

tenance Ordinance/Act, 1968, viz. far mere absence from duty.

It is hoped that the employees thus reinstated would justify by their responsible attitude and sense of discipline the consideration shown to them by the Government.

19 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Mr Deputy Speaker.....

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I know you are very much interested. But if I allow you to put question, then half-an-hour debate cannot be taken up. I am sorry.

Thereafter it was shelved for 18 years. It never saw the light of the day. Then what happened? We had the film crisis last year during March-April of 1968. Cinemas were closed, studios were closed, and artists did not work. The whole film industry was paralysed and there was a grave crisis. Then the Minister was good enough to say that he was going to set up a Film Council for the improvement of this industry. Since then, another 12 months have passed till today. When we ask what the Film Council is going to do what its structure is going to be and how it is going to tackle the problems, there is no answer. I doubt whether the proposed Film Council is going to work for the betterment of the film industry.

We have to look into the last crisis in the film industry. There was big chaos. The industry was completely closed and there had been rising high costs and star costs and there was trouble because of the minimum guarantee of price asked for by the producers. All these led to the complete paralysis of the whole industry. Government never looked into this and never tried to improve the matter or solve the problem. The Government has known very well, the Finance Ministry has known very well and so also this Ministry has known very well that there is a racket of high star prices and some top ranking stars have raised their price from a couple of lakhs to as much as ten lakhs and most of this goes under the table which is really shameful for this country. It is only to improve these things that I thought possibly this Ministry would form a Film Council. But I am very much doubtful as to how the proposed council is going to help the industry and to look into the problems of the industry. We will have to examine what is the crux of the problem and the fundamental basis of the problem. Unfortunately, this Government has not given any importance to the film industry. Today what the film industry lacks is the financial backing. It is unfortunately not considered as an industry, but only as a medium of professional entertainers. Today there is no provision for the banking institutions to advance loans to the film industry. Naturally, all the film producers and the whole industry have to fall back on unorthodox methods of getting money and this has resulted in all the vagaries,

19.4 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

CONSTITUTION OF A FILM COUNCIL

SHRI N. K. SANGHI (Jodhpur): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the story of the film industry is a sad story. What is really surprising is that the Minister of Information and Broadcasting and the Government have been treating the film industry as an orphan child which is unwanted. This has been an unfortunate aspect in this country.

The question that I asked in the Parliament as to what is going to be the form of the Film Enquiry Committee has, as usual, been side-tracked. The only answer one gets is that a Film Council is being set up for ensuring healthy development of the film industry. The Minister has failed to give an answer as to what the function of this Council is going to be, what power it is likely to have and how this Film Council is going to tackle the basic problem facing the industry and how it is going to co-ordinate the various problems facing this industry.

I would like to draw your attention to the fact that it was the Patil Enquiry Committee in 1951 which gave this idea of the Film Council for the first time.

[Shri N. K. Singhi]

Sir, in the Parliament we have heard sometimes people referring to film industry in the most derogatory terms. They say that they are showing obscene pictures; sometimes they say that they are depraving the morals of our country. But the time has come when we have to realise that the film industry has done the greatest service to this country.

Take the case of language. Today the films have carried north to south and east to west, there is one common *lingua franca*. All the people have one common language to understand due to Indian films. It is a great thing.

19.03 hrs.

[SHRI VASUDEVAN NAIR *in the chair.*]

Sir I am an admirer of Sanskrit because it is a great language. But even during the days of its highest glory Sanskrit was not spoken by the common people. Today Indian films have done a great task in carrying the language of the country, in unifying the language of the country and taking it to all over the country. As I said, when we talk of films in this House, we sometimes talk in a derogatory way about pictures and their various aspects. But all is not so bad as it has been said.

Not only this. If we think in terms of spreading the ideal of secularism, if we think in terms of the solution of social problems, if we think in terms of furthering national integration, we must recognise that films have done a great benefit to the country. I am reminded of pictures like 'Achut Kanya', 'Padosi', 'Jhanak Jhanak Payal Baje', 'Upkar', 'Kalpana' etc; we see how they have helped in removing untouchability. They have not only carried the message of the brotherhood of different communities and different religions; they have also spread the ideal of national integration and all those various aspects that are vital to us in our national life. Films are the cheapest mass media to effect national integration among the masses and eradicate most of our other problems which without films would have looked gigantic.

