

मशा नहीं था कि अध्यादेशों को जारी करने के अधिकार का इस तरह से विधान मण्डल को ताक पर रख कर, बाई पास करके इस्तेमाल हो। इसलिए इसके बारे में आप सोच समझकर जो भी हमें निर्देश देना चाहें। अगर आप यह चाहते हैं कि कोई सबस्टांटिव मोशन लाई जाए तो हम वह भी ला सकते हैं गवर्नर के खिलाफ लानी है तो उनके खिलाफ लाएंगे। जिस शक्ति में आप चाहते हैं, मैं रखने के लिए तैयार हूँ।

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Minister ready or does he want to have some time?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI F. H. MOHSIN): I will place before the House as much information as I have got from the Govt. of Madhya Pradesh as regards the question raised by Shri Chawla. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: This is an issue not of making a statement. It is purely a Constitutional issue. You better satisfy me why this is being done and then later on we will take it up.

SHRI JYOTIRMAY BOSU: He is making a statement on the Harijan issue; he seems to have come prepared for that.

MR. SPEAKER: Not now.

SHRI H. M. PATEL (Dhandhuka): Sir, this issue which Mr. Madhu Lumaye has raised is an important one. I am only requesting you that it must be taken up seriously; it must be discussed substantively so that the importance of the position like this is realised.

MR. SPEAKER: That is why I have given my indication on it

SHRI JYOTIRMAY BOSU: I want to know ..

MR. SPEAKER: No, please. I have allowed only two items. Nothing else please.

13.50 hrs.

CINEMATOGRAPH (SECOND AMENDMENT BILL— *contd.*

MR. SPEAKER: Now, we take up the further clause-by-clause consideration of the Cinematograph (Second Amendment) Bill.

We are on clause 5.

Clause 5 (Amendment of section 4)

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA (Arambagh): I move:

Page 3.—

for lines 28 to 42, substitute—

“(1A) Any person desiring to export any film for exhibition outside India shall not be allowed to do so if the film has not been certified already by the Board.”
(23).

MR. SPEAKER: You may continue after lunch

Now we adjourn for lunch and re-assemble at 3 p.m.

13.51 hrs.

The Lok Sabha adjourned for Lunch till Fifteen of the Clock.

The Lok Sabha reassembled after lunch at Three Minutes past Fifteen of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER—in the Chair]

SHRI JYOTIRMAY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): I wrote to the Speaker about the difficulty that the students are facing in the matter of admission in the Delhi University. In the Department of Economics, the number of seats have been reduced and they are being made to face a lot of difficulties. I request you to ask the Government to make a statement on this because the young students are being put to trouble. This is a serious matter.

15.04 hrs.

CINEMATOGRAPH (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL—contd.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will now resume Clause-by-clause consideration of the Cinematograph (Second Amendment) Bill. We take up Clause 5. **Mr. Hazra.**

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA (Arambagh): I have moved my amendment No 23 on clause 5 which is as follows:

Page 3,—

For Lines 28 to 42, substitute—

“(1A) Any person desiring to export any film for exhibition outside India shall not be allowed to do so if the film has not been certified already by the Board.” (23)

Sir, this is the most important clause in the Bill in respect of exporting film outside the country. Sir, I do not see any reason why a film would be certified for the purpose of exporting if it is certified already by the Board existing in the country. A film within the country would be treated in a certain manner and outside the country in a different manner—that is nothing but an unjustified thing.

Somebody or some stalwart in the Government may say that in the film world there should be a home policy and a foreign policy like a Sovereign Government. I think that would be as ludicrous as it would be on the part of Government and in my opinion that has been done in this clause. Of course, you know that if there is any political motive behind it, the Government has got no alternative than to do it and only then in the name of sovereignty and integrity, any progressive film would be banned. I ask the hon. Minister categorically whether he will allow a film to go abroad in which a shot is inserted of famine stricken men and women and they are seen picking up their food from dustbin—

I think he would hesitate to do it because it is contrary to the economic and political outlook.

So, Sir, I want to say that this clause must be amended and hence I moved my amendment. We know that a paradox is there and every now and then we hear on the floor of this House that the economic crisis is a world phenomenon. But in this connection, for exporting such a film with a shot inserted in it of famine-stricken people, the Minister would hesitate to allow the film to go abroad, and so he would not be able to do justice at least to that film. This is the paradox. So, I request the hon. Minister to accept my amendment which I have moved already.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI I K GUJRAL): Sir, my friend is under one wrong impression. Even to-day the films which are exported have been subjected to checking and certification by the customs authorities. What we are trying to deal with in this Bill is to simplify the procedure rather than an exporter getting two certificates one from the Censor Board and another from the Customs authorities. This should be easier for him if we simplify this procedure and he only exhibits the film to the Censor Board.

Generally speaking, our intention is that the endorsement will be done on the basis of the original certificate given to the producer and not to ask him to go through once again the same procedure. This will, as a matter of fact, simplify the procedure and will make it easier to the exporter. My friend naturally and rightly talked about the progressivism and all other things; we never were bothered about progressive films going outside. I hope and I wish more progressive films do go outside. If my friend can point out to me of any progressive film which was made but, which has not been allowed to go out, I shall be grateful to know about it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

Page 3,—

for lines 22 to 42, substitute—

“(1A) Any person desiring to export any film for exhibition outside India shall not be allowed to do so if the film has not been certified already by the Board.” (23).

The motion was negatived.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, the question is:

“That Clause 5 stand part of the Bill”.

The motion was adopted.

Clause 5 was added to the Bill

Clause 6 (Insertion of new section 4A)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr Daga, are you moving your amendments?

