

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I wish to draw your attention to the fact that the Business Advisory Committee had decided in the last Session to admit certain items. At least those items like the Sugar Commission's recommendations should receive priority in this Session.

श्री हुकम चन्व कछवाब : अध्यक्ष महाशय उत्तर दिलावाएं। गुजरात में हर रोज गोलीयां चल रही हैं, लोग मारे जा रहे हैं, वहां कोई सरकार नहीं। वहां कल भी और आज भी गोली चली है। आपकी सरकार यह सब करवा रही है। (इटरप्पाज) मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि उत्तर दिलावाएं। क्या जो घटनाएं वहां घटी हैं उनकी न्यायिक जांच करवाने के लिए तैयार हैं। विधान सभा को भंग करने के लिए तैयार हैं। यह एक गम्भीर विषय है। इसकी चर्चा मदन में होनी चाहिए। जल्दी इस पर चर्चा होनी चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महाशय : एडजर्नमेंट मोशन आप लाए थे इस पर। मैंने उसकी इजाजत दी। चूंकि आपकी नादाद पूरी नहीं थी, उसको आपने वापिस लिया। उस पर मैंने कल कार्लिंग एंशन की इजाजत दी। कल आप नहीं थे। अगले सप्ताह प्रेजीडेंट्स एड्रेस पर बहस आ रही है। मैंने डायरेक्शन दिया है कि जो प्वाइंट्स रेंज किए गए हैं उनका बहस का जब जबाब दिया जाय तो इनका भी जबाब दिया जाए।

श्री हुकम चन्व कछवाब : यह बहुत महत्व का मामला है। रोज लोग गोली से मारे जा रहे हैं। स्पष्ट उत्तर आप क्यों नहीं दिलाते हैं कि विधान सभा भंग करने की घोषणा करेंगे, न्यायिक जांच बिठाने की बात को ये मानेंगे, जो मारे गए हैं या जल्मी हुए हैं उनके परिवार वालों को उचित मुआवजा देंगे और कब इस सारे मामले पर बहस का मौका ये देंगे।

अध्यक्ष महाशय : मैंने कह तो दिया है और आप क्या चाहते हैं? उलटा हो कर दिखाएं कि घोषणा कर रहे हैं।

श्री हुकम चन्व कछवाब : रोज लोग गोली से मारे जा रहे हैं।

अध्यक्ष महाशय : आप भी उन पर मेहरबानी करो।

श्री हुकम चन्व कछवाब : हम क्या करें। हम पर तो गोली चलाई जा रही है। सरकार को नहीं कहते हैं कि वह मेहरबानी करो। घरों में घुस कर लोगों को गोलीबारी से मारा जा रहा है।

अध्यक्ष महाशय : एक दिन एक मसला आया, दूसरे दिन आया। आप नहीं थे।

श्री हुकम चन्व कछवाब : लोक सभा के सामने भूख हड़ताल पर विद्यार्थी बैठे हैं। यह आंदोलन सारे देश में विद्यार्थियों का फैलने वाला है।

अध्यक्ष महाशय : सरकार को कह तो दिया है। पार्लिमेंटरी एफेयर्स के मिनिस्टर संबंधित मंत्री तक इस बात को पहुंचा देंगे।

श्री हुकम चन्व कछवाब : वह कुछ बोलते ही नहीं हैं।

अध्यक्ष महाशय : पार्लिमेंटरी एफेयर्स के मिनिस्टर कैसे बोल सकते हैं। वह कन्व कर देंगे। प्रोसीजर जो है उसको फालो तो करना चाहिए। उत्तर नहीं उत्तर प्रदेश हो रहा है।

श्री हुकम चन्व कछवाब : आप भी ऐसी बात कहते हैं। आपका तो ऐसा नहीं कहना चाहिए।

अध्यक्ष महाशय : आप तीन दिन कह रहे हैं? उत्तर प्रदेश में ही तो रहे और कह रहे हैं। उत्तर प्रदेश की वजह से नहीं आ सके और आज आते ही उत्तर मांगने लगे हैं।

12.15 hrs.

CINEMATOGRAPH (SECOND
AMENDMENT) BILL—Contd.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we take up
Cinematograph (Second Amendment) Bill.

Shri Gujral.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION
AND BROADCASTING (SHRI I. K.
GUJRAL): The hon. House will recall

[Shri I. K. GUJRAL]

that in 1965 the Rajya Sabha had passed a resolution asking for setting up of a committee to examine the working of the film censorship law. Accordingly, a Committee was set up under the chairmanship of Mr. Justice Khosla on which, in addition to various other eminent people. Members of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha were also represented. The Committee did a very worthwhile work and after years of labour they produced what is now commonly called the Khosla Committee Report and on that basis, the Government examined the law and we have now come before you to amend the censorship law as it was promulgated in 1952 and later on amended in 1958.

Censorship, to say the least, is a negative function. Generally speaking, negative functions are hardly popular. All the same, a variety of considerations, all firmly rooted in the principle of public responsibility, make it necessary for certain negative functions to be operative.

In our Constitution is enshrined the right to freedom as a fundamental right of the people of India. Under Article 19(a) the freedom of speech and expression is guaranteed to all citizens. However, this freedom is limited by certain reasonable restrictions in respect of the interests of the sovereignty and integrity of India, the security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States, public order, decency or morality or in relation to contempt of court, defamation or incitement to an offence, etc. The law of censorship is the instrument of the discharge of public responsibility in respect of ensuring freedom of speech and expression subject to constitutional limitations.

Although the general principles of censorship remain fairly constant, several factors introduce a variety of variables. That is why, as the demands of society change, the system of censorship has also to change as the community keeps on adjusting to new norms and new situations.

The salient features of the present Bill which is before the House are that the censorship Board will not be merely an over-seeing advisory body as it is at present but will be actually involved in the judging of films, of course, with the assistance of assessors from different disciplines and with different social, cultural and professional background.

The Government propose to entrust the appellate functions to an independent tribunal whose advice will be accepted except in a few cases covered by Article 19(b) of our Constitution.

I may say here that so far as the issue of decency and morality is concerned, the Government, by and large, propose to abide by the findings of the appellate Board unless the Government find some very special reasons for intervention. The Government also has been feeling from time to time that the stage has come when we should very explicitly express our views regarding the trends about sex and violence in films which have been exhibited of late. When I brought into sharp focus the increasing trend of explicit sex and violence, the initial reaction in a section of the film-makers was one of fright and suspicion.

In deference to the strong wishes of this House and the other House and the intense public concern voiced by several public institutions and associations the Central Board of Film Censors had to perform the unhappy task of rigorously enforcing the code and even banning some films, which violated the principles defined in the code. I am glad to say that on due course within the industry itself voices of reason and responsible objectivity emerged in consonance with our own thinking and the unfortunate disastrous trends now seem to be on the wane. I appreciate that it is not easy to switch off the trends in a short span of time. However I do feel that it will not be fair not to notice the marked improvement which is noticeable. Several producers and directors are now coming forward to express fairly strongly against vulgarity obscenity

and violence and films which had shunned these elements completely as a matter of conscientious choice, are now gradually beginning to succeed at the box-office. I am relieved at this very happy development and through you, Mr. Speaker, I wish to place on record our appreciation for the new role which the leaders of the film industry have assumed to reverse the unfortunate trends. Public opinion is slowly asserting itself. I do feel that public opinion has finally prevailed because no media, especially the media like films, which has a direct social relevance can exist in a vacuum and without being sensitive to public opinion.

I do not want to go at length and amplify or reiterate what I have already said in the past. But I do hope the Members will take interest in this Bill and when I have heard them, I will be able to say more towards the close of this Debate.

But before I sit down I would like to say this that Government on its part will not be content by only relying upon the negative functions of censorship which as I submitted is inescapable in our circumstances, but would cause meaningful positive intervention in the film scene, which alone can contribute to the revival and regeneration of the Indian films. The honourable House is aware of our thinking to set up a Film Council as an apex body with consultative and regulatory role, a National Film Corporation to handle commercial activities in consonance with the broad principles of our film policy, the essence of which is that film is not a mere commercial commodity to be traded in, but an important input into our social and cultural milieu.

I do hope that with the proposed amendment Bill we are making our pattern of censorship meet our needs and also create conditions which are necessary for the full growth and development of the film medium.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion Moved:

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

Before I proceed with the consideration of the Bill, I have to inform hon. Members that the Foreign Minister has returned from Iran and he will make a statement at 6 O' clock in the evening, just at the end of the sitting.

There are two hours allotted to this Bill. I request hon. Members to confine themselves to the time limit. Before I call Mr. Hazra, I want to call Mr. Sreekantan Nair; he says he is not well and he wants to go; so I will give him chance now. Shri Sreekantan Nair.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR (Quilon): I am very thankful to you, Mr. Speaker, for giving me this opportunity to speak.

I called the attention of the hon. Minister to this Bill moment it was presented to this House and I pointed out how cumbersome it is and how it defeats its own purpose because it is so costly, and there are so many bodies constituted under this new amendment. I said then that the purpose will be defeated. Sir, admire his independence and his appreciation of aesthetic values and his resistance to pressures put in by some top members of his party in such matters.

So far as Censorship Board is concerned it is all right. With regard to the Appellate Tribunal you have got 11 members and you have got the examining committee.

In the very first page of the Bill, there is constitution of an Examining Committee in relation to films; on page 2, for Section 3(a)(i) for the words 'not more than nine other Members', the words 'five other whole-time members and six honorary members' making a total of all shall be substituted. This will make it more costly.

[Shri N. Shreekantan Nair]

Again under 3A, you have provided for seven assessors in each language. That means the examining committee is very very costly to Government and it defeats the very purpose which you want to serve. I would have moved a motion for sending the Bill to the Select Committee. But, for want of time, I would only like to bring this to your notice for the consideration and also for the consideration of this House and also the hon. Minister so that this cumbersome procedure may be eliminated as far as possible.

That is all what I want to say.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul): Mr. Speaker, Sir, so far as the objects of the Bill are concerned, there would hardly be any controversy. As far as laudability and salutariness of the objects of the Bill are concerned, I entirely agree with the principles enunciated in the Bill. They are in conformity with some of the recommendations of the Khosla Commission.

On reading the report, one would find that the commission have rendered yeoman service to the film industry by going into great details of the various malaise of the industry and in suggesting remedies to get out of the malaise in which it has been languishing for decades.

The Bill seeks to revise essentially the set-up of the Central Board of Film Censors so ably pointed out by the very personable and able Minister of Information and Broadcasting. Censorship in the present stage of Indian society is utterly indispensable to maintain certain moral standards for those who go to see and view the motion pictures. We cannot, at this stage, ever dispense with the censorship of films because we have yet to ensure who are in the show business. And one cannot ever undermine the influence of films on the India society. This is one media of entertainment which is a very powerful media and it has the largest impact on the social and moral values which govern any open society permitting ex-

hibition of films, produced without State intervention. The impact of the films, particularly, on the younger generation is tremendous. They are at a stage when their mind is still cultivable. It can be cultivated in the direction which could be highly dangerous and pernicious for the future of the country. But, at the same time, may be with proper sort of entertainments, we may be able to harness the tremendous wealth of the talent that we have in our young men for the emancipation of the lot of the people in this country.