My reason for raising this discussion is primarily because the Ministry of Informa-

tion and Broadcasting has been dealing with the film industry for a number of years and done injustice to this great industry. I have some statistics here. The Ministry has been spending a total sum of about Rs 23.80 crores. Broadcasting has accounted for Rs. 11.92 crores, expenditure on the PIB, Publications and others is Rs. 6.40 crores, and on the Films Division? On the Films Division which produces documentaries, they have spent Rs. 1.68 crores, on the Central Board Rs. 4,09,000; on the Commission of Inquiry on film censorship Rs. 9,000; on International film festivals, they spend Rs. 5 lakhs. From this you will see what a paltry amount has been devoted to the development of the film industry, one of the biggest industries, which ranks among the five major industries of the country with a capital outlay of Rs. 100 crores employing more than 2 lakh people, artists, technicians and others working in the industry. The industry gives the State a large revenue. It gives an entertainment tax of as much as Rs. 40 crores. The excise levy on films, which does not go to this Ministry but goes to the Consolidated Fund, is as much as Rs. 5 crores.

With all this revenue, what a small amount is devoted by this Ministry to the development of the film industry? This is a matter of a big question mark.

Now this Ministry has proposed the constitution of a film Council. But the contours of it are not known to the people concerned. With the result that there has been a cloudiness and there is speculation in the country about it. It is important that the Government should adopt it as its child, own it as a major industry and do something radical about it so that we have a better chance of taking this industry to better thresholds.

Today we are export-oriented. We are laying emphasis on earning of foreign exchange. With this idea, a new Ministry called the Ministry of Tourism and Civil Aviation had been created. Today tourism has made an impact in the country and tourists are coming to this country from foreign countries in greater numbers and we are also earning larger foreign exchange in the process.

But what has happened to films? We have a great potential market for them outside. But what are we getting? Less than Rs. 2 crores. I feel a separate Ministry has to be created so that proper emphasis could be laid on the development of this industry. We can then increase our foreign exchange earnings to at least Rs. 10 crores on this account in the next two or three years. This is of very vital importance to us. If you treat somebody who is important as a person not to be cared for, it is going to have its adverse repercussions. If we own this industry, if we utilise it for the betterment of the country, we can certainly march forward in meeting the urgent aspirations of our people through this media which can be of great help to this country.

I am sorry that the Information and Broadcasting Ministry, not only on these major issues, but even on minor ones, does not take the people concerned into confidence. They have not taken the step of consulting the various trade associations, professional people and others at all times. They have not practically consulted them. If in matters like the formation of the Film Council, the concerned interests are not consulted and taken into confidence, it would not bring any good results.

Today the industry is suffering. The finances are all blocked. You will be surprised to know that as many as 300 pictures are lying in boxes and there is no hope of their coming out.

I am glad that a Film Finance Corporation has been formed by the Ministry. They have a capital of Rs. 50 lakhs. A picture now costs Rs. 40—50 lakhs to produce. With a total outlay of Rs. 50 lakhs and another Rs. 50 lakhs loan with the Corporation has practically not been able to do any work at all. They have financed some films. But not a single one of such films has proved a hit. I am surprised that even a producer like AVM, which has produced more than two dozen, of which more than a dozen have proved box office hits, which had applied to the Corporation was refused a loan by the Corporation. This would make one feel that there is something radically wrong with the functioning of the Corporation. I feel that instead

of a film council we should think in terms of rising something greater, forming part of the ministry, having greater outlays and then only we can regiment and utilise this media in the interest of the nation. While closing I shall only say that the film industry has been like a Hindu cow which has been milked all these years but had not been given fodder and feed. The time will not be very far when this cow may be taken to the slaughter house in the name of nationalisation because whatever institutions have deteriorated this country has nationalised then. What has happened to the Life Insurance Corporation is an example. There is a cry for bank nationalisation. If they do not look up to the welfare of the industry, it will happen. It is such a great revenue earner; it is such a great foreign exchange earner. If the present state of affairs is allowed to continue, it will not be long when this House will ask for the nationalisation of this industry. We must do some thing. I would only say that the story of the film industry is like a black screen with only "the end" on it. I hope that new Minister Mr. Gujral who is such a dynamic person will give some thought to this industry and create a firmament so that we can have something to be proud of to carry on the film industry in the development of the nation. I could explain the outlook of the film industry today by a famous couplet from film of Raj Kapoor: *Main kya karoon Ram mujhe buddah mil gaya: ... (Interruptions.)*

