

[श्री पी० नामग्याल]

सेलेक्टेड केडर के होने चाहिए। होना तो यह चाहिए कि उसी इलाके के लोगों को कांफिडेंस में लेकर उन्हीं को रिस्पॉसिबिलिटीज सौंपें। आपके लिए वे बहुत यूजफूल हो सकते हैं, वहां के लिए भी और मुल्क के लिए भी वे बहुत यूजफूल हो सकते हैं।

मैं अपने इलाके की कुछ और बातें भी कहे बिना नहीं रह सकता। हमारा इलाका न शैड्यूल्ड काव्ट्स में है, न शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स में है और न वह बेकवर्ड एरिया है। यह हमारी बदकिस्मती ही समझिये कि हमें शुरू से ही ऐसा रखा गया जैसे कि हम हर तरह से दिल्ली की बराबरी करते हों, दिल्ली के रहने वालों के साथ हर बात में मुकाबला करते हों। आप को पता है कि हमारा स्टैंडर्ड आफ लिविंग हमारा स्टैंडर्ड आफ एजुकेशन क्या है? हम किसी भी बात में आपके मुकाबले में नहीं बैठ सकते, न बैठ सके हैं और न आइन्दा भी ऐसा हो सकेगा। इसका नतीजा यह है कि हमारे सारे इलाके से सिर्फ दो आई० ए० एस० और एक आई० एपी० ए० आफिसर हैं। हमारे मुकाबले में लाहौल स्पीति को ले लीजिए। हमारी और उनकी कल्चर एक है, रहन-सहन एक है। चूंकि वे पंजाब के साथ रहे और उस समय पंजाब के चीफ मिनिस्टर प्रताप सिंह कैरों थे जिन्होंने कि उन्हें शैड्यूल्ड ट्राइब्स में रख दिया। वहां की आबादी लद्दाख की आबादी से एक चौथाई है लेकिन वहां के आज बीसियों आई० ए० एस० और बीसियों आई० पी० एस० आफिसर हैं। आज उनकी पोजिशन यह है। ये जितने भी ट्राइबल एरियाज हैं इनमें उनकी यह पोजिशन है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The hon. Member may continue his speech on the next day.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North East): May I draw your attention to Direction No. 2?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now there is a vacuum. Please sit down.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Now you are coming to the half-hour discussion..

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have not yet come to it.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I am talking about what comes in between the finishing of one subject and the starting of another.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What do you want to submit?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: It is a matter of grave importance. The Home Minister is here. There is some development in Assam. He should give us a statement on it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is all right.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: What is happening in Assam is not all right.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Half-hour discussion on Mahatma Gandhi. Shri Rajda.

17.30 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

FILM ON MAHATMA GANDHI

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: (Bombay South): I am raising a matter of great public importance and significance arising out of the answer given by the hon. Minister to Unstarred Question No. 295

The Government has taken a most unfortunate decision to be co-producers and to finance through the National Film Development Corporation a sum of Rs. 5 crores to Mr. Attenborough. This has raised country-wide contro-

versy. It is raging in the press as well as among the public. The sentiments of the people have been roused. I am not merely on sentiments, but there are certain cogent reasons.

Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation, is not a subject to be dealt with so lightly, and no government which claims to be patriotic or which exploits the name of Mahatma Gandhi day in and day out should go about it so lightly as they have been doing, as they appear to have been doing.

Mahatma Gandhi, the Father of the Nation, was the symbol of the country. Any depiction on celluloid of his life is not an easy matter, and many responsible thinkers in this country are of the view that it would be well nigh impossible for a foreigner to capture the spirit, the philosophy, the elan, the ethos and the personality of Mahatma Gandhi and the freedom struggle. It would be well nigh impossible, and that would be the greatest injustice to the life and the message of Mahatma Gandhi, and that danger is relevant because in the past, in the days of Pandit Nehru, such an attempt was made, and a film was made *Nine Hours to Rama*. The Government had scrutinised the script. An Indian was acting as Mahatma Gandhi, one Mr. Kashyap. When Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru went and saw the picture, he was very much shocked; he was moved and he shouted, "This tottering old man is not my Bapu."

Now, this danger is there. Not only that there are people in the freedom struggle who sat at the feet of Mahatma Gandhi; they learnt and imbibed the spirit of his ideals, his teachings, etc. These people are all alive. Their sentiments would be deeply hurt because the purpose or the objective of the Government is very much questionable.

The Government has been shifting ground. They have so far not stated what is their objective in allowing Mr. Attenborough to produce the film of Mahatma Gandhi. Is it that the Government is so much particular or so much keen to spread the message

of Mahatma Gandhi? I would be the first man to congratulate the Government if that were the objective. But it is not so. Had it been so, the script that has been already there for this film should have been made public. Nobody has come out with the script. Mr. Attenborough is making a press statement that Pandit Nehru had seen the script and the present Prime Minister has seen the script. I do not know. Panditji is not alive today. So, we do not know whether Panditji had seen and approved the script. I think, it would be wrong on the part of Mr. Attenborough or anybody to say that Pandit Nehru had approved the script or had scrutinised the script.

There are dangers in scrutinising the script also. As I said in the case of "Nine Hours to Rama", though the script was scrutinised, in spite of that, Mahatma Gandhi's not real life but caricature was produced and Pandit Nehru banned that picture. The same danger is there today. A man like Mr. Vasant Sathe should not be taken for a ride; he should not go for a ride; he should not accept a ride at the hands of some people either outsiders or our own people within the country. He should not succumb to pressures. He should come out with all the facts. When the NFDC meeting is there, when certain dangers that are involved in this film are placed before the hon. Minister, Mr. Vasant Sathe, he has got a pet reply soying, "The Government has taken a decision. Now, no argument will help here. We have taken a decision and the film is to be produced." This shows that with a closed mind the Government is approaching this sort of a problem.