In other words, censorship by itself has an exceedingly important role to play not merely in ensuring moral standards of the people who go to the films but also ensure a proper direction for the younger generation of this country.

SHRI M. C. DAGA (Pali): I want to know what is the moral standard which will be ensured for our younger generation

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Moral standards those are which moral and standards. My learned friend will not be able to understand the explanation without standard. It would be futile for me to explain it if he does not understand it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: It is like the Holy Roman Empire which was neither Holy nor an Empire.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I shall come to the moral standards a little later.

MR. SPEAKER: They differ from person to person.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I do not want to barter away regut to creation of art for supposed moral standards. But at the same time, rampant licentiousness must not be allowed under the name of art; it must not be allowed under the name of aesthetics, and it is to that that I am going to address myself.

If one were to see the responsibility of the censors to ensure that certain moral standards are maintained in the films and to ensure that an improper or immoral direction is not allowed to be given to the younger generation who are particularly vulnerable, then one must submit that the performance of the board of film censors so far has been appallingly dismal. That is the finding of the Khosla Commission. The board of film censors tried to shift the blame on to the industry and the industry tried to shift the blame on them, and other witnesses who came in evidence before the commission tried to blame both the industry and the film censors. It has to be appreciated that in view of the very serious responsibility which this board carries, its failure means a very serious lapse. In fact, today, we find a very unholy effect of these lapses on our younger generation, and in fact, one would not hesitate in stating that the history of degradation and debasement in the values of life of our younger generation is in fact the history of tremendous box office success of films, full of excessive sex, intense eroticism and over-abundance of crime. If that is correct, Government cannot escape their own responsibility, because a casual tinkering with a very serious responsibility like film censorship is utterly unconscionable. This sort of censorship is much worse than rank naked licentiousness. This is what has been happening so far in our country. If one were to see ten box office hits, one would find that nine out of them are such as have violated the entire guiding principles of censorship in letter and spirit, the one which has not violated the letter of the guiding principles of censorship, according to which the board was supposed to act, has violated the spirit of such principles. If this be the story that all our box office hits are only those which violate the norms and principles of censorship, then it is an extremely lamentable story for which the hon. Minister will have to answer this House.

Coming to moral standards, I think it is necessary for me to offer a personal explanation and submit that whatever I

have said regarding moral standards are not something which I am stating as a puritan; nor am I an orthodox person; I am liberal in my views and fairly modern in my attitude. . .

MR. SPEAKER: That is quite a normal attitude.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: But that certainly does not debar me from expecting certain moral standards in public life, and if we have been seeing the most obnoxious obscenity, vulgarity, and lewdness in the public, we have got to protest against it somewhere some time. I do not know how effective that protest is going to be. If public exhibition of these obscene vulgar films is rampant and has become the order of the day, I submit that we are not poking our nose inside the private affairs of anyone, because I do not want to poke my nose into the private affairs of anyone.

SHRI M. C. DAGA: Can he cite the instance of any film which he calls obscene? Has he seen that film?

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I have recently seen a film which is saturated and dripping with juvenile sensualism.

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Daga wants the hon. Member's guidance.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: He wants the name of that film so that he can see that.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: Prof Dandavate will provide the name. It comes from a genius of producer, who is a friend of mine. He produced a tremendous film 'Joker', it was poetry on celluloids. It had its romance and it had its other entertainment angles and it was not an insipid film. But that film flopped. From that he climbed down to this, another film full of absolute sensualism and juvenile infatuation of the most shameless and contagious variety. This film is clearly and completely violative of so many principles which have been laid down. I just want to refer to some of them. Dagaji is a

[Shri N. K. P. Salve]

hard taskmaster. He will ask, next, 'Why do you say the film is violative of general principles?'

These general principles have been enunciated in a Notification issued by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, of which the hon. Minister is the head, and he owns the full responsibility for its implementation. It is dated, 6 February, 1960. It lays down principles which, *inter alia*, are (1) It is not desirable that a film ought to be certified as suitable for public exhibition, either unrestricted or restricted, to adults which (a) deals with crime in such a manner as to depict the *modus operandi* of criminals. Then it says 'which throws the glamour of romance and heroism over criminal characters'. Two criminals indulging in the worst type of juvenile sensualism being glorified—if that is not crime, I really do not know what it would be.

But there is more direct violation, under (b). It says 'deals with vice and immorality in such a manner as to undermine the accepted canons of decency'. A rich parents' minor sons falls in love with a minor girl fairly rich herself, and without there being the slightest semblance of anything sublime and noble in that love, both of them elope and try to commit suicide. The unfortunate part of it is that they do not die in that scene.

This film is making crores and crores of rupees. The censor has passed it. Why blame the Board of Censors? Why don't you exercise the power of review, if you have the courage? I am addressing this to the Minister. He is one of the very few Ministers who understands his job thoroughly well. He has the courage to take the requisite decision if this film is violative of these principles.

SHRI D. BASUMATARI (Kokrajhar): What is the name of the film?

SHRI M. SATYANARAYAN RAO (Karimnagar): Why does he not say 'Bobby'?

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Basumatari, you can speak in your own turn whatever your experiences are.

SHRI D. BASUMATARI: Since he has described it and we are tempted by the description, let us know the name of the film.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I am not leading him to any temptation. It does not matter which film it is. It is a film of this nature which is making roaring business; whether it is A, B or C does not matter. If I whisper the name of the film into the minister's I will not be surprised if the Minister will say 'I have seen it half a dozen times'.

Then (c) says 'which deals with the relations between the sexes in such a manner as to depict excessively passionate love scenes, scenes suggestive of immorality'.

If these principles were ever applied with a modicum of sincerity, minimal sincerity, while censoring films, I think nine out of ten films would never have been inserted into the projector for public exhibition. If at all these principles have been shown any respect, if they have ever been adhered to, they have been adhered to in their breach.

It is easy to blame the Board of Film Censors. But what has the Government done about it? Let them today ban a film like this which is having crores worth of business and tomorrow the film industry will come down to its senses. It is your responsibility. Why don't you take the responsibility yourself? Why are you browbeaten by the powerful film industry which always says, 'We are a languishing industry, we are a starving industry, we are a famished industry, we are very small people and even the 'black' which we make is niggardly as compared to the 'black' made in any other industry? This is the way they compare themselves. But what is of importance is what influence it has on the teen-age children. The Minister has a son, a handsome young man. Can he imagine what influence it has on his son when he goes and sees that film which has no nobility, no sublimity, about the sort of love making adventure that is depicted there?

I have nothing against a man and a woman having been in love from the days of Adam. It will go on till eternity. But I refuse to accept sheer carnal lust between a man and woman, however universal, as a matter of public exhibition in the name of art. An American friend of mine was telling me, "I have a serious grievance against your Indian films." I asked him what was it. He said that his grivance is that they end with the marriage, as though in India after marriage there is no romance between a man and his own married wife. This is what we have allowed our films to become just because the censors do not discharge their duties properly and the Minister himself and the Government itself are utterly blind to their own responsibilities and they merrily allow the films to go on exploiting the so me what sex starved Indian society.

Every film has a cabaret scene, a cabaret scene with a young lady shown half-nude, danoing and swinging, her bottoms in a very obscene and vulgar manner which goes on. I have yet to see a cabaret in India having that sort of dancing anywhere. We are not living in Paris; this is not Honolulu; this is not copenhagen; we are not a Scandinavian country. In this way you create a sex-starved society. You do not have cabarets in India of that nature. You allow people to witness that sort of cabaret scenes. Will the Minister give an assurance in the House that all these cabaret seen as here after at least will fall within this censor's banned list and will not be allowed with half-nude lady coming out and dancing and to create a sex-starved society? There are one or two points which I will be making, and I shall have done.

The Bill contemplates a mechanism for making the Board of Censors more effective; they will have one paid Chairman as it is now, and instead of having casual members who never discharge their duties properly and who absented themselves most of the time whenever films were sought to be censored, the Bill contemplates that there will be five wholetime members and six honorary members, out of which three would be drawn from the industry.

It is our most unfortunate experience that radicalism has come to mean State capitalism and socialism has come to mean sheer bureaucratisation. I hope the Minister will give a solemn assurance on the floor of the House that these men—five, six and the Chairman—that are drawn will be people of imagination, people drawn from public life, who have an image, who are respected, and are capable of conscientious duty and that it will not be another Board to accommodate some of the retiring ICS and IAS officers; and that it is not going to be a Board in which some yes-men will be sitting, because the Board has an extremely onerous and delicate responsibility.

Before I conclude, I would like to draw your attention to an extremely important recommendation made by the Khosla Commission. They have sought to keep the Censor Board itself out of the pernicious influence of the film industry. It is good that they have not suggested another Censor Board to censor the presen Board. They have however suggested to remove the Board office from Bombay, Madras and all those places where the corrupt influence is tremendous. I do not find anything in the Bill to remove this from the corrupt influence of Bombay, Calcutta and Madras. I have nothing against Bombay, Madras and Calcutta. But the Commission, after a thorough examination of the entire pros and cons of the matter came to the conclusion that this Board must be located away from these places. One of the places they have suggested in Nagpur. I hope the Minister will give an assurance that the main Board will be located at Nagpur.

These are my submissions.

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA (Arambagh): Sir, I want to confine myself within the periphery and jurisdiction of this Bill only. At the very outset, I would like to remind the hon. Members of this House that in the last budget session the hon. Minister told us that he would bring a comprehensive Bill in respect of the film industry. But as ill-luck would have it, we the Members of Parliament and the

[Shri Maroranjan Hazra]

people of this country do not feel that the Minister has desired to keep his promise. I must say emphatically that this Bill has been brought here not to further the cause of the cine industry or develop the industry as a whole. On the contrary it has been brought here only to tighten the grip of the party in power over the industry by creating a bureaucratic octopus. It is a matter of regret that a pair of chair and a table brings crores of rupees from this industry as amusement, or as entertainment tax at that time. The Government has a moral responsibility to do something for the industry but they are evading their duty. They are creating a miniature from a espionage system with regard to this industry

There are five kinds of units over this industry. Firstly, there is the appellate tribunal with 12 persons who will be nominated by the Government. Secondly, there will be a board consisting of 11 members out of which five will be whole-timers and six will be hon. members. Only three out of eleven will be taken from the industry. It is needless to say that the remaining eight will have a brute majority over them. Thirdly, there will be an examining committee and fourthly, a revising committee and fifthly, assessors for the regional languages. The work of all these five agencies is almost the same and to some extent is auxiliary. It is just like the police organisation. The assessors are like the TOP's, the examining committee is the police station, the revising committee is the S.D.Po's office the fourth is the office of the Superintendent of Police and the Appellate tribunal will be like the office of the IG police. If the Bill had the purpose of safeguarding the sovereignty and integrity of India, it would have been drafted in a different way. Nobody will say anything against the safeguarding of the sovereignty and integrity of India. But what has the Minister done? The Minister is going further and that arises suspicion. It is dangerous for this industry. If we go through this Bill, we would find that a provision had been inserted at a place which I want to refer at present.

