

बेकार हो गए हैं। मैं चाहूंगा कि भारत सरकार बस हजार टन गेहूँ उत्तर प्रदेश को दे दे तो ये बेकरीज बन्द नहीं होगी और मजदूर बेकार नहीं होंगे।

CINEMATOGRAPH (SECOND AMENDMENT) BILL—contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We resume discussion on the Cinematograph (Second Amendment) Bill which was adjourned in the last Session.

Mr. N. K. Sanghi to continue his speech. He is not here.

Mr. P. G. Mavalankar.

SHRI P G MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad) Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am sorry that this Bill has had to wait until this Session for consideration and final passing. But I am glad that it gives me now an opportunity to speak briefly on some of the provisions.

This House will recall the debate, interesting and instructive as it was, on the various provisions of this Bill. Many hon. members expressed their views on subjects ranging from censorship and the duties and functions of the Board of Censorship to what kind of problems are faced by the film producers and so on. I feel that the job of censorship is, of course, important in any decent and civilised society, but it is very difficult in any such democratic and free society to determine where exactly the Board of Censorship should stop and let the public taste and public opinion play a dominant role over the Board of Censorship. After all, the Censorship Board is there to determine that certain things are good for public taste and certain things are not good for public taste. But if you, in that anxiety and enthusiasm, let this Censorship Board do some things which ought to be governed by public opinion and public taste and public education, then, I am afraid the Board

of Censorship will have much vaster powers and there will be areas where in the Censorship Board's intervention would be rightly and legitimately termed as interference. Therefore, I feel that many important and delicate questions and issues arise out of the functioning of the Censorship Board and I hope the Minister with his usual skill and enlightenment and understanding of the problems and issues involved, will see to it that both in terms of the enactment of the Parliament and in terms of rules and regulations and conventions which are much more important—than the first two, conventions and traditions—good films are exhibited in this country and good films are produced which is much more important, and the functioning of the Censorship Board is arranged in such a way that although it is bound to keep good, rather reasonable, restraints on the production and exhibition of various films, in doing so, the individual citizen's freedoms and fundamental rights are in no way jeopardised. So, this difference or distinction between liberty and licence is always very thin. One can always take the argument that one is for liberty and one can go on extending that argument and stretch it to the logical and which may perhaps result into some sort of a licence.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, it is not only that this dividing line is thin, it has become blurred altogether.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I think it is very important that we do maintain this distinction between liberty and licence and I remember it was the great poet Milton who in his epic poem 'Paradise Lost' also said—I think I am almost right in quoting his couple of lines. He was talking about the people at large.

"Licence they mean when they cry liberty."

So, after all one can really degenerate into a sort of a licentious position in the matter of freedom and fundamental rights.

[Shri P. G. Mavalankar]

All the same, I do believe that the function of the Censorship Board is very delicate, responsible and as I said, although it must put reasonable restraints on these matters, it should not do anything whereby the liberties and the fundamental rights of the citizens of this Republic will be curtailed.

The functions of the Censorship Board, to an extent, are negative. It is asking the people not to see certain things and prevents them from seeing certain things, it is asserting that certain things are not good for public taste. I realise these negative functions are not always popular or palatable to some, sometimes even to many. Nonetheless, these functions they do perform. But I do feel that the Board will not be concerned merely with the negative functions and certainly when the Film Censorship Board is being discussed, we shall be able to assert in our debates on the functioning of the Board, that these responsibilities and challenges of the new times, the modern times are being realised, accepted and implemented by the Members who belong to the Board of Censors. There is what is called a generation gap all the time. In fact, the generation gap is there from the times of Socrates onwards. It is not something which is new to us today. But since the end of the Second World War in 1945, we see tremendous strides recorded and registered in science and technology, and the world has become so vast, so quick is the pace, ideas move so fast, fashions move so fast and fashions die also so fast, new fashions come in rapidly and so also tastes change very fast! Therefore, what you considered good or bad yesterday may not be considered good or bad today. Therefore, in a sense, the Censor Board's job is difficult because the people who sit on the Board of Censors, as they are experienced and seasoned people, may be having ideas which have become out of date, if not out of tune with

the accepted ideas of public morality of the day.

Therefore, what I was telling is that the Censorship Board will have to face these challenges and responsibilities with greater awareness.

We have also come to a stage in our country and the world, and our country is not to be excluded in this matter particularly, and that is, where permissive society has also been a matter of not only discussion but is a matter for experience. Parents, professors and teachers, leaders and social workers and even party politicians wherever they go, especially when they are confronted with the youth, they find quite often this phenomenon. One of the important reasons for this confrontation is that there is a different approach to what can be called permissive and what cannot be tolerated as permissive and permissible.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Even that is passing out.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I feel that if we live as we do in the modern times, there is this permissive society where all our ideas about novels, short stories, films and all kinds of human exercises, cultural exercises, and intellectual exercises undergo a radical change. Of course, I do not like in the name of decency and morality to do anything which would thwart the legitimate aspirations of younger generations, younger minds.

About youth and films, a lot has been said; there are films which can be seen by adults only and there are films meant for universal exhibition. Where it is a case of films which are meant for adults only, we find persons who are not adults, are also going there to see those films. That is because there is a certain lacuna in the general film which they try to get by going to such films. What I do feel is that we should be a little

more free in our understanding of our youth, more liberal in this regard. Some persons seem to think in this light, 'when we were young we did not do like this, therefore you should not do like this' 'you should do this' etc. I think there is a certain element of jealousy also in this respect. There is a sort of dichotomy between what the younger generation gets now and what the older people got when they were young and this creates a soft of jealousy, if I may say so. Therefore, what I feel is that our youth must be enabled—not permitted—to view the films which they like barring of course some of the basic limitations because the impact of the films on the young minds is tremendous.

SHRI R. R. SHARMA (Banda):
 What are those basic limitations?

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Basic limitations are those limitations which will stop us from destroying our basic principles, our basic values, and in domestic parlance, these are called *Satyam, Shram, Sundaram*. I do not want to enter into an argument because my time is short. My esteemed friend, the hon. Minister, Shri Gujral, is knowledgeable and he knows how films have a tremendous impact on young minds. People in the country who are illiterate and large illiterate get tremendous impact through the media of films and television. I want to ask him: Have we really made any effort seriously to enquire in regard to the educational planning of the television programmes?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I wonder whether that comes within the scope of this Bill.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: Sir, it is only as an illustration that I refer to this.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There are some limitations.

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR: I only wanted to convey that this aspect cannot be ignored. Creativity, art and imagination are the things which must never be curbed by anything which the Board of Censors do. Civility, decency and integrity must never be allowed to be passed over. Films and television have a special value and significance that must be never lost sight of. These are the points which I wanted to express. Thank you.

श्री हर प्रताप सिंह (बाराबंकी) :
 माननीय उपध्यक्ष महोदय, आपका हृदय मे आभारी हूँ जो आप ने मुझ को चलचित्र (दूसरा संशोधन) विधेयक, 1973 पर अपने विचार प्रकट करने का अवसर दिया। मैं इन का समर्थन करने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

मान्यवर, जैसा कि माननीय मदन को जात है कि अखिल भारतीय कांग्रेस कमेटी ने केवल देश में सामाजिक और धार्मिक विषयनों को ही समाप्त करना चाहती है, वरन् वह सदैव इस बात का ध्यान रखती है कि हमारे देश की जो संस्कृति है, जो परंपराएँ हैं, देश के जा आदर्श हैं जो मूल्य हैं, उन की भी रक्षा हो। मान्यवर, मैं अपने सूचना तथा प्रसारण मंत्रालय के मुख्य तथा अनुभवों मंत्री श्री गुजराल को इस बात के लिये बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि वे इस विषय में सही रुचि लेते हैं। उन्होंने इस विधेयक का बहुत चिन्तन, मनन के पश्चात् यहाँ माननीय सदस्यों के समक्ष विस्तृत रूप में प्रस्तुत किया है।

श्रीमन्, यह फिल्म उद्योग भारत के लिये एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण उद्योग है। विश्व के समस्त देशों की तुलना में भारत में सब से अधिक फिल्में बनती हैं और जहाँ तक दर्शकों का प्रश्न है, इन में बुढ़, युवा, बालक, स्त्री, पुरुष, सभी के लिये मनोरंजन का साधन है। इन फिल्मों में सभी लोगों को

[श्री छद्म प्रताप सिंह]

एक आदर्श जीवन का संदेश मिलता है और एक प्रकार से यथार्थ जीवन का उन के सामने चित्रण प्रस्तुत होता है। हमारा केन्द्रीय फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड "चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952" के अन्तर्गत स्थापित हुआ था। भारत में मार्क्सवादी प्रदर्शन के लिये फिल्म प्रमाणित करने के हेतु बोर्ड के मार्गदर्शनार्थ मूल सिद्धान्त चलचित्र अधिनियम, 1952 की धारा 5(ख)(1) में दिये गये हैं जो इस प्रकार है—

"यदि फिल्म को प्रमाणित करने वाले सक्षम प्राधिकारी के विचार से कोई फिल्म या उस का कोई अंश देश की सुरक्षा, विदेशों के साथ मित्रता के सम्बन्ध, मार्क्सवादी प्रवृत्तियों, मुद्रा की वैधता के विरुद्ध हो अथवा उस में किसी अपराध की प्रेरणा मिलती हो तो वह मार्क्सवादी प्रदर्शन के लिये प्रमाणित नहीं की जायगी।"

इस से यह बात स्पष्ट हो जाती है कि हमारी सरकार का दृष्टिकोण फिल्मों के बारे में क्या है।

श्रीमन्. केन्द्रीय फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड ने 2 फरवरी, 1970 को अपनी एक विशेष बैठक में फिल्मों में चुम्बन, नग्नता तथा अश्लीलता पर विचार किया। उस का जो सारांश था, वह मैं आप के सामने उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ—

"जब कि भारतीय फिल्मों के निर्माताओं को अपनी फिल्में बनाने की स्वतंत्रता हो, बोर्ड के सदस्यों का यह मत था कि भारत में सेंसरशिप को ऐसी अनुमति नहीं होनी चाहिये कि वह चुम्बन, नग्नता या अश्लीलता को इजाजत दे सके।"

श्रीमन्. सूचना तथा प्रसारण मंत्रालय की परामर्शदात्री समिति की एक बैठक में मैंने एक प्रश्न पूछा था—