It is a question of dignity; it is a question of the honour of the people of India. You cannot take the Father of the Nation so lightly. If there is any misrepresentation of his ideals, the people of this country are not going to tolerate it. They will not be patient in this and there will be a mass agitation throughout the country, in every nook and corner of the country.

[Shri Ratansinh Rajda]

They say that the Government has scrutinised the script; they say that the script has been scrutinised by certain eminent persons who were associated with Gandhiji. We do not know who are those eminent persons who have interpreted the life of Mahatma Gandhi and who have worked with Mahatma Gandhi. I would be very much pleased if the hon. Minister lays on the Table of the House the entire script because this House and this country is entitled to know all the details about this film. Since the country is entitled to know, since the Parliament is entitled to know everything at demand that he should lay the entire script on the Table of the House. Let the people see it; let the Members of Parliament see it. There are many Gandhians like Prof. Madhu Dandavate and many others on all sides of the House. As far as this aspect is concerned, I clarify that it is not from any partisan approach that I am raising this matter. Mahatma Gandhi belongs to the entire humanity. Einstein told that "Generations to come would scarcely believe that such a one as this Man in flesh and blood would ever walk on this earth." When a man like Einstein has paid this tribute, I think, the wisdom will dawn on the Government that they will not tackle this subject very lightly.

I demand that the entire script the entire agreement, all the details, be laid on the Table of the House. I do not know whether the agreement has been signed so far or not. Sometimes, there is a talk of ratification; sometimes, they say that somebody has gone to London. We would like to know what are all those details, what are the clauses and what is each and every clause of this agreement. That also should be laid on the Table.

As for budget, how much is the amount? Though they have said Rs. 5 crores are going to be advanced, I have my own apprehensions. Rs. 5 crores is the amount which is being shown outwardly, but how much more money is Government spending after this, apart from Rs. 5 crores. I would

like to know what the total budget is, in what parts and how it is going to be spent and how every rupee of every tax-payer is going to be squandered.

Apart from that, Government is rendering different types of help. Police help is there. Wherever shooting of the film is going on, Police forces are there, as if it is a big 'Tamasha' or a big 'Hukamshahi'. Somebody told me, (someone from where the shooting of the film is taking place) that the Policemen on such a large scale create the atmosphere that only the Police 'Raj' is there and nobody can shout slogans even such as 'Mahatma Gandhi Ki Jai'—as it happens during Emergency. So, these are the things I want to point out. I am asking Mr. Sathe not to be a party to these unfortunate things because these things are always counter-productive and would boomerang on the Government if the Government takes the entire thing lightly. Now, on the Police Government is spending something.

Again, in the Press there were reports that Attenborough has demanded 5000 kilograms of sugar. Our common man does not get sugar nowadays even at Rs. 14 or Rs. 15 per kilo, but we shall give him 5000 kilograms. It seems the milk of human kindness is sowing out from the breast of the Government for Attenborough. No Indian producer is available to them. There are men like Satyajit Ray, Mrinal Sen and such producers. We have fine talent and we know that in the innermost recesses Gandhiji could evoke the greatest response from the Indian mind and heart. Our Indian people can at least imbibe the spirit of Gandhi: I wonder whether Mr. Attenborough or any other foreigner would ever be able to do so. A great Gandhian like Acharya Kripalani raised a voice against this. He said 'I am doubtful about the objective of the Government'. In this film, the real people who worked with Mahatma Gandhi or the people who remained behind the curtain but who were the main pillars of Mahatma Gandhi's movement would not be depicted; they would not be brought out. This film is aimed at bringing into

light, without any relevance and out of all proportions, after the distortion of history, such personalities who are presently in the Government. This is how they want to distort the entire history of the entire freedom struggle, the history of the Father of the Nation. (Interruptions).

Now, if Government's objective is to spread the message of Mahatma Gandhi, already there is a picture, a truthful and authentic depiction of the life of Mahatma Gandhi. The picture is by Vithal Jhaveri and it is a five hours' picture—a truthful account. It was hailed by the Press, the public and everybody—all the eminent Gandhians. I do not know whether the eminent Gandhians who have subscribed to this script have seen that picture. All had unanimously accepted that picture. Government can take up that picture and prune that picture after editing it, to make it three hours, if the picture is lengthy. If it is five hours, all right, it can be edited and made three hours, and Government can spread it. But that is not so. Government talks day in and day out, in the name of Mahatma Gandhi. May I ask Shri Sathe as to why, if the objective is so clear—namely to spread the message of Mahatma Gandhi—during Mahatma Gandhi's Centenary year, they ordered only 5000 copies of the works and teachings of Mahatma Gandhi? It was the centenary year of Mahatma Gandhi and they ordered only 5000 copies. At that time, wisdom did not dawn on the Government that this is the Centenary year, let us spread the message of Mahatma Gandhi not only to every nook and corner of our country but to all parts of the world and let people understand his message. Because somebody has rightly stated that he is the greatest man of the Twentieth Century and if there is any answer to atom bomb, that is Gandhi. I think that is how Dr. Lohia gave tributes to Mahatma Gandhi. So, Government's objectives are really very doubtful—the way in which Government is handling this affair. It has been stated that no Indian producer has come forward. I would like to know

this from the hon. Minister. We are advancing only Rs. 3½ lakhs to an Indian producer, whoever wants to produce a film. This is the encouragement that the Government is giving. In this long span of 20 or 30 years, we have advanced a total amount, an aggregate amount of only Rs. 3 crores to the Indian producers. And here comes a foreigner. There are many things which 'probe' has written in its article. I would not go into details. Somebody came from London and Attenborough tackled her and she tackled somebody here, the powers that be. I would not go into those things because that is not my level of argument. This Government has never advanced a crore of rupees to our talented Indian producers, but here, at a stretch, within a short span, a twinkling of an eye, you are giving Rs. 5 crores to Mr. Attenborough. That is why people are very much suspicious and they think that there is something fishy about it undue pressure has been exercised from some quarters of Government, and that is why these things are happening. From this viewpoint, I would request Mr. Sathe to tell us as to what will happen if the script distorts the message of Mahatma Gandhi, You are a co-producer with Mr. Attenborough. Are you going to ban the picture thereafter after squandering Rs. 5 crores as was done in the days of Jawaharlal Nehru when he stated that 'this tottering old man is not my Bapu' and the film 'Nine hours to Rama' was banned? From this viewpoint, Government shall have to think, not twice but a thousand times, before proceeding with this 'misadventure'—I would not say 'adventure'; it is a 'misadventure'.