SHRI M. C DAGA (Pali): I move:

Page 4, line 5,—

for “Examining Committee” substitute—

“Chairman of the Board” (11)

Page 4, line 6—

for ‘Examining Committee’ substitute—

‘Chairman of the Board’ (12)

Page 4,—

Omit lines 10 to 12. (13)

Page 4,—

Omit lines 13 to 26. (14)

श्री मल बन्धु झाया : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय मैं अपने अमेन्डमेंट के बारे में एक बात कहना चाहूँ जो क्लॉज 6 में वर्णन (4) के संबंध में है। ग्रावरजेक्ट के जमाने ने नाच और संगीत बन्द हो गया और जेम्स के समय में सारे मिनट और नाटकबन्ध बन्द हो गए। मैं यह कहता हूँ कि आप ने अपने ग्रावरजेक्ट में क्या

कहा है कि टू स्ट्रीमलाइन सिप्रोसीजर। आपका ग्रावरजेक्ट क्या है और आप इसकी इतना कम्बरसम और इतना खर्चीला क्यों बना रहे हैं? क्या आप यह समझते हैं कि इन प्राविजनों में सुधार लाया जायगा मैं इसकी खतरा समझता हूँ। कला के संबंध में इन सरकारी फतवों से सुधार का काम हो जायगा ऐसा मैं नहीं समझता। या, ने अपने बिल के ग्रावरजेक्ट में यह कहा है।

Why you have brought this Bill I quote from the statement of objects and reasons:

“Having regard to all aspects of the matter, it is proposed to amend the Cinematograph Act, 1952 to streamline the machinery for examination of films, to provide also for certification of films for exhibition outside India and to take power to prescribe suitable time-limits.”

These are your words.

मैं समझता हूँ कल की आपकी स्पीच भी ऐसी ही थी।

Now, as soon as one submits application before the Board it must be examined by the Examining Committee Why you make it mandatory Now, refer to clause 3B

“The Board may, by special or general order, constitute—” Now, what is that special and general order I want to understand these two words. You say by special order and then you say by general order these committees will be constituted So, that means first you will have to issue a special or a general order and then you will constitute a Committee

Now I want to draw your attention to 4A I quote the same:

“4A. (1) Every film in respect of which an application is made under Section 4 shall be examined in the prescribed manner by the Examining Committee.

After the Examining Committee has examined a film it shall be examined by the Revision Committee and then it will go again to the Board. I would like to submit, is it necessary that it should be referred to the Examining Committee. Why should not the Board itself apply its mind? We do not know how much time these Committees may consume.

Now, I would like to quote from the main Act—Clause 115:

"The High Court may call for the record of any case which has been decided by any court subordinate to such High Courts and in which no appeal lies thereto, and if any such subordinate court appears—

(a) To have exercised a jurisdiction not vested in it by law, or

(b) To have failed to exercise a jurisdiction so vested, or

(c) To have acted in the exercise of its jurisdiction illegally or with material irregularity."

You can call the record at any time from any Committee. Supposing the Examining Committee is examining a particular film you can call the record and even before the Board has taken the decision you can call the record.

खोसला कमेटी ने कहा है कि बोर्ड को पूरी पाबन्दी देनी चाहिये। मैं न इतनी पाबन्दी लगाने का आप का परस क्या है।

श्री ब्राह्म० के० गुजराल : हमारे यहां एक कहावत है, मुझे मालूम नहीं इन के यहां है या नहीं। सारी रात रामायण सुनते रहे, सुबह पूछते हैं कि राम और सीता का रिश्ता क्या था। दो दिन से यही बतला रहा हूं कि इस सारी चीज का लक्ष्य क्या है, लेकिन डागा साहब फिर पूछ रहे हैं कि लक्ष्य क्या है—अब क्या बतलाऊं? एक बात मैं साफ कर देना चाहता हूँ—मैंने कल इस बात की

कन्सेप्शन साफ़ की थी और वह यह थी कि एक्जामिनिंग कमेटी बुनियादी तौर पर एक होल-टाइम मेम्बर और एसेसर्स के साथ बैठ कर एक्जामिन करेगी। हमारा तजुर्बा यह है कि 10 मामलों में से 9 का फैसला वहीं हो जायेगा, एक-आध मामले रह जायेंगे तो वह बोर्ड के पास आ जायेंगे और उस स्टज पर खत्म हो जायेंगे।

अब गवर्नमेंट के पास जो पावर्स हैं, बजाय इस के कि मिनिस्टर के पास रहे, हम ने हाई कोर्ट के एक जजमेंट के लिहाज से फैसला किया है कि वहां एक बोर्ड अपील अपील बन जायेगी। जो एपील पार्टी होगी उस को अपील करनी होगी और वह बोर्ड उस को सुन लेगा, फिल्म को देख लेगा और फैसला कर देगा.....

श्री मूल चन्द डागा : क्या जो कानून में है उस को आप पढ़ रहे हैं ?

श्री ब्राह्म० के० गुजराल : जी हां।

श्री मूल चन्द डागा : जी नहीं। उस में ऐसा नहीं है। उस में यह है कि आप एक्जामिनिंग कमेटी और रिवीजन कमेटी से रिकार्ड मंगा सकते हैं।

श्री ब्राह्म० के० गुजराल : गवर्नमेंट के पास पावर्स रिजर्व रखी गई है जो कभी इस्तेमाल करने की ग्राम जरूरत नहीं पड़ती। लेकिन कई हालात ऐसे हो सकते हैं जब यह देखने की जरूरत पड़ जाये। जैसे आप पालियामेंट में सवाल उठा दें कि कहीं गोलमाल हो रहा है तब मुझे देखना पड़ेगा कि क्या गोलमाल हो रहा है.....