"क्या सरकार ने खोसला समिति की राय के उस अंश को स्वीकार कर लिया है जिस में कहा गया है कि यदि कथा के प्रसंग में चुम्बन तथा नग्नता का प्रदर्शन किया जाना आवश्यक हो तो उसे मार्क्सवादी प्रदर्शन के हेतु प्रमाण-यत्न दिया जाय। "इस प्रश्न के उत्तर में कहा गया—"न तो चलचित्र अधिनियम और न ही इस के अन्तर्गत बने नियम विशिष्ट रूप से यह कहते हैं कि फिल्मों में चुम्बन की इजाजत नहीं दी जानी चाहिये। सरकार ने फिल्मों में चुम्बन के प्रदर्शन के बारे में कोई विशिष्ट अनुदेश नहीं जारी किये, फिर भी निर्देश मध्या (ज) 3 (ड) के अन्तर्गत चुम्बन की इजाजत नहीं है। निर्देश २० (घ) (अ) के अन्तर्गत नग्नता की स्थिति की इजाजत नहीं है। मान्यवर, इस बात से हमारी सरकार की, हमारे मंत्रालय की, नीति बहुत स्पष्ट हो जाती है।"

खोसला समिति ने इस सम्बन्ध में जो कहा है, श्रीमन्, मैं उसे भी उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ—

"यदि कहानों के फिल्मांकन में चुम्बन या नग्नता, अतीत का प्रदर्शन दिखाया जाना आवश्यक है तो एम. शाट को काट देने का कोई कारण नहीं होना चाहिये, बसंत कि ऐसा बड़ी सूझ-बूझ तथा मुश्किलपूर्ण ढंग में किया गया हो और वह कामुक तथा भीड़ान लगे। इस तरह मुश्किलपूर्ण फिल्म बनाने वाले निर्माताओं को प्रोत्साहन मिलेगा। सेंसर बोर्ड को चाहिये कि ऐसी फिल्मों को जो अपने भाँड़े और अश्लील फिल्मांकन के कारण कुन मिला कर भड़ी तथा हानिकारक दिखाई दे, प्रदर्शन की इजाजत न दे।"

मान्यवर, खोसला समिति की इसी रिपोर्ट के सम्बन्ध में हमारे एक प्रश्न के उत्तर

में कहा गया जिसे मैं उद्धृत करना चाहता हूँ ।

सरकार का विचार इस टिप्पणी को भाविक भाव में स्वीकार करने का है । वास्तविक मामला चुम्बन घाघि का नहीं है वरन् सुखि और कला का प्रस्तुतीकरण का है और केन्द्र सरकार फिल्म सेंसर बोर्ड से सदैव यह आग्रह करती रहेगी कि वह कलात्मकता तथा सुखि को ध्यान में रखे । मेरे विचार में सार्वजनिक प्रदर्शन के सम्बन्ध में सरकार को यह नाति बहुत स्पष्ट है ।

श्रीमान्, यद्यपि सरकारी नीति इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत स्पष्ट है फिर भी यह सत्य है कि सेंसर बोर्ड द्वारा कभी कभी मदाचार गिष्टाचार, सुखिपूर्ण तथा कलात्मकत क शब्दा के मना का भिन्न भिन्न रूप इस का उपयोग होता है । साथ ही यह बात भी है कि कभी कभी फिल्म सेंसरबोर्ड के एक सदस्य के विचार में मदाचार, गिष्टाचार सुखि और कलात्मकता का एक अर्थ होता है और दूसरे सदस्य के विचार में दूसरा अर्थ होता है । इसी तरह से यह भी सत्य है कि कभी कभी एक ही फिल्म के एक प्रकार के दृश्य को उचित मानते हैं, सुखिपूर्ण, कलापूर्ण मानते हैं और दूसरी फिल्म में वैसा नहीं मानते । यह सब बाने है । मैं समझता हूँ उन्ही कारणों से हमारे सुयोग्य सखी जो एक विद्वान् विधेयक यहा पर लाये हैं जिस से सेंसर बोर्ड को कमियों को दूर कर सके ।

साथ ही साथ एक और भी प्रश्न है जिसे आप को विचार में रखना होगा । सरकार की नीति इस सम्बन्ध में बहुत साफ होते हुए भी कि सरकार चाहती है कि कोई ऐसी फिल्म न बने जो भोखी हो परन्तु कभी कभी कुछ ऐसी फिल्में बनती हैं । उस का कारण यह है कि आप जानते हैं कि पदों की स्वतन्त्रता अभिव्यक्ति की स्वतन्त्रता के

अन्तर्गत घाती है । हमारे मौलिक अधिकारों में जो अभिव्यक्ति की स्वतन्त्रता है यह पदों की स्वतन्त्रता के अन्तर्गत घाती है । कभी कभी हमारी सरकार ने कुछ फिल्मों को अस्वीकार किया, परन्तु न्यायालय ने उन को छुट्ट मिला गई । तो ऐसी स्थिति भी होती है, जिसे हमें नहीं भूलना चाहिये । इसलिये यह कहना कि सरकार की नीति का लक्ष्यमानन है, यह उचित बात नहीं है।

जैसा मैंने कहा सुखिपूर्ण और कलात्मकता के सम्बन्ध में न्यायालय की बात का एक और उदाहरण दे कर पनी बात समाप्त करूँगा । फिल्म बोर्ड मैंगजोन के नवें वार्षिक नम्बर के मुख पृष्ठ पर एक हमारे अभिनेता शशि कपूर और अभिनेत्री सिम्मी का नए चित्र प्रस्तुत हुआ । सिम्मी ने बम्बई न्यायालय में मानहानि का मुकदमा दायर किया जिन पर न्यायालय ने यह निर्णय दिया जो मैं आप की अनुमति से कोट करता हूँ .

"No right thinking person would consider the picture to be unartistic or below taste and, as such, would not defame her"

तो इस के लिये सरकार के सामने कठिनाई घाती है । जब इस प्रकार के निर्णय हो जाते हैं तो यह कहना कि सरकार चाहती है कि इस प्रकार के चित्र दिखाये जायें, या मैंगजोनो में ऐसे चित्र आये तो सरकार पर यह आरोप निराधार होगा ।

हमारा विश्वास है कि जो विधेयक सखी जी ने उपस्थित किया है बहुत सीधे समझ कर और सूझबूझ से रखा गया है कि पूर्णकालीन अध्याय, सदस्य और असेसर्स होंगे, इन से हमें विश्वास है कि इन के पास अधिक समय होगा जिस से फिल्मों के बारे में अधिक सूझबूझ के साथ निर्णय लिये जायेंगे । और जो नया सेंसरबोर्ड होगा उस में योग्य,

[श्री रुद्र प्रताप सिंह]

चरित्रवान और ईमानदार लोग रखे जायेंगे जिन के सामने सदाचार, शिष्टाचार, मुहत्ति और कलापूर्ण आदि शब्दों का बही धर्म होगा जो हमारे राष्ट्रीय जीवन के हित में होगा ।

इधर कुछ हमारी फिल्में बनी है जो अच्छी कही जा सकती है । जहाँ पर हम आदर्शों की बात करते है, हमारे सामने एक और यह प्रश्न है कि क्या होना चाहिये और क्या हो रहा है । एक ओर हमें प्राचीन आदर्शों की रक्षा करनी है और दूसरी ओर जो वर्तमान यथार्थ है उसे नहीं भूलना चाहिये । हमलिये कुछ इधर समानान्तर फिल्में बनी हैं, और उच्च कोटि की बनी हैं । अगर उन फिल्मों की तरफ में अपनी आँखें मूढ़ लेना चाहे तो उसे उपयुक्त नहीं माना जा सकता । उन्हें हमें स्वीकार करना होगा और नये समाज में नवीन मूल्यों की जो रचना हुई है उसे हमें स्वीकार करना होगा । हमारे मंत्री जी के नेतृत्व में इस विधेयक के द्वारा हमारा सेमर बोर्ड भारत की जनता की जाँ भावनायें और आकांक्षायें हैं उस के अनु-सार काम करेगा, ऐसा हमारा विश्वास है ।

“हमें बनानी है तकदीर अपने हाथों में,
खुद अपने वक्त के परबदिगार है हम
लोग ।”

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूँ ।

SHRI N. TOMBI SINGH (Inner Manipur): I support this Bill. I fully support what my hon. friend Shri Rudra Pratap Singh has said. This Bill is very comprehensive and elaborate, and as such the amendment cannot be considered to be in any way a casual approach. This indicates the serious thinking on the part of the Government of India

The hon. Minister has introduced certain measures to introduce new committees and also to restructure certain committees for proper censoring of the films. The question is whether more restructuring of the committees or the introduction of new committees will be sufficient or not.

My hon. friend Prof. Mavalankar has very rightly referred to public tastes. Now, we are in a very serious dilemma. We have to re-examine where we stand so far as the film industry is concerned. It is very good that we are aware of it, and the Government have shown their awareness of the problem. The film industry has been left to itself for a number of decades. Over the decades, it has developed into a tradition of its own. It looks as if a hybrid taste which is neither Indian nor foreign, and sometimes a very bitter and hostile taste is imposed on us. It may look as if we are unconcerned. Those of us who have reached middle age or those who have become adults may look very unconcerned about, but it concerns our own children. What we see in the films concerns our own children. The generation gap is being reflected in our own society and in our own families. Naturally, the question becomes a very relevant one before we consider any measure for amendment of the main Act.

While welcoming the measures taken, I would like to suggest a few very salient measures which require the serious attention of the Government. I think it is time that Government re-examine the desirability of declaring a national policy on film industry. The question has been asked whether we would like to nationalise the industry. I would submit that this cannot be considered in isolation. We have to consider the need for nationalisation of the industry in relation to the social demand, the preservation of certain values and the need for introducing

new standards in our films. When we compare our films with foreign films, I do not know what percentage of the standard that we see in the foreign countries is reflected in the few films that have access to our theatres. Only a small percentage of foreign films are being shown in India, but then from these few films that we get, it is not merely the moral aspect, not merely the taste, but it is also the technical perfection of the films displaying the standard of the scientific and technological developments in different countries that have to be taken into account.

15 hrs.

When we talk of censorship, naturally we are conscious of our orthodoxy. We have been orthodox in many ways. It is right that we should be orthodox. Only by orthodoxy, we preserve our tastes and values, but there is a limit to orthodoxy. Along with the need for preservation of our values and tastes, we have to see that censorship must be directed to see or emphasise the aspect of scientific perfection.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Who will direct?