Having said this, I would invite the attention of the hon. Minister to the opinions given in the press as well as by personalities in public life like Acharya Kripalani. I am not reading them; they are galore, in hundreds. I think, our hon. Minister would kindly consider them in the interest of the honour of the nation. Being an Indian citizen, he is dutybound to see that the name of the Father of our Nation is not distorted; he is dutybound, as every

[Shri Ratansinh Rajda]
Indian is, to see that, instead of Mahatma Gandhi's film, his caricature is not brought out before the world.

There is another danger. Attenborough is going to depict all the events that took place in the life of Mahatma Gandhi—most of them. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru has stated that no man can write the biography of Mahatma Gandhi unless he is as big and as great as Mahatma Gandhi himself. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was a hundred per cent right when he expressed this opinion. But I learn that Mr. Attenborough is going to depict the pictures of communal violence that took place at the time the agitation raised by Jinnah for Pakistan was going on. I have my own grave apprehension on that. Those wounds should not be opened up now, after so many years, because they are very sentimental and delicate things to which Government shall have to apply their mind. If, Sir, only violence is shown in the picture or, if somebody is shown putting a dagger in the chest of somebody, shouting some religious slogans, I think that would create a bad impression.

We know the situation that is there in our country today. Even the slightest excitement at the hands of some irresponsible persons—political or otherwise—creates goondaism; that creates tension in our country. Take Moradabad, Godhra and all these places. We know what has happened there. At the slightest provocation, communal riots take place in our country to-day. This is a most unfortunate thing. It is an utter failure of the Government to control these communal riots. That is another thing. But Sir, Government should also see to it and examine this aspect also. Lastly, Sir, there are some people in this country who have worked with Mahatma Gandhi; they have followed his footsteps; there are many people who know all the details of Mahatma Gandhi's life and his ideals and, in their own way, they are trying to follow him; they are very much sentimental about this. (Interruptions)
Dr. Subramaniam Swamy was not a

Gandhite but, after joining the Janata Party, he is. He was appointed at Rajghat. (Interruptions). There are some who say that they are the thinkers and they rightly think. It would be wellnigh, impossible for a foreigner to depict truthfully and authentically about the life and ideals of Mahatma Gandhi to bring it out on the celluloid. So, I fervently appeal to the hon. Minister he being a dynamic person and a very good friend of mine not to allow himself to be drifted into these things. I am very much surprised.... (Interruptions).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can win him over from your other arguments.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: Sir, it is stated that after Independence within a span of thirty-two or thirty-three years or whatever it is, the present Ministry is now the biggest ministry with the ministerial calibre etc. There are some exceptions and in that exception I take Mr. Sathe and Shri Venkataraman, our Finance Minister. When I give him so much credit, Mr. Sathe should do justice. (Interruptions) Our Finance Minister knows his job well. Whether you agree with the policy of the government or not, that is a different thing. The other ministers do not have the ministerial calibre. Even a joke they do not appreciate. The other day, I told our Home Minister that the police was taking the law in their hands, his reply was that you were complaining because when that man becomes a policeman and when we give the law book in his hands—the Indian Penal Code and the Criminal Procedure Code—he takes the law into his hands. That is how he replies. I am sorry. Mr. Sathe, as I said, has his competence. But, I would request him to think afresh and to think thousand times before getting entangled into this and I again demand that the script, the budget and all the details—I have demanded them before—should be placed on the table of the House because, that must be the property of the House and this entire Parliament should have the right to examine the

script and after Parliament sanctions this script and after several people who knew about Gandhiji's life from all the sides of this House see that, this should be allowed. There are Gandhians on all the sides. That is why I told you (*Interruptions*) that let us not be partisan. Mr. Desai is here. Let us see that it is our unanimous objective, (*Interruptions*) it must be our unanimous objective.

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी (खुजराहो)
संसद में कितने गांधियन आईडियालोजी वाले हैं, जो उनको समझेंगे ?

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप लोग तो इंदिरा गांधियन हैं ।

श्री रतन सिंह राजदा : हम तो आप पर पूरा विश्वास रखते हैं । आप महात्मा गांधी के साथ अन्याय नहीं करेंगे यह हमारा विश्वास है । आप साठे साहब को मजबूर करेंगे कि वह महात्मा गांधी के साथ अन्याय न करें और प्रधान मंत्री जी को भी मजबूर करेंगे कि वह न करें !

Sir, with these words, I conclude.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI VASANT SATHE): Sir, I am thankful to my friend, Mr. Rajda for bringing this subject because I also feel that on a sensitive subject like this, we should try to clear any doubts that may prevail in the minds of the people or any apprehensions that they may have and share with them all the facts that could be shared most truthfully and freely. Sir, I entirely agree that a subject like the life of the Father of the Nation cannot be treated lightly. No one can ever think of treating it like that. Sir, it is the strength of that life and the theme "My life is my message" which adds to that responsibility. Unless the life of Mahatma Gandhi can be depicted as truthfully as possible, and in the real spirit, of Gandhiji's life, to serve as a message for the whole

world and the entire humanity, any production on his life as a film, or any book on him, will not be worthwhile. Therefore, let me at the outset say this, that we have given deep thought to all these matters which have been raised by my hon. friend Mr. Rajda. We applied our mind to all these aspects. There has been a history to this whole project. It is not out of the blue or suddenly that this has come about. Mr. Richard Attenborough has been at this idea for a long time. He has been inspired by Motilal Kothari nearly 20 years back. Since then he has been studying this project and trying to work on it. He was totally attached to this concept, apart from his ability to do it. About his ability even the best persons in this country like Satyajit Ray have very high opinion, his ability as a Director, as a Producer, as an actor. Apart from his sincerity of purpose, what does he think of Gandhiji? About this no less a person than Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was deeply impressed. I can't do better than quote him on this subject. At that time Atal ji was a member of the Rajya Sabha. This question was raised in Rajya Sabha in 1963. This we find in the proceedings of the Rajya Sabha dated the 26th November of that year. I would like to quote from this. From this you will know what Panditji thought of the whole project. It will remove any misunderstandings about 'Nine Hours to Rama'; these questions will get clarified....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Who raised the question?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Shri Krishna Chandra. This Question was, No. 153.

