situation and I consider that in our country where art and cultural life has to be nursed back to health, we need the industry to be nationalised. Now I want to be very clearly understood as to what I mean by the industry being nationalised, and what nationalisation should achieve. I should like a State Corporation to be organised with ample funds and headed by some of our best producers, artistes and art critics. And the success of the organisation would depend on the proper selection of these people who would operate this Corporation. And I think we should be very serious about their selection. The whole thing depends on it. We must take care that the persons selected are the right people. We must be serious and avoid making blunders like we did in selecting the Board of Academy of Dance, Drama and Music. We have selected two dancers in the Board, who not only are not good dancers, but have done more to destroy the classical dance heritage of our country than man or woman dead or alive.

Now the function of this Corporation would be to look out for talent and support it. Give artistes and producers a free hand to produce good art. Corporation would be a nurse-maid to bring cinema art to healthy vigorous growth. The difference between this Corporation and the present commercial production would be that the present commercial production looks to immediate gains on every picture, while a State organisation which I suggest would be working on a long term basis—would assess its work on a 15-year basis—and not worry about the results from year to year. This would give a great stability to the

artistes and they will not be harassed by financiers. In this connection I would point out that one Madam (Lady Member) yesterday made a very pertinent observation. She said that Marathi pictures and other language pictures which did not have a very large circulation were on the whole cleaner pictures and more inspiring. I wonder whether she understands the import of her observation. It is simply this that the pictures that are going to have a short circulation can be produced more cheaply. The financial considerations do not operate to the same extent as in the case of pictures that have a large circulation and must make large gains. Now this fact shows that the pictures which can be produced with a fair amount of financial ease are artistically better pictures. In this connection, I am reminded of a Marathi picture which is being shown in Bombay at present for the last 14 weeks or so.

SHRI RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: On a point of order, Sir. How is this relevant to the scope of this Bill.

MR CHAIRMAN: We are all indulging in the general reflections as to how cinemas could improve our cultural life. From start to finish that has been the procedure. But I hope he will be brief.

MAJ.-GENERAL S. S. SOKHEY: Yes, Sir. I was referring to Shyam-chi-aai produced by the collaboration of a great Mahratta writer, Acharya Atre and one of the most accomplished of Indian screen artistes, Vanmala. They pooled their resources and art. This picture has set very good standards and given inspiration and joy to lakhs of people as a result of two great artistes functioning free from all financial worries. If our Corporation could produce the same conditions for artistes as a whole, the results would be happy indeed, and I take the liberty of asking the hon. Minister to nationalise the industry. I am sure he would like to do so; I am sure he wants to serve the country well, to make this art vigorous and healthy, but I am not blind enough to imagine that he

will succeed because it seems that this Government is still tied down to the shackles of a *laissez faire* economy and even in the domain of physical production where rapid and intense development is called for, they still cling to an economy which is going to be very disappointing. That being the case, we may still have to have a Board of Censors but I should like to suggest to the hon. Minister what we should do to improve the Board of Censors. It can be done by two means: At least 50 per cent. of the members of the Board of Censors should be producers, artistes, art critics, etc. who have devoted all their time and energy to the cinema world and cinema art. This should be supplemented by writers, historians, social workers, etc. of same outlook. There is no use having people on this Board who spend all their time in trying to force their tastes and morality, and so on, on others. We must choose people more for their breadth of view than for their self righteousness. In addition, the hon. Minister may start a Film Finance Corporation not to nationalise the industry but to give financial assistance to those who are working in the industry at present. I think that some such approach is needed if we are going to enable ourselves to make use of this great medium of very great value both from the cultural as well as from the artistic points of view.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, it is disappointing that the Minister for Information and Broadcasting has placed before us a Bill dealing with a few penal details when we expected a far more comprehensive measure for the regulation and development of the film industry. The Government themselves were alive to the importance of taking steps to improve the conditions under which the film industry was working and to take such an over-all view of the existing circumstances with a view to the satisfaction of those cultural needs of society which must be looked after more than any other

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]
 thing if we want to raise the moral tone and character of our people. The fact that the Government were alive to this matter is indicated by their appointment of the Film Enquiry Committee in 1949. The Committee reported in March 1951, but the Government have given no indication yet as to when they propose to bring forward a Bill dealing with the recommendations of the Committee and all such matters as it is necessary to take into account in order to bring about the desired development. The Government appointed the Cinematograph Committee in 1927 under the Chairmanship of Mr. Rangachari. That Committee made certain important recommendations which, if accepted, would have obviated much of the trouble that has arisen and given that encouragement to the film industry to produce and exhibit films of the right kind which every speaker who has participated in this debate has emphasised, but unfortunately, the report of this Committee was still-born, and owing to various causes, no action was taken on its recommendations. I hope that the Film Enquiry Committee's report will not share the same fate and that Government intend to bring forward a measure during the next session which will show that they mean to take early steps to remove all those difficulties that have been complained of and to take those positive steps without which the film industry cannot attain the position that we should all like it to attain. I do not want to go into the details of the recommendations of the Film Enquiry Committee, but I think it is desirable to draw attention to some of its most important recommendations. We have only a Board at present for the censoring of films. I may say incidentally that the Cinematograph Committee of 1927 recommended the creation of an All India Board of Film Censors but this recommendation was given effect to only in 1949, and their recommendation for the establishment of a Cinema Advisory Council has not been given effect to yet. The Film Enquiry Committee recommended the

setting up of a Central Film Council with statutory powers for the regulation of the film industry. Its business will be to superintend and regulate the industry in all its branches, to undertake psychological research in terms of the various age groups, etc. Apart from this, the Film Enquiry Committee recommended the establishment of a Central Institute of Film Art for the training of directors, actors and technicians and for giving encouragement to producers producing good films. They have also recommended among other things the establishment of a Finance Corporation such as that to which my hon. friend Major-General Sokhey referred to. The object of this Corporation will be to help producers to produce such films as are needed in the interest of society.

There are some other recommendations of the Committee too, for instance the creation of a Central Film Fund. But I don't think that it is necessary for me to point all of them out for I expect my hon. friend the Minister for Information and Broadcasting to bring forward soon a measure dealing with the film industry i.e., the production and exhibition of films as a whole. I would however, like to say that in my opinion the recommendations of the Committee don't go far enough. The Committee seem to have thought only of taking steps to encourage the Film Industry. This is an important matter and I do not doubt it. But I am somewhat doubtful whether in the present state of things the desired end can be reached without some measure of Government control. I know that the Committee has recommended that it would be better if instead of the films being rejected after they have been produced, the shooting scripts were examined so that the producers might be advised with regard to the undesirable features in the plan in time to avoid unnecessary financial loss. My hon. friend General Sokhey deprecated such a measure of control but at the same time he recommended the nationalisation of the entire industry. Nationalisation of the industry, if it

means anything, means complete Government control. The artistes may apparently enjoy complete freedom but whether they are aware of it or not—and I think they will be aware of it at every step—they will be subject to the supervision and control of the State. I think that of the two proposals that have been put forward—one, complete control over the industry by whatever alluring name it may be called and the other, a certain measure of the control which will serve as a warning to those who want to make use of the baser instincts in us to make money—I have no doubt for my part that the second proposal will be better. But I want to go further and ask the Minister to be prepared even to take a little odium on himself by controlling the production of films. That he is not wanting in courage is shown by the steps he has taken to improve the quality of the music broadcast by the All India Radio. Everyone who has any appreciation of music will, I am sure, gratefully acknowledge the efforts made by him in this connection. They may not be as popular as they deserve to be but I have no doubt that they will be appreciated in the course of a few years when it is realized how far they have gone to raise the level of appreciation of good music by our society. I hope that he will show the same kind of courage in devising suitable steps to encourage and in a certain measure ensure the production of films that will not lower the tone of society and will not give a fatally wrong bias to the minds of our youngmen and youngwomen.

There is another subject also to which I should like to refer at this stage. The Film Enquiry Committee realising the importance of the production of films specially suited for children has suggested various measures for this purpose. It has not merely recommended the production of special entertainment films for children but has also recommended their compulsory exhibition by the cinema houses once a week. Now while the recommendations are good enough so far as they go, here again I

don't think that they go far enough. I think it will be desirable to set up a special Film Council dealing with the production of what I may call 'Juvenile Films'. If these films are so produced as to interest not merely children up to the age of 12 or 13 or 14 but also children who are a little older, I hope that they will be the means of removing one of the evils to which some Lady Members referred to yesterday.

Apart from a Children's Film Council, I think it is necessary to give special assistance to those producers who are prepared to show some enterprise in this direction. The production of films is a costly business and it cannot be expected that producers will be prepared to undergo financial risks without some certainty that their productions would enable them to receive back the money that they have spent on the production of these films, to earn at least the money that they have spent on the production of these films. I think that a measure of State assistance is necessary here, or the Finance Corporation that may be set up may be specially asked to encourage such producers as are prepared to produce films specially suited for children. Again, I think, Sir, that the Government also should take a hand in this matter. It is not enough that they should in this field, this unexplored field in India, leave everything to be done by private enterprise, even with some measure of assistance from the State. I think the State should come forward itself and produce some good films which will serve as a model to the producers.

MAJ.-GENERAL S. S. SOKHEY: Nationalise them.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: My hon. friend Maj.-General Sokhey has again referred to his favourite nostrum—nationalisation of the industry. Sir, there are defects in every direction and if the only solution that we can find for them is the complete control by the State, then we must realise that we want a leviathan State and a totalitarian society. Now, is that the society that we all desire? If we do

[Shri H. N. Kunzru.]

not, if we value human personality, if we think that human freedom and dignity have any worth, then we should, by bringing out the best that is in our own people, enable them in an atmosphere of freedom, to place before us creations that would conform to our present stage of development and would take account, at least in some measure, of our future needs. For this purpose, a certain measure of state-control is necessary and I hope that when my hon. friend the Minister for Information and Broadcasting brings forward that larger measure, that we all look forward to, he will bear particularly in mind the needs of the children. We all deplore at present the low level of the films that are exhibited. We curse the people who for the sake of gain, are trying to corrupt the morals of our young children. But we should realise that the best way to put an end to this state of things is to provide cultural education to children between the ages of five and fifteen. If we, therefore, produce suitable children's films, I have no doubt that in the course of ten to fifteen years a revolution would be brought about in the public taste and cinemas that are now seen with interest would be shunned and regarded as a social pest.

Some doubts are entertained, Sir, with regard to the popularity of children's films; but the large majority thinks that they will be popular. Even supposing that they will not be as popular in the beginning as we would like them to be, I think that this is a matter in which some financial risk should be taken. A large number of children see films from time to time, and the compulsory show of children's films in every cinema once a week may not, therefore, be found a financial failure. If, however, it is thought that this will be attended by considerable risk, increase the period from one week to two weeks or three weeks or even four weeks, but do not say that nothing can be done in this matter. Take some steps to make the exhibition of such films in the cinemas compulsory. If the Government have the

necessary will, I have no doubt that the measure will succeed very soon, even if it does not prove a success from the very beginning.