A provision of the Act says:

"A film shall not be certified as a film free for exhibition outside India if, in the opinion of the authority competent to grant the certificate, the film or any part of it presents, or is likely to present, an erroneous, distorted or misleading image of the social, cultural or political institutions of India, or any part thereof".

The question of the sovereignty and integrity of the country are already there in the previous clause. Then why again, in the name of the same, new fetters are being introduced in this Bill? Since there is no definition of this, the competent authority is bound to misuse it. Suppose in a film I insert a scene of several men and women collecting their food from the dustbin, will that be considered a fit film? The competent authority, without having any knowledge of the reality, surely would not certify that film for exhibition abroad because, according to them, it will blacken the image of India. The Minister should think over and over again as to what he is going to do in such circumstances.

In the last budget session I mentioned the problems facing the workers behind the screen like set-makers, light men and other technicians. There is not a single word about them in this Bill. I appeal to the Minister that their grievances should be looked into. I would request the hon. Minister to think over these problems and bring a comprehensive Bill in the near future which will cover all the aspects of the film industry, including the problems of the workers and technicians, so that the film industry can flourish.

श्री गुलशनचन्द डागा (पाली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, सेंसरबोर्ड की जब मैं बात सुनता हूँ तो मेरे मन को चोट लगती है। सेंसर नाम की कोई चीज नहीं रहनी चाहिए। सेंसर क्या है? सेंसर का मतलब है किसी की अभिव्यक्ति को रोकना। इसलिए गुजराल साहब, आप मेहरबानी करके सन 1974 में सेंसर बर्ड को हटा दीजिए। साल्वे साहब जब बोल रहे थे तो दुबई हर्ड जवान से बातें कह रहे थे, मैं उनकी बात को

समझ नहीं पाया। यह किसका आम्मीन कहते हैं, किसका मन्वगी कहते हैं? मारस स्टैंड्स क्या हैं? शौतान जब कुरान की आयतों कोट करता है तब कहता है। तो यह सारी बातें बेकार हैं। आपकी खुद की रिपोर्ट है। आपके लेखकों ने जो बातें कहीं हैं उसपर आपका ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। सेंसरबोर्ड ने बड़ा कठाराघात किया है हमारी एण्डस्ट्री पर, हमारी अभिव्यक्ति पर, हमारी भावनाओं पर और हमारी कला पर। और यह जो बूढ़े, सफेद बालों वाले हात हैं वह ज्यादा जाते हैं देखने के लिए। जो शरीर से कमजोर हो गए हैं वही लोग फिल्मों देखने के लिए ज्यादा जाते हैं। एडल्ट्स के लिए जो आपने रखा है उसके लिए मैं नहीं कहता लेकिन वयोवृद्धों के लिए क्या रोक है। इनसे मुझे एक खतरा और भी है। जब कभी मैं फिल्म देखने के लिए जाता हूँ वहाँ अगर कोई वयोवृद्ध पास में बैठ जाता है तो मेरी शामत आ जाती है क्योंकि न तो बोल ही सकता हूँ और न चुप ही रह सकता हूँ। इसलिए या तो इनको पीछे बिठाला जाये या इनकी सीट्स रिजर्व हों। वहाँ पर यही लोग ज्यादा देखने के लिए जाते हैं। और यहाँ पर यह कहेंगे कि हम इसका बुरा समझते हैं। मैं कहता हूँ अपने घर में जो आप काम करते हैं उसका ही असर बच्चों पर पड़ता है, फिल्मों का कोई असर नहीं होता। फिल्मों का जो असर है वह कुछ घंटों के लिए ही होता है। 1973 में जो हिन्दुस्तान अंक निकला था उसके मैं पढ़ रहा हूँ :

"... लेकिन वे यह बात समझने में असमर्थ रहे हैं कि फिल्मों में सस्ते-पन को जन्म देने की सब से बड़ी जिम्मेदारी हमारे सेंसर बोर्ड पर ही है। वर्तमान सेंसर बोर्ड संविधान की परिधि से बाहर जा कर फिल्मों पर ऐसी पाबान्दियाँ लगाता है कि इसके अन्तर्गत सच्चे फिल्मकारों को यथार्थवादी फिल्में बनाने की गुंजाइश बहुत कम रह जाती है।"

"सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने जहाँ फिल्मों पर पूर्व सेंसरशिप को जरूरी माना है वहाँ यह भी

कहा है कि सेंसरशिप संविधान का अतिक्रमण न करे। खासला समिति ने भी अपनी सिफारिशों में यही कहा था। इन सब को यह कहने की जरूरत क्यों पड़ी? क्यों कि हमारा वर्तमान सेंसर बोर्ड अंग्रेजों ने अपने राज की यथास्थिति को कायम रखने के लिए बनाया था।... आशा यह भी कि जबतक नया बोर्ड न बने, सरकार पुराने बोर्ड का पालन बिलाई से करेगी, सेंसर बोर्ड में स्वतन्त्र व्यवहार करने में समर्थ लोगों को उच्च पद देंगी।"

"सेंसर के हाथ में दर्जी का टोप पकड़ा दिया गया है और वे स्क्रीन पर नायिकाओं के कपड़े नापने का काम करने में व्यस्त हैं।"

जैसे आप न्यूड के लिए कहने लगे तो मैं समझ नहीं सका यह किसको कहते हैं। (व्यवधान) सारे अखबारों में, पत्रिकाओं में यह पिक्चर्स आती हैं। जितने भी अखबार निकलते हैं, जितने एडवर्टीजमेंट्स होते हैं यह निकलती हैं। छोटी छोटी फिल्मों की जो रील्स दिखाई जाती हैं जोकि "फार एडल्ट्स" होती हैं लेकिन वह दिखाई जाती हैं तो उसके लिए क्या मुमानियत है? यह जो आप आम्मीन की बात कहते हैं उसपर आपकी खासला कमेटी ने भी निर्णय दिया है। पेज 55 पर खासला कमेटी की जो फाइंडिंग है वह मैं आपके सामने रख रहा हूँ।

MR. SPEAKER : You may continue after lunch.

13.00 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch

till Fourteen of the Clock

*The Lok Sabha re-assembled after Lunch
at Six Minutes Past Fourteen of the
Clock*

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair.]...

CINEMATOGRAPH (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL—contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We will now resume the discussion of the Cinematograph (Second Amendment) Bill.

Shri Daga.

SHRI M. C. DAGA (Pali) : I was quoting from this report of Khosla Committee. On page 147 the Committee says :

"The Board is criticised for not being a board of censors at all because in a large number of cases the final decision is arrived at without any member of the Censorship Board having seen the film. The Board has been categorised as a parking place for Government officials who are due to move from one post to another but for whom suitable jobs cannot be immediately found. The members of the Advisory Panels have been criticised for being mostly ill-educated and for not taking sufficient interest in censorship. They work in an honorary capacity, and for each viewing they are paid a derisory amount of Rs. 10 The Board has also been criticised for inconsistency in their various decisions"

So, these are the observations of the Khosla Committee and what have you got as certain general principles or norms ?

A word about the general principles. The same Khosla Committee says:

"In most countries, there is State censorship . . . Censorship all over the world as tending to become increasingly liberal . . . There is a growing tendency not to have detailed rules of censorship but to lay down briefly-worded general principles..."

... But what about your Rules which you have framed now? I will quote only from certain portions of the Khosla Committee report and say that this Board is useless...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Do you think that the Government has not read that report? Why waste the time of the House quoting extensively from it?

SHRI M. C. DAGA : I am quoting from this report. Has the Government implemented their findings?

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul) : He is only giving the Minister the benefit of doubt.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Daga is a versatile man, he can speak on anything.

SHRI M. C. DAGA : Now, as to the details, it goes on to say.

"Under H(ii), details of surgical operations are to be considered objectionable. We find nothing in any law which prohibits such a scene or sequence. It may be necessary to make a film giving details of surgical operations for the benefit of medical students or in order to disseminate knowledge about the advance of medical science. Many more instances of indefensible clogs on the right of freedom of expression contained in the 'Application of General Principles' can be cited".

So, what I want to submit is and which is also said by the Khosla Committee is:

"It is clear that many of the rules which are at present in force have no legal sanction behind them".

They further say:

"The public taste is best looked after by the public itself..."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : What have you to say? That is the report.

SHRI M. C. DAGA : I am supporting these very principles.

तीन तीन कमेटीयां आपने बना रखी हैं। जब सरकार में पहुँच कर हम जैसे लोग मनों एक तो सेंसरशिप बोर्ड हैं। एक एग्जैमिनिंग कमेटी हैं। फिर एक रिवाइजिंग कमेटी हैं। कितना ही लम्बा प्रोसीजर आपने बना रखा है। कोई टाइम लिमिट कहीं पर नहीं है। एग्जैमिनिंग कमेटी कितना समय लेगी, रिवाइजिंग कमेटी कब तक रिवाइज कर देगी इसकी कोई टाइम लिमिट नहीं है। फिर जो सेंसरशिप बोर्ड है इसके जो मॅम्बर हैं उनकी क्या क्वालिफिकेशन होगी इसका कुछ पता नहीं है। आपने बारह मॅम्बर रखने की बात कही है। यह भी कहा है कि ये लिबरल व्यूक के होंगे। मैं तो कहूँगा कि सेंसरशिप बोर्ड को ही स्क्रैप करें। अगर स्क्रैप नहीं कर सकते हैं तो जो रिक्मंडेशंस हुई हैं उनको तो आप इम्प्लोमेंट करें। वह भी आप नहीं कर रहे हैं। जो लेगिस्ली प्रोसीजर आपने रखा है, उसको भी आप न रखा। एग्जैमिनिंग कमेटी, रिवाइजिंग कमेटी, एपेलेट ट्रिब्यूनल और बोर्ड ये सब आपने रखे हैं। बोर्ड इंटरोल्फ़ ड्रज नॉथिंग बट एन एडवाइजरी कमेटी।

I now come to Section 6 of the present Act . . .

It says: "Notwithstanding anything contained . . ."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I must now ask you to conclude. There is a time-limit. Quoting takes the time of the House. Please conclude.

SHRI M. C. DAGA: It says: "Notwithstanding anything contained . . . the Central Government may at any stage call for the record of any proceedings in relation to . . ." etc. You can call record at any time.