श्री मूल चन्द डागा : कहीं नहीं हो रहा है।

श्री ब्राह्म० के० गुजराल : डागा जी ऐसा नहीं करते हैं, वे थोड़ा लिबरल हैं। वे

खुली छूट के हक में हैं। खुली छूट के मुता-
ल्लिक मैंने प्रार्थना किया था कि यह नया सिस्ट
ड्राई कर रहे हैं, इसे खोसला कमेटी के तहत
हम ने माना है। अगर हम खोसला कमेटी
की पूरी रिकमेंडेशन को मानते तो हमें
20 रखने चाहिये थे, लेकिन हम ने 6 रखे हैं।
साल में 15-16 सौ फिल्म देखनी पड़ती हैं
—इसलिये यह मुमकिन नहीं है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall
now put amendments Nos. 11, 12, 13
and 14 to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 11 to 14 were put
and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The
question is:

"That clause 6 stand part of the
Bill".

The motion was adopted

Clause 6 was added to the Bill.

Clause 7 (Substitution of new section
for section 5)

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA: I
beg to move:

Page 4.—

for clause 7, substitute—

"7. In section 5 of the principal
Act in sub-section (1), after the
'words 'advisory panel', the words
'in each of the five regions, name-
ly, Calcutta, Delhi, Bombay,
Madras and Gujarat' shall be in-
serted." (24).

This is a processing amendment.
Before this also, I had given an
amendment, and this amendment is
consequential to that. So, I do not
want to speak about it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall
now put amendment No. 24 to the vote
of the House.

Amendment No. 24 was put and
negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The
question is:

"That clause 7 stand part of the
Bill".

The motion was adopted

Clause 7 was added to the Bill.

Clause 8 and 9 were added

to the Bill.

Clause 10

(Substitution of new sections for
section 5C)

SHRI R. R. SHARMA (Banda):
I beg to move:

Page 5, line 48—for "twelve"
substitute "five". (6)

SHRI M. C. DAGA: I beg to move:

Page 5, line 48,—

for "twelve persons" substitute—
"three persons". (15)

श्री. राम रतन शर्मा . उपाध्यक्ष जी,
क्लाज 10 सेक्शन 5(सी) के द्वारा आपने एक
एपेलेंट ट्रिब्यूनल बनाने का फैसला किया है, उसमें
12 प्रादमियों को रखने का प्रावीजन है, मेरा
संशोधन है कि 12 के बजाय 5 रखे जाये।
इसके बाद आपने यह भी कहा है कि ये एपेलेंट
ट्रिब्यूनल के जो प्रादमी होंगे वे कौन कौन सी
कैटेगरीज के हो सकते हैं—चार कैटेगरीज
आपने निर्धारित की है—आपने कहा है—

"who are familiar with the social,
cultured or political institutions of
India,

"who have special knowledge of
the various regions of India,

"who have, for at least ten years,
held civil judicial posts or who have
been in practice as advocates for
at least ten years or who have been
members of the Central legal service
for at least three years".

लेकिन सबसे बड़ी बात जो इसमें है वह आपने नहीं रखी। क्वालिफिकेशन के लिहाज से आपने चार कैटेगरीज रखी है—लेकिन एक कैटेगरी के भी 12 आदमी रख सकते हैं और चारों कैटेगरीज के भी 12 आदमी रख सकते हैं। अगर आप इसमें यह लिख देते कि हर कैटेगरी से एक एक आदमी होगा तो बात समझ में आ सकती थी। मेरी समझ में नहीं आता आप इतना खर्च क्यों बढ़ाते जा रहे हैं? एलेक्ट्रिक ट्रिब्यूनल की क्या जरूरत है? उसमें बहुत कम केमेज पहुंचेंगे, इसलिये पांच आदमियों की ट्रिब्यूनल बना दी जाये, वह काफी है, आपने कहा है कि इसमें कम से कम तीन आदमी होंगे, यह ठीक है अगर कोई छुट्टी चला जाय तो बाकी दो में से बैठ जायेंगे, लेकिन पांच आदमियों में ज्यादा की इसमें कोई जरूरत नहीं है। मैं यह भी कहूंगा कि गवर्नमेंट का कंट्रोल हर बात में ज्यादा होना जाता है।

आप फिल्म इंडस्ट्री के लिये एक निगम क्यों नहीं बनाते हैं, जैसे प्रायोरिटी रेडियो के लिये बात की जा रही है कि सरकार का कंट्रोल हटा कर के एक निगम बना दे। इसी तरह से फिल्म इंडस्ट्री के लिये भी निगम बनाये। जो भी आदमी आफिस में बैठा वह जिस तरह की फिल्म चाहता है उसके इशारे पर वैसी फिल्म बनाकर उसको प्रचार का माध्यम बनाये, यह उचित नहीं है। जिस प्रकार आज कल टी० वी० प्रायोरिटी रेडियो प्रचार का माध्यम हो गया है उसी तरह से फिल्म को भी आप प्रचार का माध्यम बनाने जा रहे हैं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: How does All India Radio come in here?

श्री राम रत्न शर्मा : मेरा कहना यही है कि फिल्म इंडस्ट्री के लिए एक निगम बना कर उस पर से सरकार का एकाधिकार समाप्त करें और 12 आदमियों की जगह केवल 5 मेम्बर रखें। मंत्री महोदय से मेरा आग्रह है कि वह मेरा यह संकोचन स्वीकार करें।

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul): May I speak on the amendments?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: No We have been following this practice that only those members who have given amendments speak. If we depart from it and other members also speak, then it becomes difficult to control, where to draw the line. You cannot deny others and then it becomes a debate within a debate. I would request that you do not insist on it. You may speak on the third reading if you want, but not on this. Let us not follow practices which would create difficulties.