SHRI N. TOMBI SINGH: Government. I am urging them through you and Parliament.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Bill proposes to give Government very limited powers, only to revise in respect of sovereignty, integrity, public morality and things like that. What direction?

SHRI N. TOMBI SINGH: With due respect to your views....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am mentioning the aspect of the Bill, not my views.

SHRI N. TOMBI SINGH: This covers widely and comprehensively certain aspects. While Government would like to restructure certain committees

which aims at inducting certain whole-time incumbents in the censorship committees so that they will maintain a sort of continuity in the examination of films, the question is whether we should allow the present trend to go on. As I have said earlier, the film industry being in the private sector they require to run the industry? Our themselves and they have developed a tradition of their own thereby giving rise to a number of problems on the side of production and distribution. These problems mingling together have just confounded our generation and it is time we gave serious thought to it.

There is one aspect, of the producers *versus* censors who always appear hostile and cruel. The producers have to see the commercial aspect, the box office aspect. This is very true but who are who run to the box offices and contribute the necessary money they require to run the industry? Our own children who are set against us. So when a film is produced and censored, how can we separate the two, namely the industry and ourselves? In this view the question of nationalising the film industry has to be re-examined. I would, therefore, suggest that if Government cannot with the existing machinery protect the tastes and introduce further development in the film industry to suit the development of the younger generation we have to examine the question of nationalising films. A committee should examine the gap that exists between what is on the stage and what we find in reality in our society. Perhaps a random survey will tell us. From what we have heard of the experience of other countries, I feel that there is not as much difference or gap in those countries as we find in our country between our films and our real life. Why is it so? This gap has to be narrowed down and in order to do so perhaps the Government will require control of the industry intensively and extensively and perhaps nationalisation should, sooner or later be done. I invite the attention of the

[Shri N. Tombi Singh]

Government to this aspect of the matter.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The more and more I listen to the speeches, the more and more confused I become myself!

*SHRI J. MATHA GOWDER (Nilgris): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, I rise to say a few words on the Cinematograph (Second Amendment) Bill on behalf of my party, the Dravida Munnetra Kazagam.

Sir, in this introductory speech Shri I. K. Gujral, the Minister of Information and Broadcasting stated that on the basis of recommendations contained in the Khosla Committee which was constituted to examine the working of the film censorship law he has come forward with this Bill. This Bill seeks to revise essentially the set-up of the Central Board of Film Censors. Besides the Khosla Committee, the hon. Members belonging to the Ruling Party, while participating in the discussion on this Bill during the last session stated unequivocally that the performance of the Board of film censors so far had been appallingly dismal. The hon. Minister of Information and Broadcasting in his reply to the debate will no doubt say that the Central Board of Censors which would be set up under this Bill would definitely prove more effective in its functioning. But I am sceptical about it. I am of the view that this legislative measure is nothing more than putting old wine in a new bottle.

You will agree with me when I say that the Central Board of Censors has so far been the refuge for the retiring ICS and IAS Officers. One may not take any exception if the political leaders and the bureaucrats and entrusted with the responsibility of administering the country. But, the culture, mora-

lity ideals of decent life etc., from the basic element of social life. An individual is more concerned about it than a political institution or a governmental organisation. It is more a social responsibility than a governmental responsibility. The society can exert greater authority on these things than the Government. It is inextricable to me how an Officer who has dealt with administrative matters throughout his career can be in a position to sit on judgment over matters connected with morality and culture and that too after his retirement. I have no hesitation in saying that the appointment of these people as the guardians of culture and morality will be leading both culture and morality to an unathomable grave. I plead with the hon. Minister that this responsibility should not be entrusted to retired ICS or IAS officers in the new Board.

Similarly, I would also like to say that the censorship of films should not also be in the hands of the Central Government. I would substantiate my argument with cogent reasons. India is a land of variegated culture. The people of our country have so many different languages as their mother-tongue. Is it possible for the Chairman of the Central Censor Board to censor a film in Tamil language, without knowing that language? The hon. Minister might counter this by saying that a Member knowing Tamil language would be associated with the Board at the time of censoring the Tamil film. But I am not prepared to accept this kind of counter argument. I have to say that justice is not done to the Tamil film or Telugu film or Malayalam film by this kind of ad hoc arrangement. The basic point to be borne in mind, besides the question of language is that Tamil culture is different from Bengali culture or Oriya culture. What is acceptable in Bengal may not be acceptable to the people of Tamil Nadu. That is why our Chief

*The original speech was delivered

in Tamil.

Minister, Dr. Kalaingar Karunanidhi, has been emphasising the need for handing over the responsibility of film censorship to the State Government. The Censorship Board set up at the State level alone will be able to do justice to a film of that State. Just because the Chief Minister of a State ruled by the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam demands this, it should not be intermidately misconstrued as the demand for State autonomy. It is only the Tamil Nadu Film Censor Board which can do justice to a Tamil Film and similarly the Film Censor Boards of other States for the films of those concerned States. We do not object if there is a Central Film Censor Board for Hindi films.

I should say that the Central Film Censor Board does not in any way help the films in regional languages. A Tamil Film is exhibited in the Capital only on Sunday mornings. Tamil films are not shown in the theatres of the Capital in regular shows. One has to rush to see a Tamil film early on a Sunday morning. Likewise, the Bengali films of word-renowned Director, Satyajit Ray are shown very rarely in the Capital. For that matter, this is the fate of all regional language films in the Capital.

SHRI M. RAM GOPAL REDDY (Nizamabad): You can see them in Vigyan Bhavan.

SHRI J. MEHTA GOWDER: Once a year in Vigyan Bhavan, yes. My point is that the Certificate of the Central Film Censor Board does not in any way help the regional language films in other centres excepting those in the State. When this is the situation, a State Film Censor Board can as well do this job and there is no need for a Central Film Censor Board so as regional language films are concerned.

Unless the Government of India constructs a chain of art theatres all over the country, the regional language have no facility of being screened all

over the country. That is why our Chief Minister, Dr. Kalaingar Karunanidhi, has been demanding that the censorship of films should be the responsibility of the State Government. I am sure that the hon. Minister will concede that there is sound argument in his demand.

I will also refer to a proviso in m Clause 11(c) which reads:

Provided further that nothing in this sub-section shall require the Central Government to disclose any fact which it considers to be against public interest to disclose.

Sir, this means blanket power in the hands of the Central Government. The Central Film Censor Board can a film without attributing any reason whatsoever. Similarly, the phrases like public order or decency or morality are beyond the confines of adequate explanation. This clearly proves my point that the Central Government want to concentrate all powers in their hands. My party Government in Tamil Nadu objects to this kind of unreasonable powers being concentrated in the hands of the Central Government. I hope that you will not treat this as an untenable argument.

It is not that only the Members of Opposition have referred to the inefficient functioning of the Central Board of Censors. The ruling party members have vehemently criticised the functioning of the Central Film Censor Board. In the light of views expressed by the Members belonging to all sides of the House, I appeal to the hon. Minister that he should take back this Bill and hand over the responsibility of censoring films to the State Governments.

With these words I conclude my speech

श्री एम० रामगोपाल रेड्डी (निजामाबाद) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, जो तरकीब बक की गई है श्री माई के गुजराल जी की सिन्ड्रेटी

(श्री एम० रामगोपाल रेड्डी)

की तरफ से मैं उस के लिए उन को बघाई देता हूँ क्योंकि यह बहुत अच्छी तरकीब है। इस की वजह से अब तक जो अपन देश में सेसरशिप का काम ठीक तरह से नहीं हो रहा था अब एक परमानेंट चेयरमैन हो जाने से यह काम बहुत अच्छा हो जायगा क्योंकि टैम्पररी लोगो को कोई उस में दिलचस्पी नहीं रहती। अब एक परमानेंट चेयरमैन और 6 मेम्बरो को मुकर्रर किया जा रहा है। 6 नान-आफिशियल मेम्बरो को रखा जा रहा है। .. (व्यवधान) 6 परमानेंट है।

तो मेरा कहना यह है कि जैसे तामिलनाडु है, महाराष्ट्र है और वेस्ट बंगाल है इन तीन प्रदेशों में जहाँ बहुत सी फिल्में प्रोड्यूस की जा रही है वहाँ से मेम्बर होने बहुत जरूरी है। अभी गौडर माहब यह कह रहे थे कि तामिल नहीं जानने वाला तामिल फिल्मों के साथ अच्छी तरह न्याय नहीं कर सकता। वह सेसरशिप का काम मही ढंग से नहीं कर सकता। तो मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि जब वहाँ का एक मेम्बर रहेगा तो यह शिकायत नहीं होगी और हो सकता है कि वहाँ का चेयरमैन भी बने। गौडर जी यह क्यों सोचने है कि वहाँ का आदमी चेयरमैन नहीं बन सकता। महाराष्ट्र या तामिलनाडु या वेस्ट बंगाल जहाँ ज्यादा फिल्में बनती हैं जिनको बहुत तजर्बा है ऐसी ही जगह के लोगो को चेयरमैनशिप दी जाय। मिर्फ आई ए एम या रिटायर्ड आर्दाभियो के लिए जगह पैदा करने के लिए यह नहीं किया जा रहा है बल्कि देशवासियो और खसूमन हमारे छोटे बच्चे जो सिनमा देख कर खराब होते जा रहे हैं उन के ब्यालाला अच्छे रखने के लिए और उन्हें इम के बुरे असर में बचाने के लिए जिस में वे आगे चल कर तर्ककी कर मके, यह किया जा रहा है। यह एक किस्म की शिक्षा है और हम यह देख

रहे है कि हमारी शिक्षा संस्थाओं में जो पढ़ाया जा रहा है उस से ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण असर फिल्मों से होता है। इसलिए फिल्म को मुधारना बहुत जरूरी है। आजकल इतनी गन्दी और नीच किस्म की फिल्में आती है कि उन को हमेशा के लिए बन्द करना चाहिए।

मेरा यह कहना है कि सिर्फ फिल्म बनने के बाद ही नहीं बल्कि बनने से पहले उस की स्क्रिप्ट को भी देखना चाहिए। स्क्रिप्ट जो लिखी जाती है उसको देखने से भी बहुत सा अन्दाजा हो सकता है कि वह फिल्म किम नमूने की बनेगी। इम में फिल्म बनाने वाला जो आदमी है जो इतना पैसा खर्च कर के फिल्म बनाता है अगर सेसर बोर्ड से यह कहा जाता है कि फिल्म अच्छी नहीं है तो उस को बहुत नुकसान हो जाता है फिर आइन्दा वह अच्छी फिल्म बनाने के काबिल भी नहीं रहता है। इसलिए इन्दा से सेसरशिप के मामले हर चीज आनी चाहिए ताकि फिल्म पूरी बनने के बाद रिजेक्ट करने से होने वाला नुकसान उस को न हो।

दूसरी बात यह है कि हमारी जो अच्छी फिल्में बनती है वे बहुत सारी दूसरे देशों में स्मगल होती जा रही है। 5 करोड़ रुपये का अन्दाजन हर साल हमारा नुकसान होता जा रहा है। तो मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि ये फि में दूसरे देशों में कैसे जा रही है और इतना बड़ा नुकसान जो हो रहा है उस को रोकने के लिए सरकार क्या कर रही है ?