That is the feeling of the people of the film industry. It is one of the biggest industries, and comes within the first five big industries, employing so many people in this country and it provides the cheapest means of entertainment to the people carrying the message of education, the message of secularism and the message of national integration and it has to be looked with greater respect. I am sure that when the Minister gives us some answers to these points he will say what he is going to do, whether he is going to have greater outlays in the next year for the film industry so that it may be put on a sound footing, whether it will be treated as an industry or whether it will continue to be treated as a profession, art or literature. I feel that we shall have some answers to the problems

[Shri N. K. Sanghi]

I have raised about the film industry from a dynamic Minister that we have here with us today.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING, AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL): I am grateful to Mr. Sanghi that he has given this House an opportunity to discuss this very vital aspect of our social life. I am in agreement with him that unfortunately we have not realised the role which the film industry can play in the country's social transformation. The impact of the audio-visual media, whether it is film or radio or TV has to be understood if we are keen to use these media our transform society in a big country like ours from a traditional to a modern society. All these media will have to be intensively used. Unfortunately our consciousness and our attitude towards the film industry is not one of social approval; we have unfortunately developed an attitude by and large that film is something socially not desirable. One has also to blame the attitude of the film industry itself and the way it has projected itself. The importance of any mass media lies in the way it is used. Like every other technological tool, it is a tool in our hands and we should use it effectively for social transformation. I am glad Mr Sanghi has drawn our attention to some of the good roles that it has played: film as a media of integration, film as a media of bringing together and popularising a common language, as a media of communication and building bridges between one part of the country and another.

I am also conscious of the fact that India today is one of the three major countries in the world in film production. I am also conscious of the fact that the investment at the moment in film industry is approximately Rs. 90 crores and the annual turnover, I understand, is about Rs. 60 crores. It directly employs 34,000 skilled workers and about 90,000 unskilled workers, and an almost equal number indirectly. Therefore, this activity, whether it is looked at from the social point of view or from the industrial employment potential point of view or it is looked at as a social media, I do not think we can afford to ignore it.

But we also know it for a fact that the industry by itself is not in a position to provide long-term solution for promotion, stability and growth, because of its inbuilt contradictions, because of the diverse interests which clash with each other. This clash of interests came to surface last year when a crisis developed, when the producers, distributors, exhibitors, everybody, clashed with each other and we realised that the problem of the industry had gone to such an extent that the Government, to a degree, had to intervene to bring them together again.

We also realised the fact that a stage had at last come when we must set up a Council like the Film Council which should be in a position to intervene as an agency for correcting these things and improve relations. Therefore, although for 18 years a debate has been going on in this country ever since the Patil Committee report came that there should be a Film Council, I think public opinion is matured to an extent to realise that the Film Council is a necessity. Since we have come to that conclusion, I think in the not too distant date, I will be in a position to come to this House to set up a Film Council under the authority of this House. We want to set up a statutory Council.

My friend has asked, why is it that I have not spelt out what the Film Council will do and what powers it will have. He will kindly appreciate that it may not be possible for me to go into the details of this till I bring the Bill before the House, when the details could be given. I can say, almost in passing, that we have an intention that the Film Council should be of a nature that it will be in a position to readjust the various factors which go to make the films and also create circumstances and conditions in which the film as a media can be of better social use. We do not want to nationalise it, because we feel that film is an expression of art, and every expression of art where creativity is called for, perhaps departmentalising it may not serve the purpose. We are very keen that the creative aspect should not get damaged. We are very keen that it should attract more and more talent, writers, actors, etc., and it should have more and more of live contact with the stage. We are keen that in this

country the theatre movement should grow because unless the theatre movement grows, the films also will not be complete.

We are also keen that the film and the theatre, both, should more social content in them. We are also keen that all those who participate in the films should have more social consciousness. We are also keen that all those who create or exhibit films should have that quality. We are also keen that the Film Council should be one of such forum which should help the various interests in the films, whether they are workers, skilled or unskilled, actors, producers, exhibitors or distributors or those people who represent society as a whole—educationists, social workers, social transformers—who can be brought together so that in this national body we are able to have a forum which can help not only the film industry but also bring to film an impact of social desirability.