I am quoting this:

"SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to refer to the reply given to Starred Question No. 325 in the Rajya Sabha on August 29, 1963 and state:

(a) Whether Government have since received the script of the

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

film on the life of Mahatma Gandhi to be produced by a British film producer, Actor, Richard Attenborough;

(b) whether Cinegoers' Association of India and Indian Pictures Producers' Association had written letters to him placing certain conditions before final permission was accorded to its shooting; and

(c) if so, what were those conditions?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING):
(SHRI SHAM NATH):

(a) No, Sir.

(b) and (c). The Cinegoers' Association of India and the Indian Motion Picture Producers' Association have written letters in this connection. The letter has merely advised adequate precautions being taken; the Cinegoers' Association has suggested the following conditions:

(i) The shooting script must be passed by a Committee comprising the officials of the Information and Broadcasting Ministry, officials of the Indian Motion Picture Producers' Association and delegates of the Cinegoers' Association of India.

(ii) The shooting script should also be cleared by the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi.

(iii) A certain percentage of the profits mutually agreed upon between the Government of India, the producer concerned and the Gandhi Smarak Nidhi should be made over to the Harijan Fund.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA:
In view of the sad experience in connection with the film 'Nine Hours to Rama' why was it not

thought fit or necessary to impose conditions?

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: Under the law we cannot fix any specifications or any conditions for that. They are absolutely free to do it. It is only because they want certain facilities from the Government that they normally approach us. So far as this person is concerned, we have made enquiries from reliable sources. He is a great admirer of Gandhiji and he stands for all that Gandhiji stood for.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA:
When is the script likely to be received?

SHRI SATYA NARAYAN SINHA: Informally the gentleman happened to be here a few days ago and he has handed over a draft of the script to the Prime Minister, just for his perusal and comments.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:
Mahatma Gandhi's life is not any proposition, like the life of anyone. So, may I know in view of the great significance of the matter whether the Government have any special rules as to when, how and in what manner and by whom the life of Gandhiji shall be screened, instead of leaving it to the general rules? The very fact that the Prime Minister is looking into it shows that there is something serious about this matter.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU:
A few days ago, the script was given to me—copy of it—and Mr. Attenborough said that before he submitted it formally to the Government, that is to say, to my colleagues' Ministry, he wanted some reaction, if that was on the right lines or if there was anything wrong which had to be changed, before he submitted the formal script. I don't understand what the hon. Member means when he

speaks of making special rules, unless it be that special attention has to be paid, and that, of course, should be done.

SHRI A. M. TARIQ: Sir, I remember in this session, when the question of the film 'Nine hours to Rama' was raised, the hon. Prime Minister gave a defence that he was given a script of the film, but when the film was actually produced it was not according to that script. That was later on accepted by the Prime Minister. So, I would like to know what guarantee the Government of India have that the film will be produced according to the same script that has been given to us...

"SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I don't remember having given any such information to this House, that I had seen that script. I have never seen that script and I have not seen it yet. I have seen it on the screen which was shown to me. I never received the script of it previously.

SHRI A. D. MANI: In view of the great interest which foreign countries have got in the life of Gandhiji, will the Government of India consider the proposal of producing themselves a film on the life of Gandhiji?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: They may consider it, but I am afraid it is too difficult a proposition for a Government department to take up.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know—only because of Gandhiji we are asking these questions—why it should be difficult for the Government to make special arrangements for filming a life of Mahatma Gandhi, if the Government feels that such a thing should be done, and circulated all over the world? Would it not be a worthwhile undertaking from the point of view of the whole country so that the nation's full attention is given to the matter and the best

that we could produce is produced?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the answer is there in the previous reply of the Prime Minister just given.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: For the simple reason that the Government is not fitted to do it. They do not have the men, competent men to do it. Ultimately, all that the Government can do is to engage somebody who is supposed to be competent enough to do. That is the only thing that the Government can do. In this case, Mr. Attenborough came about a year ago and from his talk he seemed to be very enthusiastic and, if I may use the word, mentally equipped to undertake this, and all we could tell him was, if he did it, he should submit the script and later on other things, for us to consider. He struck as being a good man for this work. That is all we could do at that time."

This was, Sir, what was stated as far back as 1963 by no less a person than Jawaharlal Nehru about this film, about the proposal, about the man, Richard Attenborough, and his *bona fides*. After that, as Panditji had stated, the most essential thing was to get the script and see the script and the script must be seen by persons he knew Gandhiji, who understood Gandhiji.

