

**RESOLUTION RE CONTROL AND REGULATION OF PRODUCTION AND EXHIBITION OF FILMS—concl'd.**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The House will now resume discussion on the resolution moved by Shri N. M. Lingam on the 3rd August, 1956, regarding control and regulation of production and exhibition of films. Out of 2 hours and 15 minutes allotted for the discussion on the resolution, 2 hours and 14 minutes are left for its discussion today.

**Shri N. M. Lingam (Coimbatore):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, as the House knows, the resolution that I moved the other day seeks to invest Government with greater powers so that it may effectively control and regulate the production and exhibition of films in the country. This raises two questions. One is, if the state of the film industry in the country is such that greater control and regulation is necessary, and the other question that naturally arises is, if the present powers of the Government are not adequate to deal with the situation.

To deal with these two aspects, one has naturally to go to the power and influence of the film. I need not dwell at length on the great influence the film has on the human mind. Along with the Press and the Radio it has become one of the three powerful means of mass communication and it can be said that its power is far superior to that of the Press and the radio put together.

Sir, in this connection I shall refer to the power of the film referred to by our Prime Minister during his inauguration of the Film Seminar held here recently. This is what he said:

"The influence in India of films was greater than the combined influence of books, newspapers and periodicals, and anything that was likely to have such a comprehensive influence was of the utmost importance from any point of view, whether in terms of art

or of moulding younger generations."

Therefore, the Prime Minister added:

"The Government must be intimately concerned with it, though in what manner might be a different matter."

He did not like too much interference by Government, but Government must inevitably be concerned with an industry which had such tremendous and wide influence.

I need not take the time of the House in going further into explaining the power of the film. Now that it is universally recognised that the film has become of such great influence for mass communication, naturally, we seek to find how it affects society. It has like all powerful things the capacity to affect society for good or bad. We have the atom bomb. The power of the atom can revolutionise the world by bringing peace and prosperity to the people if it is used for peaceful purposes; or it could create wholesale destruction. So, Sir, anything that is powerful in the world could be used for the tremendous good of the people or for their downfall.

Sir, of late there has been a general searching of the heart and that of the mind with regard to the influence of the film throughout the country. Advanced countries in the west have carried out enquiries into the influence of the film on the mind of adults generally and on that of the younger generation in particular. Various surveys have been made and one of the greatest film-producing countries, namely, the United States of America have probably undertaken the most comprehensive survey. The fact that a body like the United States Congress thought it necessary to go into the question of the effect of the film on the people shows the importance attached by that body to this very great problem.

I shall ask the indulgence of the House to go into the state of the film

industry in that country and to quote some of the findings of this Senate body which went into the matter recently.

"The Supreme Court has not ruled that the constitutional rights of a 'free screen' or of a 'free press' include the right to present any idea that may come to a film producer's or editor's mind. While the Supreme Court has handed down no legal definitions, it has tacitly acknowledged that that which is obscene, incites to violence, or otherwise jeopardizes law and order is subject to legal restraints on the screen as in everyday life."

In the concluding part of their report the Committee observes—

"The violence and brutality in motion pictures which has coincided with increased behaviour of this type on the part of young people must be counteracted with a strong insistence on the part of motion-picture producers to adhere to the principles of the Motion Picture Production Code which outlaw this type of film content. The motion-picture people must assume the responsibility of helping young children form opinions and attitudes that will help them meet the problems of living in our complex society to the best interests of both."

So, the body which went into this question has come to the conclusion that its influence has not been such as to make people live a decent living as to enthuse the people for better life, for a better taste in life, for appreciation of art and beauty in life. Strange as it may seem, if one goes through the report, it will be clear that all evidence tendered before the Committee is against the present trend of films, for its capacity to do any good. But, unfortunately, the stranglehold on the industry of big business is such that the conclusions of the report are equivocal.

Several reports have been published by the UNESCO also on this question of the influence of films on society. While they agree that the film has

great influence on people, young and old, they are not unanimous in their conclusion that greater control is necessary so that the film industry could be regulated by Government. In a country of free enterprise like America they are obsessed by this theory of *laissez faire*. One could easily understand it. It is also possible that the study of psychology in the west is not so advanced as to precisely find out the effect of the motion picture on society.

They generally are of the view that for people especially children and adolescents who are of balanced minds, who have had good upbringing, who have had good family relations, the film, however bad it might be, will not constitute a menace. It is for the children the adolescents who have a predisposition to crime or for delinquency of any other type that the film is a positive danger. But in our country with our five thousand years of experience of study of the mind of the young, we know that the influence of ideas on mind is very subtle, but at the same time very effective. We know that the mind is such a delicate mechanism that any suggestion, any idea it comes into contact with, is bound to affect it. It constitutes a cause and the effect must be there. It may be that the effect is not manifest as soon as the cause occurs, but we know Indian psychology has proved that any idea, any new idea, or any new impression, affects the mind profoundly and the effect though it may not be apparent at the time of the occurrence of the cause does affect the personality of the individual. So, we need not in this matter be guided by what surveys in the west have shown to us. It is interesting for us to see that all these surveys had shown that the influence of the film of late has been deleterious. That is the general position of the film industry in the world at large. It is not surprising, therefore, that there is censorship of some kind or other in every country in the world. The method of censorship varies. In the U.S.A., for example, the industry itself through the institution called Production Code Administration, seems

[Shri N. M. Lingam ]

to censor films. In the U.K. and the Scandinavian countries, the system is still more advanced and is probably the best having regard to the conditions obtaining in those countries. But, it is also admitted that censorship with all its comprehensive code has not been able to curb this trend on the part of the film industry to pander to the lower tastes of the people and to create artificial conditions with a view to afford an escape from the hard realities of life, to glorify crime and violence and to indulge in sadism.

With this brief survey of the influence of the film on the people the world over, I wish to refer to the position of the film industry and its relationship with the people of this country. We know the film industry started from scratch. It has developed without much financial assistance from the Government. It has developed without any organised technical or other help. It has produced good pictures; it has also produced some very good artistes. But, on the whole, we have to admit that it has not come up to our expectations. We do not grudge it and it will be unfair on the part of the Members of this House not to give credit to what has been done. But, we expected the film industry in the country to reach greater heights, in harmony with our civilisation of 5,000 years, heights in conformity with our great culture and our national ideals and great traditions. I do not know if it is worthwhile going into the causes which have contributed to the inability of the industry to rise to the expectations of the people. The film industry, for its part, lays the blame at the door of the Government. It says that it has developed without much assistance from the Government, that it has been struggling against heavy odds, unfair competition from foreign films, lack of technicians, lack of adequate market and innumerable other difficulties. An impartial enquiry into this state of affairs has been made by a Committee consti-

tuted by the Government to go into the working of the film industry.

According to that report, we have about 2,426 permanent and semi-permanent and about 793 cinemas located in tents. The daily attendance of cinemas in India is 16 lakhs, which works out to an annual attendance of 60 crores. This should give us an idea of the vast influence of the film in our country. In a year, nearly double the population of the country sees films and is affected by it for the better or for the worse.

I wish to say a few words on the question of the control exercised by the Government on the film industry. The Central Government has no powers to control the production in the industry. The production of films is a State subject. The Central Government can only sanction the exhibition of films in the country. It is rather anomalous that when the Central Government has the press and radio directly under its control, it should have only partial control over the most powerful mass media of communication namely the film. The first thing that I would suggest is that the question of production of films should be centralised. At least it should be brought into the Concurrent List so that the Centre may have a more effective voice in the production of films. Unless that is done, you cannot lay down any policy to be followed by the industry in the production of films and no effective check could be exercised on the tendency to produce films according to the whims and fancies of the producers. That is, according to me, a very necessary step if the Government really wants to have an effective voice in the film industry as a whole.

I shall refer to censorship. The Government centralised censorship after the recommendation of the Film Enquiry Committee which was appointed in 1928. It took several years for the Government to come to this decision. But, it is a welcome decision and they have done it. They are trying to make it as effective as

possible. There are several lacunae in the process. Under the scheme, no approved copy of the script is deposited with the Censor Board or with the Government. The producers can substitute portions of a censored film by others of equal length which the Board has never seen. The trailers which are shown are not to be certified. No scrutiny of the publicity materials, the photographs issued to the journals and the daily press and for display in the lobbies of the cinemas is made. Posters exhibited outside the theatres are also not scrutinised by the Censor Board. There is no legal provision for prior scrutiny of scripts. No scrutiny also is made of films before export.

There is also another dangerous aspect. I call it dangerous because we follow the west in classifying the films into two categories, A category and U category films. The A category is for adult audiences only and the U category for universal exhibition. This is just a copying of what is the practice in the west. What is happening is, when a film is advertised for adult audiences only, the producer does not hesitate to exploit the implied salaciousness of that film. He makes much of the fact that it is for adults only. The result is that even adolescents and others go to these films. How does the Government regulate the audiences in the theatres? They do not insist on age certificates. You cannot expect the policemen or magistrates to stand at the entrances to see that only adults enter the theatre to see pictures certified for adult audiences only. Although pictures are divided into A category and U category pictures, in actual practice, this leads to an abuse of the concession because it is difficult to see that adults alone see pictures of the A category, and children are severely excluded from such pictures. We need not, in this respect, be guided by what is happening in the west. We have certain standards, norms and values of our own. It should be beneath us to see the exhibition of a film which is

not suitable for the people at large. If a picture is decent, people without any distinction of age must be able to see it. The very fact that a certain picture is limited to a particular audience shows that there is something seriously wrong with it, and I would strongly urge that this distinction should go. Our pictures should be of such a high order that no one should be afraid of exhibiting them universally.