खामला कमेंटी की सिफारिशों की बहुत चर्चा चली है। उममें फिमिंग की भी इजाजत उन्होंने दी है। मुझे खुशी है कि मंत्री जी इस किस्म की चीज इम में नहीं रख रहे हैं। मैं उन से आग्रह करूंगा कि कहीं भूल कर वह उस को उम में ऐड न करे क्योंकि वह हमारी सभ्यता के खिलाफ है और हाइजिन

(श्री एम० रामगोपाल रेड्डी)

के भी खिलाफ है। बाहर की फिल्मों में जो बोमराज और किसिंग होती है उसकी बजह से बहुत स लोग विदेशी फिल्म देखना चाहते हैं। इसलिए न केवल हमारी अपनी फिल्मों की संरक्षण हानी चाहिए बल्कि बाहर से आने वाली फिल्मों की भी संरक्षण हानी चाहिए। हमारे स्टैंडर्ड के निहाय से जो फिल्में होती हैं वही हमारे देश में दिखाई जानी चाहिए और बाकी दूसरी फिल्में नहीं दिखानी चाहिए। ऐसा नहीं करेंगे तो यहां की फिल्मों का जो संरक्षण किया जा रहा है उस से कोई फायदा नहीं होगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ मंत्री जी ने जो तरतमोब पेश की है उस के लिए उन को फिर बधाई देता हूँ।

SHRI GIRIDHAR GOMANGO (Koraput): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support the Bill which is before the House. The hon. members who participated in this debate have given their opinion. Now I would like to give some suggestions to the Minister.

The Estimates Committee last year took up this matter and submitted a report about film censorship. There are some recommendations which are very essential for the Government to act on immediately.

There is the question about vulgarity and violence in films, which is good and which is bad. One author has said that nothing is good or bad but thinking makes it so. We say that this is good and that is bad. There are two kinds of films which make impact on our society and life the story films and the documentaries: one is imaginative and other is reality; a film is based on a story or novel which is only an imagination, and a documentary tells us the day-to-day affairs of the Government and what

is happening in the country. It is said that there is no reality in films. But the point is this. Though it is imaginative, when we see the reality of life in a film and compare and see, we think that the film is bad or good. The next question is whether the film is of educative value to the masses. This is a media of mass communication. The question for the Government to consider is that they should produce more and more documentaries by which Government can have quality control on films.

There are producers on the one side and Government on the other side. The producers say that, unless they produce films with vulgarity and violence, they will not be a success in the box office and they cannot earn money. They said that the Government should check this vulgarity and violence and this controversy was going on. A number of committees were appointed but due to the Government not taking immediate steps the vulgarity and violence in our films continue. Under this Bill the Board will be reconstituted and it will have six wholetime Members including the Chairman. Here I want to draw your attention to the recommendations of the Estimates Committee of Lok Sabha (1973-74), 58th Report which says:

The Committee would, however, urge the Government that while appointing members to the new Board of Film Censors and Appellate Tribunals they should ensure that only persons with proven integrity and knowledge of this industry are included. The Committee would also like that proper representation should be given to the film industry also on these bodies."

There were so many reports. There is that famous Khosla Committee report. So, while amending this law, unless we give some powers to this Board, the undesirable things cannot be checked.

[Shri Giridhar Gomango]

Now the question is: after this Bill is passed, whether the Government will have an effective control.

Now, one of the objectives is to confer on the Central Government a limited revisional jurisdiction even in respect of orders passed in appeals. Such jurisdiction can be exercised only in the interests of certain specified overriding considerations, namely the sovereignty and integrity of India, security of the State, friendly relations with foreign States and public order, decency or morality. It should be 'and not 'or' While sovereignty and integrity are essential, decency and morality are also equally essential.

Lastly, a word about the moral question. One cannot define what morality is. As I said earlier, nothing is bad or good but thinking makes it so ...

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER. You are yet to experience that

SHRI GIRIDHAR GOMANGO
Lastly I support this Bill because even though we are passing it after a year of its introduction, I hope it will help in curbing violence and vulgarity in our films

श्री टी०सी०हंसलाल (करौलबाग)

उपाध्यक्ष जी, यह जो चलचित्र सशोधन बिल हमारे सामने आया है मैं इसका हृदय में स्वागत करता हूँ और साथ में कुछ सुझाव भी देना चाहता हूँ जिनके ऊपर हमारे मंत्री महोदय ध्यान देंगे। जहाँ तक फिल्मों का सवाल है यह सशोधन बिल पिछले 1952 के अधिनियम को सशोधन करने के लिये लाया गया है। 1952 में आज तक पिछले 24 वर्षों में जिस तरीके से फिल्मों में तबदीली आई है उससे हमें यह एक रिकार्ड की बात है। आज जो फिल्में बनती हैं वामनव में

उन फिल्मों के अन्दर टिकट बेचने वाली खिड़की की तरफ ध्यान दिया जाता है खिड़की पर कितनी लम्बी लाइन लगती है उसी के हिसाब से कहानी, बीगर कलाकार म्यूजिक डाइरेक्टर आदि को लिया जाता है।

इस संशोधन के अन्दर मेरे ध्यान में सब से पहली चीज जो देनी चाहिये थी, अगर वह लाई जाती तो इसका महत्व बहुत बढ़ जाता। क्योंकि जब तक हमारे यहाँ जितने सिनेमा हाउसेज बने हुए हैं उन पर गर्बनमेंट कब्जा नहीं करेगी तब तक यह चीज मिटने वाली नहीं है। आप यहाँ पर चाहे जितनी आलोचना कीजिये सेन्सर बोर्ड चाहे जितनी निगाह डाले लेकिन फिर भी लोग एप्रोच की आड में ऐसी फिल्मों का पास करा लेते हैं जो पास नहीं होनी चाहिये। जब वे फिल्में बाहर रिलीज होती हैं तब उनकी तीव्र आलोचना होती है। मैंने ऐसी कई फिल्में को देखा है और मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि हमारी सभ्यता तथा मध्यता की दृष्टि में दिखाने योग्य नहीं है। अब तो हमारे यहाँ टी० वी० (दूरदर्शन) लागू हो चुका है वर धर में टी० वी० लग रहे हैं जब ऐसी फिल्में टी० वी० पर दिखाई जायेंगी जहाँ पर घर में माता पिता बहन भाई सब पास बैठ कर उन फिल्मों को देखेंगे तो आप स्वयं अनुभव कर सकते हैं कि उनका हमारे ऊपर क्या प्रभाव पड़ेगा। मैंने इस सम्बन्ध में एक पत्र भी लिखा है जिसमें मुझसे दिया है कि टी० वी० पर 20 साल पहले की पुरानी फिल्मों को दिखाया जाय ताकि हमारे बच्चों को यह मालूम हो सके कि 20 साल पहले जब वह पैदा भी नहीं हुए थे हमारे देश में कौनो फिल्में बनती थी उनका करक्टर उनका चरित्र किस प्रकार का था। इससे नई फिल्मों के लिए मिडान्त बन सकते हैं।

16.38 hrs.

[SHRI JAGANNATHRAO in the Chair.]

प्रती एक फिल्म घाई है—गुप्त ज्ञान धाजकल चल रही है। यह एक प्रच्छी फिल्म है और मेरी दृष्टि से वेबत मामले में बेहतरीन फिल्म है। लेकिन इसके साथ ही एक और फिल्म घाई है—प्रेम-शास्त्र। गुप्त ज्ञान देखने के बाद मैंने समझा कि प्रेम शास्त्र फिल्म भी इसी विषय पर बनी होगी लेकिन जब मैंने देखा तो बिलकुल उलटा पाया। नाम जैसे गुप्त ज्ञान है ऐसे ही प्रेम शास्त्र रख दिया; लेकिन उसके अन्दर प्रनोखी चीज देखी, बिलकुल उलटी चीज थी। मैं जानता हू कि सेंसर बोर्ड की कुछ भजबूरियाँ हैं लेकिन उस के बावजूद भी सेंसर बोर्ड को थोड़ा मशत होना चाहिये। इस सेंसर बोर्ड में ऐसे लोग होने चाहिये जो हिन्दुस्तान के माने हुए विद्वान हों, जिनको हिन्दुस्तान की सभ्यता और सभ्यता की जानकारी हो। यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि आप किसी घाई १० एम० वाले की ही इसमें रख दें। धाज इस मुकाम में जिसके पास घाई १० एम० की डिग्री है उसका हा मब से बड़ा वाचिन माना जाता है। जिस तरह में अश्रेजों के उमाने में घाई १० एम० का मब कामा में प्रिफरेंस दिया जाता था, ये घाई १० एम० वाले भी उन्हीं की पैदाइश हैं, इन की ही मब में ज्यादा प्रकम्बद माना जाता है। मेहरबानी करके सेंसर बोर्ड में हमारे तपे हुए गुणी और उम्र के लिहाज में ऐसे लोगों का लोजिये जिन को हर बात का ज्ञान हो और जो फिल्मों को देख कर, उस की बारीकियों, टैकनीक को देखकर सटिफिकेट दें। वरना इसका क्या परिणाम होगा— धाज की फिल्मों का हमारे नोजवान लडके और लडकियों पर बहुत ज्यादा असर पड रहा है

श्री ब्रूल अन्व हागा (राजी) : आप ने जो फिल्में देखी उनका आप पर क्या असर पडा ?]