Sir, there is just one matter to which I would like to refer before I sit down. Everyone here, I am sure, will realise the importance of our exporting the best films produced in this country. If we want that we should give as good an idea of our culture and of the stage of development reached by us, of the efforts that we are making to create a better society, then such cultural productions as we send out should be of the best kind. But unfortunately the export of films leaves a great deal to be desired in this respect. Generally speaking—and I speak on this matter with some experience—the films that are exported are of a very undesirable kind. I have seen them, Sir, in some of those colonies where Indians are settled, and I have deplored the unfortunate effect produced by those films on the minds of the members of our race and on the minds of those non-Indians who saw them in order to find out what degree of technical and moral excellence had been reached by the cinema art in India. This is another matter in which, I think, some government control is necessary.

I fear that Government, if they take such steps will make themselves a little unpopular in the beginning but with the work done by them in the proper spirit and with the sole desire of enabling our producers and exhibitors to play the role that society expects them to play, I have no doubt that the opposition, that may make itself felt in the beginning will subside and the opponents at the initial stage may bless the Government in a short time when they find the improvement brought about in the industry and the good reputation earned by them abroad.

PANDIT S. DUBE (Madhya Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, A great deal of ground has been covered by all the previous speakers, but.....

(MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN *in the Chair*)
if I may venture to analyse the

films, to me it strikes that they can be classified either as propagandistic films or as informative or instructive or educative or narrative or humorous or historical; it may either be comic or tragic. There are certain films the residual part of them may be entertainment.

I am more or less concerned with the entertainment part of the film. I have passed the stage of being informed or educated but I would certainly go for the purpose of entertainment and if I do not find entertainment I get disgusted. My hon. friend, Prof. Ranga professes to be a constant visitor to the films and still he says that he comes back displeased with them. I am sure that he must be finding something entertaining in those films for him to go constantly; if he wants inspiration, I am sure, he must be getting but what I am not sure is this that our films are representing, more or less, a most artificial state of things. After all, what are the films? The films are merely a repetition on the screen of what you otherwise see in the drama or you find them in books, in literature. If you have no objection to drama, you certainly should have no objection to the drama being represented in the film. To me, it certainly helps those books being shown in the films. Therefore, if we are taking a correct view of things it follows that the films should as fully represent the state of society as literature does, as the drama does, as books do. It has been always a great pleasure to me to see films of the kind of North West Passage or Gone with the Wind or How Green was my Valley or the Razor's Edge or the Bicycle Thief, things of this kind which are entertaining and which are representing the books themselves. They are extremely illuminating and a pleasure to see but we find in our films tragedy after tragedy. Where we try to find some entertainment we find that the writer thinks nothing but of exasperating your feelings, at the end the heroines suffer, people being dragged through

tortures, shrill cries, beatings, murders, killings and all these things are shown and I certainly feel disgusted when I find that films of this kind are allowed to be shown. It will, therefore, be a part of the duty of the Film Censors who have now been appointed to see that so far as these films are concerned, which have no entertainment value, they are improved.

10 A.M.

Sir, a great deal has been said about the sex aspect of these films. Now, the sex business is a very very intricate affair altogether. It is a basic part of the structure of the mind; it is a basic principle of human nature. Sex and sleep are to be found in the very structure of our creation and it will come out sooner or later. Efforts have been made to direct it in the proper channel and, unless there is a dash of it—I don't say that there should be in indecent amount, but, unless there is a dash of it—the film is not likely to attract attention, as was complained in the speech of one of the hon. Members that Jhansi-ki-Rani did not succeed because it has no sex appeal, there is nothing sexy about it. If there is no such thing, it is bound not to attract attention unless society has been educated in such a manner as to realise that sex is not everything in connection with films. The principle, to my mind, ought to be not what the public wants but that the people should want what we give them. It is this principle which, if followed very properly, taken up as in the matter of music by the Minister of Information & Broadcasting who has insisted upon classical music, will educate the people, train the people for such cinema shows as we can give them and not cater to their taste by following trends of popular acceptance in low psychology.

As we all know, Sir, so far as the cinema industry is concerned, it is in the hands of people who want to

[Pandit S. Dube.]

make money. This profit motive will act so long as the state of society is what it is and, as was said by my hon. friend Major-General Sokhey that unless we have that necessary background for society to accept cinemas as we would wish them to accept, it is not possible to raise the cultural level. Therefore, it all leads to this question as to whether the education of our children, of our younger generation is such that would make them appreciate what we give them. After all, the position is this: Have we lost our morals or have we no morals? We are going in for a classless, perhaps casteless and, in all probability, a Godless and, sooner or later, a sinless society. There will be no sin because everything that we do is permitted by public conscience. This is a danger that we are likely to fall in a sinless society in which case everything will be good. Are we prepared for this? Can we get any machinery by which human values, moral values, would be inculcated in the minds of the youth? It is suggested that we must have cultural training. How are you going to provide that? What is the basis of your cultural training? You have left off religion, you have left off God, you have left off all the ideas of the civilisation which has been handed down to you from generations. You are drifting without a rudder in the moral seas. The position, therefore, is an extremely dangerous one and calls for greater effort on the part of the Nation and unless we provide that background and unless we look at the things in the larger point of view, I have no hope for the future of the country. If therefore the cinema industry does play a part—I believe everybody agrees that it does play its part—it should be our national effort to see that the background is provided or appreciating the cinema which after all is but another aspect of literature. It has been said, Sir, that the cinema houses show a great deal of crimes and murders and gangsterism. May I ask if

anybody objected to reading about books on them when they were first published. Take up the case of Conan Doyle. He invented crimes and tried to detect them in his detective stories and also elucidate the author of the imaginary crimes. People have read them with avidity. I have never come across any complaining against Conan Doyle's productions or against the thousands and thousands of crime stories that are now on the market. Nobody protested against them and yet if they come to be shown on the cinema or on the film you seem to think that they are going to destroy the moral of the youth. By reading such books the morals are already destroyed. The books in thousands and thousands are still there and nothing could be done about them.

Unless therefore you realise as to what is exactly your object, it is not worth while suggesting remedies which will be useless, which will not help and which will not have the proper effect.

In this connection I might say that we must not be prudish about this and we must not be sensitive of these things. I know that bread is good, that it is necessary, that it is wholesome and nourishing, but does it follow that you should thrust it down my throat every time I open my mouth? I expect that this should also be the attitude in respect of cinema also. Will they absolutely deprive me of my entertainment simply because emotions and passions and sex-relationship are portrayed on the screen. Will they deprive me for all time... (Interruption).

No, not necessarily. The position is this. Since the introduction of women in the cinemas, women are shining in this line also. Women have always played a very important part in history. The face of the world has changed because of the

women's participation in more and more fields of life. They say that the history of Rome would have changed if the nose of Cleopatra were less long. The next point.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Dube, I may remind you that it is all beyond the scope of the Bill. The Bill has a very limited scope and I did not expect that a rambling sort of debate will take place on this Bill. Please confine yourself to the Bill before the House.

PANDIT S. DUBE: The Chairman had permitted the debate to go on in this manner and other speakers also.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no reason why you should also follow the same. Please confine your speech to the Bill please.

PANDIT S. DUBE: I bow down to the ruling of the Chair. As I was saying, Sir, we must not be very prudish about it.

So far as the heroines and stars are concerned they are never found wanting in any parts and among them there are most respectable people also. The only point to which we could possibly take exception is that the dances that are introduced are sometimes indecent, definitely indecent and it should be our effort to see that such prostitution of the human body which defiles the mind should not be permitted.

Sir, the cinema affects you directly through the eyes and through the ears just as the wine affects you through the mouth. Drink affects in two ways. It goes into the body and takes some time to make the mind sick and to undermine morals. But so far as the cinema is concerned it acts directly like an injection into the blood. Therefore you must take the greatest amount of care that what is being presented to us does not pass that poison which will ruin our moral fibre.

34 C.S.D.

That is all I have got to say, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I suggest that Members should not take more than 5 minutes each hereafter because this has been debated very long and all points have been thrashed out.

SHRI C. G. MISRA (Madhya Pradesh):

श्री सी० जी० मिश्र (मध्य प्रदेश) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस विषय में जितने भी भाषण हुये हैं उनका उत्तर देने के लिये सिनेमा संसार की तरफसे कोई उपस्थित नहीं है, इसका मुझे शोक है। मैं चाहता था कि श्री पृथ्वीराज जी, जो कि सिनेमा के मुख्य प्रवर्तक हैं, उपस्थित होते तो अच्छा था।

सिनेमा के सम्बन्ध में जितने दोष बताये जाते हैं वे विशेषकर सिनेमा में जो गायन, प्रदर्शन और भाषण होते हैं उनके सम्बन्ध में बताये जाते हैं और हमारा अनुमान है कि उससे हमारा नैतिक पतन होता है। यह अभियोग किसी हद तक सही है परन्तु उसके साथ ही साथ सिनेमा में अन्य उत्तम प्रदर्शन भी होते हैं जिनका भी बहुत कुछ उपयोग है यह हमें मानना चाहिये। सिनेमा के दोषों को दूर करने के लिये यह अच्छा हो कि सिनेमाकारों को मार्ग प्रदर्शन करने के लिये एक अच्छी समिति सरकार की तरफ से या किसी अन्य प्रकार से नियुक्त हो जिसमें कि ऐसे सदस्य रहें जिनको धार्मिक, सामाजिक तथा राज-नैतिक बातों के सम्बन्ध में जो उत्तम सिद्धान्त हैं उन का ज्ञान हो। यदि ऐसी समिति उन लोगों का मार्ग प्रदर्शन करे तो अच्छा होगा। इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि पहला कदम जो सरकार को उठाना है वह यह है कि सरकार एक ऐसी समिति नियुक्त करे जो कि फिल्म तैयार करने वालों का उत्तम मार्ग प्रदर्शन करे और उसके लिये बहुत सूक्ष्मता के साथ नियम बना दिये जाय

[Shri C. G. Misra.]