So, my point was that there are difficulties in the enforcement of this censorship. And with regard to foreign films, what is happening? The Censor Board is very stringent in its application of the code with regard to foreign films, we agree, but the background, the tradition of the West is different from that of ours. So, even after the stringent scrutiny of Western films, we find that the Western pictures are revolting to us, because we do not view it, at any rate the vast majority of the people that go to films do not view the films from the point of view of the background, the tradition and the culture of the West. So, the effect is that either we have a distorted view of the people of the West, of their culture and tradition, or we try to imitate them thinking that that is the best in Western life. Either way it is fraught with danger. It would be best if the West realised and co-operated, seeing the reactions in our country to their films that are exported, but in the absence of such a reciprocal arrangement, the result is that we suffer for the deficiencies in the production code administration of the Western countries. The principal country that exports films to us is the United States and unless a more rigorous policy is followed with regard to the import of films from that country, we have to put up with what I would call the objectionable features in the Western films, because if the censor is to apply our standards to the Western films, he would not be able to certify even a single film, and if he allows it from Western standards, it is bound to cause upsets and dis-



[Shri N. M. Lingam]

equilibrium in the minds of people who visit the cinemas in our country. I do not suggest a ready remedy. I do not say the import of foreign films should be completely banned. It is up to the Government to find out ways and means of regulating the import of foreign films so that the Indian films may grow unhampered by the evil influences of these Western films.

The House would be interested, I am sure, in the verdict of the UNESCO which conducted a series of studies on the film and the radio and the press. In its conclusions it gives this warning:

"The warning given by the censors to producers and directors who consistently make brutal, violent, degrading or outrageously pessimistic and negative films, should have our full approval."

Then again, they say:

"They (the children) are perfectly capable of deriving benefit from the performance; certain films elevate them morally; others falsify their moral sense, accustoming them to see in an agreeable and flattering light (to the point where they find it normal) robbery, adultery and injustice, to mention only these aspects of immorality."

So, there cannot be any two opinions about the evil effects of these films on vast masses of people not only the world over but also in a country like ours. I am not able to see how Government has been able to adopt measures to check this tendency on the part of the film industry to corrupt the minds of people. Perhaps it would be truer to say that the film industry in the country has been motivated by the box office. They have not paid any heed to the consequences of their enterprise on society. Their stand actually has been that they invest huge sums of money in pictures and unless this costly product finds a vast audience to consume it, they will be put to a loss, but this

reflects a very sad state of affairs. Every institution in the world has to subservise some ideal. Every institution has a great social purpose. It is true the absence of a definite policy on the part of Government in regard to the direction, purpose and regulation of the industry has been partly responsible for the present drift in the film industry. I expect the hon. Minister for Information and Broadcasting to let the House know what he proposes to do in the matter of organising the industry, in the matter of co-ordinating the activities of the industry and giving it a central direction and policy, what he proposes to do with regard to the setting up of a Film Bureau, with regard to the training of technicians, with regard to....

Shri Velayudhan (Quilon *cum* Mavelikkara—Reserved—Sch. Castes): The whole production may be taken over by the State.

Shri N. M. Lingam: That is a suggestion and I think you will develop your point when you have an opportunity.

Shri Velayudhan: Of course, I will have the opportunity, I think.

Shri N. M. Lingam: I would request the hon. Minister to tell the House and the industry at large what Government's attitude towards the industry is, how they propose to regulate the growth of the industry, to what extent they are alive to the difficulties of the industry, to what extent the industry is to blame, to what extent the public, the press and the Government are to blame. Unless there is a clear stand on the part of Government, the industry will not be able to adjust itself. It is true, the industry owes a great deal to the public. It has to regulate itself, it must have a self-regulating machinery as in other countries but the day when such a state of affairs would be witnessed in this country is not yet, because we have not yet made the beginnings of a reorientation in the film industry of the country. The film industry has yet to think in terms of social good,

raising the culture of the people, raising the commonest man and giving him the highest taste in life. So, the Government has to step into the picture. If that is not done and the industry is left to itself, the period of transition and adjustment of the industry to the needs of the people in a changing, dynamic society, will be painful, will be long, drawn out and the result will be that people will suffer.

As an eminent author said, the cinema must acquire letters patent of nobility as the theatre and music have achieved. We are launching great schemes of social and economic development, but we have huge leaks in our development, and one such huge leak in our national effort is the bad influence of mass media of communication like films. If the nation as a whole is to be raised, such leaks must be plugged and here it is that Government must step in. Let us not allow the films to corrupt the minds of our youths. The youths are the flowers of our country. The youth and children are our treasure; they are our assets. They are the citizens of tomorrow. So, let us not corrupt their minds, blight their imagination and spoil their spirits through the mass media of communication.

We keep ourselves open to all manner of influences. We import pornographic literature and all kinds of magazines. We show all kinds of films. At the same time, and in the same breath, we exhort people to improve their conduct, to be capable of rendering the greatest service to the country, to develop their personalities, and so on and so forth. We quote the Constitution ad nauseum, and say that we are giving the fullest opportunity to everyone to grow. But the time has come when the national effort must be conducive to the greatest good, when national energy has to be conserved for the welfare of all, and when the negative influences have to be exterminated. It is in this context that I propose that article 19(2)

should be amended, so that Government could have greater powers.

The House will remember that when a question was put with regard to the memorandum of an association of mothers in Delhi with regard to the influence of bad films on the children, the Minister said that he could not do anything in the matter, because he was powerless; and if the House so desired that he should have more powers, and it gave him more powers by amending the Constitution, he would act, and he would be able to act. Now, there is an opportunity to the House to invest Government with more powers, so that they may check this evil tendency.

The committees that have enquired into the state of affairs in the west have shown that mothers from all over the world have given evidence and have shown in unmistakable terms their uneasiness, their anxiety and their apprehensions, in regard to the effects of films on the younger generation. In our own country, there are other difficulties also, which are beyond the reach of the censors.

The main classes of films are the social films, the biographical films, the mythological films, and the 'Fantasy' films. In the social films, the theme is entirely divorced from the realities of life.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member wanted only ten minutes at that time. He has got them already.

I have got the names of about eight Members on my list. Surely, the hon. Mover himself would like other Members also to contribute something.

**Shri N. M. Lingam:** I shall conclude in about five minutes' time.

I was saying that there are four main classes of films. The social films are entirely divorced from the realities of life. It is the same triangle of love; the theme ends with a note of success for virtue. But its effect on the people is that it leaves them confused.

[Shri N. M. Lingam]

Then, we have the mythological films. In the mythological films, great caricatures are made of gods and goddesses held in great veneration. Ours is a secular State. We respect every religion, every creed, every sect; from the snake-worship to the highest form of worship, every form of worship is respected. But if a producer makes fun of our gods and goddesses, showing them in dances and in revelries, such a kind of attitude wounds the susceptibilities of millions of people.

Some attention has been paid towards the production of biographical films. But even there, with regard to the details of the life of the different persons, there are controversies. We have the recent example of the films in respect of Kabir and Bhagat Singh. So, the slightest inaccuracy raises a chain of controversies. Here, again, the censors are helpless.

I am sorry to say that in the south, especially in that part of the country from which I hail, there is a campaign, as is sought to be shown, an alleged campaign of the north against the south. There is also a series of films showing communal hatred among the southerners themselves. I would have liked to give more details of these films and their effects on the minds of people, but since the time is short, I refrain from doing so. But I would only point out that these are the broad trends of our film production, and they are doing positive harm to the country.

I would conclude by saying that here is a great opportunity to the House to invest Government with greater powers, so that they may step in and control the film industry more effectively. I cannot say that Government have been above any criticism, all these years. They have allowed the industry to drift far too long. I do not know what powers Government want. At one stage, they wanted an amendment

of even article 19 (6), which would empower them to regulate the industry in public interest.

These matters have to be examined. And it is for the Minister to say whether the existing powers are adequate or he wants more powers. I, for my part, however, would urge that Government should be given all the powers necessary, so that the great power of films may be used as a great lever for the educational and cultural advancement of our people, and also to subserve our national ideals to the great glory of our land.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that Government should introduce legislation to amend article 19(2) of the Constitution, so as to enable the Government to effectively control and regulate the production and exhibition of films in the country."

Two amendments have been tabled to this resolution, one by Shri Shree Narayan Das and the other by Shri C. R. Narasimhan. Do the hon. Members want to move them?

**Shri Shree Narayan Das** (Darbhanga Central): Yes.

**Shri C. R. Narasimhan** (Krishnagiri): Yes.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that before introducing legislation to amend Article 19(2) of the Constitution, a Committee consisting of members of Parliament be immediately appointed to enquire as to how this article has so far stood in the way of effective control and regulation of the production and exhibition

of films in the country with instructions to report within three months from the date of its appointment."

**Shri C. E. Narasimhan:** I beg to move:

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that it is necessary in the interests of national unity and social progress as well as a healthy moral and cultural life in the country to control and regulate effectively the production and exhibition of films, and, therefore, recommends that Government should see whether at present there are adequate powers available for this purpose and if found necessary it might take up the question of amending the Constitution for necessary powers."

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** These amendments are before the House. I am not placing any time-limit on speeches. But the House will see that there are about ten names, with me, of persons who want to speak on this resolution. We have 2 hours and 15 minutes for this, and the Mover himself has taken 45 minutes. So, no hon. Member should exceed ten minutes.

**Shri Achuthan (Cranganur):** Though no chits have been sent, we also would like to speak.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Certainly, I would presume that every Member present here wishes to speak.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** The House is extremely grateful to the hon. Member who has moved this resolution, for he has given an opportunity to this House to express its views on a very important subject which affects the whole community in India.

Some time ago, I had tabled a question regarding this matter. And the Minister was pleased to state that although he had received a petition signed by about thirteen thousand

housewives and mothers of Delhi pressing action to control the evil of the cinema, and although he would do whatever was possible under the present Constitution, yet he may not be able to do full justice to the case that was represented to him, and he pleaded his inability. He wanted that this House should express its views on this matter, that the Members should give vent to their feelings, and if they suggested that there was a necessity to amend the Constitution with a view to bringing about some reforms in the matter of the production, control and regulation of films, he would be glad.