श्री टी० सांहनसाल मैंने जो फिल्में पहले देखी हैं, उनको यदि धाज के बच्चे देख लें तो इन्सान बन सकते हैं।

मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हू। एक प्रच्छी फीमिलो, विद्वान फीमिलो का लडका जिसको उम्र मालूम माल थी और जो हायर सिकेंडरी में पढ़ता था उसने एक फिल्म देखी और उसको देख कर क्या गुनाह किया, उसको आपने भी अखबारों में पडा होगा। राजेन्द्र नगर में एक बुढ़िया के घर वह चोरी करने चला गया और उसके गले का पकड कर उसके मुह में उसन कपडा डूमा। वह पकडा गया। उसका मा बाब बडे परिशान हुए। एक हो लडका उनका। बे मेरे पास आए, बूँ, वह इन का परे क्षेत्र में पडना है उन्होंने कहा कि हमारा यहाँ एक लडका है और अगर इसका जेल हा गई तो हम बर्बाद हा जाएंगे। इस खतम हा जायेंगे। वह ऐसी फीमिलो है जिसके सदस्य २३० प्रच्छी प्रच्छी जगहों पर लगे हुए हैं। मैंने लडके में पूछा। उसने बताया कि वह फिल्म देख कर धाया था और एक्सपैरिमेंट करके देख रहा था। अब आप बताये कि ऐसा होता है या नहीं? आप सोचे कि अगर फिल्म प्रच्छी हो तो क्या उसका प्रच्छा प्रभाव बच्चों पर नहीं पड़ेगा? श्री देही ने बहुत प्रच्छा मुझाव दिया है। सेंसर बोर्ड फिल्म बनने से पहले ही कहानों का देख ले और उसके बाद फिल्म बने। अगर वह कहानों का पास कर दे तब तो उस कहानी पर आधारित फिल्म बने अन्यथा न बने। धाजकल होता यह है कि जब फिल्म बन जाती है तब वह सेंसर बोर्ड के पास पास होने के लिए जाती है। तब अगर वह कौची चलाना है तो निर्माता अलग चिल्लाता है और दूसरे अलग चिल्लाते हैं। वह कहता है कि उसका पाखो का नुकसान हो रहा है और आप फिल्म का पास नहीं कर रहे हैं। तब वह एप्रोच बडे बडे लोगों की सझाना शुरू करता है और पास

करवाने की कोशिश करता है। क्या उस सब से अच्छा यह नहीं होगा कि पहले ही सेन्सर बोर्ड कहानी को देख ले और मंजूरी दे दे तब ही फिल्म बने ? अगर ऐसा होगा तो ज्यादा फिल्मों को रिजैक्ट नहीं किया जा सकेगा। कुछ ग्रेश ही हो सकेंगे जिन पर कैंची चलाने को जरूरत महसूस हो। तब ऐसा नहीं हो सकेगा कि सारी की सारी फिल्म डिब्बे में बन्द रहें।

ग्राजकल प्रोड्यूसर यह कहता है कि मुझे पैसा चाहिये, एक्टर यह कहता है कि हमें तो पैसा चाहिये। मैं आपको बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि नये ग्रेश को जो दिखाया नहीं जाता है, जिन पर कैंची फेर दी जाती है, उसका ब्यु प्रिंट सर्वेक में बिकता है। ऐसे मीन जो शाट रिग जाने हैं और जो सेन्सर बोर्ड काट देना है उनके ब्यु प्रिंट बना कर हस्तुन्तान में ब्रेन दिए जाते हैं। एक जमाना था जब लडकियां फिल्मों में काम करने के लिए नहीं मिली करती थीं, यह मुझे अच्छी तरह याद है। मिस बिंबा जो दिल्ली की थी उसका पेशा कुछ और था, वैसी फिल्म इंडस्ट्री को मिला करती थी। लेकिन आज अच्छे खानदानों की लडकियां उनकी और आकर्षित हो रही हैं और नरद नागयण मिलना है और लोग तैयार हो जाते हैं, लडकियां तैयार हो जाती हैं और कहती हैं कोई परवाह नहीं जैमे मर्जी आए शाट ले लो। यह सब अन्तर आ गया है। लडकियां कहती हैं पैसा मिलना है और शाट कही बना कर दिया तो दूसरी फिल्मों में काम नहीं मिलेगा। उस इंडस्ट्री में बहुत पैसा खर्च हो रहा है। किस पर होता है यह ? एक्टर और एक्ट्रेसिज पर हाता है। हजारे आदर्शों जो इस में काम करने हैं उन में से किसी को पांच किसी को दस और किसी को 15 रुपये ही रोख मिलने दें लेकिन कुछ एक्टर और एक्ट्रेसिज ऐसे हैं जिन को 10-15 लाख रुपया मिलता है। क्या अभी इस और आपने ध्यान दिया है। 24 माल

में आप इस एम्बेडमेंट को लाए हैं शायद पहली बार। अच्छे स्टैंडर्ड की फिल्में बने इस और भी आपको ध्यान देना चाहिये। बार सप्ताह नहीं तो एक सप्ताह बे चलेंगी। देखने वाले इनको जरूर देखेंगे। गंदी फिल्में देखने वालों की भीड़ आज लगी रहती है, लाइने लगी रहती है, टिकटें नहीं मिलती हैं। अभी एक फिल्म तरसी भगत भाई है। उन बेचारों को हाल नहीं मिल पा रहा है। हाल वाले कहते हैं हमें तो रुपया ज्यादा चाहिये और तुम्हारी फिल्म दिल्ली में पहले हफ्ते में ही गोल हो जाएगी। हाल वाले बहुत ज्यादा पैसा लेते हैं। हो सकता है कि वे यह मारा पैसा गवर्नमेंट को न दिखाते हों। जिस तरह में एक्टर दस लाख लेकर दिखाने बहुत कम है उसी तरह में ये भी करने हो। मैं चाहता कि जिनने भी मिनेमा हाल है उनका आप राष्ट्रीयकरण कर दें। इस में आप को घाटा होने वाला नहीं है। और इंडस्ट्री में तो हो सकता है लेकिन इस में घाटा नहीं हो सकता है। इस तरह की चीजें की जाए तो देश का भला हो सकता है।

खोमला समिती की रिपोर्टें हगारें सामने है। वह बहुत अच्छी है विवाय चम्बन वाली बात के। उसकी रोशनी में आपने कुछ संशोधन उपस्थित किए हैं। 24 माल में आप शायद पहली बार इनको लाए हैं। मैं समझता हूँ कि फिल्म इंडस्ट्री एक ऐसी इंडस्ट्री है कि हम में हर साल प्रायः संशोधन कर सकते हैं।

इन शब्दों के साथ से इस बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ।

श्री राम रत्न शर्मा (बादा) : महापति महोदय, मंत्री महोदय ने इस बिल का उपस्थित करने समय खोमला समिति की रिपोर्टें में उद्धरण दिए हैं। इस वाक्य प्रस्तुत संशोधनों को हमें उर्बा मंदा में देखना होगा।

कला जीवन के लिए है। अगर जीवन कला में नहीं है तो उस कला का समाज के लिए

कोई मूल्य नहीं हो सकता है। यह एक सर्वमान्य सिद्धान्त है। कला के माध्यम से चलचित्रों द्वारा समाज का चारित्रिक, सामाजिक, सांस्कृतिक, आध्यात्मिक एवं राजनीतिक उत्थान करने का ध्येय रखा गया है। उसी परिपेक्ष्य में हमें इसको देखना होगा। ज्यादा नहीं पिछले दस वर्षों में जो फिल्में बनी हैं उनको हम देखें तो क्या हम ऐसा पाते हैं कि हमारा जो उद्देश्य है वह पूरा हुआ है? क्या समाज का चारित्रिक, सांस्कृतिक और राजनीतिक उत्थान हुआ है? कुछ प्रतिशत फिल्मों को हम छोड़ दें तो हमें जो उत्तर मिलता है, नकारात्मक मिलता है। दस वर्षों में जो फिल्में बनी हैं उनमें चोरियों, डकैतियों अपराधों, अंग प्रत्यंगों के प्रदर्शन और कैबरे आदि को ही बढ़ावा मिला है। इसी संदर्भ में मैं खोसला कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के पेज 90 में जरा कोट करना चाहता हूँ जहाँ उसने कहा है कि हमारी फिल्में होलीवूड की सस्ती नकल हैं। सत्य में परे हैं, हमारी फिल्में बिल्कुल जीवन से कटी हुई हैं। मैं कोट करता हूँ :—

“Another criticism made is that Indian movies are mere cheap copies of foreign movies. Often the stories are borrowed from the story of a popular Hollywood film, the dresses and erotic scenes are lifted almost bodily from them and introduced into Indian films.”

इसके पैरा 67 को भी मैं कोट करना चाहता हूँ :

“Indian films are far removed from reality and the film world is something that has no relation to real life. The characters in a film do not behave as real human beings. The story does not unfold itself in a convincing manner. the unreal world of films is therefore, lacking in conviction and fails to entertain.”

इसी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के पेज 65 के पैरा 23 और 24 में कहा गया है :

“A boy of 23 in a reformatory school said: “In my opinion it is a bad thing for young boys to see pictures showing a man stealing. Pictures of gangsters enabled me to become one of them. Movies showed me the way to steal automobiles.”:

“The investigators made a list of the tricks learnt by young delinquents from films.”.