जिससे कि उनको मालूम हो कि हमें किस तरह की फ़िल्म तैयार करनी चाहिये। यह प्रबन्ध करना बहुत सरल है और आवश्यक है। यदि ऐसा हो जाय कि फिल्म तैयार करने वाले अपनी फिल्म की योजना सरकार के सामने पेश करें और सरकार नियमों के अनुसार उसे देख कर जांच करे और उसमें जो बातें उचित हैं उनको रखने और अन्य बातों को निकालने के लिये उनको आदेश दे। इस तरह से उनको अच्छी सहायता मिल सकती है और वे अच्छी फिल्में तैयार करेंगे। इससे यह भी होगा कि फिल्म तैयार होने के बाद उसको जांच के लिये भेजने की विशेष आवश्यकता न रहेगी और तैयार होने के पश्चात् फिल्म अस्वीकृत होने से आर्थिक हानि होने की जो संभावना है वह भी नहीं रहेगी। इसलिये मैं समझता हूं कि यह कार्य पीछे के लिये छोड़ना ठीक नहीं है।

इसके पश्चात् मुझे यह कहना है कि जो सिनेमाकार हैं वे कलाकार हैं और वे कला के सम्बन्ध में जितनी भी घटनाएं संसार में हुआ करती हैं उनका प्रदर्शन अपनी कला के द्वारा करते हैं। वे चाहे भली हों या बुरी हों उनका कार्य कला का प्रदर्शन करना है। परन्तु उसके साथ ही साथ उनको इस बात को ध्यान में रखना चाहिये कि उन्हें कला का प्रदर्शन ऐसे मार्ग से करना है जिससे कि राष्ट्र की सांस्कृतिक तथा आध्यात्मिक उन्नति हो और इसके लिये उनको सरकार की ओर से परामर्श और सहायता मिलना अति आवश्यक है।

सिनेमा के सम्बन्ध में एक विशेष बात है जिसके विषय में बुराई का अनुभव होता है और वह स्त्री पुरुषों का सम्बन्ध है। स्त्री पुरुषों के सम्बन्ध में जितने प्रदर्शन होते हैं, चाहे वह

सिनेमा में हों अथवा नृत्य कला में हों वे सब हमारे देश की प्राचीन सभ्यता से कुछ आगे बढ़ गये हैं और उसमें पश्चिमी सभ्यता की नकल अधिक होती है। मुझे बहुत शोक के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि स्त्रियों के सम्बन्ध में जो बातें प्रदर्शित होती हैं वे बातें शायद यूरोप आदि देशों में प्रचलित हों परन्तु हमारे देश में प्रचलित नहीं होना चाहिये। स्त्रियों की मर्यादा की रक्षा करना हमारी भारतीय संस्कृति का मुख्य उद्देश्य रहा है। जो भी सिनेमा हों, नृत्य हों या गायन हों उनमें स्त्रियों की मर्यादा और मान का पूरा ध्यान रख कर प्रदर्शन किया जाय। मैं स्त्री समाज से और विशेषकर जो हमारे भवन में स्त्री सदस्या हैं उनसे प्रार्थना करता हूं कि इस दिशा में विशेष प्रयत्न करें। स्त्रियों के सम्बन्ध में यदि कोई ऐसी बात कही जाय जिससे उनके मान की हानि हो तो यह बड़े दुख की बात है। स्त्रियों के गौरव को ऊंचा करना और उनकी मान और मर्यादा की रक्षा करना पुरुषों का कर्तव्य है। पुरुषों को यह नहीं चाहिये कि स्त्रियों के द्वारा नाना प्रकार के खेल खेलें और उन खेलों के द्वारा आनन्द प्राप्त करें। यह बहुत ही घृणा की बात है और दुख की बात है। कलाकार जितने भी हैं उनका विशेष ध्यान अपनी कला के प्रदर्शन में रहता है और हम उनसे यह आशा नहीं कर सकते हैं कि वे कोई बड़े धार्मिक, आध्यात्मिक या सांस्कृतिक विषय में शिक्षा दें। जब तक उनको ऐसे महानुभावों की सहायता नहीं मिलेगी और उन पर नियंत्रण नहीं किया जायेगा तब तक वे पूर्णरूप से योग्य दिशा में जाने के लिये असमर्थ हैं। इसलिये उनको सहायता देनी चाहिये।

जितने कलाकार हैं वे जनता की रुचि को देख कर काम करते हैं और उसमें उनका उद्देश्य यही रहता है कि उनको विशेष आर्थिक लाभ हो और जनता उनसे संतुष्ट

रहे। जनता की सँच को ठीक करना, यह काम कलाकारों की योग्यता के बाहर है, वे यह बात नहीं कर सकते। इसलिये कोई दूसरा साधन सरकार को उपस्थित करना चाहिये जिससे कि कलाकारों को इसमें सहायता मिले कि वे उचित मार्ग में अपनी कला का प्रदर्शन करें।

एक बात गुझे और कहनी है और वह यह है कि सिनेमा का प्रदर्शन जितना ही बढ़ रहा है उतना ही राष्ट्र के स्वास्थ्य को हानि हो रही है। मैं इस बात के अत्यन्त विरोध में हूँ कि ११ बजे के बाद कोई भी मनुष्य जागे। मेरी सम्मति है कि सरकार इस पर नियंत्रण करे कि ११ बजे के बाद कोई भी सिनेमा नहीं हो। सिनेमा में लोग एक बजे तक बैठते हैं और चाय पानी पीते हैं और अल्पाहार करते हैं। यह सब खाना पीना हानिकारक होता है और इससे उनके स्वास्थ्य को बहुत हानि होती है और उनके द्रव्य की तथा सरकार के द्रव्य की भी बहुत हानि होती है। हम देखते हैं कि बीमारियाँ इतनी बढ़ गई हैं और इतनी बढ़ती जा रही हैं कि उनको रोकने के लिये सरकार को कितना पैसा आगे चल कर खर्च करना पड़ेगा इसकी कोई सीमा नहीं दिखाई पड़ती। बीमारियों को रोकने के जो उपाय हैं उनमें एक उपाय यह भी है कि कानून द्वारा ११ बजे के बाद सिनेमा का होना सरकार बन्द कर दे और ११ बजे के बाद कोई भी खेल या तमाशा नहीं हो।

धार्मिक फ़िल्मों के सम्बन्ध में भी मुझे कुछ कहना है। बहुत सी फ़िल्में ऐसी तैयार की जाती हैं जो कि हिन्दू समाज के लिये बहुत रोचक होती हैं क्योंकि हिन्दू समाज में कोई भी धार्मिक बात कही जाय तो समाज उस तरफ आकर्षित हो जाता है। परन्तु मैंने देखा है कि धार्मिक फ़िल्मों में नाना प्रकार के

देवताओं के सम्बन्ध में और नाना प्रकार के धार्मिक सिद्धान्तों के सम्बन्ध में ऐसे प्रदर्शन किये जाते हैं जिनसे जनता को कोई लाभ नहीं होता और जो कभी कभी धर्म के सिद्धान्त के बिल्कुल विरुद्ध होते हैं। धर्म ऐसा विषय है जिसे खेल कूद करके या नाच गाना करके सिखाया नहीं जा सकता है। धर्म एक बहुत ही गम्भीर विषय है जिसका सम्बन्ध नियमों से है और उन नियमों को सीखना और उनका पालन करना एक बहुत ही गम्भीर बात है। खेल कूद के द्वारा इन सिद्धान्तों को समझाना और खास कर देवताओं आदि के ऐसे प्रदर्शन करना ठीक नहीं है। मैंने देखा है कि बहुत सी ऐसी घटनाओं का प्रदर्शन किया जाता है जिनका उल्लेख हमारे धार्मिक साहित्य में कहीं नहीं है।

यह भी कहा गया कि प्रौढ़ों और वृद्ध पुरुषों के लिये अलग फिल्म होनी चाहिये।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All these are repetitions.

SHRI C. G. MISRA: Well, Sir, I am finishing. I am suggesting a different thing. I am going to suggest that there should be separate films.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All these points have been urged already. Please conclude your speech.

SHRI C. G. MISRA:

श्री सी० जी० मिश्र : यह कहा गया कि प्रौढ़ और वृद्ध पुरुषों के लिये अलग फिल्म होनी चाहिये। इसके बारे में मुझे कहना है कि बालकों की मानसिक अवस्था के अनुसार ऐसी फ़िल्में दिखाई जायँ जिससे उनको मानसिक विकास के लिये शिक्षा मिले। परन्तु बालकों तथा प्रौढ़ों के लिये अन्य विषयों के सम्बन्ध में भेद न हो। यदि बालकों को सनेमा देखने नहीं जाने देंगे या रोकेंगे तो यह मुश्किल होगा। इसलिये ऐसी फ़िल्में होनी चाहियें कि सभी देख सकें।

राष्ट्रीयकरण के सम्बन्ध में मेरा कहना है कि राष्ट्रीयकरण बहुत ही कठिन होगा। अगर फिल्म तैयार करने वालों को योग्य सहायता और सम्प्रति दी जाय तो उचित होगा।

[For English translation, see Appendix IV, Annexure No. 166.]

MAULANA M. FARUQI (Uttar Pradesh):

مولانا ایم - فاروقی (اثر پردیس):
جناب دہلی چیرمین صاحب - آج دو دن سے اس بل پر جو بحث ہو رہی ہے اس سے ایسا معلوم ہوتا ہے کہ اس فلم انڈسٹری کے اوپر گورنمنٹ جو کنٹرول کرنا چاہتی ہے وہ بہت مناسب معلوم ہوتا ہے۔

یہ ایک ایسی چیز ہے جس کا اثر صرف انڈسٹری ہی پر نہیں پڑتا بلکہ اس کا اثر ایک طرف سوسائٹی کے اخلاق پر پڑتا ہے دوسری طرف آرٹ پر، مہوزک پر اور تصویر کشی پر۔ تیسری چیز جو سب سے زیادہ ضروری ہے وہ یہ ہے کہ ہمارے ادب پر اس کا خاص طور سے بہت برا اثر پڑتا ہے۔ ان تمام چیزوں کے علاوہ بہت سے لوگوں نے جن میں مرد و عورتیں سب ہی ہیں کہا ہے کہ اس سے انسانی جلسی قوتوں پر کافی اثر پڑتا ہے۔ یہ بدقسمتی کہہئے یا خوش قسمتی کہ کافی سے زیادہ لوگ فلم سے دلچسپی لیتے ہیں۔ اور اپنی جیب کا پیسہ اس میں خرچ کرتے ہیں۔ چنانچہ اگر اس کا اچھا اثر ہو تو پورے ہندوستان میں اس کا اچھا اثر پڑے اور اگر خراب اثر ہوتا ہے تو پورے ہندوستان میں اس کا خراب اثر پڑتا ہے۔ غرضیکہ ان تمام چیزوں کو دیکھتے ہوئے ہمیں اس پر بڑے غور

و خوض اور سمجھداری و بیداری کے ساتھ کنٹرول کرنا چاہئے۔

میں آپ کی توجہ ہندوستان کے قدیم زمانے کی طرف دلانا چاہتا ہوں جس میں بھی یہ سب چیزیں رائج تھیں اور اس زمانے میں یہ چیزیں بہت ڈیولپ بھی ہوئیں۔ میوزک اور آرٹ کا ڈیولپمنٹ پرانے زمانے میں دو طریقوں پر ہوا بڑے بڑے راجاؤں اور بڑے بڑے لوگوں کے درباروں کے ذریعے سے جنہیں بڑے اچھے گانے والے اور گانے والیاں جاتے تھے اور ان کو انعام و اکرام ملتا تھا اور ان لوگوں کی وہاں پرورش ہوتی تھی۔ عام لوگ وہاں جاتے تھے فائدہ حاصل کرنے کے لئے یا دلچسپی لینے کے لئے اور ان کا گانا سنتے تھے۔ پہلے یہی چیز نائک اور نوتلکی وغیرہ کی شکل میں رائج تھی اس میں میوزک اور آرٹ کی ترقی ہوتی تھی اور چلتا کا پیسہ بھی نہیں خرچ ہوتا تھا۔ آرٹ بھی ترقی کرتا تھا اور لوگ دلچسپی بھی لیتے تھے۔ ان کے محلوں اور باغوں اور مکانات میں تصویریں زیلت کے لئے بٹائی جاتی تھیں جس سے تصویر کشی کا فن بڑھتا تھا اور ترقی پاتا تھا۔ دوسرا طریقہ آرٹ - میوزک اور اسی طرح کے دوسرے فنوں کے ترقی کا باعث محبت و عشق تھا۔ یہ محبت خدا پر مامتا اور اس کے رشی ملی اور پرافتس کی ہوتی تھی چنانچہ