बिना बोर्ड का डिडिक्शन हुए एक्शन छः के तहत आप रिकार्ड को ले सकते हैं। सेंसरशिप बोर्ड को आपने कौन सी सब पावजे दी हैं। जो लेगिस्ली प्रोसीजर आपने रखा है वह आपको नहीं रखना चाहिये

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE (Calcutta North-East): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I fear this is a futile piece of legislation and I am very sorry that the Minister who has earned the reputation of being acknowledgeable person in regard to Cinematography has chosen to bring forward this legislation which might very well have been kept away from Parliament. We have already taken 10 years or so because in 1965 the Khosla Committee was appointed and then a long period of gestation has led to the appearance of the Cinematographic legislation. Sir, I do not understand why the Minister with his flamboyant appeal to the country chooses not to apply his mind to the evolution of some kind of a national policy in regard to the production, the exhibition and the distribution of films in this country in a manner which would really be worthwhile.

I see, for instance, something of the mood of the Government and I have no patience with this kind of conduct when I find that nearly a couple of years ago this House had the delectation of having listened to discussions on a Bill moved from the Government Benches regarding the working conditions of workers in the cinema industry and that was withdrawn on the plea that it had to be formulated a little differently, and since this time, nearly two years ago, we have been treated to the spectacle of one assurance after another by the Minister in regard to the introduction of the Bill about the conditions of work of those who are producing these

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

pictures either in the production side or in the exhibition side or in the distribution side.

Nothing has been done in spite of the fact that in the autumn session last year, the Minister himself had suggested that he was going to move this Bill in that very session itself. But, nothing happened in the winter session; nothing has happened also in this session and in this session you would be ever so busy with your budget. I find that he said in answer to a question on 19th of December, 1973 that the drafting stage is still continuing in regard to this matter. This goes on at a point of time when certain interests—big money interests—Indian as well as foreign, are vitiating the entire atmosphere of cinematographic production, exhibition etc. in this country. We have heard about the tone which prevails in the big-money cinema centres like Bombay and Madras where most of the production is too tinsel and too footling for any self-respecting country to produce films either for herself or for exhibition outside. We have seen also foreign interests coming into the picture. And Government seems absolutely indifferent in a manner which is, to put it very politely, egregious. I say this because only the other day we were told that there is, in this country—this was on 19th of December, 1973, U.S.Q. No. 5464 in the Lok Sabha—accumulated account on 30th of June, 1973 in favour of eight U.S. firms, to the extent of Rs. 4,973 crores in block funds by firms which were importing films into this country. There was an idea at one time that this could be utilised for producing worthwhile joint-venture films. But, nothing has happened from what the Government's answer was on it. The answer was 'No'. These funds are there. I wish to point out how big-money operates. Only last year, there was a transaction which caused an uproar all over the country because a scandal was exposed and Government itself admitted position.

The Metro Cinema owned by an American Company M.G.M., transferred its interests by a corrupt transaction in Swit-

zerland to a so-called Swiss company which obviously, was operating through an Indian national who was their stooge, a man called Shiva Shander Gupta, whose name was also mentioned in this House and who was described by the Minister of State for Finance, Shri Ganesh, as a person who was evading the clutches of the law. He was put up as the show-man. The Swiss Corporation took over the interests of MGM Metro Cinema and its exhibition, distribution and so on and so forth. As a result of this transaction, I am sure that MGM had indirectly transferred its block funds in India in favour of the Guptas and in return, got some accrued amount abroad. This man, who has accounts, operating in Switzerland and elsewhere, was described by Shri Ganesh as a person who was escaping from the clutches of the law; he goes about, strutting all over the place threatening even Members of Parliament who are trying to stand for the rights of the Metro Cinema employees. He threatens them because he has got a whip hand over the administration. There is no doubt about it.

And when we discovered the full exposure of the Metro scandal, the Minister himself, Mr I. K. Gujral repeatedly stated in Lok Sabha and in Rajya Sabha that he was seriously considering the idea of taking over the Metro cinema; it would have been a wonderful proposition if the best cinema houses in Calcutta and Bombay could have been taken over and run by the Government. He said repeatedly in this House and the other House that he was considering the taking over of that cinema, but of course, nothing has been done, and to make matters worse, with the employees of Metro Cinema trying to get out of the clutches of a criminal, who is evading foreign exchange regulation laws and other things, like Shiv Shankar Gupta, when the Metro Cinema employees in Calcutta got from Calcutta High Court an injunction preventing that man Gupta from operating as the owner of Metro Cinema, the Government of India was brought in as a party to the application, but the Government of India did not have the gump-

tion to appear in the Calcutta High Court merely to say what the Minister did say openly in this House and the other House that they were considering taking over the Metro Cinema.

I hear now from the Minister himself that they have dropped the idea of taking over the Metro Cinema because they cannot touch the people in Switzerland; there is a change of ownership of cinemas operating in India from American hands to so-called Swiss hands; the hands have got an Indian agent to operate for them, yet they can do nothing about it, because some hocus-pocus has taken place in Switzerland and the arm of the Government of India cannot extend there. The Government of India has not got the gumption to do a thing. That is why they cannot bring in legislation for the working people in the cinema industry, they cannot do anything to control big money interests, and when big money interests are allied with foreign money, then, of course, the Government shivers in its shoes and cannot do a thing to touch those interests concerned. This Government is thinking of bringing in legislation to improve the cinema industry by acting in accordance with the modified recommendations of the Khosla Committee. It is about time that this nonsense stops. It is about time that this fraud on the country stops. It is about time that Government ceases to talk about this kind of thing. The time of Parliament need not be wasted over the discussion as to how far the Khosla Committee's recommendations about kissing being permissible or cuddling being permissible can be sanctioned by the vote of Parliament; that can be left to other agencies.

If you wish to have my opinion, I would cut out this censorship business altogether. The way to operate it is: let Government keep to itself the power of making sure that nothing that is vulgar in the sense of something which goes against the grain of Indian national decency would be allowed in the cinema. But all this talk about puritanical pruning here and there is sheer abracadabra and the sooner we can give up this kind of exercise

which costs money to the country the better. The Khosla Committee's report was submitted some time after 1965, and we find Mr. Khosla is busy with a hundred inquiry committees and commissions and in his leisure he produce something and Parliament has to consider it. Stop this nonsense. Go ahead with a sensible policy, and then alone you would be able to do something. I say so because Government comes forward and puts in something about the image of India having to be projected properly. Do it in a fundamental manner. Do not continue to work in the mechanical, official, bureaucratic fashion which you have conducted so far. Do not allow your corrupt elements in the Ministry as well as in the administration to be won over by big money interests Indian and foreign, as they have been repeatedly. If there were time for a full discussion, there are people here who know something about the cinema industry and they would be able to tell you all about it. Do not allow this sort of bureaucratic practice to continue, and I say this because they talk about the improvement of the standard of Indian films.

The Indian film which brought laurels to this country, was '*Pather Panchali*', directed by Satyajit Ray, which brought India to the forefront of the world cinema. It was made by Satyajit Ray and it showed the life in our villages in the 1920's, not now; but even so, it was a beautiful story because it was truthful; a true story aesthetically told can be as beautiful as you wish it. Satyajit Ray told that story in a beautiful fashion. He got the story written by Bibhuti Bhushan Bandyopadhyaya, and he made a wonderful job of it as a film.

When it went to the bureaucrats, they said: it shows the poverty of India—and India had two Plans at that point of time—and after the two Plans have been in the picture, to show the poverty of India would be a terrible thing and, therefore, add on to this picture something about the factories set up under the First Five Year Plan and the Second Five Year Plan and make a different job of it! This is the criterion

[Shri H. N. Mukerjee]

applied by bureaucrats who operate under the aegis of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting. They do not know a thing about the aesthetic aspects of the cinema. They do not have a notion about how the image of this country can be projected. If a scene is there showing the poverty of our people, they say 'Look here, this is something which goes against the Indira Government the Congress Government and all the rest of it'. If the truth is told at the same time, the nobility of the people of this country in the midst of the wallowing poverty, that would shine out like stars in the heavens. If you do a truthful job of it as a film producer, you can bring out something of the worst aspects of human life and you can show how they coexist with some of the noblest and the most magnificent elements of the human character.

That was why when a Frenchman produced a picture 'Oh Calcutta', they went on making a noise about it. They do that sort of thing. But our film masters have the capability in them provided they have a free hand in this matter. Today no wonder they cannot do it.

I know Mr. Gujral has done a few good jobs. The Poona Institute is working very well. To some extent, the Film Finance Corporation at least is ready and willing to assist those who come out with original ideas about production and that sort of thing. But that is not enough. On the contrary, you have to do more if you really mean business.

You know I have said in this House that I have a soft corner for the Minister. But my patience is exhausted when I find the way in which the working people in the cinema industry are treated. When I see them working in Tollygunge, Calcutta—I do not know about the Bombay situation; my friends know it better—I see that nothing is done to help them. When I see that big-moneyed interests who control the production, distribution and exhibition dominate the scene, I am fed up with this petty fogging little legislation about kissing or cuddling or God knows what other sort

of thing. I am no puritan, I was reminded of what a 14th century friar had said. He said it in the 14th century and he was a friar and you can imagine the kind of morals he pressed. He said: 'A young man and a young maiden in a green arbour on a May morning—if God does not forgive them, I will'.

It does not matter two hoots to us. This is a country of sunlight, of sun and rain, a country open to the elements. This is a country of Konarak. This is a country of Khajuraho. Nobody in the country is worried about it.

So I would cut out this legislation. I would throw it in the wastepaper basket. Khosla report or no Khosla report, this is not necessary. The Government, coming into the picture in an enlightened rational manner, can control this industry in the national interest and look after the working people who are the salt of the Indian earth, on whose toil depends whatever little production you are going to sell abroad. You get some pneumatically attractive females to be picturised and you earn some foreign exchange. I would not mind it in the least. Go ahead in that manner, but deep down, have a genuine policy. Open more cinemas—You have rung the bell. We do not get much opportunity to discuss this. I hope I am not being irrelevant.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER. Left to myself, I would like to hear more of it.

SHRI H. N. MUKERJEE. I discovered that on the 4th April, 1973 we were told in reply to starred question No. 605, that the Conference of State Ministers of Information held in December 1972 at New Delhi, attended by all States except Tripura, recommended that the States should divert a fixed proportion of collections from entertainment tax for promoting the construction of more cinemas, and this was adopted unanimously.

Nothing has been done in regard to this. We can have so many more cinemas. Nothing has been done here also. For instance, I find that in Bangalore city,

with a population of a little over 12 lakhs, there are 61 cinemas. On this account, Bombay has 87 while Bombay should have 121 more. Calcutta has 150; it could have 210 more. All over the country we could have a larger number of cinemas, but they must be run properly.