श्री आइ० के० गुजराल : मेरे मित्र ने जो आपत्ति उठाई है कि 12 आदमी क्यों रख रहे हैं तो वह इसलिये किया जा रहा है कि आमन्त्रण पर यह लोग बड़े व्यस्त होंगे हैं और उनके पास समय कम होता है। इसलिये 12 आदमियों का एक पैन्ल होगा उसमें से तीन आदमी एक साथ बैठेंगे। ननक्वाट तो उनको मिलनी नहीं है इसलिये इतना कोई प्रश्न नहीं है। पैन्ल में से 3 मेम्बर एक दफा बैठेंगे। लिखी दफा एक मुहदमा गया था हाई कोर्ट में और उसने जजमेंट दिया था कि इन बिस्म का ट्राइब्यूनल होता चाहिये उस लेबिल पर बाय इसके कि सरकार खुद फैसला करे। उसको ध्यान में रखते हुये हमने यह किया है। बाकी जो लम्बी बात आपने ही कि कला को कमा जा रहा है उसके बारे में मैं कल कह चुका हूँ, और आप वह और मेरा मुक्तेनजर एक ही है। यहाँ प्रोपोजेड का कोई मवाल नहीं है। सबाल तो यह है कि जो कुछ हो रहा है बहुत सी जगह से उसको कैसे सुधार करे। उस बारे में आप की और हमारी राय मिलती है।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I shall now put amendments Nos 6 and 15 to vote.

Amendments Nos. 6 and 15 were put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 10 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 10 was added to the Bill.

SHRI M. C. DAGA: I must have a chance to speak.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I expect members to be a little more alert and to give more attention to the business of the House. When Shri Sharma had finished, I looked to you, but you were too busy with something else. So I called the Minister. You have missed the bus.

Clause 11

(Amendment of section 6)

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA: I beg to move:

Page 7,—

omit lines 18 to 42. (25)

I think this clause is unnecessary because the constitutional obligation is already there. When our Constitution already provides for it, why enter it again here? It is not necessary.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am not able to understand his argument. Naturally it is in conformity with the Constitution. Bills have to be in conformity with the Constitution.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I will put this amendment to the House.

Amendment No. 25 was put and negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 11 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted

Clause 11 was added to the Bill.

Clause 12 to 21 were added to the Bill.

(Short title and commencement)
Amendment made:

Page 1, lines 3 and 4,—

for "Second (Amendment) Act, 1973"

substitute—

"(Amendment) Act 1974" (2)

(Shri I. K. Gujral)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 1, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Enacting Formula

Amendment made:

Page 1, line 1,—

for "Twenty-fourth Year
Substitute—

"Twenty-fifth Year" (1).

(Shri I. K. Gujral)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Enacting Formula, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The Title was added to the Bill.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I beg to move:

"That the Bill as amended, be passed"

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed." I have a long list of members who want to speak in the third reading. This is a sphere where no two people can agree—where liberty ends and licence begins, what is morality, what is generation gap, etc. All kinds of ethical, sociological and other questions come in. I can very well understand that there is a big sphere for discussion.

May I even so draw the attention of the Members that the scope of the discussion at the Third Reading of the Bill is only in support of or for the rejection of the Bill. The details could not be gone into. I see that Mr. Limaye has given the points also, that is, foreign funds for Indian cinema producers and cinema houses and pre-censorship liberty. I do not know how these points come in. If he wants to reject the Bill on the basis of these points, that is a different matter.

Shri Limaye.

श्री मधु लिमये (बाका) मेरी राय में यह अत्यन्त अनावश्यक बिल है। बेकार इस सदन का वक्त जाया करने का मंत्री महोदय ने प्रयास किया है। फिल्मों का जो सेमरशिप है उसको रद्द कर देना चाहिये। मैं प्री-सेमरशिप के एक दम खिलाफ हूँ। हमारे देश में मविधान है, कानून है। अगर कोई फिल्म निर्माता या एग्जीक्यूटिव, दिखाने वाला, थियेटर का मालिक, कोई भी कानून के खिलाफ काम करता है तो हिन्दुस्तान का कोई भी नागरिक या सरकार उसके खिलाफ अदालत में जाकर कानूनी कार्यवाई कर सकती है। वह कह सकती है कि यह नैतिकता के खिलाफ है, देश की सार्वभौमिकता और अश्रुणता के खिलाफ है या और भी जो कुछ कहना हो तो अदालत में जाकर कह सकती है। पहले इस बोर्ड में एक होल टाइम चेयरमैन होता था। अब ये पांच होल टाइम मैन्युका करने वाले हैं। क्या यह विधेयक इस लिये आया है कि पांच लोगों को नोकरी मिले ? इन दिनों में हमारे देश में वित्तीय मजदूरी है। एक एक पैस की बचत करने की जरूरत है। क्या श्री गुजराल अपने पांच दोस्तों को कोई नोकरी देना चाहते हैं, इसलिये यह बिल लाये हैं ?

SHRI K. GUJRAL: I promise that I will give one job to his friends.

श्री मधु लिमये : वह मुझे नहीं चाहिये। यह बिल बिलकुल अनावश्यक है। पैसों की बचत करने का एक बहुत बढ़िया मौका है। सारे

देश में बजत का वातावरण आप उत्पन्न करना चाहते हैं। ऐसी हालत में यह अनावश्यक विधेयक और ये सारे प्रावधान क्यों लाये जा रहे हैं, मसझ में नहीं आया।

इसमें बहुत सी मजदूर चीजें हैं इन्होंने जोड़ा है और यह सोचा है कि ये देश का बहुत कल्याण कर रहे हैं :

"In particular and without prejudice to the generality of the provisions of sub-section (1), a film shall not be certified as a film fit 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."

मसझ में नहीं आता अगर इस तरह की फिल्में इस देश में दिखाई जाएगी तो अच्छा है।

"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."