Sir, at first, as I have said, Mr. Richard Attenborough, has been at it for a long time. He has not been taking it lightly. He just did not read a book or a biography of Gandhiji and said "All right," I will make a film on it. No, he did not do it. He decided to prepare a script. He showed the script to Jawaharlal Nehru. After that also, he kept it, asking people, preparing the script, so that it can be as truthful because he himself felt dedicated to the cause. No man would take such long years to work on a particular project. This

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

goes to the credit of Attenborough and, Sir, one of the first persons and it will be agreed by this House, one of the most eminent persons, who knew Gandhiji, who worked all her life with Gandhiji was, Meera Behn, who was Miss Madelene Slade earlier, who came and became the disciple of Gandhiji's and associate all her life. It was that lady who was first consulted by Richard Attenborough on the script. Then, after the script was prepared, he came here and the person in India who have been consulted were Prof. Swaminathan, who has been editing the works of Mahatma Gandhi's life, for example, the Publication Division's 90 Volume Complete Works. Then, Shri B. R. Nanda, the famous biographer and Gandhian scholar and last but not the least in India that we know of was Shri Radhakrishna, the Secretary of the Gandhi Peace Foundation.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Acharya Kripalani?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Have patience. I do not consider myself competent to speak on Mahatma Gandhi at all. I have that much of humility. No script in the world on the life of anyone either Jesus Christ or Lord Budha or Mahatma Gandhi can ever be agreed to by all or every one in the country. This is not a matter which you put to vote in the Parliament or somewhere. You have to accept it as a basis and the spirit I will quote only a few sentences from the script just at the beginning of this. Now it is introduced, what is the central theme in the mind of the writer of the script or the maker of the script? That will be clear from these words. It says on page 1 like this: "The camera is moving towards an Indian city. We are High and Far Away but it is not a vast panoramic shot, the screen is small, the colours muted." You (Mr. Deputy Speaker) are a man from the film world; you know something about it; you will appreciate it. It further says, "On the screen these words appear:

No man's life—much less the life of a man like Gandhi—can be encompassed in one telling. There is no way of giving each year its allotted time, of not omitting this person, that important moment. What can be done is to be faithful in spirit to the record, and to try to find one's way to the heart of the man...."

This is how it begins. Let me quote after showing that screen of the funeral procession. The scene is that the "commentators from all over the world are covering the ceremony, we concentrate on one, let us say the most distinguished American broadcaster of the time, Edward R. Murrow, who stands on the makeshift platform, a microphone in his hand, describing the process as TECHNICIANS and STAFF move quietly behind him." And these are his words:

"The object of this massive tribute died as he had always lived—a private man without wealth, without property, without official title or office." Mahatma Gandhi was not a commander of great armies nor ruler of vast lands, he could boast no scientific achievements, no artistic gift. Yet, men, governments and dignitaries from all over the world have joined hands today to pay homage to this little grown man in the loincloth who led his country to freedom.

Again the voice goes on. It further says as follows:

"He was a man who made humility and simple truth more powerful than empires." And Albert Einstein added, "Generations to come will scarce believe that such a one as this ever in flesh and blood walked upon this earth"... but perhaps to this man of peace, to this fighter who fought without malice or falsehood or hate, the tribute he would value most has come from General Douglas MacArthur:" in these words:

'If civilization is to survive, the General said, 'all men cannot fail to adopt Gandhi's belief that the use of force to resolve conflict is not only wrong but contains within itself the germ of our own self-destruction'.

Perhaps, for the rest of us, the most satisfying comment on this tragedy comes from the impudent *New York P.M.* which today wrote,—

"there is still hope for a world that reacts as reverently as ours has to the death of a man like Gandhi."

You see, this is the spirit. Now, to say that Attenborough, merely because he is a foreigner that he would not understand Gandhiji is to do injustice to him and it will be unfair to him, and as he said in one of his interviews:—

'Gandhiji cannot be a monopoly of any nation or of any people. Gandhiji belongs to the whole world and the whole humanity.'

And now, Mr. Rajda should be happy, it is a tribute to India and Gandhiji that here is a man from Britain who wants to pay tribute to Gandhiji, take his message and take it all over the world. So, we should not look at it from the angle of a foreigner or otherwise. What is to be seen, and I entirely agree with you, is the script, the spirit of the script and as I have quoted to you will appreciate that if this is the spirit in which Gandhiji is going to be depicted, there can be no message for the world better than this on the life of Gandhiji—the way in which he is trying to project it.

Now, therefore, if this is agreed, then comes the question, what should the Government have done? Why did we feel attracted to this project? The main reason was if a film like this is to be shown from the practical angle throughout the world, then as you know, coming from Bombay in a film the most important thing is whether you have the contacts and rights of

distribution. Best films are made in India. There are good directors and good actors. But how many of these films have been shown or circulated in cinema houses in the world. Because the distributors don't take it. Unless the distributors who control the exhibition, accept this film even a good a film made would not be shown. And therefore, the attractive part of this—apart from the first, the first was the merit—was, that Attenborough's *bona fides* are clear and the script. Once that was cleared then the second and more important, commercial, economic aspect was how can this film be shown throughout the world? If it is not shown throughout the world, there is no meaning, because it had no relevance to India, as Gandhiji is quite close to us and people know him very well. There are no special attractions for India for a Gandhi film. Therefore, the attractions and relevance of him to the world is there today more than any other time. Therefore, we were taking this aspect, and when we found that in this production there is an involvement of a distribution company, known as I.F.I.G.F.I. which has British and American collaboration, in this I.F.I.G.F.I. they have the distribution rights. Now, their involvement is two-thirds of the finance. In this entire project when we were told that it is going to cost about 21 million Dollars, out of which 14 to 15 millions Dollars will be invested by this Company, that was the guarantee that they will have a stake, they will have an interest in seeing that money in Dollars is recovered, from where will they recover? As Rajda knows very well, a producer, before he produces a film contacts a distributor and ensures that the distribution rights are there so that he can at least recover whatever he invests. Therefore, when this was shown to us and we were assured of the investment, then come the question whether we should invest or not.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: How much amount out of \$ 14 million has come?

SHRI VASANT SATHE: The entire amount is guaranteed. The whole amount is not to be spent right now.

Then came the question: what interest do we have? You were right when you said that if something went wrong in the production of the film—although the script might be good, in depiction, it is distorted—would we have a voice? So that we should have a voice in this, we made a proposal that this must be a coproduction. It was not so at the time of 'Nine Hour to Rama'. We ventured into this.