Go ahead; let the State come into the picture and begin by taking over such a criminal concern as the MGM—Metro—how in the hands of an Indian stooge. Get a national sector in so far as the cinema industry is concerned. Extend your operations; extend colour films and other facilities to be used by different areas of the country, and then you will find a genuine advance in cinema production. Otherwise this legislation as proposed is worth nothing at all. It should be thrown into the waste-paper basket.

श्री राम सहाय पांडे (राजनरत्नांक) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्रोफेसर हीरेन्द्र मुखर्जी को इस बात से सहमत हूँ कि इस विधेयक को अगर और काम्प्रीहेंसिव बनाया जाता, इस के निर्माण के पीछे जिन-जिन लोगों का हाथ है, जिन का श्रम है, कथाकार हैं, कलाकार हैं, संगीतकार हैं, मजदूर हैं, उन सब का ध्यान इस में रखा जाता और एक ऐसा विधेयक आता जिस में कि हमारी कला की ओर कलात्मक सृजन करने की जितनी प्रवृत्तियाँ हैं उन सब के वर्णन होते तो अधिक अच्छा था। आप कुछ आनरैरी, कुछ पैड सेंसर बोर्ड के मेम्बरस बना कर उन से क्या तबक्को रख सकते हैं ? क्या चाहते हैं आप उन से ? खासला कमेटी का रेफरेंस देते हुए प्रोफेसर हीरेन्द्र मुखर्जी ने कहा और मैं भी उस को दोहराता हूँ कि उस काम्प्रीहेंसिव रिपोर्ट को सामने रखते हुए उस के बाद जितनी पिक्चर्स प्राइवेट हर्ड उन पिक्चर्स का खासला कमेटी के क्रिमिनल, और सेक्स तथा मोरैलिटी के आस्पेक्ट में, कौन से तराजू में तौलकर के ए कटेगरी या यूनिवर्सल कटेगरी का सीर्टीफिकेट दिया ?

मैं समझता हूँ कि इस वक्त एक सब से बड़ा मीडिया मनोरंजन का फिल्म है जे कि कामन मैन तक पहुँचता है। आप ने यह कहा कि

सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट फाइन एथास्टी हांगी अपीलट एथास्टी के बाद भी यह देखने के लिए कि उरा में इंडीप्रिटी एंड सावरेनटी आफ दि कंट्री पर कोई विपरीत प्रभाव तो नहीं पड़ता है या उस में अश्लीलता या नंगापन जहाँ कहीं भी आएगा उसको हम देखेंगे . . .

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री आइ. कै. गुजराल) : देखेंगे नहीं, काटेंगे।

श्री राम सहाय पांडे : मैं समझता हूँ कि नंगापन को देखकर के तो आप को जरूर काट देना चाहिए। लेकिन आप को यह देखना है कि यह एक सब से बड़ा मीडिया है और संसार में जितने भी चलचित्र बनाने वाले उद्योग हैं हमारे देश का नम्बर शायद उस में तीसरा या चौथा है . . .

श्री आइ. कै. गुजराल : टाप पर हैं, पहला है।

श्री राम सहाय पांडे : अभी हाल में हो गया होगा। तो उस में हमारा पहला नम्बर है। अब मुझे ऐसा अनुभव हो रहा था कि एक हिस्सा सेंसर का तो आप ने रख लिया कि सेंसर बोर्ड कैसे बनेगा, उस के अधिकार कैसे होंगे, उस के ऊपर एक अपीलट एथास्टी हांगी। उस के बाद केंद्रीय सरकार हांगी। लेकिन यह उसी तरह की बात हांगी जैसे हम तुम एक कमरे में बन्द हो जायें और चाबी खो जाय वाली बात है। इस में कोई चाबी गुम हो गयी है। परग ही नहीं कि चाबी है कहाँ ? मूल को छोड़ दिया आपने और ऊपर के हिस्से को पकड़ लिया। मूल में कहाँ है ? कला कहाँ है ? कौन है कलाकार ? सत्यजीत राय के संबंध में हीरेन्द्र मुखर्जी ने कहा। बंगाल के निर्मित चित्रों को देख कर क्या हमारे अंदर गहरा नहीं होता ? क्या कला के सृजन और निर्माण के प्रति सौन्दर्य के प्रति, गत्य के प्रति हमारे अंदर की सुन्दर भावनाओं का उद्गम नहीं होता ? लेकिन कलकत्ता को छोड़ कर बम्बई और मद्रास आइए जहाँ केवल क्रिमिनल एक्ट और सेक्स के चित्र हमारी तमाम इन्द्रियों को उत्तेजित करने वाले प्रावधान, नंगे हाँस, ठूँसाठूँसी बर्बन्डे, जानें क्या क्या उसमें वह मंजाते हैं और उस के पीछे सब से बड़ा क्रिमिनल जो है वह डिस्टीन्यूट

[श्री राम सहाय पांडे]

हैं जो कहता है कि हम को एम सीन दो तब दिल्ली को हिट करेंगे। पंजाब वाला कहता है कि हम को ऐसे सीन दो तब पंजाब में बाक्स हिट करेंगे। यू. पी. का डिस्ट्रीब्यूटर कहता है कि पैसे चाहें अधिक लें लां लेकिन हम को ऐसे सीन दो वुअन्नी चवन्नी और पैसे फेंकने वाले, हाथ हाथ करने वाले जिस में काजेंज के लड़के जिनकी जेब में गां बाप का पैसा होता है, वह खर्च कर के वे सिनेमा के अंदर आएँ चाहें फीस देने के लिए पैसे उनके पास न रहें। हाथ हाथ के चक्कर में, धासना के उल्टीपन के चक्कर में वह जा कर ऐसी पिक्चर्स को देखते हैं। डीसेंसी या इनीडिसेंसी ये रिलीज्ड टर्म्स हैं। यह बड़ा मुश्किल है कहना कि डिस्टेंस क्या है और इनीडिसेंसी क्या है। लेकिन हमारी संस्कृति का पुरातन तत्व या हम जिस ढांचे में पले हैं, जिस में बढ़ रहे हैं, मा बाप की संस्कृति की पृष्ठभूमि जो भी है, उस में हमें यह तो देखना है कि कहीं उस में गूम्प तो नहीं आ रहा है कहीं हाहाकार तो नहीं गरा गया है, कहीं हमारा समाज तो नहीं झूट रहा है, उस से हमारी वितृष्णा तो नहीं हो रही है। मैंने यूरोप में कई जगह ऐसी पिक्चर्स देटी लेकिन मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि उन पिक्चर्स से वह की जनता थक चुकी है, उब चुकी है। आप किसी नायिका को निर्वसन करने से मना कर दें तो उस के सौन्दर्य को उस के सत्य रूप को उभाड़ेंगे, कला से गीठन उगरे और भैं फटता है यह जिज्ञासा रहने दीजिये देखने वाले के अंदर कि ऐसा अगर होता तो क्या होता? आगे प्रश्न चिह्न उस पर छोड़ दीजिए। अगर आप ने कला को गंगा कर दिया नायक नायिका को गंगा कर दिया तो क्या बच गया? फिर कुछ बचा ही नहीं। फिर कहाँ है कला, कला का सृजन कहाँ है? कहाँ है शिव, कहाँ है सत्य, कहाँ है सनातन, कहाँ है परम्पराएं? इस शरीर को गंगा करने के लिए एगे पिर्मिटिव स्टैंज पर जाना पड़ेगा और अगर उस को हम सजाएँ तो कला और सुन्दर बन कर सामने आती है। हमारे यहाँ उस को सजाया गया है और सजा कर के प्रस्तुत किया गया है। कला को परिधानों से, वस्त्रों से संगीत से नृत्य से स्थापत्य से मूर्त से सजाया गया है। हम ने

ऐसे मन्दिर भी बनाए हैं। लेकिन उस से हमारी संस्कृति भंगकती है। उस में हमारी संस्कृति पीरायी हुई है। हम उस को ओफल नहीं कर सकते। लेकिन डिस्ट्रीब्यूटर के कहने पर, डाइरेक्टर के कहने पर हम अपनी नायिका को और एक्सट्राज को जो हमारी ही बहने हैं पकड़ कर और हिला हिला कर नचाएँ उग रें इस करवाएँ कैद करवाएँ, यह क्या है? अभी हमारे बाढ़ डा कर्णी सिद्ध बोलेंगे, वह कह रहे थे कि हम पिक्चर देखने जाते हैं तो पूछ लेते हैं पहले कि कौसी पिक्चर है, स्टोरी कौसी है, कहीं बच्चों के साथ बैठ कर देखने में लज्जा न आए। हम जानते हैं कि ऐसी पिक्चर देखने बाप और बेटे के लिए एम्बेरीसंग होता है। अब जैसे बंगाल में बनी हुई पिक्चर्स हैं उन में भी रोमांस होता है, उन में भी कला है। नामगा को अगर आप कलात्मक रूप दें दें नायिका को यदि परिधानों से भ्रूसीउज्जग करके सौंदर्यगयी बना दें और उस में हमारा उन्दीयन होना तो तो हमें कोई एतराज नहीं है। मैं उसको डिसेंट कहता हूँ लेकिन उसके वस्त्र उतारना - आपको पता है ट्रॉपिडी के वस्त्र को दुश्गारासन ने उतारना चाहा और उसको दुर्योधन की गोद में बैठाने की प्रवृत्ति उसकी थी उसको आज तक समाज ने माफ नहीं किया। इतना जघन्य कार्य, सार्वजनिक मनोवृत्ति के उस जघन्य पाप को आज भी जनता ने माफ नहीं किया। हम जानते हैं कि बंड रूम में क्या होता है और यह भी जानते हैं कि स्त्री पुरुष के सम्बन्ध क्या होते हैं, लेकिन सार्वजनिक रूप से जिस स्त्री को हम बहन कहते हैं, भैं कहते हैं, कलाकार कहते हैं उसको इस रूप में प्रदर्शित नहीं करना चाहिए। हमारे ऐसे कलाकार हैं।

जैसे लता मंगेशकर हैं, उनकी सुरीली आवाज के कारण पिछले 30 सालों से वे "क्वीन आफ मेलोडी" बन चुकी हैं, उनकी मधुर आवाज को सुनकर कौन उन पर गर्व नहीं करेगा। श्री सत्यजित रे के पारिवारिक चित्रों को देख कर क्या भारत की कलाकृति गौरवान्वित नहीं होती है, लेकिन बड़ा गरक हो इन बम्बई और मद्रास वालों का जो हिंसा और माफक के नाम पर एक पर्वटेंड एक्साइटमेंट करते हैं, क्योंकि उस फिल्म को बाक्स-ऑफिस हिट

बनाना चाहते हैं, उससे अनाप-शनाप पैसा पैसा करना चाहते हैं। आप इन बनाने वालों, थैल-रेक्टरों और डिस्ट्रीब्यूटरों को पकड़िये जो सात हजार सिनेमाघरों से बंझिन्हा पैसा कमाते हैं। यह तो ऐसा धन्धा है जिस में कौश पैसा आता है, उधार का कोई काम नहीं है और इसमें काम करने वाले कलाकार खुद ब्लॉक में पैसा लेते हैं और उसके बाद ऐसी जिन्दगी बसर करते हैं जो हमारी सामान्य जिन्दगी से कहीं दूर है, इस तरह की रंगीनियों में वे भ्रमते रहते हैं।

हमारे समाज का एक सार्वभौम रूप है, उसकी इन्टीप्रिटी है, यदि हम उसके स्वरूप का निर्माण करना चाहते हैं तो हमें एक काम्प्रीहेंसिव बिल लाना पड़ेगा, इस अधारिटी के बनाने से काम नहीं चलेंगा। इस लिये मैं आप से अनुरोध करता हूँ कि आप एक काम्प्रीहेंसिव बिल लाइये।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: On a subject like this, I can appreciate that one can easily fall a prey to going into the intricacies of nesthetics, philosophy, morality and things of that sort. But the House has allotted only two hours and I do not know what to do; the list of speakers keeps on swelling. Each member seems to be inspired by another, and the field is limitless.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): If this House devotes time only to economics and not to culture and art, it is a sad aspersion on the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Left to myself. I would prefer to hear more of speeches like that of Professor Hiren Mukerjee. Even if we take one full day, I am sure we can never come to any consensus or agreement on what is morally right and what is morally wrong. I will try to accommodate as many members as possible. But no member should take more than ten minutes.