Often we discuss here one aspect of the film or the other which sometimes gets highlighted but you must also realise that all that is being done in the film world by this country is not ignorable also. We may not have done much but, all the same, we have reason to feel proud of it. A number of our films documentaries and features have received international recognition. A number of good film producers have come up and they have been internationally recognised, and many of our actors, directors and producers are now reckoned as some of the prominent figures in the film world all over, and it is something to be proud of. I therefore have an increasing feeling that the film world is now attracting and producing people who are specimen of some of our best people in the country. So, it will not be fair to condemn the industry as a whole, nor will it be fair not to appreciate the positive role that films are playing. Nor will it again be fair not to recognise that those who are working in it are bringing laurels to this country also.

I want to pay homage to them on the floor of this House. It may not be correct to mention names; the list is too long. Last year, only in documentaries, 11 films received international prizes. Within the last two or three months this year, I have

come across 4 or 5 films which have won international awards. In every international film festival, whether they are documentaries or feature films, Indian films have made their mark.

Positively the Government has been trying to do something. My friend mentioned about the Film Finance Corporation. I am conscious that this corporation has not been able to make that much impact as it should, because of lack of funds. Although the films have become expensive, the total amount at the disposal of the corporation is so limited that the impact has not been felt. But we should remember that the corporation is not meant to give loans to big and huge films, but it is meant as a corrective, for promotional activity and build new trends and activate those experimental films which can go to cultivate better taste and create better circumstances. Even if the Corporation is in a position tomorrow to get more funds, it may not be able to give huge advances or loans to big producers of expensive films. We are anxious that whether it is the corporation or the Film Institute, its activity should be more promotional to create better tastes and bring those people into films who are unable to express themselves otherwise. It should be a media of expression and experimentation must be encouraged, so that a new era can be opened where film comes to play a vital role as a leader in the process of social change and transformation. Therefore, whether it is the Film Finance Corporation or Film Institute or film awards or international film festivals, we are utilising all these as tools for trend-setting and we want to intensify this effort further. I am sure when the Film Council comes into its own, it will be a very big national forum for correction and promotion and creating congenial circumstances in which we can have good and socially more useful films.

श्री भोलानाथ मास्टर (अलवर) : सभा-पति महोदय, पहले प्रश्नकर्ता के उत्तर में मंत्री महोदय ने इतने डीटेल में बात कही है कि प्रश्न करने की कम गुंजाइश रह गई है। लेकिन मैं दो-तीन छोटे-छोटे प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ। इस फ़िल्म काँसिल के बारे में पहले ही निश्चय

[श्री भोलानाथ मास्टर]

हो चुका था तो इसमें देरी होने का क्या कारण हुआ।

दूसरी बात यह है कि यह फिल्म कौंसिल बन जाने के बाद में जो फिल्म स्टार्स के बारे में सबसे ज्यादा चर्चा होती है कि सबसे ज्यादा ब्लैकमनी उन लोगों के पास होता है जो उनके लाकर्स में और बैंक के लाकर्स में पकड़ा जाता है तो इस तरह से उनको पैट्रनाइज करते हैं तो उससे हमारे देश में ब्लैक मार्केटिंग को प्रोत्साहन मिलता है और बदनामी भी देश की होती है, ऐसी हालत में इनको यह फिल्म कौंसिल किस प्रकार से रोक सकेगी ?

दूसरे, यह जो फिल्म फाइनेंस कारपोरेशन है उसकी तो यूटिलिटी के बारे में आप भी कह चुके हैं कि परपज सर्व नहीं करता है और दूसरी बात आपने खुद बताई है कि डाक्यू-मेंट्रीज को इनाम मिला है उनको प्रोत्साहन मिला है तो ऐसी हालत में क्यों नहीं हम इनको नेशनलाइज करें जिससे कि ब्लैक का जो रुपया फिल्म स्टारों के नाम से ज्यादा से ज्यादा छिपाया जाता है, उसको निकाला जा सके और दूसरी बात और इसके साथ-साथ यह भी है कि यह भी आप मानते हैं कि यह बड़ा भारी मास मीडिया है, तो मास मीडिया होने के नाते अगर हम इनको बाकायदा एजुकेशन के लिए काम में लायें तो नेशनलाइजेशन से ही वह मतलब सर्व हो सकता है, दूसरा कोई रास्ता नहीं है। इन तीनों प्रश्नों के बारे में आप अपना उत्तर देने की कृपा करें।