About the commercial part, so that we may have a say in the production as well as distribution, what has been done? We are co-producers. As co-producers, for India and the nearabout territory we hold the copy-right. Secondly, as far as the distribution is concerned, the agreement provides that Indian partner i.e., the NFDC, will have the distribution rights for India and the nearby territory right upto **Afghanistan and Malaysia and Indonesia in the South East and all the socialist countries.** In this way we are ensuring an area where we have the rupee deal on Government to Governmental level and where we could distribute this film and try to make good our investment. But then this is not enough. The concept is that the investment made by both these parties is pooled together and till both the parties recover their investment fully from the returns, no profit will accrue to anyone. So, the first condition is that there must be complete recovery. For example, hypothetically, if on the rupee side, we are not able to recover more than half of the investment, then what will happen? Till the other half is recovered from the dollar side, no profits will accrue to anyone. When this recovery is complete, then from the profits, the share will be *pari passu* in the proportion that we invest. That is the most fair thing that one could think of. Therefore, all these considerations have been borne in mind.

Why was NFDC not consulted before? The spirit is right. The

NFDC Board came into existence in September. This decision was taken in the Cabinet on 28th August. So, we privately discussed with some of the top producers in this country who know the business and who were connected with the former Film Finance Corporation. Therefore, that much precaution we had taken. As soon as the NFDC Board was formed, in the very first meeting of the NFDC Board this proposal was put to them. As you have mentioned, I can be very honest to you, some of them did express apprehension, but when the matter was clarified to them, they agreed "yes, this appears to be a very viable proposition; we should go ahead".

I may tell you, fortunately today itself—it is a coincidence that your question has come—the Board was meeting in Bombay and I have got information that the entire Board has unanimously accepted and ratified the agreement, the terms of which I have just explained to you. We have learnt our lessons from our earlier experiences and all these precautions have been taken.

I would only submit let us go with the spirit. As I said, Gandhiji is not your or my property; he is relevant for the whole world. And here is a man who feels totally dedicated to him; about that even his worst critics have no doubt. Therefore, let us not create misunderstanding, let us not create misapprehension.

It was stated that through this film probably we are going to boost the present people in power. If that is what you have in mind, let me tell you that in this entire film Shrimati Indira Gandhi is not shown anywhere even once. Therefore, why make such allegations? Ofcourse, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru is there. Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel is very much there.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: They must be there.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Therefore, if you say these persons also should not have been there, then that is a different thing. But if you have in

mind some person whom you want to be there, this is a film on Mahatma Gandhi and not on the persons whom you would like to be included in the film.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: The hon. Minister is distorting what I said.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: But you made an imputation about the motive. If there is an allegation that we want to project the people in the present Government in this film, that is unfair.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: I was only referring to the apprehension which Acharya Kripalani has made public.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Acharya Kripalani could also be wrong. He may not be fully informed. Now that I have clarified all these facts here today, if persons like you go and explain the position to the revered Acharya Kripalani, the doubts that he may have in his mind will be removed and I am sure he will not have any apprehensions.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): The scenario which you have read out is a beautiful one. Various quotations have been given. But really the best quotation is by the Negro leader who said that Gandhiji turned the jail chains of this captors into shining ornaments of martyrdom. There can be no better praise.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: If they have missed it, this an other tributes could also be used. If there are any suggestions to be made about the making of this film, if you find something which is not in keeping with it, or something is missed, there is always room for rectifying or improving it. Here is a person who has an open mind, because he is interested in depicting Gandhiji in his true spirit. Therefore, you need not have any apprehensions on any of the counts.

As far as police protection is concerned, even for ordinary films police

protection is given. Apart from the curiosity of the people, in this country unfortunately everything is being converted into a matter for opposition. Even though my friend, Shri Rajda did not mean it, there was a hint that there will be a mass movement, a threat of agitation etc. I would beg of you not to bring Gandhiji into this for Gandhiji's sake. You can stone, if you think fit, a car rally, which also is a very bad thing to do. No civilized person should do this. We are not people from the Stone Age to do that. But if you do that, one could understand it.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: We have not done it.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Thank you very much. But for Heaven's sake do not demonstrate before the makers of this film, do not try to show yourself in a poor light by encouraging anyone to do this. This will not be in keeping with the Indian character and Indian ethos.

As far as sugar is concerned, now there is no control. Why are you raising it again? Nobody asks for 10,000 Kgs. or anything. They can get as much sugar as they want to buy. Don't try to bring it from the sublime to the ridiculous. For heaven's sake, don't do it.

With these remarks, I think I have clarified the position.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: I have one more clarification.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Rajda, according to the rules, you have already got the clarification from the Minister. There are four more people. You cannot ask for any clarification now. You can get any clarification if you want by meeting him in his room. Now, the rules will not permit. Now, Mr. Virndhi Chander Jain.

SHRI RATANSINH RAJDA: What are you going to do after the film is ready to find out that the film is...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This will not go on record. This is against the rules.

(Inerruptions)**

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I told you, we are the co-producers, we will see the film at every stage, so also when it is finally made. Why do you presume that we do not do that?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The atmosphere is very good. Don't point out anything. (Interruptions). Mr. Jain, you can put only one question. I will permit no speech. Only one question you can put. (Interruptions). Everybody should abide by the rules. If you don't abide by the rules, we cannot conduct the business of the House. It is not for you to dictate the rules for me. You can put only one question. I will not allow any discussion on the subject.

SHRI KAMALAPATI TRIPATHI (Varanasi): It is only Half-an-Hour discussion. But it has already taken one hour and fifteen minutes. How much time you are going to give?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He can put only one question. I will allow no discussion.

(Interruptions)

SHRI VIRDHI CHANDER JAIN: I will take only two or three minutes, not more than that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: it should be in the form of a question.