श्री हुकम चन्द् कछवाय (मुरेना) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, माननीय मंत्री जी जो बिल लेकर आये हैं मैं इसका विरोध करता हूँ, क्योंकि इस

बिल को देखने से ऐसा लगता है कि यह बिल उनकी पार्टी और सरकार के प्रचार के उद्देश्य से लाया गया है। जहां तक सेन्सर बोर्ड की बात है, यह एक सफेद हाथी के समान है। बम्बई में फिल्म उद्योगपतियों ने इसे ऐसा जकड़ रखा है, सुरा और सुन्दरियों के बीच में, कि यह हिल नहीं सकता, इतना अधिक भूष्ट हो गया है कि हर एक व्यक्ति यह कहने को तैयार है कि जो अच्छे चित्र हैं, जिनसे लोग शिक्षा ले सकते हैं, जो चरित्र निर्माण कर सकते हैं, उन्हें यह बोर्ड अनुमति नहीं देता, लेकिन जो चरित्र को गिराते हैं, जो जीवन स्तर को गिराते हैं, उनका प्रोत्साहन देता है। यह धारणा आज आम लोगों में फैल गई है।

पिछले 15 सालों से जो फिल्में बन रही हैं, बड़ी बड़वा फिल्में बनी हैं। मंत्री जी इस बात को स्वीकार करेंगे कि जिस प्रकार के पोस्टर आज बाजारों में लगाये जाते हैं, उनमें कितने भद्दे और नंगे चित्र होते हैं और छोटे छोटे बच्चे उनसे प्रेरणा लेते हैं—बिगड़ने की जहां तक फिल्मों में दिखाया जाने वाला नंगापन है, मैं आपको एक उदाहरण देता हूँ, वह फिल्म आज भी बाजार में चल रही है—उसका नाम है—प्राण जाय पर बचन न जाये, उसमें कितना खुला नंगापन है, जिसका कोई हिसाब नहीं, इसका लोगों पर क्या असर पड़ेगा। आज हमारा दायित्व यह है कि लोगों का चरित्र निर्माण हो, लोगों का राष्ट्रीय चरित्र बने, उनमें अन्दर देशभक्ति की भावना पैदा हो, उनके अन्दर सामाजिक ज्ञान पैदा हो, वे देश के हित के बारे में सोच सकें। लेकिन आज विद्यार्थी का जीवन क्या है—जो पांशाक एक्टर पहनता है, वही विद्यार्थी पहनता है। ऐसा लगता है कि देश के नाइयों ने हड़ताल कर दी है, लड़के लड़कियों के बराबर बाल रखने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, दोनों को पहचानना मुश्किल हो गया है।

प्रो. मधु दण्डवत : राम-कृष्ण के दिनों में भी बाल बड़े रखे जाते थे।

श्री हुकम चन्द् कछवाय : वह उस समय का फैशन था। मैं बतला रहा था—मध्य प्रवेश में एक घटना घटी—एक लड़का प्लेट फार्म पर जा

[श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय]

रहा था, उसको देखकर दूसरे लड़के ने सोचा कि कोई लड़की जा रही है, उसने आगे बढ़कर उसका चुम्बन ले लिया, लेकिन बाद में पता लगा कि यह लड़का था, लड़की नहीं थी। लड़के काँशिश कर रहे हैं कि लड़कियाँ जैसे हों जाय, उनके जैसे बाल और उनके जैसे कपड़े पहनना चाहते हैं। मैं समझता हूँ आपका भी इस किस्म की गलतफहमी होती होगी, बाजारों में आप ने कार में से देखा होगा कि लड़के और लड़की को पहचानना मूश्किल हो गया है, हमारे इरा सदन में भी कई ऐसे सदस्य हैं।

इस गलती का मूल कारण हमारा सेंसर बोर्ड है, इसका स्तर दिन-प्रति-दिन गिरता जा रहा है, गानों का स्तर गिरता जा रहा है। मैं आपसे प्रार्थना करूँगा कि आप इस क्षेत्र में कुछ सुधार करें। यह हमारे पास एक ऐसा साधन है जिसके द्वारा हम लोगों का चरित्र निर्माण कर सकते हैं, देश-भक्ति की भावना उनके अन्दर भर सकते हैं—लेकिन आपका बोर्ड इस तरफ ध्यान नहीं दे रहा है। लोगों के अन्दर विलासिता बढ़ रही है। अश्लीलता बढ़ती जा रही है।

भारत की फिल्मों विदेशों में बड़ी प्रसिद्ध हैं, बड़ी लोकप्रिय हैं, लेकिन वहाँ की जनता को भारत की फिल्मों देखने का कम मिलती है। पता नहीं हमारे यहाँ से ही विलम्ब से भेजी जाती है या वे लोग उनको विलम्ब से मंगाते हैं। वहाँ पर जो भारतीय और दूसरे लोग रहते हैं वे भारत की फिल्मों को बहुत अच्छा मानते हैं, उन से प्रेरणा लेते हैं, उनको पता चलता है कि हम क्या कर रहे हैं। दूसरी ओर यूरोप में जो फिल्में बनती हैं उनका प्रचलन यहाँ हम काफी तेजी से कर रहे हैं, वहाँ के रीति-रिवाजों को यहाँ पर फैला रहे हैं, जब कि यूरोप की ये फिल्में हमारे देश के लिये ठीक नहीं हैं। वे फिल्में जब यहाँ पर चलती हैं तो इतनी भीड़ होती है कि 5 रुपये का टिकट ब्लैक में 15 रुपये का बिकता है और लोग उनमें दिखलाई गई अश्लीलता

को देखने जाते हैं, जिनसे उनके मन के अन्दर उत्तेजना पैदा होती है, काम-वासना ज्यादा पैदा होती है। ऐसी विदेशी फिल्में बन्द होनी चाहियें तथा भारतीय फिल्मों को अधिक मात्रा में विदेशों को भेजने का प्रबन्ध कीजिये।

हमारा जो सत्तारूढ़ दल है आम तौर पर उस की यह पालिसी है कि जिन फिल्मों में उस की आलोचना होती है, उन को सेंसर बोर्ड इजाजत नहीं देता। सेंसर बोर्ड को इस प्रकार के आवेेश दिये गये हैं, वे ऐसी फिल्में पर पाबन्दी लगाते हैं। देश की जनता की जो परेशानियाँ हैं, उन की जो कठिनाइयाँ हैं वे भी देश के सामने आनी चाहियें।

आप ने एक अच्छा काम किया है। कला के विकास के लिये, कलाकारों के प्रशिक्षण के लिये आप ने एक ही स्थान पर एना में ट्रेनिंग स्कूल खोला है—मैं चाहता हूँ कि यह अनन्त स्थानों पर होना चाहिये। यह जरूरी नहीं है कि जहाँ फिल्में बनती हैं, वहीं पर ट्रेनिंग स्कूल खोला जाये। जब भरती के लिये इन्टरन्यू होता है तो बड़ी लम्बी क्यू होती है और अधिकांश लोग रह जाते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हर प्रदेश में स्कूल खोलिये जहाँ लोगों को ट्रेनिंग मिल सके और अच्छे कलाकारों का निर्माण हो, अच्छे कलाकार ही आगे देश का मार्गदर्शन कर सकेंगे। मैं आशा करता हूँ कि आप अभिक मात्रा में स्कूल खोलेंगे।

देश में आज जितने सिनेमाघर चलते हैं उन की हालत बड़ी खराब है। आप किसी भी सिनेमाघर में जाएँ, बड़ी गन्दी और बहूदा हालत में हैं, फिल्म चलती है, देखने वाले का वहाँ बैठे-बैठे दम घुटता है। उसको अच्छा नहीं लगता। इसलिए आप ऐसी योजना बनायें कि जितने सिनेमाघर हैं वह अच्छे और सजे हुए हों, साफ-सुथरे हों, अच्छे ढंग से बने हों जिससे वहाँ पर बैठने के बाद—दर्शक के मन में आकर्षण पैदा हो और वह महसूस करे कि मैं एक अच्छे स्थान पर बैठा हूँ हाल का जो असर है वह भी उसके मस्तिष्क पर पड़ता है। इसलिए आप अच्छे हाल बनवाने का प्रयास करें।

अन्त में मैं मंत्री जी से प्रश्न करना चाहूंगा कि मैंने जो दो तीन बातें उठाई हैं उनको ठीक प्रकार से लागू करने का प्रयास करेंगे। साथ ही यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस बिल में बहुत जल्दबाजी की गई है और जितने भी वक्ता यहां पर बोले हैं उन्होंने इससे अपनी सहमति व्यक्त नहीं की है इसलिए मंत्री जी इसको वापिस ले लें तथा विस्तार करके दूसरा बिल लायें जिससे इस उद्योग में जो कलाकार और कर्मचारी हैं उनका भी कुछ हित हो सके।

एक बात और है कि जो बड़े-बड़े ऐक्टर हैं उनका जो जीवन है वह राजा-महाराजाओं से कम नहीं होता, वे अपने ठाट-बाट पर बड़ा पैसा व्यय करते हैं। उनके पास जो काला धन है उस पर भी अंकुश लगाने का प्रयास होना चाहिए। इतना ही मैं कहना चाहता हूँ।

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barmer) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the films in our country are not organized as an industry. It is a misnomer to call it a 'film industry'. It is at best a trade or a business or commerce; we can call it a show-business. There is nothing wrong with our film people. Our artistes, actors and actresses, our technicians, our directors, our musicians and singers, are comparable with the best in the world. And still the films that are exhibited in our country leave a lot to be desired. I am not going to distinguish a religious film from a sex film or a crime and violence film from a social film. That is not the correct distribution. Even a religious film can be a very bad film. That is not the correct distinction. The distinction is whether a film projects things in a beautiful way, in a sensible way. If it appeals our sensitivities, if it appeals to our finer instincts, if it cultivates our tastes of aesthetics, it is a good film. Nude in itself is nothing. There are nudes which are beautiful, there are nudes which are crude, vulgar and obscene. What I mean to say is that most of the films that are exhibited in our country today are bad, ugly, crude, obscene, and they cater to the lower and

vulgar tastes of the masses. This is the basic question. How is it that these directors who are technically very competent, who know how to handle the medium, these very musicians who can compose the most melodious tunes in the world, these very singers whose melody is comparable with the best in the world, these very actors and actresses whose histrionic talents are comparable with the best in the world, these people are giving us bad films? It is said that they produce what is required or what is desired by the audiences. This is an argument which does not stand reason. Did the people ask some industrialist to manufacture the Lux Soap? Nobody does any demand survey. It is just the reverse. When a particular type of films are shown to the people repeatedly one after another, the tastes of the people are conditioned. I entirely agree that it is very difficult for a good film to succeed at the Box Office today.