श्री शिवबन्धु झा (मधुबनी) : सभापति महोदय, मेरा पहला सवाल यह है कि फिल्मों की क्वालिटी इम्प्रूव करने के लिए सरकार के पास कौन-सा प्रोग्राम है। आम तौर पर हिन्दुस्तानी फिल्मों में बाहर की दृष्टि से यह देखा गया है कि उनमें प्राकृतिकता कम रहती है, अमरीकी फिल्मों में ज्यादा नैचुरल होती है, जब कि हिन्दुस्तानी फिल्मों में बनावटीपन आता है। मैंने बहुत-सी अमरीकन फिल्मों देखी

हैं—आप 'गौन विद दी विड' देखें, दी लोंगेस्ट डे देखें, प्रेजिडेंट लेडी जो जैक्सन की जिन्दगी पर है, प्लाइमाउथ एडवेंचर, डोज सिटी, विरजीनिया सिटी, कॅप्टन ब्लड देखें बहुत ही नैचुरल और अच्छी फिल्में हैं। इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि फिल्मों को प्राकृतिक बनाने के लिए आपके पास क्या प्रोग्राम है।

आपने कहा है कि फिल्म कौंसिल बनाने का प्रश्न विचाराधीन है। क्या आप उस कौंसिल में नान-फिल्मवालों को, सोशल वर्कर्स को रखेंगे या नहीं ?

क्या वह कौंसिल कोई कोड-ग्राफ-ईथिक्स बनायेगी, जिससे टैक्स इवेजन, ब्लैक मार्केट करनेवालों का आचरण अच्छा हो सके ?

आपने अभी जवाब देते हुए कहा है कि नेशनलाइजेशन को सोशल-ट्रांस्फॉर्मेशन का हथियार मानते हैं, लेकिन फिर भी आप इसको प्राइवेट सेंक्टर पर छोड़ देते हैं और समाजवाद की बातें करते हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि आप इसको प्राइवेट सेंक्टर में किस आधार पर छोड़ना चाहते हैं, क्या सरकार इसके राष्ट्रीयकरण पर विचार करेगी ?

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना) : यह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है और इस पर बहुत सारे प्रश्न पूछे जा सकते हैं, लेकिन मैं तीन ही प्रश्न करना चाहता हूँ। पहला प्रश्न यह है—हमारे देश के अन्दर झूझाझूट का प्रचार बहुत जोरों से है, खास तौर पर शंकराचार्य या गोलवलकर जी के कहने के बाद से इसमें ज्यादा तेजी आ गई है। हमारे देश में कुछ ताकतें ऐसी हैं जो कि देश की राष्ट्रीय एकता के सवाल और धर्म-निरपेक्षता की नीति पर चोट कर रही हैं, जो सम्प्रदायवाद के फैलाने में मदद करती हैं। इन बातों के खिलाफ जनता को शिक्षित करने के लिए, जनता के दिमाग को तैयार करने के लिए क्या आपने कोई इस तरह की फिल्म बनाने की योजना बनाई है ? यदि बनाई है तो वह क्या है ?

जो फिल्म कौंसिल आप बनाने वाले हैं क्या आप उसमें किसी संसद सदस्य को भी रखेंगे ?

अभी मंत्री महोदय ने बतलाया है कि इस उद्योग में लाखों लोग काम करते हैं, लेकिन उनकी स्थिति बड़ी ही खराब है, दयनीय है। उनकी यूनियन्ज भी हैं। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि क्या आप उन कर्मचारियों की मजदूरी और दूसरी सुविधाओं को तय करने के लिए कोई वेज-बोर्ड बनाना चाहते हैं, ताकि उनकी समस्याओं का समाधान हो सके और वे इस उद्योग के विकास में ज्यादा सहायक हो सकें ?