इसके बाद 32 आइटम की एक लिस्ट दी हुई है। मैं समझता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय, माननीय सदस्यों और आप ने इनको अच्छी तरह से पढ़ा है।

मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह पीसमिल एमेंडमेंट कर के वह कोई फायदा नहीं पहुंचा रहे हैं। इस एमेंडमेंट के पीछे उनका क्या मोटिव—उद्देश्य—है, उसके बारे में भी मैं बनाना चाहता हूँ।

मिनेटिंग्राफ़ एक्ट 1952 में पास हुआ था। 1958 में री-एडिशन के रूप में बने थे। 1969 में खोसला कमेटी की रिपोर्ट आई और 1973 में यह एमेंडमेंट लाया गया है। क्या मंत्री महोदय बनायेंगे कि इनके साथ तक क्या होता रहा। अगर वह वास्तव में फिल्म उद्योग और फिल्मों के स्तर में सुधार करना चाहते हैं, तो उनको इसके लिए एक काम्प्रिहेंसिव बिल बनाना चाहिए था। यह जो पोलिटिकल एमेंडमेंट है, उसका उद्देश्य यह है कि जो सरकार के चमचे हैं, जो आई० सी० एम० रिटायर हो गये हैं, उनको कहीं फिट करने के लिए स्थान बनाये जायें।

सरकार कहती है कि हमारे देश में आर्थिक संकट है, पैसा नहीं है, स्कूलों में बन्द होने की नीव आ जायेगी। लोगों को जरूरत की चीजें नहीं मिल रही हैं। दूसरी तरफ़ मंत्री महोदय इतनी जगहें पैदा कर के सरकारी खर्च को बढ़ा रहे हैं। जैसा कि फ़िनांसल मेमोरेंडम में कहा गया है इस बिल की व्यवस्थाओं को

कमर्शियल करने के लिए 2,75,000 रुपये प्रति वर्ष का कर्षा होगा मैं सचबतता हूँ कि इसकी कोई प्रावश्यकता नहीं है।

इस बिल में केवल सैकशन 3 और सैकशन 5 में एमेंडमेंट प्रस्तुत किये गये हैं। सैकशन 5 में कहा गया है :

"Any person, desiring to export any film for exhibition outside India shall in the prescribed manner make an application to the Board for a certificate in respect thereof and the Board may, after the examination of the film as provided in this Act and the rules made thereunder —

- (i) sanction the film as a film fit for exhibition outside India; or
- (ii) direct the applicant to carry out such excisions or modifications in the film as it thinks necessary, before sanctioning the film as a film fit for exhibition outside India."

यह कितनी आश्चर्यजनक बात है कि जो फ़िल्म देश से बाहर दिखाये जाने के लिए होनी, उसको बहुत क्लोबली देखा जायेगा और उसमें प्रावश्यक काट-छांट और परिवर्तन किये जायेंगे। क्या मंत्री महोदय यह नहीं चाहते हैं कि जो फ़िल्म देश में रहने वालों को दिखाई जाये, उसका स्टैंडर्ड भी अच्छा हूँ? क्या केवल वही फ़िल्में अच्छी बननी चाहिए, जो बाहर भेजे जाने के लिए हों? मैं समझता हूँ कि इस एमेंडमेंट में कोई दम नहीं है, और हमसे कोई फ़ायदा भी नहीं है। इस लिए मंत्री महोदय इस एमेंडमेंट को वापिस ले लें।

मैंने अपने एमेंडमेंट्स के द्वारा चाहा है कि बोर्ड में सिर्फ पांच आनरेरी मेम्बर रखे जायें, ताकि देश पर ज्यादा भार न पड़े। देश जैसे ही शरीर है उसको और ज्यादा शरीर न बनाया जाये।

मैं चाहूँ कहूँ कि मंत्री महोदय इस बिल को बिचड़ा कर मैं और कोई कामिनीय बिल बिल लूँ।

श्री बाबुराम अश्विनीवार (टी.कमराड़) : सभापति महोदय, जो संशोधन विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया गया है, मैं उसका समर्थन करता हूँ। इस विधेयक का उद्देश्य बिल्कुल सीमित है। इसके द्वारा यह व्यवस्था की गई है कि सेन्सर बोर्ड में 5 स्थायी मेम्बर रहेंगे, जिनको बैतल मिलेगा और 6 अस्थायी मेम्बरों का प्रावधान किया गया है, जिनमें 3 मेम्बर फ़िल्म उद्योग के कर्मचारी, या उसमें काम करने वाले होंगे। इस व्यवस्था से बोर्ड अधिक कुशलता से काम कर सकेगा।

यह संशोधन करने की प्रावश्यकता इस लिए पडी कि अभी तक सेन्सर बोर्ड के सदस्य अस्थायी थे और वे काम में पर्याप्त रुचि नहीं लेते थे। इस लिए सरकार ने सोचा कि बोर्ड में ऐसे लोगों को रखा जाये, जो पूरे समय काम करें, ताकि वे फ़िल्मों की खामियों को ध्यानपूर्वक देख सकें।

कई माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है कि हमारी फ़िल्मों में अस्वीलता है। लेकिन हमारी संस्कृति में भी ऐसी बहुत सी बातें हैं, जैसे खजुराहो और कोणार्क डेम्पल। वे स्थायी हैं, वे सदियों से चले आ रहे हैं और हज़ारों की संख्या में लोग उनको देखने जाते हैं। उनका प्रसार लोगों पर क्या पड़ता है?

घाज से बीस पन्चीस साल पहले हमारे देश में जो चलचित्र बनते थे, उनके कलात्मक और चित्रक क्रांतिक, सांस्कृतिक कुरीतियों का प्रदर्शन, समाज सुधार और ऐतिहासिक घटनाओं से सम्बन्धित होते थे। देखते नाशों पर उन चलचित्रों का बहुत अच्छा प्रसार पड़ता था। लेकिन जब से पश्चिमी देशों की सभ्यता हमारे देश में आई है, तब से हमारी फ़िल्मों में कहानी का न कोई सिर होता है और न पैर।

इसी तरह हमारे यहां साहित्य भी मर सा चुका है। हमारे साहित्यकार ऐसी प्रेम कहानियां लिखते हैं, जो कनाट प्लेस के आस-पास खत्म हो जाती हैं। एक मकान में पूरी कहानी खत्म हो जाती है। ऐसी छोटी छोटी पुस्तकें हर जगह बिक नहीं हैं इतनी तरह हमारी पत्रिकाओं में नंगे और अश्लील चित्र छपते हैं। पिछले हफ्ते लिटलज में एक अमरीकन महिला का इसी प्रकार का फोटो छपा है।

इस लिए आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि सरकार गम्भीरता से यह देखें कि बुराई की जड़ कहां है। हमारे देश में आज जिस साहित्य की रचना की जा रही है, उसमें अश्लीलता भरी रहती है। वह साहित्य हमारे नाजवानों को गलत दिशा की ओर ले जा रहा है। उस साहित्य में चोरी डकैती और पाकेट-मार की बातें होती हैं और बड़ी बातें हमारे चित्रपट पर भी दिखाई जाती हैं।

इसलिए मैं मंत्रों महीदय से निवेदन करूंगा कि राखों रुपये खर्च करके जो फिल्म बनाई जाती है, कंबल उसका निरीक्षण करना पर्याप्त नहीं है उस फिल्म की बहानों को पूरे बोर्ड के सामने आना चाहिए और यह देखना चाहिए कि कहीं वह हमारे इतिहास, हमारे आदर्शों और हमारी परम्पराओं के प्रतिरूप तो नहीं है, कहीं उससे हमारी अखंडता के भंग होने की आशंका तो नहीं है। हमारी संस्कृति के विरुद्ध तो नहीं है, ऐसी बातों पर जब तक हम विचार नहीं करेंगे तब तक बोर्ड का काम सही दिशा में नहीं हो पाएगा। मैं चाहता हूँ कि कंबल जो फिल्म बन कर आती है उसी को नहीं, बल्कि उसकी जो कहानी है उस पर भी विचार करना चाहिए कि वह किस तरह की है।

16 hrs.

अब रही यह बात कि लोग सिनेमा देखते हैं तो उस का असर उन पर पड़ता है तो सिनेमा तो मैं नहीं देखने जाता लेकिन जब मैं शहरों में जाता हूँ तो वहां हमें जिन्दा विव दिखाई देते हैं। लड़के लड़कियां स्कूल में क्या करते हैं? शहरों में जो शापिग करने जाते हैं वहां क्या देखते हैं? हर जगह एक सामाजिक बुराई इस तरह की फैल गई है। हम अपने घरों में देखते हैं, घरों में भी ऐसे ही कपड़े पहनते हैं। बाप और मां के सामने लड़के और लड़कियां आज किस तरह के कपड़े पहनती हैं? स्कूलों में लड़के लड़कियां किस तरह के कपड़े पहनती हैं? तो केवल सिनेमा से ही नहीं होगा तमाम सामाजिक बुराइयों को हमें देखना होगा। हम तो अपने घरों में जिन्दा ही किन्नी फोटुए देखते हैं, शहरों में भी देखते हैं, सड़कों पर देखते हैं। तो इस के ऊपर कुछ प्रतिबन्ध लगाना चाहिए सरकार को इस के ऊपर विचार करना चाहिए... (व्यवधान)... इन बातों की तरह ध्यान देना चाहिए कि देश का चरित्र कौन भुंधरे, हमारे लड़के पढ़ें लिखें। आज स्कूलों और कालेजों में तरह तरह की नशीली दवाइयों का इस्तेमाल होता है। उस के उपर प्रतिबन्ध लगाना चाहिए। तरह-तरह के हिप्पियों जैसे कपड़े पहनते हैं, उसके ऊपर प्रतिबन्ध लगाना चाहिए। अभी हम ने देखा बम्बई में एक कालेज में क्या हुआ और जबलपुर में तो एक सब इस्पैक्टर को लड़कों ने मार दिया। वहां के स्कूल के प्रिंसिपल ने कहा कि जो अपने बाल कटा कर आयेगा उस को हम अपने कालेज में ऐडमीशन देंगे। तो बगल में नाई की दुकान खुल गई। नाई की दुकान से पहले बाल कटाये जाते थे तब ऐडमीशन लेने जा पाते हैं। गलत तरीके से हिप्पियों को तरह के कपड़े पहनना या बाल रखाना जितनी इस तरह की बातें हैं इन को बन्द कर देना चाहिए। हमारी जो अपनी प्राचीन सभ्यता है उस के मुताबिक हमें चलना चाहिये।..... (व्यवधान)...

जो हम कहने हैं वह करना चाहिए। हमारी भारतीय सभ्यता ऐसी है कि किसी भी मुक्त के सम्पर्क में हम धरा। हम उस को बदल नहीं सकते। सभ्यता पुरानी हमारी प्राचीन सभ्यता है, कितना भी विदेशों का प्रभाव पड़े हुए उसे को बदल नहीं सकते। इसलिए, अपनी सभ्यता को सुरक्षित रखने की तरफ सरकार का ध्यान देना चाहिए। उनके लिए चाहे उमर क हमारे कानून क्यों न लाने पड़े लेकिन स्कूलों में समाज में प्रार शहरो में जो हम तरह के लोग घुमने फिरते हैं उसके ऊपर प्रतिबन्ध लगाना चाहिए। हम के लिए नियम बनने चाहिए कि कैसे कपडे पहनने चाहिए और कैसे उन को रहना चाहिए। इन शब्दा के साथ म इस बिल समर्थन करना है।

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHR I. K. GUJRAL.) I am grateful to the House for debating this issue with so much interest. You will recall that we had debated this in February last and I was feeling that perhaps it might be difficult for us again to link up the discussion we were having five months ago but fortunately Members have kept their minds so fresh that even after five months' break the link was not broken and the discussion was worthwhile.