That is why dozens of films, indeed very good films, are lying in cans and no distributor is buying them, the reason being that the tastes of our people have been conditioned and circumscribed by a particular type of vulgar films. No amount of half-hearted measures, no amount of patch work here and there can remedy the situation.

Sir, I have never demanded nationalisation of the film industry and I am opposed to it because that does not help. Of course, theoretically, it is possible as they say that once films are nationalised, the only films we will have shall be the films about family, films about the Five Year Plans, films about the public undertakings and films about the Government policies and all that. I do not see anything wrong in that. If art is hired for advertisements, nobody raises an eye-brow. If house-wives are used to publicise or advertise aspirin or saridon or cigarettes, nobody raises an eye-brow. But if these very media are used for family planning, for propagating certain policies, objection is raised that it is propaganda. After all,

[Shri Amrit Nahata] all art is propaganda. Still, I do not plead for the nationalisation of the film industry. I was trying to find out and place before you the reason why the best of the people give us the worst of the films. The reason is the domination, the octopus grip of private finance over this industry. That is the basic reason...

AN HON. MEMBER . Very correct.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : The private financier in the form of distributor, in the form of exhibitor are the immediate audience of a film producer. And what is the film producer? He is a proposal-maker and a proposal-seller. The Indian film producer does not do anything. He does not direct the film, he does not write the film, he does not do anything in the making of the film. He does not even process the film. He makes certain proposals. To-day in India's film industry, everything has a price. If I take a particular actor and a particular actress with a particular music director, it has a price. So, I make a proposal and sell it. My immediate audience is not the people who will be coming to the theatres to see the film. My immediate audience is the film distributors. And most of these film distributors are ignoramuses, they are idiots and stupid people who have heard the names of Prem Chand or Tagore. They are black-marketeers, racketeers and smugglers and what not. They are gamblers essentially and they are suffering a lot. Most of the distributors go bankrupt within a couple of years. Still in a spirit of gamble they enter the industry and they buy the films and they dictate the terms. They say, 'No. There must be a cabaret dance here.' And the poor producer asks the Director, 'You must introduce it' and he has to introduce a cabaret dance. If he does not, his film will not be sold. If it is not sold, he cannot get finance. No producer invests any amount, substantial money in the films. . .

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : This is a film man speaking.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : The film producer invests a small initial sum. Then he takes half a reel or a reel of the film, gets it processed and shows it to the distributors and then sells it. Those distributors, one or two of them, who want to buy the film for a particular territory, will pay money in instalments. This is how the film will proceed further and will be completed.

So, the financier is the distributor and the distributor also does not pay from his own pocket. He collects advances from the exhibitors and the cycle goes on. Nobody invests money from his own pocket. Ultimately, it is the cine-goers who finance the film at the window. This is the basic reason.

That is why I say, liberate the film producer or the Director or the technician or the writer from this octopus grip of private finance and these very directors, these very technicians and these very musicians will give us good films and beautiful films.

How to do that? There are various ways. I can place a very concrete suggestion. Let the Government of India constitute a Film Corporation of India. This Film Corporation of India shall be manned by anybody who has directed at least one film during the last three years and all directors will be members as also the technicians except the producer because, as I have already said, the producer is nobody in the actual making of the films.

15.00 hrs.

The Directors, the Actors, the Music Directors, the Editors, the Cameramen, all these can be Members of the Film Corporation of India. Let that Film Corporation body be democratically constituted, let it be democratically run. Some membership should be open to anybody who is qualified and trained under certain educational film institutions being run by this very Film Corporation of India. This shall have monopoly of making films. Its entire financial responsibility should be taken up by the Central Government. That is my submission. If such a financial responsibility is undertaken by the Central

Government and if in this way they are liberated from the grips of private financiers, I am sure you will have good films in this country. That is all that I wanted to say.

DR. KARNI SINGH (Bikaner) : I welcome the opportunity in this House for Members to discuss the Cinematographic Act and other matters connected with it. There is no doubt that in the last few years, the Indian Motion Picture Films have improved in quality. I remember, in my college days, most college students considered it a waste of time to go and see Indian films. But in a very short span of time today you have seen that we make some of the finest films in the world and we can rightly be proud of them. It has just been mentioned about Shri Satyajit Ray. I think his name is so famous that even foreigners think that they have got a lot to learn from his art and technique.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : Please excuse me for this intervention, but I have a serious intervention; the first film that Shri Satyajit Ray made could not be finished because he could not find a single buyer and it was the West Bengal Government which came to his rescue and the first film, that is, *Pather Panchali*, was finished.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : It is not a petty intervention, it is a pretty intervention !

DR. KARNI SINGH : I agree that very often very high standard of art can very easily go over the heads of masses and very often prove a flop although in later years the same film may be a great success.

SHRI R. S. PANDEY (Rajnandgaon) : I think that that picture was a flop because another bad and vulgar picture was available in the market.

DR. KARNI SINGH : Sir, I hold the view that movies and television entertainments have an educational value. Therefore it is essential that Government in some shape or form of censorship controls the type of films and television programmes

that are put up before the masses so that they do not hurt the sentiments of the laymen who go and see them.

I had two occasions which make me think seriously about these cinematographic and censorship aspects. One was this. A friend of mine was playing golf with me. I met him in the golf club and he told me that his son had come and asked him one thing. He had a girl friend and he asked whether he could bring his girl friend along and could he use his house, father's house. As adult human beings, we are concerned with this because this is a phenomenon that they are learning from foreign films. You cannot say that any amount of liberty can be given to film producers to protect any aspect of life because it may not correspond with the Indian way of life, Indian way of thinking. Another occasion was this. There was a theft at the National Museum and when the thief was caught he said that he was influenced by some of these western films that glorified thievery and crime and all that kind of thing, how to steal a million and how the most elaborate modern scientific means were used to break open bank safes. Now you have only to go and see certain movies today, not so much Indian films, but Western films. I do not know the reason why such Western films are permitted to come to India. Every film that you see is connected with violence and crime. Actually I once wanted to write to the Minister after seeing two or three foreign films. Here what was the idea of prohibiting first-class epics made in other countries from coming into this country and allowing the third class murder mysteries depicting violence, thefts, arson, murders and killings ? If the youth of this country are going to be exposed to this type of films, what type of a country are we going to build for the next generation ?

Therefore, I feel that censorship in some shape or form is necessary. I am not opposed to art. I consider myself an amateur photographer. It has been my hobby. I make amateur movie films. I do feel that art should not be smothered or

[Dr. Karni Singh]

controlled. But, where art gets off and phornography enters, that is a very thin dividing line. I think even the Western world which has experimented it, makes the obscene phornographic films available to every man who wants to see it, are now having second thoughts. I do not really know whether it is really improving their society at all or whether it is only something that caters to their baser instincts.

I would like to make a suggestion to the hon. Minister that your censorship board must consist of teachers, doctors, psychiatrists not just anybody, but, people who deal with the human mind or who deal with the minds of India's youth. I think they will be far more capable in telling the censors as to what types of films should be made available to the youth. I am not opposed to the liberalising of the censorship too. I do feel that. I would like to see movie films and take my children and wife who will sit with me and enjoy the films. I mean what I call the family films. I have seen some films with my adult son and daughter and have felt extremely embarrassed. You may turn round and say you are a prude. After all I am an average Indian human being and so I feel that there are certain norms in which we, the Indian people, have been brought up in. It sometimes hurts us to see that norms destroyed in front of our very eyes, and in front of our children. As Mr. Pandey said when we see such movies, along with our children, we are greatly embarrassed. Therefore, some kind of censorship is necessary. I would only make an appeal to the Hon. Minister that let him not be carried away by the concept of art or that kind of thing. You have to guide the nation and tell the people what types of films and T. Vs. are going to be shown to the masses in this country. You have to produce films for the generation of young men and women of tomorrow who are going to be first-class decent human beings given the proper conditions.

I think you can do it. But, for that, you will need the help of the psychiatrists, teachers, doctors, writers, philosophers, thinkers etc. on censorship boards. I hope you will utilise their talent that is available in the country.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I must congratulate the hon. Minister for bringing forward this Bill. Although I do feel that this is a half-hearted measure, yet I feel that something is better than nothing. This will be an improvement over the present censorship system. That is why I am congratulating him.

But, I feel that we have to go to the very root of this problem. In the name of freedom, we say that films too should be given complete freedom to produce whatever they want. What is it that we are trying to encourage in this country? What is it that the younger people want? Some people say that it is the younger people who want to see this type of films. Only the other day or rather only yesterday or day before, on TV they had carried a sample survey. And that was shown. A question was asked: 'Young men, why is it that you see the films?' To this they replied 'we see that because nothing better is available.' Even a young man does not want to see any films other than the sex films in the most lurid form. I took my son with me to see the film. He later told me that he would not like to see such films. I would ask Mr. Daga, would you like this thing to be done by your own sister or daughter? Or would you like a thing to be done by your own son? The immoral thing is one which when done or spoken either hurts yourself or the society.

For, you are living in a society. If you were alone in a jungle, you can do what you like. If my friend Mr. Naik was alone in a jungle and there was no other person at all . . .

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara) : I am in a political jungle.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : I agree he is. SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : Unsuccessfully.

SHRI R. S. PANDEY : Why does he suppose ? Suppose he is in a jungle, then what happens ? Suppose a *sher* comes ? SHRI VASANT SATHE : What are they trying to show to the young men ?

It was something unnatural.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : If he were in a jungle he can do whatever he likes. The 'Sher' would refuse to touch him.