अगर किसी फिल्म में यह कहा गया हो कि भारत में बिना रिश्ते दिए इंडस्ट्रियल लाइसेंस नहीं मिलता या जब तक कोई बड़ा आदमी का रिश्तेदार नहीं है तब तक उसको यह नहीं मिल सकता है तो आप क्या कहेंगे ? जो फिल्म भारत में दिखाने के योग्य है वह बाहर भी दिखाने में कोई हिचक नहीं होनी चाहिए। अगर हिन्दुस्तान में जो वस्तु स्थिति है उसका बिदारक चित्रण किसी फिल्म में किया गया है तो सत्य में घबरावने की कोई जरूरत नहीं होनी चाहिए। हिन्दुस्तान के बारे में अढ़ाई तीन हजार साल से लोग लिखते और बोलते आये हैं। उसमें कुछ नुकसान नहीं होता।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि मेरी बात को मंत्री महोदय पकड़ें। अगर कानून के खिलाफ

कोई फिल्म है तो उसके ऊपर बाद में कार्रवाई हो। प्रीसेंसरशिप को मैं लोकतंत्र विरोधी काम समझता हूँ। इन्द्र कुमार गुजराल जी बहुत दृढ़ हुए दिमाग के आदमी हैं। पता नहीं मिनिस्टर बनने के बाद ऐसा क्यों कर रहे हैं।

श्री बसन्त साठे (अकोजा) : गंदी पिक्चर हो तो उसको कैसे रोका जाए ?

श्री मधु लिमये : कार्रवाई हो सकती है। इसके लिए प्रीसेंसरशिप की क्या जरूरत है। अगर मान लीजिए लेखों के बारे में यह कहा जाए कि उनका सेंसर करने के लिए भी एक बोर्ड बने तो उसका सीधा जवाब यह है कि लेख जब प्रकाशित हो जाए तो लेखक और प्रकाशक दोनों जो इसके लिए जिम्मेदार हो उनके खिलाफ कार्रवाई हो। हर क्षेत्र में प्रीसेंसरशिप नहीं होना चाहिए। इसको भी मैं विचारों की अभिव्यक्ति का एक माध्यम समझता हूँ। इसलिए प्रीसेंसरशिप के मैं खिलाफ हूँ। इसको गैर कानूनी मानना है।

मुझे मद्देनारे कर कानून बनाने की जरूरत थी जिससे देश का अहित हो सकता है। मुझे जानकारी मिली कि बर्नार्ड के एक मिनेमा निर्माता को सोवियन संघ से काफी पैसा मिलता है। किस करार के तहत यह है इसकी सफाई मंत्री महोदय देंगे। स्वयं उन्होंने मेरे पत्र का जो उत्तर दिया है उस में माना है कि सिनेमा घरों के निर्माण के लिए इसका इस्तेमाल किया गया है। हो सकता है कि कल अमरीका से पैसा आए, चीन से आए या और किसी देश से आए। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या यह चीज देश के हित में है? क्या विदेशी पैसे का इस्तेमाल अपनी जायदाद बढ़ाने के लिए, अपनी सम्पत्ति बढ़ाने के लिए हिन्दुस्तान के निर्माता करें, इसको आप ठीक समझते हैं? इन्द्र कुमार जी गुजराल कह सकते हैं कि मैं क्या करूँ, यह तो वित्त मंत्रालय का विषय है।

इस बिल के अवसर पर उनको इस चीज को मैं समझना है स्पष्ट करना चाहिए और वित्त मंत्रालय को कहना चाहिए कि जो भी कार्रवाई इसके लिए आवश्यक है उसको वह करे और भविष्य में इस तरह पैसे का दुरुपयोग न होने दे। इस तरह से विदेशों के अगर हम लोग पैसे के माध्यम से एजेंट बनने लगे तो यह देश के हित में नहीं होगा। गणेश जी भी सुन रहे हैं। उनको आप भी अपनी राय दें कि यह सब नहीं होना चाहिए।

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE (Betul) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I cannot be a cynic to say that there should be no pre-censorship, nor can I claim to have the privilege to say that there should be rigid censorship. One should have an independent approach based on hard realities of our social life, and any approach which is bereft of appreciation and realisation of such realities would not help. One way or the other I would also not go into the question where morality ends and immorality does not begin or where decency ends and vulgarity does not replace it, or whether in the name of art we are seeing plenty of pornographic trash in various films - because the Minister, I regretfully submit, seems to be relishing some of them. (Interruption)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You should have spoken in the First Reading.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE : I am coming immediately to Clause 10 which contemplates amendment of the existing section 5C. It is a typical legislation which we are making, which will be observed only in its breach, so far as both letter and spirit are concerned. By this amendment it is contemplated to constitute Appellate Tribunals where the members are going to work free for us. First of all, why should Government expect that conscientious and honest people will come and work free?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Five members will be permanent. They will be given some allowance; they will not be serving free.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: As far as I understand, they will not be remunerated; they will not be employees of the Government. They are entrusted with an extremely important task. Where a producer feels aggrieved by an order of the Board refusing to grant the certificate or feels aggrieved over not being given a certificate of a proper category, he will appeal to these people. See the constitution. Tremendous qualifications are being prescribed—which are being described in generality and vagueness and which cannot be more equivocal—as to who should be the persons. "A person who is familiar with social, cultural or political institutions." Excepting the Minister I cannot understand in the 560 million people, is there any person who is not familiar with the social, cultural and political institutions?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Mr. Salve is the only person.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I can be the second exception because I am his friend. Can you think of a thing like this? Can you say that anyone above the age of 6 is not familiar with the social, cultural and political institutions of India?

The second requirement is: 'who have special knowledge of the various regions of India'. What is this special knowledge—one never knows.

Thirdly, 'who have special interest in films and their impact on society'.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: You qualify all the three.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I am very grateful to the Minister. Everytime the House is a witness to his saying that Mr. Salve qualifies for all the three. Only recently....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Perhaps he had you in mind.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I never shall be able to serve on it because I do not have time to work free on a job....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You get allowances.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: I believe in honest earning and I will never have time to work on this. Perhaps he is looking up for someone who is looking for something.