Let me recall that five months back some leading Members of the House took part in the debate, namely Shri Sreekantan Nair, Shri Salve, Shri Hazra, Shri Daga, Prof Mukherjee Dr. Karni Singh who was a member of the Khosla Committee also though the attended only one meeting—Prof Dandavate and some friends spoke today and they have all enriched the discussion very much.

What became obvious was the concern about the present situation regarding films because everybody realises that this is a very powerful me-

dium which could be used for good or for bad. Particularly in a society like ours, we have to keep in mind the impact on minds, especially young minds. Visual media, particularly the film have come to occupy the centre of stage in our cultural life. It is a fact whether we like it or not, that today all performing arts fortunately or unfortunately I think more unfortunately than fortunately, derive their inspiration more from the films than vice versa. I say so because I feel that the performing arts should set the standards for films and not vice versa, particularly when the tradition and heritage of our performing arts is so rich from which we can draw a lot. I feel that our children in particular have to be somewhat, if I may say so, saved from the impact of the films as they are at the moment. We have not realised how much impact this medium is having on the making of minds. In this regard, the Khosla Committee has done very good work. It was a committee composed of learned people who gave their time and applied their mind to study the various aspects of the film and it came to some conclusions the result of which is this Bill. It is important to remember not only the impact the film has on adults and grown-ups but the deep impact it has on the minds of the children and the younger people. The Khosla Committee has exhaustively quoted from the book *Our Movie Made Children* by Forman. I shall take a few minutes to quote some very pertinent quotations which the Khosla Committee has given from that book. I quote from page 61 of the report.

"55 Forman states that children retain 70 per cent of what the adult retains upon seeing a film and that the impression of a film lasts for a considerable time. Indeed some of the impressions mature and become clearer with the passage of time. The film, therefore, makes a very strong impact upon children, far stronger than adults are prone to believe. Experiments made with

educational films show that knowledge increased 20 per cent to 40 per cent more on screening a film than on communicating the same knowledge through other means. The author adds that a scene in a film shapes the attitudes and social values of children. Any kind of medium which employs visual as well as aural communication makes a deep and lasting impact upon an impressionable mind."

"5.6 Forman points out that the mental make up of a criminal in the film is not explained. It is not till the very end that he meets his punishment and in the meantime a great deal of sympathy is aroused for him. The part of many criminals in films is taken by popular stars who are well dressed, handsome and often rich. In the same way, love without marriage constitutes a disproportionately large part of film themes, and the actors are usually popular film stars. Therefore in the minds of the audience, particularly the young and impressionable part of the audience, a measure of sympathy and approval is aroused."

"5.9 The author says "Imagine the child from the age of six on exposed to the flood of movies pouring across the screen, loaded chiefly with the well-known movie trinity of love, sex and crime with all the violence, vulgarity and false values that so many movies have. It is a question whether the child will have become so excited as to lose sleep for a week or will sleep so drugged or exhausted by emotional fatigue that his sleep will be a kind of stupor. Whichever of the two happens the price paid is exorbitant."

This is the basic background in which we have to examine the film scene as such.

"Film as we all know, leaves a great deal of impression. As I have said just now, it is not only on the child

but also on the adult mind. I, therefore pose a question to this august body and, through this, to the society as a whole whether it is a matter of social concern or not. Can society ignore this powerful medium? Up till now have we or have we not let the film alone to do whatever it can to the society at large? We have let the fate of the society, the shape of the society, the future of the society particularly the future of the tender minds in the hands of those whom we may choose to call by and large, financial adventurers. These financial adventurers have not taken cinema either as an art, or as a contribution or as something which we may call culture. They have taken to it for the purpose of digging gold. They have not gone for the purpose of reforming society and realising the responsibilities that society imposed on them. But, unfortunately, a substantial section of them have looked upon it for making quick money by the shortest possible methods and possible means. I do feel that at least sometimes my friend, Shri Jyotirmov Bosu should agree on something, because I am talking of culture and I hope he is interested in culture more than politics, at least sometimes

I do feel that society, unfortunately, as such has turned a Nelson's eye to this very important happening within the society as a whole. Sometimes we have been motivated by puritanism. We have felt that in our puritanism we can wish the film out but the film could not be wished out. The film has come and the film has invaded our cultural life; rather, it is now part of the entire life of the society as a whole. Therefore, when we have continued to have an ambivalent attitude towards the film as such the film has gone further and made its impact. I, therefore, feel that today at least the time has come when we should realise that this powerful force has to be controlled not in the political sense but in the social sense and used for social purposes.

I do feel that people who have social consciousness and social responsibility

should be given more and more opportunity to make films. I also feel that this sense of responsibility has to be the basic ingredient for any cinema policy that we may choose to follow in this country as a whole. We should also face the fact that this medium in today's context has to be dealt with and cannot be wished out. I do feel therefore, that towards this powerful visual medium which can shape the society as a whole particularly in our country where educational and cultural inputs are so much needed, we should have a positive attitude because the film can be used to a great deal of advantage.

I would also like to point out again going back to the Khosla Committee, because they have made a very interesting observation—they have quoted from the same book to which I have just now referred—the author claims:

"We pay for our school system. We pay for our water supply. We also pay for the motion pictures. What would we say if any questionable character were to be allowed to come in suddenly and take charge of our children's school? Or, if suspected water were even occasionally turned into our mains? What an outcry goes up if the milk supply in a town is suddenly discovered to be in the least degree tainted. The vast haphazard promiscuous so frequently ill-chosen, output of pictures to which we expose our children's minds for influence and imprint, is not this at least of equal importance?"

This is the basic issue.

Unless we are able to treat and decide to treat the cinema on the same basis as we treat our text-books and literature, till then the cinema scene as such will not improve. This can improve not by censor alone. I am not going to claim that after this Bill is passed and after the new Censor Board is set up, the cinema scene will

change. That can change only if we decide that social investment has to be made.....

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZARA (ARAMBAGH): It has no connection with the Bill.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I think, if you will use more of your imagination and less of your speaking-power you will find the connection.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (DIAMOND HARBOUR): Be relevant.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am glad Mr Jyotirmoy Bosu is interested in relevance.

I do feel that unless we decide as a society that social investment has to be made and cannot be delayed, we will only face a social peril. Unless we are really in a position to evolve and turn our eyes fully on the contribution that film has been making a stage is fast arriving when we can face like some of the Western societies a social catastrophe.

I think, for some time now I have pleaded here and outside that the main method of improving film is that society as a whole and the Government as such must decide to make substantial investment in film. In today's context, as I have said we see that films are made by those who are the worst type of profiteers. I am not condemning everybody in film industry. I am talking of the financial structure of film industry as such. Unfortunately, that section of finances have gone into the film industry which charge very heavy interest. Not only they charge heavy interest but they dictate their terms also. Even the best of the scripts and the best of the stories get destroyed because healthy finance is not available.

I have had the opportunity of studying the systems of some of those countries which we may call as developed countries particularly in that sense of freedom of expression

about which my hon. friend, Shri Daga, is concerned and in those countries, we have seen that the Governments there have made massive financial investments. Unless we make healthy finance available, unhealthy finance and healthy films cannot co-exist. It is just not possible. Unfortunately, we have treated films as a "Kamadhenu cow". We have only tried to get entertainment tax out of it. We have not tried to feed back any money into it. The result of it is that the film scene in totality is degenerating.

Recently, we have made a small experiment in setting up the Film Finance Corporation. Although the contribution has been very meagre in 15 years of the Film Finance Corporation's existence we have been able to find about Rs. 1 crore of investment even then we have seen that the film scene has changed considerably. Because of intervention of the Film Finance Corporation, because of a new wave of films and the emergence of the regional cinema, there has been a contribution which directly and indirectly has been good even by small investment. I am very certain that unless we decide that a percentage of the earnings of the entertainment tax will be fed back into the film industry, the cinema scene will not improve.

Every day the technology of film-making is becoming expensive. Raw film has become expensive; cameras have become expensive. The production of film has become expensive and because it is becoming expensive, the eye is on the profits as such. That is why all the nostalgia we have about the older films has faded out. All those who were mostly motivated by the creative instinct could not stand the pressure of finance. Very fortunately, since the coming in of the Film Finance Corporation and also of persons like Shri Satyajit Ray and others in the film industry, a new type of school if I may say so, a minority cinema has also been simultaneously built. This minority cinema to a great extent has

contributed to the change of the attitude of the people.

I am speaking in this August House where the whole country is represented. I do wish to appeal through this House to the society and policymakers that we must decide to invest in the cinema industry as such and that only then we can possibly create what we may choose to call an Indian cinema.

SHRI NOORUL HUDA (Cachar): Are you appealing to change social values?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Social values I feel, cannot change only by wishes. For changing social values through a medium, investment is needed, and investment should be made by us. I do not exonerate the responsibility of the Government. I am trying to say that the responsibility of the Government is considerably more because not only the Centre but also the States keep on crying that films are doing harm. But what are we doing about it, how much have we decided to invest, I like to ask. The States earn on an average about Rs. 60 crore, annually on entertainment tax. But in 15 years we have invested only Rs. 1 crore through the Film Finance Corporation. Naturally, you cannot change the scene as such. I make appeals because sometimes my own heart breaks; I feel that, in spite of my best efforts, I have not yet succeeded in finding money or even in convincing my colleagues in the Government. My senior colleague is sitting here. Without investment the medium of cinema cannot be used to advantage, and disadvantages can be considerable

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: If you project the image of the ruling Party through cinema, you will get a lot of money.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: My friend, Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, eats, drinks and sleeps with politics. Nothing else ever crosses his mind. For some time, for a change, he should remember that he comes from the rich land of Bengal

[Shri I. K. Gujral]

the land of Tagore, where culture also matters. If he tries to put himself in that frame of mind he will be able to think of things better and finer than what his mind is being applied to always.

The scene has changed in this country. India has undergone many changes. Today India is the biggest film producer in the world. We produce the maximum number of films compared to any other country, and if I am not mistaken—I hope I am right in saying so—that in spite of everything, it is a very fortunate thing that our creative genius in the cinema has emerged and asserted itself compared to the creative genius in the world. We have seen that in many competitions and many festivals our film-makers have made their mark and they have been able to show to the world that better films can be made and have been made in spite of all the difficulties that they have been facing.