الودا - ایجنٹا کے غار آپکے سامنے
ہیں جنہیں دو دو سو سال تک
خاندانوں نے صرف کر دئے مہابیر
اور مہاتما بدھ کی مختلف تصویریں
بلانے میں اور انکی مختلف حالتوں
کے بیان کرنے میں - یہ ان کی
صرف محبت میں ہوا ورنہ کوئی
اتنی تکلیف نہیں برداشت کر سکتا -
اسی طرح بہترین میوزک ان بھجوں
نے پیدا کر دی جو ان لوگوں کی
محبت میں گائے گئے - ان میں
جو اسی جذبہ پائے جاتے تھے ان
کا انکار نہیں کیا جا سکتا - لیکن
اس کے برعکس اب آپ کے یہاں
جو گانے ہوتے ہیں اس سے بجائے اس
کے کہ قوم کو سدھارنے اور ملک کو
آگے بڑھانے کے لئے ایک اچھا جذبہ
پیدا ہو ان گانوں سے ہمارے دل
و دماغ کی ایک بگڑے دھنگ سے
تفریح ضرور ہو جاتی ہے لیکن اس
سے ہم کوئی فائدہ حاصل
کرنے کے بجائے عیش و عشرت میں
پڑ جاتے ہیں اور میکدوں کو زینت
دیتے ہیں -

ہمارا جو پہلا آرٹ تھا وہی اب
بعد میں سنیما اور تھیٹر کی شکل
اختیار کر گیا ہے - گریس (یونان)
جس کو یورپ قداموں کا بانی
سمجھتا ہے اور جس پر اس رومن
کلچر کی بنیاد پڑی وہاں کے قدامے
بھی بلند اخلاقی معیار پر تھے -
اسی طرح سے ہمارے یہاں بھی

پرانے زمانے میں قداموں کا معیار
بہت اونچا تھا - جسکو سامنے رکھ کر
جب تھیٹر رائج ہوا تو ہریشچندر
اور اسی طرح کے دوسرے قدامے بلکہ
جس سے ہمارا اخلاق بہت اونچا
ہوتا تھا لیکن اب آجکل ہمارے
یہاں یہ چیزیں جو صورت اختیار
کر رہی ہیں ان کی حالت بہت ہی
عجیب ہو گئی ہے اس کے اوپر
ہمیں کافی غور کرنا ہے - کیونکہ صرف
یہی نہیں کہ اس سے ہمارا اخلاق
گر گیا ہے بلکہ اس سے ہماری تعلیم
ہمارا آرٹ اور ہماری انڈسٹری سب
برباد ہو گئی ہے - اب صرف ایک
ہی چیز سامنے رہ گئی ہے اور وہ
ہے جیسی قوت کی پرورش اور اس
کو ابھارنا جسکی وجہ سے بڑی بڑی
فصیح چیزیں اور عریاں تصویریں
رائج ہو گئی ہیں - نہیں آپکی توجہ
ایشیا اور یورپ کے ان ملکوں کی حالت
کی طرف دلافا چاہتا ہوں جنکو یورپ
نے اس فصیح اور عریانی کو
رائج کر کے برباد کیا ہے - ایران کو
لے لیجئے جہاں ۲۰۰ برس کے اندر
ایسی فصیح اور ننگی ننگی تصویریں
رائج ہوئیں کہ ان ملکوں کا اخلاق
انتہائی گر گیا اور اس کے ساتھ ساتھ
عباشی اتنی بڑھی کہ اس ملک
کے لوگ اقتصادی مشکلات میں
پھنس گئے ہیں - پھر اسی طرح مصر
اور دوسرے ملکوں میں بھی یہ چیز
پھیل گئی - آپ کو یاد ہوگا کہ

[Maulana M. Faruqi.]

ہنگامہ نے یہودیوں کو اپنے یہاں سے نکال دیا تھا تو ان پر جتنے الزامات لگائے گئے تھے ان میں ایک الزام یہ بھی تھا کہ یہودی وہاں پر فحش اور ننگی تصویریں رائج کرتے تھے۔ آج ہمارے ملک میں بھی سنیما کے ذریعہ اس طرح کی چیزیں پیدا ہو رہی ہیں اور اس طرح کے اڈے قائم ہوتے جا رہے ہیں جو عیاشی کے سنگر ہیں۔

آج ہمارے نوجوانوں پر ان کے اخلاق پر ان کی تعلیم پر اس چیز کا بہت برا اثر پڑ رہا ہے۔ وہ اس قسم کی تصویروں کو دیکھنے کے لئے اپنا اور اپنے ماں باپ کا بہت روپیہ برباد کرتے ہیں۔ ہمارے دیہی کا ایک مزدور جو صبح سے شام تک کام کرتا ہے اور صرف ۱۲ آنے کماتا ہے وہ ۸ آنے کا ٹکٹ لیکر سنیما دیکھنے جاتا ہے چاہے اس کے گھر میں فاقے پڑے ہوں۔ آج ہمارے دیہی میں کروڑوں آدمی روزانہ سنیما دیکھنے جاتے ہیں آپ اس کو روک نہیں سکتے۔

میں یہ نہیں کہہ سکتا کہ آپ اس انڈسٹری کو نیشنلائز کر کے قبضہ کر لیجئے اس میں شاید گورنمنٹ کو دقت ہو۔ لیکن میں یہ ضرور عرض کروں گا کہ گورنمنٹ کی طرف

سے زیادہ سے زیادہ اس پر کنٹرول کیا جائے۔ اس وقت ضرورت یہ ہے کہ اس میں ایسی فلمیں جو صرف جنسی قوتوں اور عیاشی کے جذبہ کو ابھارنے میں مددگار ہوں بند کر دی جائیں۔ آج انہی تمام فضول چیزوں پر لوگوں کی دلچسپیاں بڑھانے کے لئے بہت زیادہ روپیہ خرچ کیا جا رہا ہے۔ لیکن ہمارے اخلاقیات اور تعلیم کو سدھارنے کے لئے کوئی توجہ نہیں دی جا رہی ہے حالانکہ اسی انڈسٹری کے ذریعہ اگر کوشش کی جائے تو ہمارے اخلاق اور ہماری تعلیم وغیرہ میں بہت کافی سدھار ہو سکتا ہے اور ہمارا معیار بلند ہو سکتا ہے۔ امریکہ اور دوسرے ملکوں میں اس طرح کی چیزوں پر روپیہ خرچ کیا جاتا ہے کیونکہ ان کے پاس کافی پیسہ ہے مگر ہمارے غریب ملک کے لئے جبکہ ہم ترقی کی طرف بڑھنا چاہتے ہیں ہمارے لئے ایک ایک پیسہ بھی بہت زیادہ ہے۔ لہذا ہم کو اپنے اخلاقیات اور اقتصادیات کو دیکھتے ہوئے اپنی اس فلم انڈسٹری کی حالت کو بدلنا ہوگا اور اس کو ایسے ڈھنگ پر چلانا ہوگا جس سے ہم کو فائدہ پہنچ سکے۔ اس کے لئے ہماری گورنمنٹ کو ان تمام چیزوں پر کنٹرول کرنا ہوگا اور زائد سے زائد کرنا ہوگا۔

[For English translation, see Appendix IV, Annexure No. 167.]

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA
(Madhya Bharat):

श्री कन्हैयालाल डी. वैद्य (मध्य भारत):

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस बिल (Bill) पर कल से जो बहस हो रही है उससे यह चीज साफ हो गई कि हमारे फिल्म (film) उद्योग का स्तर बहुत ही गिरा हुआ है और उसमें सुधार करने की बहुत आवश्यकता है। माननीय मंत्री जी ने कल अपने वक्तव्य में यह कहा था कि कुछ ऐसी फ़िल्में हैं जिनके द्वारा विदेशों से सम्बन्ध खराब हो जाते हैं, पुराने अधिनियम द्वारा इस दोष को दूर करना असम्भव हो गया है, इसलिए इन दोषों को दूर करने के लिए प्रस्तावित विधेयक उपस्थित किया जा रहा है। किन्तु यहां दो दिन से इस सम्बन्ध में जो बहस हुई उससे मंत्री जी को यह अनुभव हुआ होगा कि न केवल विदेशी फिल्में बल्कि हमारे देश में जो फिल्में तैयार होती हैं, वे इतनी गन्दी और भद्दी होती हैं कि उन पर रोक लगाना बहुत ही आवश्यक है। सेंसर बोर्ड (Censor Board) को कानून द्वारा जिन फिल्मों को सर्टीफिकेट (certificate) देने का अधिकार दिया गया है और जिन फिल्मों को प्रदर्शित करने का अधिकार इस बोर्ड द्वारा दिया गया है, उनकी भी जांच का प्रबन्ध अवश्य किया जाना चाहिये।

हमारे देश के अन्दर जो फिल्में प्रदर्शित की जा रही हैं, उनमें ६० प्रतिशत फिल्में ऐसी हैं जिनके प्रदर्शन अधिकार जब्त होने योग्य हैं क्योंकि उन्होंने इस देश के चरित्र को, इस देश की संस्कृति को नष्ट कर दिया है और ऐसी भयंकर स्थिति पैदा कर दी है जिसको रोकना हमारे लिए बहुत ही आवश्यक हो गया है। यदि हमारी राष्ट्रीय सरकार इस दोष को दूर करने की कोशिश नहीं करेगी तो यह निश्चित रूप से हमारे जनराज्य के लिए एक चैलेंज (challenge) होगा। हमने इस देश का जो विधाम

बनाया है, जिसके अन्तर्गत हम देश का नव-निर्माण करने जा रहे हैं, जो सामाजिक और आर्थिक क्रान्ति करने जा रहे हैं, वह क्रान्ति असफल हो जायेगी। हम इस देश में एक जन कल्याणकारी राज्य की नींव डालना चाहते हैं। जन कल्याणकारी राज्य की नींव किसी देश के, किसी राष्ट्र के, किसी समाज के, किसी जाति के चरित्र पर निर्भर करती है और उसी पर वह कायम होती है। यह एक प्रचलित कहावत है कि जिस जाति का, जिस राष्ट्र का, जिस समाज का धन चला गया, उसका कुछ नहीं गया, स्वास्थ्य गया, उसका कुछ गया, किन्तु जिस का चरित्र चला गया, उसका सब कुछ चला गया। अगर देश के चरित्र को नष्ट करने के लिए सिनेमा उद्योग को पूरी छूट दे दी गई तो हम इस देश का नव निर्माण न कर पायेंगे।

इस सदन में इस बारे में जो आलोचनायें की गई हैं समय के अभाव के कारण मैं अधिक कुछ न कहूंगा किन्तु अभी श्री शोखी जी ने इस उद्योग के राष्ट्रीयकरण करने के सम्बन्ध में जो विचार प्रकट किये और उस पर श्री हृदयनाथ कुंजरू जी ने अपने विचारों को व्यक्त करते हुए कहा कि क्या यह सम्भव हो सकता है और क्या उचित होगा कि हम अपने कलाकारों को राज्य के नियंत्रण में कर लें। मैं उनका ध्यान इस बात की ओर खींचना चाहता हूँ कि इस देश में जो कलाकार हैं उनकी अवस्था बहुत ही शोचनीय है। वे या तो ईमानदारी से काम करते हुए भूखे मरते हैं और या उन्हें उन पूंजीपतियों के चक्कर में पड़ना पड़ता है जो उन्हें अपनी कला को बेचने के लिये मजबूर करते हैं। हमारे देश के जो कलाकार और लेखक हैं उनकी इतनी शोचनीय हालत हो गई है कि उन्हें अपना और अपने बच्चों का पालन करने के लिए इन पूंजीपतियों के द्वार पर जाना पड़ता है। आर्थिक कठिनाइयों के कारण

[Shri Kanhaiyalal D. Vaidya.]