I would request him to consider why he should not have only three people. One of them should be a High Court Judge and another should be a lawyer and of more than 10 years' practice and another an expert.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is Third Reading. It is no point. If you want to use this for total rejection of the Bill, yes, it is quite relevant. But if you want to him to make any change in the Bill, you cannot do it.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Let us throw out the Bill, lock, stock and barrel.

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Akola): I am a witness about his honest earnings. I can say that you did not protest.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is not the case of a lady protesting.

SHRI N. K. P. SALVE: My respectful submission is that this is one of the major defects. Other defects are there as pointed out by so many other friends. Therefore, I would request Mr. Gujral to reconsider it in the light of our submissions.

I am very grateful for your indulgence. It is difficult for me to go beyond this for obvious reasons.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Even if you wanted, you cannot do.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): I could not quite

follow you. You talked about film taxation

All that I wanted to say is about the Metro cinema in Calcutta and its employees. The Minister and the Government are running with the hare and hunting with the hounds. When this matter came up before the Calcutta High Court, they did not even care to put up a defence and when asked where there was no defence, there was no reply. All that I would say is that this Metro cinema and the other two cinemas should be taken over by the Government. That is all I wanted to say.

SHRI VASANT SATHE Irrelevant.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU Whenever I talk of employees, it is irrelevant to you.

MR DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Naik.

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara): I would not enter into the controversy about the morality or the lack of it which seem to be very near and dear to the heart of our friend, Shri Salve. I am only going to read an excerpt from the Indian Express dated 4th June 1974 which says

'The film distributors...

Of course, the reference is to Delhi.

"...think that the fast-increasing popularity of the television is posing a serious challenge to the film business."

While we were very happy yesterday to hear the learned discourse of the hon. Minister about the impact of films, I would only submit with reference to the context of censoring, that with all the powers on earth trying to censor the Indian movie or any other movie, you will still have abundant loopholes with the ultimate purpose of the maker to corrupt the minds of the people on the one side

and thereby, to make a certain amount of money and profit. What I am saying is that if the contemporary history not only of India but elsewhere is to be seen, if the Hollywood movie industry has been destroyed, it has been destroyed by the arrival of the advent of the television on the modern scene. There are strong reasons to believe that the Indian movie industry has a vested interest in seeing that the television in this country does not find a place for itself because it is going to be a challenger and competitor for the Indian movie industry. Therefore, leaving aside all this talk about censorship, the morality or the lack of it, when we see so many things happening in our country I would submit, Sir, that the competing claims and priority of the Indian Television Industry should be recognised. Yesterday the Minister said that he is going to raise a fund to set up a movie industry. I would in all sincerity and humility submit this. Raise a fund by all means, but at the same time, help to set up a television industry in this country by this fund. Help the television industry to see that the films that are exhibited are proper. I say this because it is a powerful communication medium.

श्री कमल मिश्र मधुकर (केसरगढ़) :

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, कल मैंने मंत्री महोदय के भाषण को बहुत ध्यान से सुना। मंत्री महोदय ने यह ठीक कहा कि चूकि सिनेमा का जन-मानस पर बड़ा प्रभाव है, इसलिए जन-चेतना को जगाने के लिए और उसको नया रूप देने के लिए सिनेमा का प्रयोग किया जाना चाहिए। लेकिन मंत्री महोदय जो बिल लाये हैं, उस का स्कोप बहुत ही निमित्तिष्ठ है। हमारे देश ने अपने मामले कुछ लक्ष्य रखे हैं—धर्म-निरपेक्षता, समाजवाद, राष्ट्रीय एकता, हमारी पुरानी प्रवृत्ति परम्पराओं को प्रोत्साहित करना और विज्ञान के माध्यम से नये युग के साथ सम्बन्ध स्थापित करना, आदि। लेकिन हम देखते हैं कि इन

विषयों के बारे में हमारे यहां फिल्में नहीं बनाई जाती हैं। हमारी फिल्मों में पुरानी पिटी-पिटाई बातें होती हैं और उन में नई बातों और नये विचारों के लिए कोई स्थान नह रहता है।

यह ठीक है कि हमारे देश में कुछ अच्छी फिल्में भी बनती हैं, लेकिन जरूरत इस बात की है कि देश ने अपने लिए जो लक्ष्य निर्धारित किया है, उस की पूर्ति के लिए किये जाने वाले प्रयास में मिनेमा का भी उचित योगदान होना चाहिए। दिशाहीन और उद्देश्यहीन फिल्मों से हमारे देश का कोई लाभ नही हो सकता है। आज स्थिति यह है कि हमारे बड़े-बड़े फ़िल्म प्रोड्यूसर केवल मुनाफे के लिए चलचित्र बनाने है। मुनाफा कमाने के लिए बल्लार से बल्लार, क्राइम से घरे हुए और भारतीय चलचित्र बनाए जाते है।

हम चाहेंगे कि मंत्री महोदय ऐसा बिल लाये, जिसके द्वारा हमारे मोशल आबजंक्टिव की प्राप्ति के लिए फिल्मों की महायत्ना ली जा सके। आज देश में जो जन-आन्दोलन हो रहे है-धर्म के खिलाफ लड़ाई हो रही है, भूमि के लिए मर्घपं हा रहा है, मजदूरों का मर्घपं चल रहा है, जो विषय और समस्यायें जन-जीवन को आन्दोलित कर रही है, वे हमारी फिल्मों में प्रकट नहीं होती है। तनीजा यह है कि हमारा फिल्म जगन केवल मुनाफा कमाने के लिए पुरानी लकीर पर चल रहा है। सभी महोदय यह प्रयत्न करे कि हमारे फिल्म प्रोड्यूसर अपनी फिल्मों में देश के मोशल आबजंक्टिव का समावेश करे। हमारी फिल्में मोशल उद्देश्यों, साहित्य, संस्कृति और कला से विहन नहीं होनी चाहिए।