I am very glad that this resolution has secured the ballot, and this House has now got the opportunity.

No one can deny the importance of films in our life. It plays a very important part, educationally, nationally and culturally, besides providing entertainments. There are various ways in which films have an effective influence on the various sectors of society, children, mothers, adults and others. Although they are an effective means for the promotion of national culture, education and healthy entertainment, if they are not regulated and controlled, they may go astray and lead to rather degeneration and decay of society. Films which are a means of uplift and progress may lead to disaster. I would quote from the Report of the Film Enquiry Committee the view expressed by some educationists:

"On the whole, the influence of music and dancing of the average Indian film on children's tastes is not healthy or of good quality. Children learn by imitation and the gestures and language of love scenes, dare-devilry, roguery and crime leave impressions which take some time and more powerful and intimate influences to eradicate".

This shows that films are to be controlled and regulated in an effective manner.

[Shri Shree Narayan Das ]

At present, as has been stated by my hon. friend, the Centre has control only on the certification of films. The production and distribution of films are still left to the States. I am sorry I cannot say in what way the various States have exercised control over the production and distribution of films. I am not quite aware of this. I think there may be different ways of controlling and regulating the production and distribution of films in different States. But as long ago as 1927, a Committee was appointed to inquire into certain specific matters with regard to films. At that time, also, it was suggested that the production of films should be regulated and controlled by the Centre. I do not know why at the time of framing the Constitution, production of film was left in the State List. It was not brought even to the Concurrent List. But there is a provision in entry No. 52 of the Union List which says that if certain industries are declared of national importance, they can be brought under control by the Centre. So like other industries which have been taken over by the Centre, the production of films should also be brought under the control of the Centre. I do not know why the Government have not taken steps in this direction so far. In view of the fact that this industry now plays a very great and important part in various sectors in various manners—this is a very important means of mass communication—I think the Government should have taken some steps as will give them power to regulate and control the production of films also.

As has been stated by my hon. friend, this film industry is not only a means of entertainment, but with the advance of science, with the progress of science, educationists feel that even films can be a very great instrument of mass education. They can help in the spread of education, in teaching various subjects. There-

fore, although I am conscious that the Government have given a huge amount to a society registered under a certain Act and they would be responsible for films for children, I think that is not sufficient, and Government should take control over this industry.

As regards the question whether this industry should be nationalised altogether or it should be left to the private sector without any interference, there are two points of view urged. One view is that if Government interfere with this industry and nationalise it, then art will not progress and there will be restriction on the development of art and other things. Therefore, the suggestion is made that this industry should not be nationalised. But there are others who hold the view that the individuals who are engaged in this industry may have in view both purposes: they may have in mind the social aspect also. But generally it is seen that private persons promote industries with a view to making private profit. With the profit motive in their minds, they do not take care whether the films produced have a good social aspect and produce a healthy effect on society or not. They do not care to see that no evil effects are produced on society through the medium of films.

Therefore, there should be some control. I do not, for the time being, advocate that the film industry should be nationalised. But it should be controlled in various ways. There should be some balance between the two. Whereas individuals should be allowed to produce stories for films, their production, distribution and exhibition should be controlled by some body to be set up by Government with the effective participation of such persons who can be in a position to see whether those films are for the benefit of society or not.

There is a Censor Board functioning at present, but, as has been

stated in reply to my question, sometimes even the Censor Board is not in a position to ban the exhibition of such films as are not in the social interest of the community. They think that article 19 (2) of the Constitution stands in the way of such a course of action. Unless there are clear grounds to show that the film is indecent, they cannot prevent its exhibition.

Therefore, I would like to suggest the appointment of a Film Council. I do not know what were the reasons why Government did not think it worthwhile to give effect to the recommendation of the Film Enquiry Committee for the appointment of a Film Council. There should be a Film Council consisting of persons from Government and also other qualified independent citizens who would advise the industry, the Censor Board and the Government on different matters regarding film production. I would suggest that there is necessity for such a Council at the Centre to perform the functions I have indicated.

As has been stated here, in the U.S.A. there is a separate Committee consisting of representatives of Government as well as independent persons to regulate production. It has been suggested that on the basis of the American model, there should be a Production Code Administration here. There should be a Committee to look after production and to advise the producers on various matters so that the films produced may be to the advantage of the society.

Therefore, although I am in agreement with the principles suggested by my hon. friend, I have moved an amendment only with a view to see that a Committee consisting of Members of Parliament should be appointed to go into all these questions. Since I was busy with the Bihar and West Bengal (Transfer of Territories) Bill, I was not able to find out how far the recommendations of the Film Enquiry

Committee have been given effect to by Government. I would like to know what were the recommendations given effect by Government. But I would like to suggest that there is great necessity to examine this question of the working of the present Cinematograph Act and the powers at present given to the Central Government and the State Governments, and how those powers have been utilised.

5 P.M.

The control, regulation and production of films—all these things will require to be studied. If after study, the Members of Parliament come to the conclusion that there is a necessity of amending and, if so, in what way, article 19(2) of the Constitution, then the House should give its verdict. Therefore, I think the hon. Mover will accept my amendment to the Resolution.

**Shri Ramachandra Reddi (Nellore):** I have very few observations to make on this Resolution. However much I appreciate the sentiments that have been expressed by both the Mover of the Resolution as well as my friend Shri Shree Narayan Das, I have not been able to see eye to eye with them in regard to the amendment of the Constitution for this purpose. Though the House is very much accustomed and habituated to the amendment of the Constitution in other sectors, I do feel that there is no need for the amendment of the Constitution for this purpose.

The Cinematograph Act of 1952, as modified up to September 1953, has given ample powers to Government to interfere, where it is necessary, with the discretion of the producers and to make the film a medium of education and entertainment.

The industry should be considered as one which is very young in this country. It had its beginnings in the year 1917 in the motion picture trade and the talkie movement came in

[Shri Ramachandra Reddi]

1931. After a series of trials and errors and spending lakhs of rupees over this industry, the producers have now come to a stage when they will be able to stand on their own legs.

No doubt, there are certain films which do require a good deal of modification and pruning and censorship. I am sure, to the extent possible, the Board of Film Censors is doing that work to the great satisfaction of the film-goers. To see that everything is modelled on the sentiments of a few people is not possible because there are varied notions and varied tastes in this country and the film producer, knowing the psychology of the country, tries to produce films so as to suit every taste. Here and there if there is too much of romance, I think, the Film Board of Censors is doing its little bit of work by cutting such portions which are really found to be objectionable.

Here, in India, we have got about 200 producers and about 3,500 cinema theatres, apart from the touring cinemas that are going about in the rural areas. The producers employ about a lakh of personnel and lakhs of rupees are being spent every year for the purpose of production, each film costing about Rs. 5 to Rs. 10 lakhs. Money is found somewhere and sometimes the distributors also give advances for the development of this industry.

I see that the Government, at any rate the Minister-in-charge has been anxious to see that the Constitution is amended so as to give him more powers in the matter of control of films and film production. I think, in the year 1954, in the month of August—and it seems to be August indeed—there was a resolution on the floor of this House discussed, when the Minister has said that he would like to have more power given by Parliament to him for the purpose of improving film production and also for the betterment of the morals of

society. I do think that the Government is not the only institution which should think of pruning the morals of this country. The film-goers themselves have got their own tastes. It is not every film-goer that appreciates every film he sees. The moment he sees that a particular film is not up to his standards, naturally, he dissuades other people from going to that film at all.

Of course, the student population is there and the student population is anxious to see every sort of film; especially in their teens, they are attracted more by romance than by anything else. But, we must not forget the fact that the film producers have been doing their best in improving the art and the histrionic talent of the country, in developing the taste for music and doing everything for the promotion of the art in several ways. If such an attempt is going to be restricted further, I am afraid that the incentive to produce the best of films will be very much reduced and, to that extent, the Government will be doing something wrong against the development of the film industry.

I learn that the Government is already taking several steps to improve the film industry by way of giving annual rewards to the best films. I think there is also a proposal to introduce a Film Production Bureau to advise producers before starting production. I am also told that a Film Financing Corporation will be established to finance these film producers and a Children's Film Society is going to be established. The Government has undertaken the enterprise of producing documentary and instructional films which are excellent in their own way. There is very little to be said against it and we have everything to say in its favour. If the hon. Members of Parliament feel that it is necessary that the Government should be given greater powers to control the morals of the country and as such the morals

of the producer himself, I think, they have already the powers under the rule-making powers given under the Cinematograph Act. I think they can tighten up the rules and see that better films are produced.

As a matter of fact, we see now-a-days that historical any mythological pictures are more in the forefront; and, there are, of course, a number of social pictures too. The social pictures have, no doubt, been having a little bit of unhealthy influence over certain minds. But, that alone should not be taken as the main reason for the Government having greater control over the film industry. The Act itself imposes several restrictions and Government also take several steps whenever they are required. The power of the Central Government or the local authority to suspend certain films in certain cases is also there under the Cinematograph Act.

I may just refer to the opinion of our Prime Minister when he inaugurated the Film Seminar under the auspices of the Ministry of Education of the Government of India in Delhi on the 27th February, 1955.

On the question of censorship he observed "that creative art should be allowed to improve without much of State interference" for, he said, "the State cannot be the judge of men's morals."

On another occasion, Dr. Radhakrishnan at the time of the opening of the Canadian paintings in Delhi, I think, observed:

"Whereas it is the function of the State to provide food, clothing and shelter, it should not socialise intellectual and artistic endeavour. The highest work of genius is individual free, unregulated and uncontrolled. The artist cannot be told his direction. He does not perhaps know it himself. The State can give art courage, confidence and opportunity. It is to be a patron, not a master."

These words are very significant, and I commend them to the hon. Minister and other Members of this House and not to have too much of interference in the production of films. As it is, Government have enough powers to exercise, to see that the film production is properly conducted.