श्री रणधीर सिंह (रोहतक) : सभापति महोदय, सबसे पहले तो मैं मंत्री महोदय को मुबारकबाद देना चाहता हूँ कि फिल्म कौंसिल बनाने के सिलसिले में उन्होंने नेक कदम उठाया है। यह भी बड़ी खुशी की बात है कि हमारे मिनिस्टर साहब खुद भी एक बहुत बढ़िया एक्टर-मिनिस्टर लगते हैं, निहायत ही कल्चर्ड आदमी हैं जो अपने सञ्जैक्ट को भी वखूबी समझते हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि इनके होते हुए कोई न कोई इम्प्रुवमेंट जरूर आयेगी।

पहला सवाल तो मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ इस देश में एक्टरों और एक्ट्रेसज की इतनी चौधर है, इतनी इज्जत है कि बड़े-बड़े नेता, यहाँ तक कि इन्टरनेशनल नेताओं की भी उतनी इज्जत नहीं है। लेकिन दूसरी तरफ हमारी फिल्म इण्डस्ट्री की आज यह हालत है कि कोई भी वालिद अपने 15 साल से कम उम्र के बच्चों को फिल्म देखने भेजना नहीं चाहता। इस की वजह क्या है, क्यों नहीं भेजना चाहता? इसलिये कि इन फिल्मों में सिवाय इस्किया बातों के और कुछ नहीं होता है—लाल दुपट्टा मलमल का—इस किस्म के गाने होते हैं—मुझे डर लगता है कि अगर मैं फिल्म देखने चला गया तो कहीं मैं भी न बिगड़ जाऊँ। आपके मिनिस्टर इन्चार्ज होते हुए और इस मामले की नज्ज आपके हाथ में होने से क्या आप यह

देखने की कोशिश करेंगे कि देश क्या चाहता है, समाज क्या चाहता है? क्या इस किस्म का फिल्मी माहौल पैदा करेंगे, फिल्म इंडस्ट्री में इस किस्म की तब्दीली लायेंगे जिससे कि करैक्टर, देशभक्ति और नेशनल इंटिग्रेशन के नजरिए से ट्रांसफार्मेशन आये और अगर 6 साल के बच्चे-बच्ची भी वहाँ जायें तो बिगड़ कर न भायें बल्कि इस मुल्क के बेहतरीन सिटिजन बन सकें ?

दूसरे क्या यह मुमकिन है कि आज हिन्दुस्तान में जो डेवलपमेंट हो रहा है, जो सारे प्रोजेक्ट्स हैं, देहातों में जो डेवलपमेंट हो रहा है, जो कि नेशन करता है और जो सोशल लाइफ है, उसका एक पूरा खाका देश के सामने आ सके, क्या इस बात को लेकर भी आपकी कोई योजना है?

तीसरे आज एक्टर और एक्ट्रेसज लाखों रुपया ब्लैक मनी का कमाते हैं। मेरा बच्चा भी बी० ए० करके कहता है कि मैं एक्टर या प्रोड्यूसर बनूँगा अलिफ बे पे आता नहीं लेकिन हर लड़का कहता है कि मैं एक्टर बनूँगा और लड़कियाँ कहती हैं कि एयर-होस्टेस बनना चाहूँगी—तो इसमें जो लाखों रुपये ब्लैक की बात है, जो घाँघली मची है इसको दूर करने के लिए क्या आप इंडस्ट्री को नेशन-लाइज करने की बात सोचेंगे क्योंकि यह देश की एक बहुत बड़ी इन्डस्ट्री है और यह मुल्क के अखलाख और करैक्टर को बनाने वाली है और एजुकेशन का माध्यम भी है? इन बातों का मैं जवाब चाहूँगा।

SHRI I.K. GUJRAL: The hon. Member, Shri Bholu Nath Master, raised a question about the delay in bringing up the Film Council Bill. I have already said that for 18 years these talks have been going on. Unfortunately, the delay, as I mentioned earlier, has been because there was so much resistance on the part of the film industry. Now, as a result of various negotiations carried on and discussions carried on by the previous Minister of Information and

[Shri I. K. Gujral]

Broadcasting, Shri K.K. Shah, and also as a result of the crisis which came last year; there is a changed atmosphere. As a result-of-talks that I have had with some representatives of the film industry, I find now the atmosphere is changed and, I think, it will be easier for us to bring up the Film Council Bill. Let us also keep this in mind that it is much better to bring a Bill a statute, which is acceptable to the film industry as a whole because it will then work better. When I say the film industry as a whole, I am including all component of the film industry, i.e., producers, actors and extras; technicians; and the people who work behind the screen or those who carry the things—all those suffer more and never come on the screen. That is why we are thinking, when we constitute a Film Council of having in the Film Council the representatives of producers, distributors, exhibitors, directors, artistes, technicians, and labour in the film industry so that all these components are brought together.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: A representative of film fans also.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I have deliberately only mentioned uptill now those who are in the making of the film.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Obviously, there will be some Members of Parliament also on it.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am also thinking of having State representatives, particularly, of those States where the industry is more developed and also other States, and also educationists, thinkers and philosophers in the country, in short I wish the variety of our national life, must get reflected in the Film Council.