हमारे कलाकार, लेखक और साहित्यकार इस तरह की कहानियां और गीत इन पूंजी-पतियों के लिए तैयार कर रहे हैं जिससे कि हमारा देश अधः पतन की ओर जा रहा है। इन हालातों में हमारे देश के अन्दर कला का विकास नहीं हो सकता है और न हमारे देश के अन्दर लेखक और साहित्यकार ही इस तरह के आर्थिक दबाव की स्थिति के कारण अपनी और इस देश की उन्नति ही कर सकते हैं। तो यह बात समझ में नहीं आती कि हमारी सरकार इस देश को एक कल्याणकारी राज्य बनाने के लिए कला के साधनों की उन्नति क्यों नहीं कर रही है।

पंच वर्षीय योजना में जिन बातों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने का सुझाव दिया गया है उससे हमारा देश एक महान देश बनने वाला है। क्यों नहीं इस उद्योग का भी राष्ट्रीयकरण किया जाय जिससे देश को महान बनाने में इससे सहायता ली जाय। दूसरे देशों में इस उद्योग के द्वारा नव-निर्माण के कार्यों में सहायता ली गई है तो यह उचित ही होगा कि अगर सरकार इस उद्योग पर ज्यादा से ज्यादा अपना नियंत्रण रखे तो हमारे देश और समाज को उन्नति करने में काफी सहायता मिलेगी।

अभी हाल ही में निचले सदन में हवाई यातायात का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने का एक बिल रखा गया था, उसकी प्रतियां हमको भी मिली हैं। जब सरकार करोड़ों रुपया हवाई यातायात का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने में खर्च कर सकती है तो क्या वह इस उद्योग में ५० या ६० करोड़ रुपया खर्च करके राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं कर सकती है। जिस तरह हवाई यातायात के लिए एक और दो कारपोरेशन (Corporation) बनाये जा रहे हैं तो क्या इस उद्योग में भी उसी तरह के कारपोरेशन नहीं बनाये जा सकते। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान इस ओर आकर्षित करूंगा

और उनसे निवेदन करूंगा कि वह इस प्रश्न पर बहुत गम्भीरता पूर्वक विचार करें। इस तरह का कानून इस सदन के अन्दर जल्दी से जल्दी लाने की चेष्टा करें जिससे न केवल यह उद्योग सरकार के नियंत्रण में आ जाय बल्कि सरकार का इस उद्योग पर पूरी तरह से कंट्रोल (control) हो जाय। अगर सरकार ने इस तरह की कार्यवाही की तो हम अपने देश का बहुत अच्छी तरह से नव निर्माण कर सकेंगे और पंचवर्षीय योजना को भी सफल बनाने में कामयाब होंगे। अगर इस देश को हमें आगे बढ़ाना है तो हमें उन सब चीजों की ओर विशेष ध्यान देना होगा जो कि किसी देश की प्रगति करने में बाधा के रूप में सामने आती हैं।

आज हम यह भी देख रहे हैं कि जितने भी फिल्म देश में प्रदर्शित किये जा रहे हैं उससे हमारा देश अधः पतन की ओर जा रहा है। आज इन फिल्मों द्वारा हमारे देश के युवकों का चरित्र नष्ट हो रहा है और उनकी राजनीतिक, सामाजिक और आर्थिक दशा बिगड़ती जा रही है। इसके द्वारा हमारे समाज में भ्रष्टाचार और अनैतिकता की भावना जागृत हो रही है। हमारे साहित्य की, हमारे लेखकों की और हमारे कलाकारों की जो दशा इस उद्योग ने कर दी है वह वर्णन नहीं की जा सकती है। यह सरकार की जिम्मेदारी हो जाती है कि अगर वह जन कल्याणकारी राज्य की स्थापना करना चाहती है तो उसको इन सब बुराइयों को दूर करना ही होगा।

आप सब लोगों ने इस बात का खयाल किया होगा कि हमारे देश के जो छोटे छोटे बालक हैं उनके दिलों पर भी इस उद्योग द्वारा जो बुराइयां फैल रही हैं, आ गई हैं। मैं अपने पड़ोस के बच्चों को जिनकी उम्र केवल पांच और छः वर्ष की है अक्सर ये गाने गाते हुए सुनता हूं —“लाल दुपट्टा

मलमल का"; "ए दिल तु मुझे ले चल"। इसी तरह के बहुत से गाने उन को कंठस्थ हो गये हैं। इस का असर बहुत ही खराब समाज पर पड़ रहा है।

SHRI T. PANDE:

श्री टी० पाण्डे : इस में क्या एतराज है।

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA:

श्री कन्हैयालाल डी वैद्य : एतराज तो है ही, मगर उसका सुधार भी हमारे पास है। अगर सरकार की ओर से इस उद्योग पर नियंत्रण हो गया तो आज हम देश के अन्दर जो भ्रष्टाचार और अनैतिकता देख रहे हैं वह दूर हो जायगी।

मैं हाउस (House) का ध्यान और विशेषकर माननीय मंत्री जी का ध्यान इस बात की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि इस अनैतिकता को दूर करने के लिए वे एक व्यापक बिल लायें जिस से कि जितनी भी बुराइयाँ आज हम इस उद्योग द्वारा समाज के अन्दर देख रहे हैं, वे दूर हो जाय। इस के साथ ही साथ मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से यह भी निवेदन करूँगा कि जो फिल्मों पास हो गई हैं और जिन के द्वारा समाज को बहुत नुकसान पहुँच रहा है, उन की भी फिर से जांच की जानी चाहिये। इस तरह की फिल्मों को हमारे सेंसर बोर्ड (Censor Board) ने कैसे पास कर दिया है उस की पूरी तरह से जांच की जानी चाहिये। इस विषय में श्रीमती लीलावती मुन्शी ने जो कि बोर्ड की सदस्या रह चुकी हैं काफी प्रकाश डाला है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please do not go back. No repetition.

SHRI KANHAIYALAL D. VAIDYA: No Sir, I am repeating only one thing as to what the Member said.

श्री कन्हैयालाल डी. वैद्य : उन्होंने ने हमारे सामने प्रकट किया है कि हालाँकि बोर्ड यह अनुभव करता है कि यह फिल्म बड़ी भ्रष्ट है, बड़ी खराब है किन्तु जब सिनेमा के मालिक लोग यह बताते हैं कि उस के बनाने में हम ने २० लाख या ५० लाख खर्च किया है तो उस के नुकसान को ध्यान में रख कर बोर्ड फिल्म को सर्टीफाई

(certify) कर देता है। यह बड़ी बुरी चीज है कि सेंसर बोर्ड पूंजीपतियों के लाभ को ध्यान में रख कर उन को सर्टीफिकेट दे और देश को नाश की ओर ले जाने का उन्हें मौका दे। यह बहुत ही महत्व का प्रश्न है और इस पर सरकार को विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिये। सारा सदन, इस देश की जनता और देश के करोड़ों लोग इस बात की मांग कर रहे हैं कि सिनेमा इंडस्ट्री (Cinema industry) के भ्रष्टाचार को बन्द किया जाय।

[For English translation, see Appendix IV, Annexure No. 168.]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri K. B. Lall.

SHRI K. B. LALL: Sir, you have called my name and it is indeed a windfall favour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please follow the noble example of Mr. Vaidya. Have you got anything new to say?

SHRI K. B. LALL: Yes, Sir. I have something new to say. I never thought that I will be called upon to speak and I do not know if there is anything left to speak on this subject now. After the speeches of Mrs. Munshi and Mrs. Arundale.....

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not make a speech because I have called upon you. If there is nothing new you can stop.

SHRI K. B. LALL: I am saying because I have to say something. And I am very grateful for the favour you have shown me. Of course, when Mrs. Munshi was speaking, it seemed to me that she was pleading like a guilty person. She was a member of the Film Censors Board and she was defending her own action to some extent and in a way depicting the conditions that have been obtaining in the country and from that everybody can understand how the matter stands at present so far as the film industry is concerned. I think as the things have

[Shri K. B. Lall.]

now come to light, the hon. Minister in charge will take note of them and come with a comprehensive legislation later on, for which his hands have been strengthened. But so far as this piece of legislation is concerned, there cannot be anything that could be said against this except that it is not up to the mark. This is the whole grouse of the House here. We are seeing daily how we are losing in our morals and how the future generation is being affected. The only thing that I would like to say is that the modern films are affecting our character and culture and ultimately the very civilisation of our people. If we do not realise the situation in which we are driven by these cinema shows, then we will not be able to deliver the message that Mahatma Gandhi wanted to give to the world. His message was based upon our spiritual heritage and so far as spiritualism is concerned, cinema cuts at the very root of it. I just heard the speech of Pandit Dube and I did not expect that he would make his speech in that light. He said that so many students read the books and they do not speak a single word against those books, and why should they raise any objection to cinemas? It was a wonderful argument. Of course the people who read books keep their thoughts to their own mind. But here willing or unwilling, those who may or may not like the effect of cinemas come under its influence if they visit cinema show and there is a direct effect upon them. When spiritualism is taken into consideration, our own *shastras* say "Shabda Brahm". The word is Brahm. Every word that we utter, every thought that we think, has got this impression on our spiritual life and it is reacting upon our *karma* and through our *karma*, reacting upon our culture. You see that our very thought is vitiated when we see that obscenity shown in the pictures exhibited. According to me, those obscene pictures should at once be pulled down. I do not know how the conscience of our people tolerates them. These pictures which are fascinating and which are attracting and appeal-

ing to the baser sense of our people should at once be banned. They are worse than even the prostitution. Although I am not against cinema itself, I surely feel that the kind of films aiming to rouse sex desires are taking our society to perdition and if these things go on, I think there will be very little left for us to do anything for our country. I only appeal to the Minister in charge that he will take note of the feeling in this House and if the Film Censors Board is not doing anything, he at least can see that the obscene pictures are not exhibited in public places. I am of the opinion that the cinema shows should be totally scrapped. We have seen the way in which they depict our morals, the way in which they depict our character on the screen. It is affecting the very education of our people. Education is not what we read in books. Smile in his book 'character' has said that when a child is born in the lap of the mother, from that moment its education begins. So every moment we are getting education and you can understand what education we are getting from these cinema shows. I would therefore appeal to him that if he cannot scrap the cinema shows altogether, at least he will see that such obscene pictures are not exhibited in the public places for advertisement because they vitally affect the education of our young generation. I think perhaps some of those who are addicted to cinema going, make an excuse of relaxation after day's hard labour. They only make it a convenient excuse for relaxation. Let them put their hands on their hearts and say whether they go there only for relaxation or degeneration. It is only the highly paid servants, the well-placed people, who visit cinema houses, and it is they who, for one excuse or another, support this immoral industry. It is said that this industry deserves help, and if this should be helped, why not the industry of prostitution? I think that this industry should not be helped at all, and the sooner it is wiped out, the better it will be for the country.