In the end, I would only say that the film production in this country is just developing on proper lines, and any interference by the Government would be uncalled for. I would say that it is not worthwhile that the mighty arrow of the Government should be used on the small sparrow.

**Shri C. E. Narasimhan:** I have moved my amendment, which does not vary very much from the resolution of Shri Lingam. I felt that Shri Lingam's resolution was somewhat mandatory and I thought that it should be more of the type of giving direction in order to meet the situation. I commend my amendment to the Minister of Information and Broadcasting and I do not mind if he makes certain verbal alterations. I admit I hastily drafted it and therefore if further verbal alterations are necessary, they may be carried out in order to meet the situation. But I think my amendment will meet the purposes of Shri Lingam and of the Minister and to some extent meet the viewpoints of the hon. Member on the other side who just had his say.

As we all know, film production is a very complicated affair. Several people, artists, playwrights, musicians and others combine and bring out a film; it takes months and means a lot of money. Ultimately the film has to be sold and profit made. Surely those who produce film do not do it for the sake of philanthropy. They may be philanthropic-minded, may donate and be charitable-minded, especially for deserving causes. But essentially they are interested just in making money, which everyone is normally entitled to. As a result



[Shri C. R. Narasimhan]

they necessarily look to the box office. They cannot spend money and just lose it, failing to catch the box office. Sometimes naturally the box office may mislead them and lower the standard of the films. These are the difficulties of the film producers. But Government also have some duty in the matter. In falling victims to the box office, the film producers lower the standard of the films. Government cannot remain quiet because they are the guardians of the adolescents and children of the country. Even legally they are the guardians and should take care of their position, their future, their mental and moral development. All these are the first charge on the Government. Therefore, Government also come in. Thus, there is an eternal tussle between the film producers and the Censor Board, which functions on behalf of the Government. It is very difficult to draw a border line between the two. Even if any border line is drawn, it cannot be a permanent one, it will have to be flexible and as time goes on, it may have to go backward and forward.

Shri Lingam's resolution is covered by my amendment. We have to protect our youth and our countrymen against the evil effects of the films, and most of us are agreed on that point. We do find that in some cases Government have not got adequate powers. Therefore, it is felt that Government should have some more powers. I have no objection. I even welcome it. But one thing is necessary. First, you feel that the Constitution itself should be amended. I think it is a serious matter. I do not mind treating the Constitution also as a flexible instrument, but let us do the amending of it carefully and cautiously and only when the occasion demands. That is why I have given notice of my substitute resolution. The Government may change the Constitution if after examination they find that the change is necessary. But that is not enough. Merely having the power will not solve the problem,

and the Minister may not actually achieve the purpose. Even if Government arm themselves with the necessary powers, they must always carry the industry with them. They must be able to persuade the industry by telling them that this is not good for the country, such and such step alone is good for the country and so on. Unless Government and Parliament also keep alive the institution of persuasion, I do not think any improvement will take place. I am one with the Minister and with Shri Lingam in arming the Government with the necessary powers.

**The Minister of Information and Broadcasting (Dr. Keskar):** I have expressed no opinion in the matter.

**Shri C. R. Narasimhan:** But we see that the very existence of the Censor Board shows that Government want to be armed with powers. I know that the majority here is interested in some kind of control and having greater powers for the Government. Naturally the Government will have to take more powers. Being a party man, I am in the Government so to speak. I am not making a tall claim thereby.....

**Shri . Veeraswamy (Mayuram—Reserved—Sch. Castes):** The majority is for control.

**Shri C. R. Narasimhan:** When I say Government, it includes Parliament. Parliament may pass a law and arm the Government with the necessary powers, but that alone will not be enough. Persuasive wisdom also is necessary—the persuasive wisdom of the Minister and of the Government in carrying the industry with them will achieve the purpose. I commend my substitute motion for acceptance of the House with any necessary verbal changes that the Mover may like to make.

श्री राजा राम शास्त्री (जिला कानपुर—मध्य): मैं प्रस्तावक महोदय को इस बात के लिये बधाई देता हूँ कि उन्होंने आवश्यक

विषय की ओर इस सदन का ध्यान आकषित किया। आजकल की समाज पर फिल्मों का क्या प्रभाव पड़ता है, इस पर कुछ अधिक कहने की जरूरत नहीं है। इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि आजकल आम जनता और पूरे के पूरा समाज को शिक्षित करने का यह सर्वोत्तम साधन है। जिस तरह से दूसरे व्यवसायों में है उसी तरह से हमारे फिल्म व्यवसाय में भी अच्छे और बुरे दोनों प्रकार के व्यक्ति हैं।

**Shri Veeraswamy:** As the time is very short, I suggest that every Member may be given only five minutes to speak.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member shall be given five minutes.

**श्री राजा राम शास्त्री :** आज हमारे देश का हर परिवार यह महसूस करता है कि बहुत बुरा प्रभाव इन फिल्मों का हमारे नवयुवकों पर पड़ रहा है। अगर गवर्नमेंट इस व्यवसाय में सुधार करने के लिये कोई कदम उठाती है तो इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि पूरे का पूरा समाज उसका स्वागत करेगा और इसका अच्छा प्रभाव होगा। इसमें कोई शक नहीं कि आजकल के फिल्म प्रोड्यूसर जो फिल्में बनाते हैं, उसमें उनका दृष्टिकोण आम तौर पर ख़या कमाने की ओर ही अधिक रहता है। यह बात वैसी ही है जैसी कि हम पूरे समाज में देखते हैं कि जो भी व्यवसाय है उसमें हर व्यक्ति का दृष्टिकोण पूंजीवादी है और यही हाल फिल्म इंडस्ट्री का है।

अब सवाल यह पैदा होता है कि क्या इस व्यवसाय में कोई सुधार किये जा सकते हैं या नहीं। अक्सर कास्टीट्यूशन (संविधान) का हवाला दिया जाता है और यह कहा जाता है कि हमें इस बात का हक नहीं है कि किसी निजी व्यवसाय में कोई दस्तदाजी करें। लेकिन जब एक बार इस चीज को स्वीकार कर लिया जाता है कि कोई चीज बुरी है और उसका बुरा प्रभाव

समाज के ऊपर पड़ता है और उससे हमारे राष्ट्र को नुकसान पहुंचता है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि हम को इस बात का पूरा अधिकार है कि हम दस्तदाजी करें और उस चीज का राष्ट्र के हित में प्रयोग करवाने की चेष्टा करें। गवर्नमेंट इस बात को महसूस कर सकती है कि उसको ऐसे व्यवसाय का राष्ट्रीयकरण नहीं करना चाहिये। लेकिन जहाँ तक नियंत्रण का तालुक है, गवर्नमेंट उस पर नियंत्रण रखने का कोई न कोई प्रबन्ध अवश्य कर सकती है और उसको गलत रास्ते पर जाने से रोक सकती है। मेरा अपना विचार यह है कि अगर सरकार इस व्यवसाय के ऊपर नियंत्रण रखने की ओर बढ़े तो हमारा फिल्म व्यवसाय काफी तरक्की कर सकता है और बहुत ही ज्यादा उपयोगी सिद्ध हो सकता है।

पिछले दस बारह वर्षों के अन्दर इस फिल्म व्यवसाय ने काफी तरक्की की है और जब कभी हमारी फिल्म इंडस्ट्री को दूसरे देशों में प्रवेश करने का मौका मिला और वहाँ पर हमारी फिल्मों को भेजा गया तो वहाँ पर भी उनको डिस्टिंक्शन मिला है। इस चीज को देख कर मुझे बड़ी खुशी होती है। इस सम्बन्ध में सवाल यह उठता है कि अगर सरकार की तरफ से कुछ कोशिश की जाय, तो क्या उस में सुधार नहीं हो सकता है। मेरा ख्याल है कि सुधार अवश्य हो सकता है। मुझे अपने देश की फिल्मों देखने का बहुत मौका मिला है। मैं कह सकता हूँ कि उन का स्तर पहले से काफी ऊंचा उठा है, लेकिन सुधार की गुंजायश अब भी उन में है, इस विषय में दो मत नहीं हो सकते हैं। मैं कई देशों में गया हूँ और वहाँ पर फिल्म इंडस्ट्री की स्थिति देख कर मुझ पर बहुत प्रभाव पड़ा है। खास तौर से रूस और चीन में मुझे यह देख कर बहुत आश्चर्य हुआ कि उन देशों की सरकारों ने किस तरह फिल्म इंडस्ट्री (उद्योग) को अपने हाथ में

[श्री राजा राम शास्त्री]

लेकर उस के जरिये से बच्चों से ले कर बड़ों तक में—सारे समाज में—शिक्षा का प्रसार किया है। हमारे देश में स्थिति यह है कि जो फिल्में बड़े लोगों के लिए हैं, उन्हीं को बच्चे भी देखते हैं, जिस के कारण उन पर बुरा प्रभाव पड़ता है। मैं समझता हूँ कि इस तरफ निश्चित रूप से ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये कि बच्चों के लिये भ्रमण फिल्मों का निर्माण हो और वे फिल्में ऐसी हों, जिन से बच्चों पर भ्रष्टाचार प्रभाव पड़े।