इस बिल में सेसर बोर्ड को मजबूत करने की कोशिश की गई है। लेकिन आज हमारे देश में नौकरशाही और बड़े प्रोड्यूसरों में जो मिली-भगत है, उसको देखते हुये मुझे संदेह है कि सरकार का यह उद्देश्य पूरा होगा या नही। इसलिये सभी महोदय यह आश्वासन दें

कि नौकरशाही और बड़े प्रोड्यूसरों की मिली-भगत को रोका जायेगा और हमारी फिल्में देश के मोशन उद्देश्यों को प्रतिबिम्बित करेगी और इस प्रकार नये हिन्दुस्तान के निर्माण में अपना योगदान करेगी।

SHRI DINESH JOARDER (Malda):

Sir, I would suggest that the Bill be withdrawn. It is not necessary since we have already got a statute. Yesterday, the Minister told us that he would not be accepting the suggestion of pre-censorship of film-scripts. At the same time he also told us that last year to the extent of 15 feature films were rejected by the Board of Censorship. Also this year three films have been rejected within this period. We see certain films and they are all full of vulgarity and obscene sequences and similar other things. There are also certain films with sequences and stories of crimes, violence and murder. They simply consume a lot of foreign exchange in the form of imported raw films. This is a sheer wastage. All these colour films are wasting away a lot of foreign exchange consuming raw films, both black and white films and coloured films, and other raw materials also. Actually, they are creating such an atmosphere in our society that these vulgar films and other crime films only propagate immediately violence and criminal activities in our society. These films should not at all be allowed to be produced. For this purpose at least there should be provisions for pre-censorship of the scripts and also controlling the production. There should also be certain provisions and law for controlling the influence of heroes and heroines whose activities are predominant in the film industry. A handful of heroes and heroines are exploiting and enjoying the cream of the industry and controlling the economy of the Film Industry. They accumulate a lot of black money. So, in this field, at least there should be some provisions to see that such

activities could be controlled. So, I request the Minister that such films which propagate vulgarity and pornographic stories etc. should be controlled and not be allowed to be produced. The films which are awarded some prizes by Government, journalists and other institutions should be allowed some facilities so that they can be screened and exhibited throughout the country so that large sections of common people can see those films. Certain provision should have been there to encourage those films to be screened throughout the country.

I suggest that the Minister should accept my suggestion in view of what I have stated.

*SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA (Arambagh) Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, at the third reading stage of this Bill, I will urge upon the Minister to withdraw this Bill. If we consider whether the Cinema Industry will be benefited by this legislation, I will say 'No'. Whether our tradition and culture will be benefited by this? Again the answer is 'No'. Will we be able to provide for mass education through this legislation? The answer remains 'No'. Therefore, I say that this Bill should be withdrawn as it serves no social purpose. Yesterday, the hon. Minister during the course of his speech had referred to Rabindra Nath Tagore. Sir, I will mention about a couplet written by Tagore which, when translated reads "Clouds are thundering in the sky in torrential rain while I sit on the bank without hope". The hon. Minister is also in the same predicament. We are in the midst of chaos and crisis all around us at present. There is crisis in the cultural sphere and there is economic crisis. The Hippie culture, which I consider as negation of culture is spreading its influence all round. The Minister has brought this Bill at this critical time. The hon. Minister had in his speech yes-

terday mentioned about 'entertainment tax'. I will draw his attention to the performance on stage and drama and in this connection, I would cite an instance. A play was being staged in a park. Suddenly, the police went there and committed various atrocities. They even murdered a boy named 'Prabir Dutta'. In this way constant attack is going on on our cultural activities by the police. I feel that through this Bill the Film Industry will have to tow the Government line, as is sought to be done by the Minister.

Sir, some time back the hon. Minister arranged for the screening of a film called 'Upacha Sonar Mati' for the benefit of Members of Parliament. In that film feudalistic Zamindari was shown to be existing in our country and capitalistic 'Zamindari' was created. The ideas and sayings of Shrimati Indira Gandhi was given much publicity and prominence therein. Sir, in this Bill in the name of 'Censor' in the name of law in the name of examining and revising Committee and in the name of appellate tribunals what is really sought is that the Government wants to portray its own class character and image through this cultural medium. This Bill is only the first step towards that end. Therefore, I oppose this Bill and demand that it must be withdrawn.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Sir, I am grateful to the hon. Member, that they have evinced so much interest even at the third reading stage. I am particularly happy that though Shri Madhu Limaye could not be present during the first reading stage he did participate at the third reading stage. So far as the general trend of the debate at this stage is concerned, Sir, you would have noticed that there is commonness of views between what I said yesterday and what the hon. Members by and large said today. The hon. Members have said that the

*The original speech was delivered in Bengali.

present situation in the film scene is causing concern. It is a cultural input which cannot be left to the whims of those who are indulging in speculative profiteering. They have said that this is something which has to be treated on par with at least those basic things which go to make a nation. Yesterday I swelt at length on the same things. Film which is a powerful media should be basically treated on the same lines as textbooks or healthy literature. Mr. Madhu Limaye said that in spite of the fact there is a danger to the cultural system of our society; in spite of the fact that tender minds get exposed and the results are not happy; in spite of the fact that some of the western societies have now had to hold a congregational enquiry in spite of all this Mr. Limaye said the society as a whole should not assert itself. It should not stop such things happening and leave it to the courts. Earlier during the day when he was speaking on Bihar Ordinance he pleaded that as the courts take long time and is a time consuming process it should be avoided whereas when it comes to these things which harm in depth Mr. Madhu Limaye has got faith in that aspect of judiciary.

16.00 hrs.

DR KAILAS (Bombay South): The courts come in when the harm is already done.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: He has become a great censor of public morals.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I have not. But I am certain that there are men of as good integrity and as fine judgment and as good taste as Mr. Madhu Limaye available in the country, and I have faith in them, and I have faith in their judgment. When we choose people of that level and with integrity, censorship will be better looked after than today.