श्री वृद्धि चन्द्र जैन (वाड़मेर): उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह प्रश्न राष्ट्रीय नहीं, बल्कि अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय महत्व का प्रश्न है। मंत्री महोदय ने अभी जो जवाब दिया है, उससे मैं बहुत ही संतुष्ट हुआ हूँ और मेरी

गलतफहमियां भी दूर हो गई हैं। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि उन्होंने स्क्रिप्ट के बारे में कनसल्टेशन किया है। प्राचार्य बिनौवा भावे भी महात्मा गांधी के बहुत ही नजदीक थे। अगर स्क्रिप्ट के बारे में उन्हें भी कनसल्ट किया जाये और उनकी भी राय ली जाय, तो बहुत अच्छा रहेगा। अगर मंत्री महोदय एग््रीमेंट की कापी सदन में प्रस्तुत कर दें, तो जो भी मिस-अंडरस्टैंडिंग है वे दूर हो जायेंगी। मैं चाहता हूँ कि एग््रीमेंट की कापी के साथ ही अगर स्क्रिप्ट की कापी भी प्रस्तुत की जा सकती है, तो मंत्री महोदय उसे भी प्रस्तुत कर दें।

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR (Gorakhpur): One who understands Gandhiji and his values and ideals can very well produce a film on him if he has got such an idea to produce a film. There are reasons to believe that Mr. Attenborough can do this work, as the hon. Minister has so well explained. But the point is that the the Government is going to spend Rs. 5 crores on this. May I know whether five crore people in this country will be able to understand it because of the language problem? Was this considered when you decided to give this task to Mr. Attenborough?

I would also like to know whether the Government has received protests from the Indian film makers against this decision to participate in the production of an Indo-British film on the life of Gandhiji, and if so, the salient points of the protest.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना): उपाध्यक्ष जी, महात्मा गांधी को मैं सबसे बड़ा साम्राज्यवाद विरोधी मानता था और दूसरे उन्होंने देश भर में देशभक्ति

की उत्कट भावना पैदा की । इसलिए मैं जरूर चाहूंगा कि इन दो बातों का निर्वाह किसी भी फिल्म में जरूर किया जाए । मैं मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह जो दो आस्पेक्ट हैं उनकी लाइफ के, उसके बारे में फिल्म में कोई चर्चा, यथेष्ट चर्चा है या नहीं ?

ठीक ही कहा गया है कि गांधी जी के साथ काम करने वाले, उनके दर्शन में विश्वास करने वाले भले ही बाद में दूसरे रास्ते पर चले गए हों, जैसा कि आचार्य बिनोबा भावे हैं, आचार्य कृपलानी हैं, डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद जी थे, मौलाना आजाद थे और डा० पट्टाभि सीतारमैया थे—यह सारे लोग उनके सहयोगी थे । प्यारेलाल जी तो उनके सहयोगी थे ही । तो इन लोगों से कोई राय, विचार विमर्श इस वृत्त चित्र के निर्माण के सिलसिले में किया गया है या नहीं । पं० जवाहरलाल नेहरू जी का जिक्र किया गया ...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: None of those whom you have mentioned are alive today.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: They were alive when the earlier film was being made, and he mentioned the name of Pandit Nehru.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Acharya Kripalani and Pyare Lal are alive.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री : यह फिल्म बनाने का काम बहुत दिनों से चल रहा है ।

इसके अतिरिक्त फोरम फार बेटर फिल्मस जो संस्था है, उसके जो बड़े बड़े निर्माता हैं उन लोगों से इसके बारे में कोई राय ली गई ? अगर ली गई तो क्या उनकी राय आपको मिली ? इसमें

बहुत सारे लोग हैं, मैं समय की कमी की वजह से नाम नहीं पढ़ रहा हूँ ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Are you a Gandhian or a Marxian?

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: I am a Marxist, I am not a Gandhian.

लेकिन हमने उनके साथ काम किया है, उनको हम सबसे बड़ा साम्राज्यवाद विरोधी और देशभक्ति की उत्कट भावना वाला मानते थे ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are a Marxist and you are not a Gandhian. Anyhow, you are interested in the film on Gandhiji.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री : क्या यह बात सच है कि इस फिल्म को अंतिम रूप देने के सिलसिले में प्रधानमंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी का भी इंटरव्यू लिया जाने वाला है ? यह चर्चा चल रही है कि उनका इंटरव्यू लिया जाएगा ताकि गांधी जी के साथ-साथ इनका सारी दुनिया में प्रचार हो जाए ।

श्रीमती विद्यावती चतुर्वेदी (खजुराहो): उनके प्रचार की कोई कमी नहीं है । वे बगैर प्रचार के जन-जन के दिल में समाई हुई हैं । उनके लिए इसकी कोई जरूरत नहीं है ।

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: I am asking whether there is any possibility of taking interview of Smt. Indira Gandhi regarding this film.

श्री रामविलास पासवान (हाजीपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह बात सही है कि इन लोगों ने गांधी जी को नहीं देखा है और इसीलिए गांधी जी की आवश्यकता हम लोगों को अधिक है । मैं कहता हूँ कि जब पहली बार हमने बचपन में रामलीला देखी थी तो हम इसी उद्देश्य से देखने गए थे कि जैसी राम लीला में फोटो होगी वैसे ही भगवान होंगे । इसलिए महात्मा गांधी की जब चर्चा करते हैं तो हमें इतने हल्के-फुल्के ढंग से इस चीज को नहीं

[श्री राम विलास पासवान]

लेना चाहिए। यह बात सही है कि सरकार जो चाहेगी, मनवालेगी और हम लोग चाहे इस पक्ष के हो या उस पक्ष के, विरोध करना चाहेंगे तब भी इस 20 साल की दिमाग की उपज को एक दिन में तोड़ा नहीं जा सकता है। साठे जी के जमाने में यह मामला हो रहा है, इसीलिए उसके साथ नेक-नामी और बदनामी, दोनों के हकदार साठे जी ही होंगे। इसलिए हम लोगों की और साठे जी की यह ड्यूटी है कि दोनों पक्ष के लोग अपनी-अपनी जिम्मेदारियों को समझकर मामले को उठाएं। जहां तक हमने सुना है कि विदेशों के आदमी भी महात्मा गांधी के मामले में उनके भक्त हो सकते हैं। हम लोग अरविंदो आश्रम गए थे, वहां हमने माताजी को देखा था, माताजी विदेश की ही थीं। लेकिन जब आप इस फिल्म को प्रोड्यूस कीजिएगा, चेहरे और बोलचाल को प्रोड्यूस कीजिएगा, एक्शन को प्रोड्यूस कीजिएगा, हम लोग अंग्रेजी जानते हैं और अच्छी अंग्रेजी बोल भी सकते हैं, लेकिन इसके साथ साथ उनके हाव-भाव, उनके बोलने का तरीका, इंप्रेसिव होगा या नहीं, इस सारी चीज को देखने की जरूरत है।

साठे जी सबसे बड़ी गलती तो शुरू में ही हो गई है। अब उस गलती को सुधार सकते हैं। आपने कहा है कि आपने 20-30 साल में उनको तीन करोड़ रुपया दिया और...