A question has been raised, again and again, about the 'black money' with the film actors, etc. Naturally, none of us can be happy that the film actors and stars, those who are respected in national life, should be accused of having black money. I am only hoping that they will become conscious of their social responsibility and will remove this stigma from their fair name and will create circumstances when they are not mentioned like this in the House.

I am also hoping that when the Film Council comes and we are in a position to regulate the industry better, then to a degree it might be reduced. You may kindly keep one thing in mind. The black money, upto a degree, has also come about by two reasons. Firstly, there are many adventurists in film production line. People who make money elsewhere might go and make one film. They go about buying actors with a price which may not be rational or which may have no bearing with the industry as such. As a result of the Film Council, since we intend that the Film Council should be in a position to license and regulate production and producers, I think to that extent, the adventurists and those who are not otherwise qualified to be in industry will get eliminated and to that extent black money might reduce.

The biggest difficulty is that, in our country, those who go to see films are too conscious of welcoming only film stars and they do not go by the quality of the film so much as the film stars. I will give you an example. With the help of the Film Finance Corporation, we produced 43 films, but we have not been able to exhibit 36 as yet, because they are not star-studded films. The stars are so much welcome in our life and that is one reason why the prices go up and then these things happen. As our public becomes more educated, the content of films will matter more, and new experimental films will matter more, and in the same proportion, the black money will also go down.

It was said that I had mentioned only documentaries as having received prizes. Documentaries have received prizes. But feature films have also received prizes. I did not mention the number because I did not have the figures with me. I would only mention that a number of films of Satyajit Ray, for example, have received recognition. So, feature films also have received a great deal of recognition. Therefore, let us not feel that only documentaries have.

Mr. Jha asked me what steps we propose to take to improve the quality of the film in the film industry. Ultimately, if you ask me in one word...

श्री शिवचन्द्र झा : सिकन्दर जैसा हुआ, मुजाता हुआ ।

श्री इ० कु० गुजराल : अगर मैं एक भ्रज करूँ कि फिल्म हो, किताब हो, शायरी हो, कोई चीज अच्छी तभी पैदा होती है जब पढ़ने वाले, देखने वाले अच्छे टेस्ट के पैदा हो जायें । अगर आप और हम ऐसी चीजों को देखना न चाहें जो घटिया हैं, जो हमारी जिन्दगी को नीचे ले जाती हैं तो जाहिर है कि वह नहीं बनायेंगे । इसलिए हमको चाहिए कि हम ऐसा माहौल पैदा करें जिससे लोग अच्छी चीजों को पसन्द करें । ज्यों-ज्यों तालीम बढ़ रही है, लोगों के अन्दर टेस्ट की बातें हो रही हैं तो क्वालिटी जरूर बढ़ेगी ।

श्री शिवचन्द्र झा : हमारे सामाजिक जीवन को भी प्राकृतिक ढंग से नहीं प्रजेंट करते उसको भी कृत्रिम रूप से लाकर पेश करते हैं ।

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am afraid, this is a very large question. We cannot discuss this issue in a half-an-hour discussion.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I would only deal with one question which has been repeated again and again and that is regarding nationalisation. Although I am one of those who are votaries of the public sector

and nationalisation in many things, I would say that nationalisation is not the panacea for all ills. Let us keep this thing in mind. Therefore, we should not quickly jump to the conclusion that by nationalisation the quality of films will improve, content will improve. We have also seen that in societies where there is more emphasis on nationalisation, the quality of art production has gone down. Therefore, I would not like to come to any conclusion. But I would also like to say that if you come to the conclusion that the social content is not coming in spite of the public demand, then, of course, steps can be thought of.

I think, I have covered almost all the points except that of Mr. Randhir Singh. Mr. Randhir Singh's point was why the actors are more glamorous. I can only tell him one thing. All those who speak behind the microphone and all those who act behind the footlights will always have more glamour. And, I think, that between our community and the film acting community, there is much in common.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned till 11 A M. tomorrow.

19.40 hrs,

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, May 1, 1969 Vaisakha 11, 1891 (Saka).