मैं वह मानता हूँ कि वह एक प्राइवेट इंडस्ट्री (गैर सरकारी उद्योग) है, लेकिन मेरा विचार है कि अगर गवर्नमेंट उस की तरफ ध्यान नहीं देगी, तो बहुत बड़ा नुकसान हो सकता है। कुछ समय पूर्व जर्मनी में दुनिया भर के देशों की फिल्म इंडस्ट्री की एग्ज़िहिबिशन (प्रदर्शन) हुई और सब देशों ने उस में भाग लिया और अपनी अपनी फिल्में वहाँ भेजीं। हमारे देश की फिल्में भी वहाँ गईं। मुझे यह देख कर बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ कि दूसरे देशों की सरकारों ने इस बात की तरफ ध्यान दिया कि उनकी फिल्मों का भ्रष्टाचार प्रदर्शन हो, उनका ज्यादा से ज्यादा एडवर्टाइजमेंट (विज्ञापन) हो और वे बड़ी से बड़ी आइडिएन्स (जनता) को अपनी तरफ खींचें और इस में उनको सफलता भी मिली। परन्तु हमारे लोगों ने शिकायत की कि हमारी सरकार और हमारी एम्बेसी (दूतावास) ने इस बात का प्रबन्ध नहीं किया कि हमारी फिल्मों का भ्रष्टाचार एडवर्टाइजमेंट हो ताकि वे अधिक से अधिक जनता को अपनी ओर आकर्षित कर सकें। इन सब कमजोरियों के बावजूद हमारी फिल्मों को वहाँ पर पुरस्कार मिल सका, यह देख कर मुझे बड़ा आश्चर्य हुआ।

मैं यह जरूर देख रहा हूँ कि हमारे समाज में प्रचलित विचार-धारा और गतिविधि का प्रभाव हमारी फिल्मों पर भी पड़ रहा है, हालाँकि यह भी सत्य है कि हमारे यहाँ

ऐसी फिल्में भी बनती हैं, जिन का समाज पर बुरा प्रभाव पड़ता है। हमारे यहाँ ऐसी फिल्में अब यहाँ बनने लगी हैं, जो कि हमारे समूचे देश के वातावरण, समूचे समाज में सुधार और प्रगति के काम और जनता के सुधार के काम को प्रतिबिम्बित करती हैं। मैं यह भी देख रहा हूँ कि हमारी फिल्मों में जनता के प्रति हमदर्दी और बड़े बड़े धनी व्यक्तियों के प्रति घणा का प्रदर्शन किया जाता है, जो कि रूपये को बरबाद कर रहे हैं।

जहाँ तक टैकनीक का ताल्लुक है, अगर गवर्नमेंट इस इंडस्ट्री की कुछ सहायता करे, उस को कंट्रोल करे, उस की देख-रेख करे, तो फिल्म व्यवसाय के लोग और गवर्नमेंट दोनों मिल कर इस व्यवसाय की काफी तरक्की कर सकते हैं।

मैं अधिक न कह कर सिर्फ इतना ही कहूंगा कि अगर गवर्नमेंट के सामने कोई बड़ी एकावट है, जिस की वजह से वह कोई काम नहीं कर सकती है—हालाँकि मैं इस बात को नहीं मानता हूँ—, अगर उस के पास कम पावर्ज हैं तो वह सदन के सामने आ कर और पावर्ज ले सकती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि आम तौर पर इस सदन की राय होगी कि इस व्यवसाय को स्वतन्त्र हरगिज न छोड़ा जाय और इसके ऊपर गवर्नमेंट का नियंत्रण होना चाहिये। वह इस व्यवसाय को एक साधन बना कर समूचे देश में शिक्षा का प्रचार व प्रसार कर सकती है। इस समय गवर्नमेंट की जो डाकुमेंटरीज (प्रलेखीय चलचित्र) तैयार हो रही हैं, वे काफी भ्रष्टाचार होती हैं और उनके द्वारा लोग समझते हैं कि हमारे देश और समाज में क्या काम हो रहा है। अगर गवर्नमेंट इस व्यवसाय को नियंत्रित करे, तो वह इस को देश की उन्नति के लिए एक मुख्य साधन बना सकती है और, मैं समझता हूँ, यही प्रस्तावक महोदय का उद्देश्य है। मैं धाखा

करता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट इस प्रस्ताव को स्वीकार करने की कृपा करेगी।

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the problem is not to give more powers to the Government, to regulate the cinema industry, but the problem is that the Government should be wide awake, should be alert to make use of the powers which it has already got to regulate this industry. I would like to ask, Sir, how many pictures have been banned during the course of this year for their obscenity or vulgarity? I would like to know, Sir, in how many pictures the film censors have introduced any improvement? I would like to know, Sir, in what way the film censors have tried to raise the taste of the public and to raise the social consciousness of the public? Sir, if these questions are put, I think, the record may not be very dismal, but surely it cannot be very satisfying. Therefore, I come to feel that while our film industry may be to blame because it depends so much on box office receipts, and while our public may also be to blame because every country gets the film that it deserves, I would also say that the persons who are there to regulate these films and other things are not taking this public utility as seriously as they should.

**Shri Feroze Gandhi (Pratapgarh Dist.—West cum Rae Bareilly Dist.—East):** There is no quorum.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Now that it has been brought to my notice, the bell may be rung.

Now, there is quorum. The hon. Member, Shri D. C. Sharma may continue.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** The regulation of this industry by law and by regulations is only one aspect of the problem. The other aspect is that our public opinion should be so well organised and so sensitive that it should be able to exert some influence on the film producers. In all

progressive countries, there are regular film goers' societies or associations and these associations very often exercise a very wholesome check on the production of films which tend to disrupt society in one way or the other. I fear something like that has not been done in this country. Therefore, this is an aspect of the problem into which I believe we should go.

Then, I think the problem is mainly of education and I must say our Government has been doing something in that direction. For instance, recently we had a seminar in which Mary Seaton took part, and I think she gave very wholesome suggestions to the film producers. Therefore, I believe there should be more seminars to educate the producer, to educate the actor, to educate the technician, even to educate the storyteller because all these persons go to make up the film. There should be seminars and the Government also should show the way. Some time back I saw a documentary which was produced by the Ministry of Home Affairs in the United Kingdom. It was about the rehabilitation of delinquent children. The persons who took part in that film were not professional actors. They were just picked up for the work and they did very good work. I would say that our Broadcasting Ministry should also produce films on topical subjects which can give the right kind of lead to our country. I know that documentaries are doing some good in this direction, but they are not enough. We are making just a beginning so far as children's films are concerned, and that I think is a very humble beginning. At least I think they are not going to have a bright future because of the way in which they have been given a start. So, I would suggest that the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting should give a lead in this matter as it is being done in the United Kingdom by producing those films which serve social needs and social ends. If that is done, I think one useful purpose will be served.

[Shri D. C. Sharma]

I believe that in the U.S.A. they have what is called a production code. It is given in the Film Enquiry Committee Report. There are all kinds of regulations there, how to preserve law and order, guard against barbarity, obscenity, profanity etc. All these things are given in detail. I do not know how many of these things are observed there. Perhaps most of these things are observed in the breach, but I would say there should be a similar production code in this country also and that there should be conferences between the producers and the Ministry very often so that their standards of production and the standards of social conduct can be levelled up. I believe that the crux of the problem does not lie so much in regulation as in education. We must educate all those persons who take part in the production of films.

Dr. Rama Rao (Kakinada): I agree with many of the views expressed by our friends Shri Lingam and others. There are a few differences, but I do not understand the actual steps which the Mover wants to propose for this, because I feel Government have enough authority as it is. Secondly, if they really want any further authority, they are welcome here, but they do not want to do anything in the matter more than what they are doing. On the one hand there must be effective censorship; on the other hand, censorship should not go to the extent of strangling initiative on the part of our producers. Therefore, within these limitations the powers they have are enough.

I welcome the opinions expressed about the improvement of the film industry. Now I want to say one or two things not mentioned by other friends. We are the second largest producers of films in the world. And I join my hon. friend Shri N. M. Lingam in complimenting our film producers on their having come to a standard, and their having established themselves and the industry on a

firm basis, in spite of the unhelpful attitude of Government.

At the same time, our films are not as good or as high-classed as they should be. There are very fine film directors, and very fine film producers, but still we have to improve our films. So, I suggest that Government should undertake film production. I am not saying at present that Government should nationalise film production, though they should, in course of time.

Our aim now is to establish a socialist pattern of society. When we have that ideal before us, we must shake off our old ideas, old restrictions and old inhibitions. Therefore, we must think in terms of nationalization of the industry, but at any rate, not at present. So, I would suggest to the Minister to start film production and also the production of documentaries and features.

Of course, recently, he had stated that the artistic talent may not be available to Government as freely as to the private industry. I doubt it. I question it, in fact. Why should Government, with their mighty resources, say that they are unable to obtain the necessary artistic talents? They ought to be able to give better terms to the actors and artists than the private film producers. It is true that film stars shine in the firmament very brightly for a few years and then fade away. Many of the film stars in America also are reduced to a state of poverty, and there are funds organised for the benefit of the old film stars. On the other hand, if they are under government service, they may not get fantastic salaries, but at least their future can be assured.

Therefore, to begin with, Government ought to take up film production, particularly, production of films for children, historical films and other such things.

I am not one of those who feel that films should be completely free from romance. So far as sex is concerned, I am opposed to sexy films, for they are the greatest bane of our film industry at present, but sex is a fact which you cannot avoid.

**Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla):**  
Avoid it in the screen.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** I mean 'sex' in a different sense.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member may avoid it in his turn, but let the hon. Member. Dr. Rama Rao, proceed in his way.

**Dr. Rama Rao:** Films should have romance, but in a decent and presentable form.

Coming back to the suggestion that Government should take up film production, I would say that we have so many of our documentaries. To say in the face of this that artistic talent is not available is not quite correct. The producers of our documentaries, and our technicians have shown that they are capable of the finest of productions. So, there is no reason why Government should not take up these things.

They may even lose in the beginning. But that does not matter. They can experiment and try to gain experience. They may commit errors now and then. But that does not matter. This is a huge industry, in fact, one of the biggest industries in the country. Why should it be left to the mercies of private capitalists?

I say that Government must take up film production. If they cannot eliminate the private sector—which I do not want at present—they can enter the field and start gaining experience at least, and thus set the standard which should be there. Government, with all their resources—I am not speaking only in terms of money, but even in terms of equipment—can command many things, which the private industry cannot command.