श्री वसंत साठे : अभी तो कुछ नहीं दिया।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : इसको आप देंगे, लेकिन इतना फायनेंस जो भारत सरकार कर रही है यदि भारत सरकार अपने देश के किसी प्रोड्यूसर को प्रोत्साहित करती तो ऐसी बात नहीं थी कि कोई भी प्रोड्यूसर नहीं मिलता हमारे पास बहुत से लोग राजेन्द्रबाबू की फिल्म के लिए आते हैं बिहार के काफी लोग आते हैं शिवेन्द्र सिंहा ने भी कहा कि हम लोगों को बना दीजिए। मैं सरकार से इतना ही आग्रह करूंगा

कि आपने सब लोगों का नाम लिया अब्दुल गफ्फान खान, जिनको फंटियर गांधी कहा जाता है, उनका भी नाम लिया और भी कई लोग हैं जो कहते हैं कि गांधियन हैं---गांधियन हैं तो मैंने हंसते हुए कहा कि आप इंदिरा गांधियन हो सकते हैं, इस ओर साठे जी को ध्यान देना चाहिए। इसलिए मैं आपसे बस इतना ही कहता हूँ कि महात्मा गांधी जी को जो मूल आत्मा है वह हमेशा चित्रित होती रहे यह आपको और हम सब को देखना है आप इसको पब्लिक प्रोपर्टी न बनाइए। आप इसको सभा के पटल पर मत रखिए, लेकिन मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम सब लोगों को मिलकर इस संबंध में देखना चाहिए। एक्टर के संबंध में कहा गया तो साठे जी हमको जानकारी मिली है कि जिस प्रोड्यूसर को आपने अपनी फिल्म को बनाने के लिए दिया है उन्होंने आज तक एक फिल्म बनाई है और वह फिल्म भी फ्लाप हो गई है। वे फोटोग्राफर है। आर्टिस्ट जो है वे उतरें और महात्मा गांधी जी का नाम देश विदेश में जाए। महात्मा गांधी विदेशों की भी प्रोपर्टी है और महात्मा गांधी पर विदेशियों का भी अधिकार है लेकिन मैं मंत्री जी से यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे देश में महात्मा गांधी जी का सही रूप किस ढंग से चित्रित किया जाएगा, इसका वे जवाब दें और जैसा मैंने पहले कहा है उन का जो रूप हो वह सही रूप से चित्रित किया जाए, इस बात को मंत्री जी देखें।

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Most of the questions that have been raised were, in fact, dealt with by me in my detailed reply. But I entirely agree with my friend, Mr. Ram Vilas Paswan, and Mr. Ramavatar Shastri that adequate care...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Hari-kesh Bahadur also.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: .. and Mr. Harikesh Bahadur; Shri Ramavatar Shastri because he has worked with Gandhi, and Shri Harikesh Bahadur and Shri Ram Vilas Paswan because they have never seen him. From both these angles, it is very important that adequate care must be taken throughout the making of the film to see that it reflects the life of Gandhi in its true spirit and conveys his real message.

As far as India is concerned, there is going to be a Hindi version of this film. Therefore, it will be available for Indians. But, as I said initially, this is an international film, mainly for the audience outside the country, in the world. If the film were not to be made on Gandhi this time, people in India would not be much losers. But because he has felt, and people outside have been feeling, as I have quoted from some of the references, that Gandhi's message is very relevant today for the world, he is keen to produce this. In that spirit, therefore, it will be there, and all care will be taken, I can assure the hon. Members. Very great names have been mentioned like Acharya Vinobha Bhave and others....

AN HON. MEMBER: Panditji also.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: Panditji was associated with this; he was a member of the Cabinet when this decision was taken.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: Do something about the appearance of Gandhi. The photo looks like that of the Minister of Agriculture.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I can assure you that they will take that care; that anxiety is there for the producer.

Now, a question was asked whether Gandhiji, image as a fighter against imperialism and as the champion of the downtrodden, whether that right image has been kept or not. I just quote one of his...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: A Marxian question!

GMGIPND—Job III—2612 LS—12-1-81—890.

SHRI VASANT SATHE: On page 72 of the script, this is what Gandhiji, while addressing the Indian National Congress, says. He has quoted his speech. This is what Gandhiji says:

Illiterate they may be, but they are not blind. They see no reason to give their loyalty to rich and powerful men who simply want to take over the role of the British in the name of freedom."

Continuing, he says :

"This Congress tells the world it represents India. My brothers, India is 700,000 villages...."

This was before Partition.

".....not a few hundred lawyers in Delhi and Bombay. Until we stand in the fields with the millions who toil each day under the hot sun—we will not represent India nor will we ever be able to challenge the British as one nation."

It is such things from his lips which are there throughout in this Film which is the real message of the life of Gandhiji. I am sure, Panditji might recall the speech of Mahatma Gandhi to the Indian National Congress.

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE: He did not want Partition. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI VASANT SATHE: I am not talking about partition.

So, Sir, I think I have done. I am hopeful and confident that all the Members in this House including the Opposition must have been satisfied that their apprehensions, however, remote, have now been removed.

I am sure there will be no opposition to this Film anywhere in the country.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Monday the 1st December.

19.02 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, December 1, 1980/Agrahayana 10, 1902 (Saka)