THE MINISTER FOR INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (DR. B. V. KESKAR): Sir, I did not expect when I brought this Bill before the House, that it would develop into a full-fledged debate on the cinema industry, censorship and other allied subjects. That does not mean that I have anything to say against it. In fact, I welcome the views expressed by Members here, as they give us a very valuable guidance in coming to tentative decisions. Nevertheless, I was not prepared for all this, and I hope Members will excuse me if I do not go fully into everyone of the questions raised. That will not only take a lot of time, but it will also mean re-viewing the work of the Films Division of this Ministry, the cinema industry as a whole and the work of the Censor Board for whatever they have done up to this moment, but I will certainly try to reply to some of the more important points raised in the debate here.

Firstly, I would like to remind hon. Members that the Bill is a very limited one. In fact, its scope is to try to remedy certain defects in the existing Act, and it has neither the ambition nor the objective of trying to improve upon anything as far as the question of censorship is concerned. That does not also mean that we are not thinking of reorganising the cinema industry or the censorship that is at present going on. We had thought that this could be better considered in a more comprehensive measure which might be brought forward at an opportune moment much later. In the debate that has taken place since yesterday, certain general questions have been raised regarding censorship and the role of the cinema in society, and before replying to some of the questions of detail that have been posed by Members. I would like to say a few words regarding some questions of principle. May I at the very outset compliment my hon. friends for the very valuable suggestions that they have put forward, whether they have supported or whether they have opposed, whether they have agreed or

disagreed. I think they have put forward valuable points of view and they will be extremely helpful to me in formulating any future policies regarding control or decontrol of the cinema industry. There can be many opinions regarding the exact role of the cinema industry in society. No doubt, the industry is an extremely important one, but I need not go into the details of what its potentialities are either for doing good or evil.

I find, Sir, from the views expressed by Members since yesterday that the big majority are strongly in favour of tightening up the control over the industry and censorship. I realise the limitations of censorship. Censorship—by that I mean censorship which comes after a picture is made—is rather a defective way of controlling a picture because, when everything is ready, it may be possible for you to trim it in some way or other but that way you will not be able very effectively to express what you want that picture to express or to cut out what probably you would like to cut out from the picture. So, to that extent, it is a defective way, but as things are, that was the only thing available and it is not possible for us to say that, because censorship is not probably the best way of regulating pictures, therefore let us have no censorship. There is no doubt that a number of pictures have got very objectionable features, from the point of view of morality, from the point of view of crime or from various other points of view, and it is not possible for us to overlook or ignore those things and say, "Well, by cutting out here and there, you cannot make any difference." It might not make a lot of difference, but it does make some difference, and we have had to be satisfied with it up till now.

I am sorry that my hon. friend, Prof. Ranga, is not here. He very energetically put forward certain suggestions yesterday that the Government should go the whole hog and have some positive control over the industry. This is not an easy subject to decide, and I would like to make a mention of what I think about it later.

[Dr. B. V. Keskar.]

At first, I would like to refer to one question to which reference has been made by a very large number of Members during the debate yesterday and today, and that is about the recommendations of the Film Enquiry Committee. Today, my hon. friend, Pandit Kunzru, referred in detail to this question and in one way or another we have heard this reference made by various speakers. Sir, the Film Enquiry Committee's report was presented in 1951. The Committee made many recommendations, useful recommendations no doubt, but the recommendations have to be examined from the practical point of view, and the Government have had to see how far it is possible for them to implement them. There are two types of recommendations that the Committee has made. There are the financial recommendations, for example, the Film Enquiry Committee has suggested that there should be a uniform entertainment tax throughout the country; they have suggested the lowering of income-tax on the film-producing sector of the industry; they have suggested a Film Finance Corporation. Now, with regard to these financial recommendations, may I say that it is not possible for us to come to very definite decisions regarding all these matters or even some of them? For example, take the case of the entertainment tax. This is a purely State subject, and it is not possible for the Government of India to direct the States that they should for example have uniform rates of entertainment tax or have the tax at a particular level. Because the Provincial Governments immediately might say that it is all very well for the Centre to say that we should have a tax at a particular level but it is we who have to foot the Bill and we will have to look into our own financial structure and see how far we can afford to forego, some of the income that we get from that tax and so forth. In fact when this question was taken up at the Finance Ministers' Conference here we were not able to get any encouraging response from the Provincial Finance

Ministers to this thing. I have just mentioned this as an example to show that it is quite easy for an enquiry committee to make an ideal recommendation but when the question of implementation of those recommendation comes, various factors and interests and parties have to be taken into consideration and if after consulting all those we are able to come to a consensus of opinion or to some agreement, then only it will be possible for us to accept that recommendation and that is one of the reasons why there has been so much delay in coming to some conclusions regarding the recommendations of the Committee. Take the other group of recommendations made by the Committee. There is the Production Code Administration. There is also the suggestion for a Film Institute and there is the suggestion for a Film Council. Now the suggestions are useful. At the same time we have to see how these bodies should be constituted, who will be the members, what will be their powers and whether it is possible for us at this stage to have these bodies functioning in a smooth way taking into consideration the rather chaotic conditions in the Film Industry in India and whether it will be possible to group together all these people without raising many quarrels and jealousies and rivalries. All these things have to be taken into consideration. There is also the question of consulting the industry concerned regarding these matters. There had to be consultation with the Provincial Governments whose opinions had to be taken. All these have taken a certain time. But I think the time is not wasted because I believe it is better to go slowly and surely rather than to take a certain decision which we might have to revise later and I think the time that we have spent in getting various opinions from the States, from the industry and other persons interested in it, has given us certain experience of their reactions.....

PROF. G. RANGA: (Madras): It is 2 years.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: It is not we alone that can take a decision. Many

persons are concerned and replies have to come from others and we cannot give them an ultimatum that the reply should come within a certain date. But I might say that we have examined these questions and at present the main recommendation of the Committee are under very active consideration of the Government and I hope to be able to announce very soon as to what practical steps we are going to take regarding some of their recommendations. I might say that as far as the question of the Film Council is concerned, there are yet many difficulties in the way of constituting such a body at this stage but regarding the Production Code Administration and Film Institute, we are investigating the formation of this body and you will not have to wait for very long before definite proposals regarding these matters are placed before Parliament.

11 A.M.

There were questions concerning the reorganisation of the censors which were raised by many Members. This question is closely linked with the question of implementation of the Committee's report. For example, there is the question whether censorship should be post-censorship or pre-censorship and I have no doubt that any guidance or censorship before a film is produced is more effective and more useful than one which is done afterwards. This is also the practice followed in most countries, even where the cinema industry has not censorship. They too follow a code of censorship of their own and it is from that model that the Production Code Administration suggested by the Committee has been taken to a great extent. The American Film Industry has got its own censorship organisation and they look into all their films and their scripts from this point of view before a film is produced. There is no doubt that it saves a lot of money to the producer who otherwise might waste a big sum on producing something which the censors will reject and to that extent it is a great loss to him and once he knows their approach

to this problem and also that he can have the guidance of an Administration like Production Code Administration, he will know on what lines to go and how and what sort of pictures they should produce. Of course, it is not possible to say in all cases that pre-censorship of Production Code will completely eliminate censorship because a picture is always judged on what it shows on the silver screen ultimately and not by any description of it that is written, whether it is the script or the song. We have to see the picture itself but I think 75 per cent. of the labour involved in such censorship is really done if there is some guidance before the picture itself is produced.

There have been many suggestions made on the floor of this House regarding either censorship or the cinema industry and the Cinematograph Act. I might assure hon. Members that I will carefully examine all the suggestions made and see to what extent we can think of acting on them or profiting from them. Lot of discussion has taken place on the role of the cinema and whether we can effectively make any rules to carry out that role. Now I personally am in hearty agreement with the sentiments expressed that the cinema has an important role to play in our national life and it can contribute much to the advancement of our people culturally, educationally and socially and I have lost no opportunity of expressing this to the cinema industry wherever I have gone but how we can carry out that role is a matter which is a little more complicated.

Various views have been expressed yesterday and today here as to how we should control the cinema industry and to what extent we should control it. Now, much as I would like to control the industry as effectively as possible so that it could play its role in our national life, we will, I think, have to look at this question from, I would say, a matter of fact point of view. We can go to a certain length, for example, in the matter of censor-

[Dr. B. V. Keskar.]
 ship or the Production Code Administration. But we should remember that we are working under certain constitutional rules, and in a very comprehensive measure of control, it is quite likely that constitutional issues might be raised, and I do not want that at this moment we should be placed in an embarrassing position of having to take the odium of bringing forward things which may be said to exceed our powers or which may lead to the remark that Government is trying to control everything and to go against the spirit of the Constitution. Why I am saying this is because I personally feel that there is very great need to control this industry and I also feel that its importance in our national life is very great. But at the same time, we have to see that the restrictions that have been placed in the Constitution have also to be taken into consideration and I want the House to understand that if they want us to take any further steps, as they have been pressing so much, they will also have to support the Government in any further action that we might take in the matter. We do not want to be kicked from both sides—first for not doing something to improve the cinema industry and the films and if we bring forward any measure in that direction, then at that time to be told that Government is trying to usurp something which the Constitution has not allowed them to take up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Then amend the Constitution.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: That is for the Parliament to decide. If we feel that Parliament considers this thing to be so vital for the development of our nation that they think there should be an amendment of the Constitution to help us in controlling it, we shall certainly do so; but we do not want to proceed further in this matter until we are sure that there is such a consensus of opinion in Parliament in favour of it. I, however, welcome the views that have been expressed so unreservedly by hon. Members here today and I might assure them that we

will examine this matter very carefully and I am certain that we can usefully try to help the cinema industry to serve the role that it can and should play in our national affairs.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Help the children too.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Pardon?

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: I say, please help the children too by keeping their special needs in mind.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Well, I have noted the suggestions made by Pandit Kunzru when he was speaking and if I do not mention now all the suggestions made here, it does not mean that they have not been noted by me, though I may not be able to say off-hand, what we will be able to do. But we certainly realise that the importance of films in child education and guidance is very great, though there of course, financial questions are involved and they will have to be examined very carefully.

My hon. friend Maj.-Gen. Sokhey has put forward one or two suggestions. He said there should be the nationalisation of the industry. Of course much could be said for the nationalisation of the industry, but at the same time, he said something in which I thought there was some contradiction, I mean in the suggestion for the nationalisation of the industry and for having no censorship. This I was not able to understand, probably he meant something else. I personally feel that both these cannot go together. Of course, censorship is not a very happy thing and I personally do not think that a negative thing like cutting this and that is a very good thing. There should be constructive censorship and guidance and that is what is proposed in what we are trying to bring forward before Parliament—guiding the creation of pictures before they are produced—and I think that might serve the purpose until, if Parliament so desires, something more comprehensive is brought forward.