Therefore, I would earnestly appeal to the Minister to break new ground and start producing feature films generally, and especially for children. For this purpose, it is true that we must have new sets of rules, and new forms and methods. The former administrative methods, rules and regulations, audits, and red tape, would not work in the film industry. Therefore, we may have an autonomous corporation, with enough freedom. Some fine directors,—of whom there are many—may be selected, and given the freedom to produce. I am quite sure, there are many film directors, who are devoted to art to such an extent that if Government invite them, they shall certainly be prepared to come and serve the country in preference to getting high salaries in private firms. I am sure Government will take up these things.

Regarding foreign films, there are many films from which we can learn many things. There are many high-class films which we cannot avoid. But more are absolutely sexy and worthless. They are very immoral and have a very bad influence on our people. If Government have to obtain further authority from Parliament to restrict and control and choose so far as foreign films are concerned, I appeal to the House to give it.

Regarding the 'for adults only' films, I think it is the biggest humbug. If they want more attraction, if they want more people to come and see the film, they put the label 'for adults only'—so that more young adults and old adults are attracted to the film. Actually, more young adults see the film because the advertisement says there is something secret which you should not see; they manage to see the film because you are prohibiting them from seeing it. So this 'adults only' label is the most mischievous thing. If it is really for adults, if it is objectionable for children, I would rather not have it at all.

[Dr. Rama Rao.]

Therefore, there must be greater restriction placed on foreign films, not only for the benefit of our psychology and morals but also to prevent the drain on foreign exchange. Therefore, I hope Government will take to film production. I am sure Parliament will gladly give whatever money is wanted for this purpose.

**Shri Tek Chand:** There is an impression which seems to be gaining ground that a cinema hall is a class room where one learns juvenile delinquency. There is a feeling that if there be any laboratory in any land, if there be any nursery, where young criminals are produced, are coached up and receive their refresher course, the cinema hall is a very fruitful source. This is an impression not confined or restricted to the orthodox people of this country; this is a feeling also in America. People who have devoted thought and attention have come to the conclusion that crimes and criminals receive their inspiration from some of the motion pictures, they had on one occasion or another seen. Somehow pictures depicting crime and depravity have an abiding impression on the minds of the young and they, in their own way, try to re-enact in actual life the fantastic crime they saw on the screen.

Therefore, the motion picture has made a substantial and material contribution to criminality. It has also a substantial part in encouraging depravity and moral lapses. Not that there is any lacuna in the present law. The arm of the law is long enough and strong enough even today, as it is, to check objectionable pictures. But I am a little censorious about the conduct of the censors. I feel that they are remiss in discharging their onerous duties which they owe to the society and to the impressionable youth of the country. If the picture censors were discharging their functions effectively, diligently and honourably, I have no

doubt a good bit of the objectionable yardage would disappear and would not have its baneful influence on the juvenile mind. This recent distinction between A certificate and U certificate is most mischievous. The moment a picture receives A certificate, which means exclusively for the adults, it is an invitation to those who have prurient predilections to go and see the picture and thereby participate in a certain mental dissipation. Whose duty, Sir, is it to check the adolescents and to allow admittance to the adults? Naturally, the man who is selling the ticket. And, you will find, and I have no doubt that the Government has facilities to find out, that those pictures which are advertised for adults only draw crowded houses including adolescents and children. This distinction ought to disappear; the sooner the better.

Regarding the mythological and historical pictures, one thing I would like to say. If the object is to pooh-pooh religion, if the object is to ridicule people's beliefs, these mythological pictures are eminently successful. If their aim is to raise religious deities in the estimate of the people, they fail miserably.

Regarding historical pictures, one thing you must see to. There must be a very strict control to see that cinema producers do not play tricks with history; they do not fall foul of the facts. Take for instance, a recent picture depicting the life of Bhagat Singh. There they depicted certain things which exist exclusively in their imagination; certain other scenes were referred to which had no existence; in fact, they were all fiction. With respect to historical pictures it is very proper that there should be stricter control to see that history as it is reflected and not history as imagined by the producer, with, of course, a different motive and object.

I am not in favour of nationalisation of the film industry but I do feel

that Government should have a stricter supervision and control so that the cinema industry which has great potentialities for influencing the mass mind is harnessed to the service of good, clean and healthy entertainment and not to pander to the prurient propensities of the impressionable youth.

**Shri Veeraswamy:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am very glad that hon. Shri N. M. Lingam, the sponsor of this Resolution has drawn the attention of our Minister for Information and Broadcasting and of this House to the seriousness of the deterioration of the standard of our films. Though I do not agree totally with my hon. friend, Dr. Rama Rao, for complete control over the production and exhibition of the films in our country. I also insist upon increased control over them, because many of the films in our country are so obscene that they affect our national character, tradition and general outlook on life. There is no decency or decorum in many of the films because I do not think any film commences without a love scene. Love is a secret affair and it is not a street affair. Nobody can tolerate a love scene in the streets. It is, therefore, indecent, it is contemptible on the part of a civilised people to allow such scenes to be exhibited in the theatres. This matter is a very serious one, and when the attention of the hon. Minister has been drawn to this, I do hope that he will see to it that at least the films to be produced hereafter do not have such obscene scenes which will demoralise our national character and spoil the youth of our country and thereby will be of no use to us at all.

You might have seen in newspapers that Bombay women numbering about 30,000 to 40,000 expressed themselves some time back against the exhibition of obscene films. In our State, even though there is lot of difference between Rajaji and Periyar Ramaswami with regard to several questions, both political and social, they are one in this respect and they have

438 LSD.

the greatest contempt for production and exhibition of obscene films which affect our character very much, which mislead our youth and spoil them. Therefore, I need not say in so many words that such films should be banned. The Government should, exercise their control, whether by amending the Constitution or through any other means. They should exercise control over the themes of the stories, the direction of the films, production and also exhibition. The Censor Board should be so patriotic as not to accept any story which contains obscene matters.

I would urge upon the hon. Minister, Dr. Keskar, to take steps to see that films on historical themes are produced—films dealing with social disabilities, caste distinctions and removal of the same, films aiming at improvement of the general standard of our people's character, themes instilling into the people the spirit of social service should be encouraged.

Another thing that I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister and the House is that the exhibition of films after 10 o'clock at night affects our national health. I wanted also to make this appeal to the Deputy Minister of Health, but she is not now here. I request the hon. Minister to ban exhibition of general films in theatres after 10 o'clock at night because it affects the health of the labourers. Their health was being affected in those days before prohibition by toddy and other drinks, but now the films affect their health because they attend the film exhibitions after 10 o'clock at night and go back home after midnight. Thereby they lose their sleep. When they get up in the next morning they are so exhausted that they are not able to work efficiently and well. Therefore, I would urge upon the hon. Minister to see that obscene things are not produced and the exhibition of films is banned after 10 o'clock. He must see that good films are produced with



{Shri Veeraswamy.]

a view to improving the standard of character of the society.

**Some Hon. Members rose. —**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is time that I call on the hon. Minister. But if hon. Members agree to take only five minutes each I will call them.

**Shri Ragbunath Singh (Banaras Distt.—Central):** Yes, I will take only five minutes.

**An Hon. Member:** It is already past six o'clock.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Today the House will sit up to 6-30. We have not only to finish this resolution but we have to start the other one also.

**श्री रघुनाथ सिंह :** जैसा कि श्री टेक चन्द ने अभी कहा कि आज के जो सिनेमा हाल हैं वे भ्रनाचार, वासना और भासक्ति के स्थान हो गये हैं और मैं उनसे इस बात में पूरी तरह से सहमत हूँ।

इसके साथ ही साथ हमें यह बात भी देखनी है कि जो धार्मिक, भक्तिपूर्ण और ऐतिहासिक फिल्में हैं उनको इस प्रकार से झलत तरीके से सामने रक्खा जाता है कि वे वास्तविकता से बहुत दूर रहती हैं। उदाहरणार्थ मैं आपको कबीरदास जी की फिल्म के बारे में बतलाऊँ कि हम लोग उस फिल्म के प्रदर्शन पर रोक लगवाने के लिये माननीय मंत्री महोदय के पास पहुँचे थे और हमारे अतिरिक्त और भी बहुत से देशवासी उनके पास यह मांग लेकर आये थे और उन से यह निवेदन किया था कि इस फिल्म में कुछ परिवर्तन होना चाहिये। उस फिल्म में कबीरदास को लोई के लवर के रूप में प्रस्तुत किया गया था जिस पर कि हमने एतराज किया था। कबीरदास कितने बड़े संत और महात्मा पुरुष थे लेकिन उनकी जो फिल्म बनी उसमें उनकी स्त्रीय पर लोई के लवर के रूप में प्रस्तुत किया गया था। हमने देखा कि बावजूद हिन्दुस्तान के तमाम कोनों से यह धावाज धाने के कि इस फिल्म

का प्रदर्शन रोक दिया जाय, उस फिल्म का प्रदर्शन नहीं रूका और वह उसी रूप में सिनेमाघरों में प्रदर्शित की गई क्योंकि मंत्री महोदय ने उस सम्बन्ध में अपनी असमर्थता जाहिर की कि हमारे पास ऐसा कोई कानून नहीं है जिस से उसके प्रदर्शन को रोकना जा सके।

इसी तरह मैं आपको बतलाऊँ कि पाकिस्तान ने एक हिन्दुस्तानी फिल्म का प्रदर्शन अपने यहां बैन कर दिया क्योंकि उस फिल्म में एक गाना "हुल्ला गुल्ला मल्ला" आता था और जिसको कि पाकिस्तान वालों ने "ला इला लिल्लाह" का व्यंग समझा और यह स्पष्ट बात है कि अगर इस प्रकार के गाने फिल्मों में रक्खे जाय और उनके द्वारा इस तरह दूसरे धर्मों पर और बड़े बड़े लोगों पर इस प्रकार का आक्षेप किया जायेगा तो उससे देश की हानि होगी और आर्ट की उन्नति नहीं होगी बल्कि अवनति होगी।