The other day, I saw a film much publicised; *Bikini on the Beach* is understandable. But why have *Bikini* on the road from Bangalore to Bombay midway on a rock ? What is this sense of proportion or propriety ?

Unfortunately, even from the point of view of art, I say that the censors have totally failed in doing their duty. Even from the art point of view, sexual relationship or intimacy can be depicted in a very artistic, civilised and aesthetic manner. You do not have to depict two human beings, a young man and a girl as you would depict an animal, a dog and bitch. Aesthetically there is something ennobling in a man and a woman. I have seen the film 'Bobby' and I do not agree with my friend Shri N. K. P. Salve has said. I do not know if he has really seen that film. It is a very refreshing film. A young boy and a girl come together. I do not think there is anything to object to except the loving of the key and that song. Otherwise, what does the film try to depict ? I am not talking of the young man and girl coming together, but they are trying to show that they elope and run away and their parents cannot help; they run away against society and against their parents.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : That is by the Information and Broadcasting Ministry.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : What is the whole object of this medium ? This medium in this country must encourage young men or those who see them, apart from entertaining them, to be creative young men. It must encourage them for some higher values to build this nation. But does it do that ? What is being shown is only escapism. What the young men cannot have in real life they like to see for two hours in the film or on the silvery screen. This is why they see films. Are we not going to have some basic objectives ? Otherwise, we shall be getting into a vicious circle and producers would come forward and say 'What can we do ? Only such types of films are asked for by the people; therefore, we must produce them and make money'. Then, you more of that type of taste and more and more of such things are asked for by the people and so there is more and more vulgarity and lewdness and violence and so on.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : Two minors.

SHRI VASANT SATHE : If a young boy and girl at the age of 16 or 17 come together, there would be nothing unnatural in it. If it were shown instead of this that the parents had such an influence that the boy could have had patience and the girl could go for higher education and read and then they could come together, that would have been something ennobling. But what does the film show ? It tries to encourage them by saying that the best thing that should be done is to elope with his girl and then try to commit suicide . . .

Again, what an amount of violence is shown in our films; I had fortunately something to do in my college days with the gentleman's art of self-defence, known as boxing. I really do not understand the type of violence that is being shown in these films. A man is going on boxing and bashing for five minutes at the other man, jumping, kicking and doing all sorts of things, but there is no harm at all.

[Shri Vasant Sathe]

With one blow you can knock out the other man and he will never get up. But here you can go on giving blows after blows to the other man.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : Will he demonstrate it to the Minister ?

SHRI VASANT SATHE : What is the reaction ? In colleges, I have seen young boys doing this. Just to impress the girls they pick up a fight and they go hitting. What are you trying to encourage ? Why do you allow such type of violence to be shown, scenes steeped in violence and glorifying violence too ?

There is another aspect. This is about the blackmarketeers and smugglers. Do you know that in most of the films the smugglers are shown as fellows, living a most luxurious and nappy and rich life. Will this not tempt the young mind to emulate them ? You may say that for the sake of the story it is necessary. A man wants to make a film and wants to make easy money. But what is its impact on the young mind ?

Government must lay down some guidelines. Of course, there is an examining committee. There is a revision committee. There is an appellate board, tribunal and then Government. In between, there is a reviewing authority. Why this duplication and multiplicity of organisations ? Why should Government not have a committee of public men to give clear guidelines ? Of course, these guidelines have been there. Only they have never been implemented. If this is done and if you are strict on some films, I am sure it will give better results.

I wish you godspeed. The only thing is, try to see that we create and use this medium for the good of the country, for the good of the people. In the name of freedom, let us not spread depravity in this country. Let us not erode the values and moral fibre of the youth of our country.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : The contents of this Bill very clearly reveal that our Government is the saddest victim of the generation gap. The object of the Bill is to streamline the machinery so that examination of films, provision of certificates for films for exhibition outside India and all other related problems can be tackled quite effectively. Therefore, an amendment is sought to be made through this Bill to see that the entire structure of this machinery and organisation is totally changed, in a way it is streamlined. But I am afraid if the machinery as proposed in this Bill is accepted and implemented, elements extraneous to art will be introduced into the film industry in this particular process of censorship, and there is nothing more dangerous to the content of art than elements extraneous to art being superimposed as a superstructure on the structure of art itself.

A piece of art must be judged solely by its inner sovereign values. To my mind, these inner sovereign values of art can be nothing else but the sensitivity of art, the transparency of art, the intensity of art, the highest significance of art from the point of view of expressing life as it exists. If the life is ugly, even the depiction of ugly life can be the most beautiful piece of art. Let us not go into this debate whether nudity is vulgar or something else is vulgar. In a piece of art even an aristocrat who has been clothed right from top to bottom can be an expression of the most vulgar thing in life and the nudity of an *Adivasi* woman who is hunted in our present-day society, when she is seminated and raped by an aristocrat, can be the most beautiful depiction of a piece of art. Such elements of rape and violence introduced into the film might, if taken in isolation, appear as something crude, something very obscene. But in the context of a piece of art, if it is properly fitted in, probably even that piece of rape or the action of rape might itself reveal the pity of the audience for that victim and probably the noblest and the sublimest feelings of the audience can

be roused. Therefore, mere nudity is not something that can be considered as obscene and as extraneous to art.

Someone has rightly said that an artist expresses only the mode in which he can conceive life at all. To him what is dumb is deaf and therefore expression is the soul of art. The sense of art is in the sensitivity of its being in close relationship with truth and beauty. If that is the soul and the spirit of art, the expression of art is not to be curbed; the expression of art is not to be stunted. I am afraid the type of bureaucratic machinery that you are proposing, the various types of liaison and duplication of machinery that you are suggesting, will not enhance the prestige and the content of art. I am sorry to say that it will bring about the stunting and stifling of that particular piece of art.

The moralists talk so much of obscenity, of nudity, of the display of sex, of violence and eroticism. I must candidly admit in the context of the entire structure of a beautiful art, all these things, even a cabaret dance, even a rape scene, even violence, even nudity and even the so-called obscenity in that context of the proper liaising and perspective of that art, particular piece of art, can be the most beautiful thing.

I am giving one simple illustration. Many of you must have seen the classic piece of art, *Sahib Bibi Ghulam*, both in Bengali and Hindi. It has depicted the habit of an aristocratic Bengali of one particular age and he is shown with all his vices. There is adultery there; there is violence there, there are all forms of violence and display of eroticism there. Adultery is displayed there; but it is displayed in such a beautiful manner that when you see adultery there, and when you see all the vices there,—when you see drinking there and when you see the zamindar forcing his wife to drink so that he can get the vicarious satisfaction that even his pious wife has been forced to drink,—probably all these things may appear to some of the moralists as obscene, but in

the context of the film, what is the impression that is created in the audience? It only creates a sense of hatred for the aristocratic zamindar class of that type, and it creates a sense of pity for the victim of that aristocrat. All these things are indicated there.

Therefore, things are ugly or beautiful. Oscar Wilde once said that there is nothing vulgar or there is nothing obscene. All art is either good art or bad art. I think even the most so-called vulgarity, if depicted in a manner, in the context of a particular situation, may be all right. In isolation they might appear to be very bad. People may say anything about a cabaret dance. But even the most vulgar cabaret dance shown in a particular context, shows what type of aristocratic life one side is leading, and probably if the other side of the picture is put in the proper context, in fact, even on the young mind there cannot be any bad effect.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: What do you say about the cabaret dance for money-making?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I am coming to that. I have been weighing my words very carefully, (*Interruptions*) I have been saying that all these so-called obscene things, weighed in the perspective of art—all these things shown in the perspective of the art—actually enhance the situation. If there is vulgarity in life, even by showing the vulgarity in life in the films, you can create some sort of hatred for that type of life. There are *dramas* and there are films, in which people are shown as addicts to drugs. But after seeing the piece of art, one is not driven to that particular vice, but one is driven to a feeling that something that was shown is a bad thing.

From that point of view, my contention is that it is better that in the perspective of art, a particular event has to be judged, and therefore, I would leave the judgment and the assessment, whether they have been put in the proper artistic perspective

or not, not to the bureaucrat but to the artists, and on that I do not think there can be any difference of opinion as far as this House is concerned.

In that context, I should like to come to the last point and there I shall refer to the objection raised. If cabaret is shown, if smugglers' activities are shown and the ferocity is displayed only in order to play to the gallery it might appear to be a vulgar thing and it will be a vulgar thing. All that is happening as my friend Mr. Nahata has rightly pointed out. It is only because a few private financiers, who control the production of films produce films for profits, but they do not produce beautiful pieces of art. The remedy lies in removing a mal-adjustment in the film industry. They should be completely removed and a balance should be struck and proper guidance should be given even for financial motivations. Then the moralist will not have to draw wrong lessons; they may not have to strengthen the censor machinery. They have to strengthen the machinery of art. Art has to become a pivotal point of the entire machinery and not a few Government bureaucrats, in which case, possibly all this controversy arising out of the Bill will end. My second point, therefore, is that since the machinery provided for the Bill will not be able to fulfil this basic task, this House should throw out this Bill lock stock and barrel.

SHRI N. K. SANGHI (Jalore) This Bill has given us a chance to discuss the film industry. Much of my work, has been lightened by what Prof. Mukherjee and Shri Nahata said regarding the background of the film industry. So much has been said about censorship in India that I do not want to go into that aspect. This matter was discussed by the committee consisting of knowledge people under the Chairmanship of Mr. Khosla who took marathon evidence in this matter and that committee has come to certain conclusions. There were also certain Members and I think their opinion has to be considered.

It has been stated that in film industry there is glamour, dazzling lights, showmanship and everything. On the other side the industry has poverty, qualor and hunger as also the pitiable life of the workers in the film industry. Unless we achieved some cohesion between these two—the glamour on one side and pitiable conditions on the other side. I do not think any rapport can be there. Shri Gujral is heading the Ministry and he has understanding and involvement in the industry. We expected a somewhat response from him. In 1969 when I discussed the matter of formation of the film council Shri Gujral was good enough to give an assurance on the floor of the House that this council would come very soon. Unfortunately five years have passed, but nothing has been done. Two years ago, on a private Member's resolution we discussed labour relations in the film industry and the Labour Minister gave us an assurance that legislation was coming. Again nothing has been done. We do not know in which way the industry is being tackled.

In the context of this Bill it is better to go into the history of censorship in this country. The original Act was passed in 1898 in this country. In 1952 an Act was passed and a board of censors was set up. In 1958 they provided two categories of films (U) and (A).

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: You may continue your speech on the next occasion. We shall now take up Private Members Business.

15.29 hrs.

WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION (AMENDMENT) BILL*

[AMENDMENT OF SECTIONS 2, 3 ETC.]

SHRI P. M. MEHTA (Bhavnagar): I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923.

*Published in Gazette of India, Extraordinary, Part II, section 2, dated 22-2-74.