Now, these are my general remarks. On the points raised by hon. Members here, I would like to say a few words. Mr. Mazumdar raised one or two points and one of them was about a film called "The Road to Peace". Mention of this film has been made also in the House of the People. I would like to say that there seems to be a complete misapprehension as to what was done regarding this film and what is being done. Now, this is a film about which I was not aware myself and in the ordinary course of things, my friends who probably brought this film from outside submitted it to the Board of Censors and the Board of Censors rejected it. Now, on the floor of the House the complaint was made that it was unjustly rejected. Well, I drew the attention of the hon. Members who brought forward this complaint to what is contained in the Cinematograph Act where it is laid down that any person who feels aggrieved that his picture has been unjustly rejected by the Central Board of Film Censors can always appeal to Government immediately to rectify that injustice. Such appeals are made and we look into them and we have quite a number of cases where we felt that injustice had been done and we took a decision over-riding the decision of the Board. So we suggested that if they felt that this film had been unjustly rejected, it might be better for them, the persons concerned, to make an appeal to Government in due course, and that is where the matter is. And if I understand rightly, an appeal has just come and in due course the appeal will be looked into. There should be no question of trying to bring the Government into this because the Board is an autonomous body and though it does follow general directions laid down by Government, we cannot always go into every little thing that the Board is doing. If the Board rejects a picture, and if it is brought to our notice, we certainly try to look into the matter. We cannot, I suppose, go into every picture about which the Board has taken a decision. My point is the Government should not be blamed and should not be ask-

ed why a picture was rejected or not rejected.

DR. P. C. MITRA (Bihar): Is the Board the expert or the Government?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: The Board is authorised by a Parliamentary Act to do certain things on behalf of Government and to that extent, within that limit, the Board is not only expert but has got the right to pass certain judgments.

DR. P. C. MITRA: Can the Government over-ride the Board?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Government can over-ride—also according to the same Act.

The other point mentioned by Mr. Mazumdar was with regard to the penalties and fines that have been mentioned in this measure. I think he is under some misapprehension. All the fines mentioned here were also mentioned in the old Act and they will be decided upon by a court of law and not by ourselves. The fine will not be levied by executive order. The matter will go to the court and it is the court which will decide what the fine shall be. It will, of course, depend upon the nature of the offence. If the offence is serious the court might inflict more penalty and if the offence is not serious, the court might inflict less penalty. He need not have any apprehension that we are trying to inflict mechanical fines or penalties. That penalty only will be inflicted which is held by the court to be just. The court decides as to whether any penalty should be inflicted or not, whether the things brought against that particular person or company are right or wrong.

So, the court being there as the final Judge, there need be no misapprehension that there will be a miscarriage of justice. Of course, I am not going into all the points that he has raised because there are many common points between what he said and what other Members have said, as for

[Dr. B. V. Keskar.]

example, the imitation of 'Hollywood'. I am in hearty agreement with what he said and what many others said that one of the difficulties of our industry had been that they had been blindly trying to imitate Hollywood; probably the glamour was of the great income that Hollywood is making. Now, I have always taken every opportunity to impress upon our producers that they are committing a great mistake in trying to build up on the model of Hollywood for two reasons: First of all, the finances and the resources that are available to the industry in Hollywood are so vast and the technical help and equipment that they can get is so great that the Indian producers are committing a grave mistake in trying to fashion their own industry and methods upon Hollywood. It is very much like a very poor man trying to imitate a very rich man in building his house and his equipment etc., probably, that will mean that they will waste a lot of money and they are not likely to get the same results because, we have to remember that the market available to the American industry is so vast in its own country and so paying that they can spend enormous amounts upon it and the Indian industry, however much it may spread, will not be able to rival that industry there which is very much richer.

The second point is that there are certain principles which probably the big producing companies in Hollywood follow, which probably are not the best for our industry here to follow because conditions in every country differ, for example, trying to have a certain publicity campaign for certain personalities who may be called stars and, on the strength of their name trying to get big box office receipts and similar things. I am not so sure whether these will ultimately pay or that these are the best things for our industry to follow, but I will not go more into the detail regarding this question. I feel however what many friends have expressed here, that the industry will be doing wrong in con-

tinuing to follow the Hollywood pattern of films. In fact, it has been brought to their notice many times that the industry in other countries which is less rich and probably has not got the same equipment as they profess to have, have produced as magnificent pictures as any and, therefore, vast amount of money or even technical equipment is not the pre-requisite to producing first class pictures.

There has been a suggestion made that there should be more women in the Board of Censors. It is not possible to fix the number of women and men members but certainly we would like to keep in mind that there should be some women members on the Board because women, whether they are here in this House or not, do take a very important part in social activities and, therefore, they are able to judge the reactions of films on society in general and also of the public.

My friend, Mr. Rajagopal, made many practical suggestions regarding the censorship that is going on at present and what we should do to improve it. He himself is a member of the Panel and he knows how they work and I am glad that he has raised certain points. Some of the points that he has raised, for example, that we should immediately authorise Regional Officers to communicate our decisions regarding cuts made in films to the District Magistrate is a very useful one and we will certainly examine the suggestion. I think he is probably wrongly informed regarding the question of gazetting the cuts; he thought that the cuts are gazetted after one month; they were no doubt, but we are taking steps to see that cuts are gazetted every week so that the District authorities concerned and the industry also may come to know what portions have been cut from any particular film that is going to be shown, and I think that that will help in bringing to the notice of those concerned regarding the Board's decision about a particular film.

Dr. Seeta Parmanand made a strong plea for having a more comprehensive

Bill to be brought in. I think she was probably mentioning the re-enactment of the present Bill or, I am not sure whether she wanted to mention a Bill after consideration of the Film Enquiry Committee's Report. If it is re-casting of the present Cinematograph Act in the light of our experience I might say that the matter is under continuous consideration as to whether the functioning of the Act is good or is defective in certain respects and, at a proper moment, this question might be taken up. But, I think the more important question probably is to have a Bill which takes into consideration some of the recommendations of the Film Enquiry Committee and, to that, we are giving immediate attention.

Much has been said about the A & U certificates by Members here. Some of the criticisms that have been levelled are quite justified, but I am not sure yet that because we have not been able to enforce the A & U certificates' differentiation, we should abolish that difference. The difficulty has been that though we have passed the Act and the Censor Board makes the difference between A & U certificates, the main work of stopping the non-adults from going to such shows is done by the police and, has to be done by the police, even, if you like, by special police. It cannot be done either by the Central Government or by the Censor Board and there are many difficulties in the way of the Provincial Governments or State Governments in enforcing the Act quickly because it will entail a very big expenditure for them. But, I might inform hon. Members that this question has been taken up urgently with the State Governments as to how the A or U certificate can be enforced in theatres to see that where a film is granted a A certificate only, it will be enforced by the police in the most effective way.

Mr. Sinha made many suggestions, some of them very interesting ones. I will not try to expatiate on those suggestions; they are very practical ones and we will have to admit how far

they can be carried out at this stage; for example, he has made suggestions about Film Clubs and also a paid Board. I have to say that a paid Board would no doubt be better in some way because the members will be able to give their whole time. At the same time, we have to see the advantage of having a Board in which the members are honorary, in which we can have eminent personalities who would give their unbiased opinions about general policy. I think that is also an advantage; but probably it might be useful to have paid whole-time members but then the question of financing such a Board will immediately come in and, that raises certain difficulties. However, the question can be examined further.

Pandit Banarsi Das Chaturvedi spoke about Hindi films. No doubt, it is unfortunately true that the complaints that we are getting are in a majority about Hindustani and Hindi films and not so much about other language films. It is a big problem but as the problem is related to the bigger and the general problem, I think the remedy is not with regard to films in a particular language but will have to be a general one.

Mrs. Alva made a very strong speech and condemned, what I referred to before also, the import of certain type of films, Hollywood films, into the country. She has made certain suggestions regarding the categories that are practised in the United States about certification of films etc. We will have to look into that question. She made a reference to cinema papers. I might say, in this respect, that it is not possible for the Censor Board to check up cinema papers. Cinema papers come under printed matter and not under cinema films. That is a different subject altogether. I hope Members will agree that printed matter and a thing on the screen are very different things and we cannot deal with them as matters to be put under the censorship rules or to be controlled by the censors. I do realise that some of them do require checking and this can be done only under a

[Dr. B. V. Keskar.]
different aspect, that is, as a question of obscenity in literature.

My friend Prof. Ranga spoke very strongly about our not controlling the industry. I agree with him that this industry is a very vital one and we have to see how far and in what effective manner we can guide it so that it is more useful to us. I am glad that he has been disappointed at my achievements and has urged me to do something more in order to justify my being here. Well, Sir, my supposed youth to which he was referring yesterday and which unfortunately equals his own, might have been at fault but I hope, with the support of his dynamic energy and moral backing, we will be able to do something more than what we have been able to do up till now.

Mr. Tankha has made quite a number of practical suggestions here and we will examine them. First of all he made a reference to the registration of a film and he was speaking as though this registration of a film was like a car registration. Under the rules that we have now made every sale of a film will have to be noted, that will not be a registration like a car registration but it will enable us to keep a tag on a film when it changes hands. The other suggestion he made was that the two months' notice should be increased to six months. Now this is not the notice really. Two months refers to the period of suspension and the amendment is there to that effect, namely that the suspension shall not be for more than two months maximum so that within this period a firm decision this way or that way will be taken and so that the producer concerned will not be kept in suspense indefinitely. So it is not the type of notice which probably he had in mind when he made the reference.....

PANDIT S. S. N. TANKHA (Uttar Pradesh): I have taken objection to the two months suspension. I said it was too short a period. I have not advocated, and it is not my intention to

advocate that a notice of six months be given to the producers or the owner of the films.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: You want it to be 'notice'. I am sorry we have to disagree and that is what I said at the beginning, namely that our experience of 'notice' has been rather unhappy and we do not think that it serves our purpose. He made another suggestion that a copy of the film should be deposited. It is a useful suggestion. But I may inform him that in the new Rules that have been issued this has been done. This is also one of the things that the courts pointed out. After all by what standards are you going to say that a particular film deviates from the film passed by the Board? Exhibitor can say that this is the film passed as there is a certificate attached to it. In order to obviate that we have made it compulsory now that a copy of the film shall be deposited either in 35 or 16 millimeters or a shooting-script.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): What about the suggestion to raise the fine from Rs. 1000 to Rs. 5000? That was also Mr. Tankha's suggestion.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: If you look carefully at the amendment you will find that if there is repetition of the offence you are to pay a fine of a Rs. 1000 a day. So I do not think it is necessary to raise the fine.

Then Pandit Kunzru brought up the general question of the Film Enquiry Committee. At the very beginning I made a reference to the general question of the recommendations of the Film Enquiry Committee and what we are proposing to do about it. I do agree with him that it becomes more and more obvious everyday that some measure of control is necessary to canalise the industry to more useful channels. But, as I said already, we have to take into consideration the constitutional structure and see how and in what way we can bring about such an effective control. I might assure him that the suggestions that he

has made regarding children's films and other suggestions also will be carefully examined.