My hon. friend Shri Limaye had also raised a point regarding the certification of export films. I think he

was not here when we were discussing that clause, and I had said then, which I shall repeat now, that we had tried to simplify the procedure. At the moment, all the films which are exported are re-censored by the customs authorities, but we think that it is cumbersome because a film need not be censored twice. Therefore, we are taking this power from the customs authorities and giving certification power for this to the Censor Board which will do it on the basis of the certificate once granted.

He has also drawn my attention to the recent advance of some amounts to a cinema-owner. He has been in correspondence with me and I have written to him already and tried to explain the position. One of the cinema-owners in Delhi and Bombay entered into an agreement with the Sovo exports, exporters of the Soviet films, because they wanted to buy in bulk from these two cinemas and exhibit their films here. That agreement was entered into with the permission of the Ministry of Finance. I have given him the details already. So, I do not think that he should feel concerned about this because we do keep a vigilant eye on any such transaction that takes place.

My hon. friend Shri Salve has tried to use this opportunity to speak twice. Yesterday when I spoke he was not present here. Perhaps, he was making his honest

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He was trying to apply some salve to the discussion.

SHRI J. K. GUJRAL: Since he was not present here at that time he has repeated all those points today. But with due respect to him and to his judgment, I would submit that I had already replied to all his points in detail yesterday, and, therefore, I shall not take your time any more to repeat those arguments.

My hon. friend Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu has again raised the issue of Metro.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Not Metro but Metro Cinema. 'Metro' means underground.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: By 'Metro' I meant the Metro Cinema.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He has to explain why he is overground.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: It has generally surprised me that he is interested in things which are overground.

About Metro Cinema, I had tried to give the details yesterday that the negotiations were going on. He had drawn my attention to some litigation that was going on between the management and the workers to which Government were not a party.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Burdwan): On a point of information, I had the privilege of appearing in the matter. The Central Government were a party to it. Repeated notices were sent, and I am sure the hon. Minister's recollection is not that poor that he does not remember it. Requests were repeatedly made to him that the Government should intervene. But the Government did not choose to intervene on the pretext that the Law Ministry did not advise them to do so. Therefore, what he says is not correct. Let him not say something which is not correct. His recollection may not serve him right now, but the Government was a party; he may kindly recall how many times Prof. Mukherjee and myself had requested him that the Government should appear.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: My friend Shri Hiren Mukherjee did ask me that we should become a party because the workers wanted us to become a party

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Only to appear.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: But the Law Ministry advised us that we need not directly involve ourselves in this. We have enough of our headaches rather than get involved in things where

Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu wants us to get involved.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Is it a matter of law only or is it a question of policy also? Who will decide the question, the Law Ministry or his Ministry?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am deciding the matter of policy, so far as purchase is concerned, in consultation with the Ministry of Finance and the Reserve Bank and the Ministry of Law. We are negotiating the purchase of these two cinemas. At this stage, I should not be asked to explain it further.

Shri Naik has also rightly pointed out that censorship law, howsoever good, will always have loopholes. I quite agree with him. That is why I said yesterday, and I repeat, that censorship at the very best is a negative measure. It cannot really serve a positive purpose. That is why I tried to visualise yesterday what I chose to call a positive social intervention on the cinema scene by having healthier finance, by having a positive attitude by having enlightened public opinion. These are the things which will ultimately change the scene, but censorship has a limited role to play.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: Not doing a negative is also considered positive, logically.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Unless it is a new philosophy because knowledge is changing. When I was a student in my earlier days I used to hear the philosophy that two negatives make a positive.

He raised the issue of TV which is a subject by itself. But I agree with him that TV is a media which this country should build and invest in. It is, neither a luxury nor something which a country like ours can afford to miss because with the help of this powerful visual media we can do a lot for our cultural uplift and social transformation.

My friend, Shri Madhukar, has drawn my attention to the same points regarding the profit motive and the speculative motive and regarding the motive of those who by and large operate on the cinema scene. This needs to be changed. I could not agree with him more. But unfortunately this Bill particularly has a limited purpose. But I am working through various methods to usher in what I have chosen to call a comprehensive film policy.

Shri Joardar has again drawn my attention to the misuse or abuse of raw stock in the foreign exchange on films which are not needed, which are social poison. I agree with him. But I have my limitations. One of the methods of getting over those limitations is this Bill itself. I hope when I come with other measures, perhaps he will have more satisfaction.

Shri Hazra has drawn our attention to certain things. He is divided in two worlds. He is worried about the cultural crisis which is being affected very much by the cinema. At the same time, he is also worried about the small expenditure which we might incur for correcting this thing. He wants that everything should be had free. He wants the cinema to be corrected, but it should not cost; he wants that there should be censorship, but it should be inexpensive. He wants the censorship to be more effective, but it should be free of cost. To some extent, society has to pay if it wants to intervene in a powerful medium like this. I have been pleading for more intervention, not less intervention; I have been pleading for positive intervention, financial intervention so that this cultural input can be made use of to serve a positive purpose of society.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

The motion was adopted.

16.08 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (PONDICHERRY) 1974-75

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We shall now take up discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants in respect of the Budget for the Union Territory of Pondicherry for the year 1974-75.

Only one hour is allotted for the entire thing.

DEMAND No. 1—LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,49,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year commencing from 1st April, 1974 in respect of 'Legislative Assembly'."

DEMAND No. 2—ADMINISTRATOR

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 5,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year commencing from 1st April, 1974 in respect of 'Administrator'."

DEMAND No. 3—COUNCIL OF MINISTRIES

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That a sum not exceeding Rs. 2,87,000 on Revenue Account be granted to the President out of the Consolidated Fund of the Union Territory of Pondicherry to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year