आप देखेंगे कि आज कल फिल्मों में शराब पीना, स्टन्ट फिल्में जैसे मारघाड़, भाग जाना, चोरी डकैती करके भाग जाना, इस प्रकार की जो फिल्में दिखाई जा रही हैं उन्हें देख कर हमारे युवक समाज पर बहुत खराब असर पड़ रहा है और इस तरह की असामाजिक फिल्मों को तो अवश्य बैन कर देना चाहिये।

जहाँ तक सेंसर बोर्ड द्वारा फिल्मों के पास किये जाने का सम्बन्ध है, उसके बारे में मेरा कहना यह है कि फिल्म जब तैयार हो जाती है तब सेंसर बोर्ड के पास भेजी जाती है। मेरा सुझाव यह है कि आपको यह करना चाहिये कि फिल्म तैयार करने का समय जब आये तभी उसके कथानक, कहानी, गीत और संवाद आदि को देखकर अगर वह तैयार करने लायक हो तो उसको बनाने की इजाजत दी जाय और इस तरह की इजाजत मिलने पर ही फिल्म की तैयारी में हाथ लगाया जाय और यह तरीका अपनायें

से घन की भी बचत होगी और फिल्म देखने वालों का भी फायदा होगा और फ़िल्म बनाने वालों का भी फ़ायदा होगा। अतएव मेरा यह निवेदन है कि संविधान में संशोधन करने का जो प्रस्ताव उपस्थित किया गया है, संविधान में इतनी जल्दी संशोधन तो नहीं होना चाहिये लेकिन मंत्री महोदय से मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि ऐसा कोई एक कानून अथवा नियम जरूर बनायें ताकि हमारे इस फिल्म व्यवसाय की उन्नति हो और यह ठीक ढंग से काम करे। हमको यह भी ध्यान में रखना चाहिये कि भारतवर्ष के अलावा साउथ ईस्ट एशिया, बर्मा और कम्बोडिया आदि देशों में हमारे बहुत से हिन्दुस्तानी भाई बसते हैं और वहाँ भी हमारी फिल्में जाती हैं और जब वहाँ के लोग इस प्रकार की स्टन्ट और बेहूदा फिल्में देखते हैं तो हमारा सिर शर्म के सारे झुक जाता है। इस लिये मेरा यह निवेदन है कि आप इस बात का ध्यान रखें और ऐसी व्यवस्था करें ताकि इस देश में अच्छी फिल्मों और शिक्षाप्रद फिल्मों का निर्माण हो।

**Shri Achuthan:** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, after listening to the speeches by a number of hon. Members on this resolution, I have come to feel that it is not a simple proposition. In fact, the industry has come to stay, and from the statistics that is before us we find, that throughout the length and breadth of this country, even in small villages, there is a permanent theatre run throughout the year. Hereafter, when people will become more educated and the standard of living rise, the tendency will be for more people to go to the theatre. Why? Because there is that appetite for that; there is that desire for some relaxation or entertainment. That desire is growing and we must give due encouragement to that. It has got its cultural aspect, educational aspect and the sense of artistic development. We find that in many of the

films all these things are naturally there. We can improve matters by the better efforts of directors and actors. The record of the film stars in India is on the whole creditable. I do not wish to go into the other aspects of their life. But as they appear in the pictures they have given a good account of themselves and they deserve to be encouraged. Moreover, we see in a proper social picture music, dancing, new ideals, new impulses, new emotions.

What is the position of the common man in India? Most of them are poor, have no opportunities for education, have no occasion for reading, or for entertainment. So the only source of some relaxation for them, or to have some aesthetic enjoyment is simply to go to some theatre, pay two annas or four annas and have some relaxation or enjoyment for two and a half hours. This has necessarily to be encouraged. That is my view point.

This is a very delicate matter to handle. Where can we curtail or control? That is a difficult matter. I am not finding fault with the Ministry. Even though they may try their level best to see by their organisation or machinery of the Censor Board to curb in places where it is necessary, it is not very easy. Opinions differ. In the case of many a picture we find that though at the time it was produced it was properly directed and had good response, within a week or so, it has no response and the film has simply to be kept safe in a box, and is commercially a failure.

So unless the standard of the society rises and unless new codes are evolved, this problem cannot be tackled. How far can we go with regard to romance, where begins the vulgar aspect, all these are matters very difficult of a solution. We are not a set of saints to close our eyes and ears. According to me in villages this is the only source of entertainment for the common man, the workers, the labour, who

[Shri Achuthan.]

must have some source of relaxation. So, necessarily it is a delicate job.

I do not know how far the purpose is going to be achieved by amending the provisions of the Constitution. This could be better achieved by voluntary effort, by very careful and tactful handling by the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and more by the associations, so that a code of morality can be evolved by which certain limits are not trespassed as to have a deliterious effect on the society as a whole. So that, instead of amending the Constitution, I would suggest that the Ministry should keep a better watch over the constitution of the Boards of Censors. Let us encourage them to have such common code by which there cannot be any conflicts as regards religion is concerned, as regards society's progress is concerned. I may even go to the extent of saying that we must not inculcate too much of nationalism. We find too much of national feeling in some pictures. This may have its undesirable effect in due course. That age is gone. We must have the future before us. The best men of society, educationists, social reformers, parliamentarians or other representatives and other organisations performing other functions should discuss these matters and formulate a code by which the percentage of unnecessary and undesirable films might be reduced to a minimum. That is the course that I can recommend at this stage.

**Dr. Keskar:** I have listened very carefully to the debate on Shri N. M. Lingam's resolution which asks the Government to take steps for amending the Constitution in order to get more powers for controlling the cinema industry.

There is no doubt that this industry has developed into the most powerful media for mass education, mass entertainment and mass contact. It is visual. It does not re-

quire education. One can see something living on the screen. Naturally, even the most ignorant appreciate it and like it. It is for this reason that throughout the world, now, millions of people in all the countries regularly see the cinema film. From that point of view, the effect of the film cannot be judged by simply treating it as, for example, any other artistic production, say, a drama. However popular the drama might be, because of the immense number of people who see that, it has a mass social effect—one film or a group of films—and it is not possible for us to brush aside the cinema production as simply an effort at mass entertainment.

I would not like here, with the short time at my disposal, to go into the cinema industry in detail. Since the time this industry has become so important and so pervading, there have been in many countries efforts to find out the effect it is having on the public and the effect it has on adolescents and juveniles. There is no doubt that there is a definite opinion amongst educationists, amongst judges and amongst sociologists that the effect on the juvenile mind of the films as they are produced today—I am not talking of our country—is not a very desirable one. Shri N. M. Lingam had quoted aptly extracts from the enquiry carried out by the American senate regarding juvenile delinquency and the effect of the cinema on juvenile crime or how far the cinema incites crime. Even before that, there have been enquiries by groups of professors, educationists and there is no doubt that films of a certain type have been instrumental in encouraging criminal tendencies, amongst the juveniles, tendencies to be not affected by violence or to like it, tendencies to commit thefts, dacoities and tendencies to develop a kind of contempt for human life. Now, all these things are there, I will not refer to them because they are available. In our country also

there is no doubt that the effect on the adolescents is very considerable. If we go to the cinema houses we see, and an analysis has shown, that the most frequent visitors to the cinema are of two categories. One are the students, the other are the uneducated masses, and in that in the cities I would say it is the students who predominate. That being so, there is no doubt that a consideration as to the standard of films and how to improve them is a matter of social importance and national importance. We cannot under-estimate the importance of this subject. We have had opportunity on the floor of this House of discussing this question sometimes during Budget discussions and sometimes also in discussing certain allied problems.

At present in this country we are following the procedure of censorship which probably was established even before 1947 but which was consolidated and considerably modified during the last four or five years. We have had the new Cinematograph Act, 1952 which has been now functioning for five years. As the present legal position stands in our country, and that I want to put very frankly before the House, the censors have got certain powers given under the law. Generally, our approach to this question has been that the censorship code that we have issued is within the limits set by clause (2) of article 19 of the Constitution, and all the detailed directives issued are based on that. There are questions raised regarding the Government's powers by many friends who spoke here, and I find a number of speakers stressed that Government has plenty of power, but it is remiss in not using those powers for that purpose. I would like, first of all, to make it very clear that we have examined this question in great detail, and Government is quite aware of all the powers it has. Of course, nothing is absolutely definite because in interpreting certain things, it is possi-

ble that there might be a difference of opinion, but as far as we have been able to examine the question, certainly Government has the power to impose reasonable restrictions regarding certain matters. As you know, clause (2) of article 19 says Government can impose reasonable restrictions regarding decency, morality, law and order and foreign relations. Government cannot go beyond these three or four subjects mentioned in clause (2) of article 19. There might be differences in the interpretation as to how far you can go and how far you cannot go within these reasonable restrictions. If one is a lawyer, one can stretch the law to the greatest extent, but Government has to take a reasonable and balanced view of things. And it is not possible for us to bring within the ambit of this everything possible, and say that we have got the power, and we shall act according to it. I would like to mention here frankly that, as I see it, there are certain types of films, which, from the point of view of our social progress, from the point of view of the juvenile and adolescent generation, might be undesirable. But can we stop them all? Can we curb them? It is possible to say that as far as questions of decency and morality are concerned, Government can do it, and can act to a great extent.

But there are a number of categories which it will not be possible for us to cover, even with the best of intentions. For example, mention has been made here of one particular matter, and my hon. friend Shri Tek Chand was very eloquent in mentioning that is the historical inaccuracies in films. He stressed greatly production of films on national heroes, which were not true to facts. That is beyond our law as it is today. There have been, and there will be doubts. Naturally, if a film producer were to take up the question of national heroes, it would be a great attraction. But as I see the law

[Dr. Keskar]

today, even if somebody produces a film on Mahatma Gandhi and shows him in the most undesirable postures, it would be very difficult for me to stop the film. I can stop it probably only by saying that that it would cause such great resentment in public mind, that the law and order situation might be breached, and therefore, we should stop the film.