Sir, I have not been able to reply to all the points that hon. Members had been good enough to make here and if there are any which have been left over I will certainly try to let them know what we have done about them. The omission to reply to them is not because I do not want to enlighten them but because already we have taken very good time over the consideration of the Bill and so many general points of principle have been raised, necessarily the smaller points of detail have to be left over for the present.

With these words, Sir, I move that the Bill to amend the Cinematograph Act, 1952, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

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

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill. There are, no amendments to Clause 2.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Clause 3. There is the amendment of Shrimati Seeta Parmanand. Please move it.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND (Madhya Pradesh): I shall move my amendment and make certain observations and if I get a suitable reply to what I say then I would be willing to withdraw the same.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. Please move your amendment first if you are keen on it.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND: I move:

"That at page 1, line 8, for the word 'section' the word 'sections' be substituted, and after line 16 the following be inserted, namely:—

'6B. *Advertisement of certified films.*—Every distributor or exhibitor shall prominently mention the nature of the film on posters, placards, pictures, handbills and any other type of announcement, oral or written, by the use of large-sized letters U or A and in any similar vocal style thus making it clear at every stage of advertisement whether the film is suitable for all (Universal) or for adults only (A).'

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Amendment moved:

"That at page 1, line 8, for the word 'section' the word 'sections' be substituted, and after line 16 the following be inserted, namely:—

'6B. *Advertisement of certified films.*—Every distributor or exhibitor shall prominently mention the nature of the film on posters, placards, pictures, handbills and any other type of announcement, oral or written, by the use of large-sized letters U or A and in any similar vocal style thus making it clear at every stage of advertisement whether the film is suitable for all (Universal) or for adults only (A).'

The clause and the amendment are now open to discussion.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND:

डाक्टर श्रीमती सीता परमानन्द : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय जी, मुझे इस अमैंडमेंट (amendment) की इसलिये आवश्यकता हुई कि जो दो प्रकार के फिल्म होते हैं, अर्थात्

[Dr. Shrimati Seeta Parmanand.]

। जो कि नयस्कों के लिये होते हैं और सार्वजनिक होते हैं और दूसरे वे जो कि केवल बालकों के लिये होते हैं, उन का ठीक से प्रचार नहीं किया जाता, अर्थात् मैं यह अनुभव करती हूँ कि फिल्म के साथ जो सेसर बोर्ड (Censor Board) का सर्टीफिकेट (certificate) मिलता है उस का कहीं भी ऐसी जगह एडवर्टिजमेंट (advertisement) में उल्लेख नहीं होता जिस से कि लोग समझ सकें कि यह किस प्रकार की फिल्म है । जो बाहर प्लैकार्ड्स (placards) या पोस्टर (posters) रहते या रास्तों में जो पैदल, टांगे पर या मोटर पर एडवर्टिजमेंट्स निकलते हैं उन में कहीं यह नहीं लिखा रहता कि यह किन के देखने के लिये फिल्म है और किस तरह का सर्टीफिकेट इस को दिया गया है । मैं चाहती हूँ कि इस बात को बहुत सफाई से सब जगह बताया जाय । सब एडवर्टिजमेंट्स में इस को बताया जाय और दूसरी तरह से भी बताया जाय । अभी यह होता है कि जो फिल्म दिखाई जाती है उस के साथ तो सर्टीफिकेट दिखा दिया जाता है लेकिन बाहर इस के बारे में कुछ नहीं बताया जाता कि इस फिल्म को कौन लोग देखें । यह कहा जाता है कि अगर "ए" फिल्म में लड़के जाते हैं तो उन को रोकना मुश्किल होता है । अगर मैं जो कह रहा हूँ उस के बारे में नियम बन जाय तो फिर बहुत कुछ दिक्कत कम हो जायेगी और मैं पूरे विश्वास से कहती हूँ कि जो सिनेमा दिखलाने वाले हैं वे भी उस में पुलिस की मदद करेंगे और मदद देने को आयेंगे क्योंकि जो युनिवर्सल (universal) फिल्म है उस में वे बच्चों को ज्यादा आने देंगे, उन के लिये ज्यादा से ज्यादा एक्सक्लूसिव (exclusive) दिन रखे जायेंगे और कन्सेशनल रेट्स (concessional rates) रखे जायेंगे ताकि वे ज्यादा से ज्यादा तादाद में

उन दिनों आयें । उन दिन वे खुद बच्चों को फिल्म में आने देने में ज्यादा मदद देंगे और बड़े लोगों को ज्यादा मदद नहीं देंगे ।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just a minute please. You are introducing a new section. It is not an amendment. I am sorry your amendment is out of order. You are introducing a new section for which you should bring an amending Bill.

DR. SHRIMATI SEETA PARMANAND:

डाक्टर श्रीमती सीता परमानन्द : मैं सिर्फ दो शब्द ही बोलूंगी कि किस वजह से इस अमेंडमेंट (amendment) की परवानगी दी गई थी । मुझे सिर्फ दो शब्द बोलने की आज्ञा दे दें ।

[For English translation, see Appendix IV, Annexure No. 169.]

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This amending Bill seeks to introduce a new clause after Section 6. Now you want to include a new section. I am afraid your amendment is out of order and I rule it out of order.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Why was it admitted then?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It was a mistake. I am sorry.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: I might, in order to alleviate the doubts she may be having in her mind, say that we have a rule—Rule 33A about advertisements of films. It says: Any person advertising a certified film or exhibition thereof by means of insertions in newspapers, hoardings, posters, handbills or any other means, shall indicate in the advertisement whether the film has been certified for unrestricted public exhibition or for public exhibition restricted to adults only. So the rule is there and we can modify the rules whenever necessary and I would prefer to have it in the rule rather than in the Act so that we can modify as and when necessary, otherwise we have to bring forward an amending Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

That Clause 3 stand part of the Bill.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Title and the Enacting Formula were added to the Bill.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: Sir, I move that the Bill be passed.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

DR. P. C. MITRA: What about the film which is declared by a court of justice as undesirable? What would be its fate?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It will not be shown, that is all.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: That is a hypothetical question, and it is for the court to decide.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: Sir, I have to make one suggestion. I want to point out to the House a constitutional mistake that has been made by the hon. Minister for Information and Broadcasting. While the votes were being taken just now as to who were in favour and who were against, Dr. Keskar also said 'aye'. He has no right to say 'aye' in the voting of this House of which he is not a member. That is the constitutional mistake.

SHRIMATI MONA HENSMAN (Madras): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have asked for a few minutes at this stage because I am aware that the time of oratory is past but I wish to comment on this Bill with a view to prosecuting future legislation on the subject. We have had very good speeches which have covered the whole ground of the Cinema Industry, and placed the whole position before us, so I wish now to make a few practical suggestions and I would commend them to the Minister for any future legislation that he might afterwards introduce. Sir, the Leader of the House told us that the policy of Government was to hasten slowly and I am well aware that the hon. Minister for Information and Broadcasting went very fast with his reforms in the

beginning, but he has had to slow down his pace and he is certainly going slowly and, I hope, surely at the present moment.

This is a very good Bill but I would like to draw the attention of the Minister and the attention of this House to two or three points in it as now passed by the House. Much has been said about the social, moral and cultural background of the Cinema Industry, and I do not wish to repeat the suggestions that have already been made. Now I want to say a few words about the commercial aspects which has not been touched upon so much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is not the time for speeches.

SHRIMATI MONA HENSMAN: Sir, I wish to emphasise that this penal clause is concerned with the commercial aspect only. Sir, the penalty that has been suggested is that the fine may extend up to one thousand rupees. It leaves it to the discretion of the court whether to impose a fine of Rs. 5, Rs. 10, Rs. 15, Rs. 100 or anything else up to Rs. 1,000. The fine for a second offence also extends only up to that amount. It is left open to the court to impose a fine as it thinks fit. I would commend to the hon. Minister that this is not likely to satisfy the requirements of the case. It is not fair that a second offence should be open to this option on the part of the court. Again the Bill lays down that the offender shall be punishable with imprisonment, or fine, or both. That again, Sir, is left to the discretion of the court. I must put forward Sir, the suggestion that a very definite directive should be given to the courts by the Government that the maximum fine be imposed the first time, and for a second offence the maximum fine and imprisonment.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister has already touched upon that point.

SHRIMATI MONA HENSMAN: Excuse me, Sir, this has not been touched upon. The penal clause is to be applied to those films that are cut, but now can the Government prevent those from being used again. I would ask

[Shrimati Mona Hensman.]

the hon. Minister to make this a practical possibility by providing that in the case of any cuts made by the Censor, the negatives of the cuts and all copies of the same should be handed over to the due authorities so that such cuts will certainly not be reproduced again. I am convinced, Sir, that, as in the case of Broadcasting, the hon. Minister will consider appointing a Director for cinematography. Such a Director will have to be very carefully chosen and the choice should not be on an expert basis. We do not want experts in this Branch. We have and we need expert engineers for matters regarding engineering, and expert medical men for health reconstructing and experts for all technological undertakings, but we do not want expert actresses or actors and cinema fans to be on the Advisory Boards, or to be a Director of this Industry. They will have each their own preferences and favourites—doubts, fears, suspicions and jealousies which will surely influence the working of their office. We want somebody of the standing of a member of a State or Union Selection or Public Service Commission Board—the sort of person who can look at everything from an impartial point of view. We are fortunate in having a Minister for this portfolio, a gentleman who is young enough to enjoy films and old enough to appreciate the points of view that have been put forward by us, the older people. The film is a very important factor in the future of our nation and I would ask him to use this as a spearhead for the progress of the nation and not for the good of private enterprise or vested interests.

Finally I would also say that if the Government cannot produce educational films for children—the Minister has just said that public finances do not permit him to do this—we should encourage private enterprise to produce such educational films as are very necessary in our country for our children at this time. At present films for education are brought from abroad, but we should have our own films to orientate our children to Eastern not

Western ideas and ideals. Perhaps it was a ladies' day—yesterday and today—and men may be surprised at the active part we have played in the consideration of this Bill. We feel we have made our own contribution in the public interests and I hope the hon. Minister will look into all these points when he implements the various clauses of this Bill.

SHRI K. B. LALL: I want to ask one thing of the hon. Minister. The hon. Minister said that he can take certain steps with regard to exhibition and that he can have control in this matter. So far as education is concerned, when people's minds are being polluted so much by these things, I want to know whether he can exercise educative control also and whether he can take any step with regard to the educational side of the control.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: There is hardly any point raised, Sir. With regard to courts, I might say that it is not possible for us to control as to what punishment the courts should give. We can lay down what is the offence and what the maximum punishment is, and the courts, I think, can be left to decide what they consider to be the right punishment. That is all, Sir. I think no other point has been raised.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

THE INDIAN LIGHTHOUSE (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1952

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI O. V. ALAGESAN): Sir, I beg to move that the Bill further to amend the Indian Lighthouse Act, 1927, as passed by the House of the People, be taken into consideration.

Sir, this is a very light measure and I should not detain the House for long on this very simple measure. But for the fact that the House was occupied with a very interesting subject these one and a half days, it should have been disposed of much earlier.