There is also the question of films not being specifically very objectionable, that is, films, not having a number of very indecent scenes or objectionable scenes, but which, at the same time, might have a generally not desirable effect, from the point of view of morality or decency. It is rather difficult to get films of such a generally low standard included within this ambit.

I am trying to put before hon. Members how far it is possible for us to go and how far we feel it is not possible for us to go. My main point is that there are certain categories of films, to which some hon. Members had referred also, and which it is not possible for us to cover. I have to say this, because some Members have tried to make out a point that Government have all the powers, and it is only Government and the Censor Board, who are to blame for all that we see here. I must emphatically state that the Censor Board—and I have had the privilege of seeing their work at close quarters now, for so many years—are trying to do their best, and have done yeoman service, as far as the question of control on objectionable films is concerned. It is not easy to follow a sweeping policy regarding this.

Films come, having different subjects, different contexts, different backgrounds, and so on. There are foreign films as well as Indian films. Every film has to be carefully looked into, and if necessary, cuts have to be ordered, or if necessary, the film might be banned or not allowed. This

is a very fatiguing and very detailed procedure. I do not think that the censors have been remiss in their duties. I am not prepared to accept the statement that is made, for, it is very easy to make such a statement, and it is quite possible that one hon. Member might differ from the censors regarding a particular scene in a particular film. But the censors have been trying to do their best, in trying to follow the directives laid down by Government and also in trying to follow the general policy that has been laid down in the code of directives.

Apart from these differences of opinion, I would say that they have tried very conscientiously to do their job well. It is not possible to do a perfect thing. It is human to err, and there might possibly be here and there a few errors and slips. But they are bound to occur, and we cannot judge the work of the censors by showing one mistake here or there, or one inconsistency here or there. By and large, if hon. Members will take the trouble of seeing in detail the work done by the Censor Board during the last two or three years, they will find that they have done a tremendous job at great odds, because unfortunately, they have not been getting the best of co-operation from the film industry; yet, they have been responsible for considerable improvement in the standard of our films today. But as I said, the censors can go up to a certain limit only. They cannot go beyond that. It is not possible for them to take up the question of film reform. In many directions, that might be desirable Dr. Rama Rao was referring to this, and I entirely agree with him in many things. But censorship is a very negative process. It tries to stop what is objectionable. Reform is something positive and constructive, that is, trying to show something good. It is, of course, difficult for the censor to suggest that something constructive and good should be shown. He

can only examine what is bad and ask that it should be cut out. That, no doubt, is rather an unsatisfactory thing.

I would like to mention here the steps we feel necessary—and we have been trying to take—for further improvement of, or giving greater guidance to, film production in the country. References have been made to the Report of the Film Enquiry Committee. I might say very briefly that we have already under preparation a Bill for a National Film Board which will have a unit for what is called the Production Bureau.

Shri Raghunath Singh and one or two other friends also mentioned about scripts being shown before films are prepared so that no money is wasted unnecessarily. That is exactly going to be the object of the Production Bureau. It will see scripts and give advice regarding them to the producers before they are brought before the public.

There is also a proposal to have a small-scale Film Finance Corporation to help in production of better films

So all these will be coming under the purview of the National Film Board Bill which I hope we will be able to introduce in the very first week of the next session.

Government are not very keen to control the industry or to regulate it. I, of course, see that this is a very important industry from the social point of view for the future generations. At the same time, controlling such an industry itself raises many complications and problems which Government will have to tackle successfully. It is not possible for Government to take such a step and afterwards find themselves confronted with all these problems. Therefore, we are not very eager to have such a sort of control, as desired by my hon. friend, Shri N. M. Lingam. Members in this House are sometimes accusing Government of trying to take too many powers. I must say here that we are not at all desirous of having so

many powers entrusted to us, though I do agree that where it is necessary in the national interest that it has to be done, Government should certainly do it. Only if the House agrees with Government, we can go further.

As far as the question of the film industry is concerned, I do not think that from the practical point of view it will be easy to have such a control established or implemented. It might create, as I said, a number of difficulties. Shri Shree Narayan Das had said that Government should make a declaration under entry No. 52 in the Union List and bring this industry under Central control. That can be done, though that, by itself, does not solve any problem. That might be necessary if Government try to have an overall Act for control of the industry; otherwise, it would not be necessary.

For want of time, I will not refer to the question of censorship, whether it is good and how far it should go. The Prime Minister's remarks have been quoted by certain friends who did not quote what the Prime Minister said afterwards. If they had done so, they would know that he said that if films went into undesirable trends, they would have to be curbed. But that is beside the point. It is not necessary. But after listening to the debate here, I might say that we also feel that some check and control on films is essential in the national interest. There is no doubt about it, especially in a country where we are planning for a Welfare State, it is not possible that such a means of mass communication, mass entertainment and mass education cannot be just left so free that they can produce anything they like, whatever its effects on the public. At the same time, we do not feel that we should take it over ourselves and run it. I do not think that is necessary or at present desirable.

Mention has been made of foreign films. A number of other things are there to which I can reply in great detail. The suggestion of Dr. Rama Rao is very interesting that Govern-

[Dr. Keskar]

ment should also make feature films. I agree with him; but it is not something which we should take up lightly. It is no question, as he thinks, of Government not being able to get the artistes. That day my answer was misunderstood by him. But I would try to make him understand some other time for it may take too much time now. But, what I meant is that artistic production is not something like machine production unless it is given to very competent people, probably, it may go completely wrong. Therefore, if at all we take it up, it should be done carefully. But, I do not rule out the suggestion that he has made. It is an interesting suggestion and we will certainly study it carefully.

Our view briefly is that it is necessary and it is in national interests to have a check on film production. But that need not be by taking complete control of the industry and regulate it in every detail and in every way. For the work of censorship what is known as the Production Bureau itself should be sufficient. But, as I said very frankly, certain types of films which are undesirable will not be covered by this. I do not know how this can be done. We are examining this question.

A number of friends have referred to the different categories of films, historical films, films which are treating in a ridiculous manner the Gods and Goddesses. Then there are what you call ordinarily films of lighter tone. All these do probably come within our competence. But when the interpretation of the law actually comes, we find it difficult for us to do anything. We are examining as to how this can be done. If that much is done, I think that itself will give a sufficient direction to the film industry in the country. I hope that in carrying this out the Government will also get the co-operation of the producers because they also, I hope, realise that this is not simply an industry for profit; this is also a

social industry and a social industry has to take notice of society and what is happening there and what are its trends and where it is going. If that is done, I think, many of the difficulties will be solved and we will be able to raise the standard of films in the country.

I have been very brief. Otherwise the points raised by my hon. friends have been so many that I would have to take half an hour more if I want to reply to them. I will, certainly, take an opportunity at some other time, because I am going to keep them and give answers in detail to the points raised here.

As far as Shri Lingam's Resolution here is concerned, I am afraid it will not be possible for me to accept it because it is so mandatory and Government is asked to rush in to change the Constitution. I know, once Government takes it up, a number of my hon. friends will rise and say that Government is trying to attack the freedom that has been given by the Constitution. We are ground between two millstones and I would rather go in for such an amendment after very careful study and serious consideration. I think I would not be able to accept that.

There are two amendments.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Yes, one is of Shree Narayan Das and the other is that of Sri C. R. Narasimhan.

**Dr. Keskar:** Shri Das's amendment is for a committee. But I am afraid that going through the whole question by a committee might only lead to a lot of discussion and would not bring about any results. Shri Narasimhan's resolution is also a substitute resolution. I would have been prepared to accept it if the words "control and regulate effectively the production and exhibition of films" were not there. If he is prepared to change the resolution to read "improve the standard of films", then I would have no objection to accepting his resolution, provided the House wants it. I am

observing a neutral attitude in this matter.

**Shri C. R. Narasimhan:** Really it improves my amendment.

**Dr. Keskar:** If that is done, I would have no objection to accepting Shri Narasimhan's substitute resolution.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Now, I shall put the amendment of Shri Shree Narayan Das to the vote of the House.

**Shri Shree Narayan Das:** I would like to withdraw my amendment.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I take it that the hon. Member has the permission of the House to withdraw his amendment.

*The amendment was, by leave, withdrawn.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Let me put Shri Narasimhan's amendment, as modified by the hon. Minister, who is prepared to accept the amendment with the modification that instead of "control and regulate effectively the production and exhibition of films" it should read "improve the standard of films".

**The question is:**

That for the original Resolution, the following be substituted:

"This House is of opinion that it is necessary in the interests of national unity and social progress as well as a healthy moral and cultural life in the country to improve the standard of films, and, therefore, recommends that Government should see whether at present there are adequate powers available for this purpose and if found necessary it might take up the question of amending the Constitution for necessary powers."

*The motion was adopted.*

**RESOLUTION RE APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE ON WORKING OF DIRECTIVE PRINCIPLES OF STATE POLICY.**

**Shri Tusbar Chatterjea** (Serampore): I beg to move:

"This House is of opinion that a Committee consisting of fifteen Members of Parliament be appointed to enquire into and report within six months, how far the Directive Principles of State Policy laid down in the Constitution have been applied in the legislative and administrative actions of the Union Government and the State Governments."

In this House many a time we have discussed various matters about the Constitution...

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Member may continue on the next day.

**BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE**

**Dr. Keskar:** Sir, on behalf of the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, I would like to announce the following changes in the order of Government business in Lok Sabha for the week commencing 20th August as set out in the statement made this morning:

1. Further consideration of the motions for modification of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Rules will be provided after the passing of the Jammu and Kashmir (Extension of Laws) Bill.
2. Voting of Supplementary Demands for Grants for 1956-57 and Demands for Excess Grants for 1951-52 will be taken up thereafter.

6-39 P.M.

*The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, the 20th August, 1956.*