This Bill is trying to remove some of the difficulties that censorship has been facing. Any censorship law, at its very best, is a negative force or a negative approach. It, naturally, can have only a very limited role. Although it must assert against vulgarity it must assert against debasing of taste, it must assert against dehumanising of sensitivities and finer values, it must assert against perversion, it must assert against glorification of the goondas and it must restore to women and children their rightful place in the society. Even then this cannot be as effective as public opinion because the most effective censorship in the country is ultimately the public opinion. Public opinion in this context has naturally to be educated.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior): Where is the public opinion?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: That is what I am appealing for. You and I should

arouse that public opinion. To an extent a change has come. I will give one or two indications. For instance, till about last year whenever the Censorship Board gave 'A' Certificate to a film, the film-makers were generally very happy because they thought that it would dig more gold. But now we have seen a change in the course of the last year or so. Whenever 'A' Certificate is given, there is now always a hue and cry and the demand is more for 'U' Certificate. This itself is indicative of the change. Another indicative is this. The regional language films for instance, Malavalam films, Kannada films and Bengali films, the new ones that have come up in these three or four States, have made a place for themselves; they are based on classics, on social investigation, social issues. And this scheme is now being respected more and more. But I do feel that even then....

SHRI P. G. MAVALANKAR (Ahmedabad): If you are building a case for quality films, let us spend more on it.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I do not invest anything on it. You are talking of more and more. I say, let us invest something on it. Unless we decide to invest something on it the cinema scene will not change. I do not know whether you were here when I was speaking on this point. Perhaps you had been out. I am not accusing you but on this I have spoken at length because I am one of those who would like you to feel—it is not a question of this side or that side—that it is a matter of common concern for all of us. This is a powerful medium which makes and shapes the minds of men and so it needs investment like the books....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Gwalior): Where are the cinema halls even if you make better films?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Not only cinema halls but better films have to be produced, more and more specialised films for children and young men

need to be made and all this needs investment. I think the stage has come when the country should apply all its mind whether we can or we cannot at least part with 50 per cent of the entertainment tax to see that better cinemas come in and even the number of cinema theatres that we have in our country as our friend Shri Vajpayee has drawn our attention to, is only about 7,800. Can you imagine that the Soviet Union with a population of one-fourth of ours, has 1,40,000 cinemas. The UNESCO some time ago had laid down norms for cinemas. Even if we follow those norms in the developing countries, we should increase our cinema halls by three times because what is happening to-day is not that cinemas are few but the cinemas are expensive. The lowest cinema ticket plus the entertainment tax has become so expensive that a lower middle class man or a poor man just cannot afford to go to cinema at all. It is not a question that he cannot be influenced but he is kept out of the contact with the cinema and entertainment is denied to him. In urban areas more and more we are finding tensions which are not only economic tensions but non-economic tensions also because there is no release from those tensions. We have made some experiment in Delhi recently by starting an open air cinema in the Rabindra Rangashala where we have kept the ticket at 50 paise and Rupee one. We have 8000 seats and you will be surprised that every day every seat is sold and every day 3000 people come who, I must say never go to cinemas otherwise and people from Juggis and jhoppis who cannot just otherwise afford to go to a cinema.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: It creates a law and order problem.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: That problem will always be there whenever people get together. But that does not mean that we can afford to throw the baby with the tube water. Therefore, I do feel that we should possibly think in

terms of having something in this context.

Some of my friends talked about the criteria followed by the Censorship Board in rejecting the films. In the last couple of years I am particularly keen that films that preach violence ..

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What happened to the Member who was caught red-handed taking a bribe in Bombay?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I do not know. Perhaps Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu knows better.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Jyotirmoy Bosu gets the information.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I would have appreciated if the hon. Member gets up and speaks. The hon. Member did not participate in the debate. He was busy writing his notes for something else. Suddenly something flashes across his mind and he starts interrupting.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I am privileged to sit on the same bench as the Chairman. Please do not carry coal to New Castle.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am prepared to give the floor to Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu to give us some worthwhile suggestions. But he does not apply his mind to matters of culture. That is the tragedy. That is the real difficulty.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: At the present moment I am worried about the stomach culture in this country.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I hope your negative approach will fill that soon. As I was saying that we have been trying to assert and curtail violence and vulgarity in the cinema. In the last year for instance, we denied certificates to 15 films. In this year in the first 5 months, the Censorship Board refused to certify 3 films. Also the

[Shri I. K. Gujral]

metreage of cuttings has considerably increased. In 1973, apart from the films which were not permitted to be shown, about 15,000 metres were cut from the various films. But cuts do not solve any problems. As I have said just now, all these are negative methods. Positive methods have to be found.

Then I come to the points made by Shri Sreekantan Nair who said that the set up is being made more cumbersome in respect of the Film Censor Board for that, I would say, it is not cumbersome but it is being made simplified in the sense that now we are going to have six whole-time members and the result would be, since every film will have to be seen by at least one whole-time member uniformly in regard to the application of the rules will be there and it is far more easier for them to sit with the assessors of a particular language and take a view on the film at the moment. With the help of the honorary committees we are not able to make the impact and that is why we have accepted the recommendation of the Khosla Committee and we are going in that direction.

Now I come to another point which was raised by my friend Mr. Salve and it is this. He spoke about the various aspects of the films and he had particularly drawn my attention to the film Bobby which was worrying him very much. I have drawn the attention of the Film Censor Board to the remarks made by Mr. Salve.

Mr. Manoranjan Hazra talked about the fate of the Cine-workers who do need attention. I may tell him that we are at the moment at the stage of drafting of a Bill for protecting the salary etc. of these persons and I do hope I will be in a position to come to the House very soon with that Bill to help them to occupy a useful place in the cinema industry as such.

Now, Mr. Daga made a long speech and he was particularly worried about the words censor, about the older people, about the dangerous trends and so on. He said in the course of his speech that films had not made any impact, I think Mr. Daga's speech was very classical, because, he is one of those people who feel that cinema is seen and forgotten sooner than one thinks. But if you sit with Mr. Daga he will even tell you what film he saw some twenty years ago and what was the story there, and still he feels that the impact of the film can be easily forgotten! Mr. Daga also quoted Khosla Committee Report, and Mr. Daga said that they had talked of liberal approach. I agree. Liberal and licentiousness are two different things. I am all in favour of liberal approach. I am not a conservative and I am not for a conservative approach at all but I am for a more responsible approach. I do agree with Mr. Daga that ...

SHRI B. V. NAIK (Kanara): What you do is this. When it comes to practical things, what you are doing is, you are not going to introduce good films, but you are going to cut the bad films. That is to say, it is only a negative function. The hon. Minister is very sensible and I am sure he will give greater thought to it.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am grateful for the credit you gave for being a sensible one; you can say sensitivity, as well, because in art values I have sensitivity as well. We have changed the approach the methodology etc. and I have told time and again what all things we have done to change the scene. That is why I have spoken with regard to a comprehensive film policy. Elsewhere I had also spoken of the cess. I have spoken on the Film Council. I have spoken of art theatres. I have spoken about film societies. I have spoken of children's films. I have spoken about setting up of the corporation which in totality is going to change the scene.

SHRI B. V. NAIK: What all you can do with the censors is to take a scissor and cut the negative part but you cannot substitute a good part.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I have said so. My friend, Prof. Mukherjee is not here. He also had talked of the need for a sensible national films policy which I have tried to enunciate just now and also the Cine Workers' Bill. He had also talked about the Metro Cinema and Shri Bosu is interested in that also and because Mr. Bosu is keen that something should be said about the Metro Cinema. I would only like to say here that we have set up a negotiating committee from the various industries together and some representatives of the owners are also here and the documents are being examined. I hope we shall be in a position to settle this issue soon. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You support Messrs. Gupta Brothers in Bombay. And you, Mr. Ganesh, have given him support.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: He has given me full support. I also feel that Shri Nabala, particularly, had talked of the good films and the people's demand for a good film. He had asked for a Film Corporation. I am glad to say that only two days ago the Cabinet had approved of the setting up of a national film corporation. I think we shall be setting it up very soon. With the setting up of that we shall be able to start at least a new phase in import and export of films also and earning some money to finance the films corporation to perform the responsibilities more adequately.

Dr. Karni Singh had emphasised about the need for a family film. I could not agree with him. But, I do feel that healthy and helpful family films are needed. Prof. Dandavate, sitting here, has made a speech which is very useful and learned. He has talked about the generation gap in the government thinking. I do not

think that there is generation gap in the government thinking. I think that the generation gap is not in the context that we are against what the new generation wants. I am all for the films which are youthful in approach, which are youthful in their comprehension, which are youthful in their art films and which are youthful in their sensitivity. But, I think that what is sold in the name of the youth is not that either Prof. Dandavate or I would wish. I think it is not in that sense that we have any generation gap problem. I think Prof. Dandavate also had asked a question which needs a reply. He has asked whether the elements which are extraneous to arts are judged by the art form. I think it would be too much if we say that all the films are in art forms although some of the makers do believe in them. Do you know, Prof. Dandavate that out 100 films which were started in India, seventy per cent of the films fall under it because people who are adventurers and who have earned money in something else—in stock exchange or something else—do want to venture into the films? The result of all this for making a good film. In that they are neither interested in the art films nor in aesthetics. We have, fortunately, as I said just now, some leaders who have a deep commitment to the art films and the things of that kind. I do not think that there is any difficulty coming from the censors or from those who are certifying the films as such.

Before I finish, I must compliment Prof. Dandavate for his very very beautiful speech on the art and the enunciation of the art film.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): I would like to ask; is it not true that even in those societies in some of the countries where efforts are made to control and regiment art, there not only the freedom of the artist is lost but even the creative mind is disturbed?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I am not able to say 'Yes' or 'No' because this is a discussion in which, if Prof. Dandavate wants me to say 'Yes' or 'No' I would not like to reply. I can assure you of one thing and that is that no attempt whatsoever on our part will be made either to regiment the art or to try to control the art. We are only trying to eliminate those things to be unhealthy and known to be perverse to debase human values which, not only acts as a poison to our society but is now acting as a lava to our basic and cultural art value. We are now trying to fight against this and not against the art films as such.

Shri Mavalankar has naturally and rightly asked that we must be always conscious of the difference between the freedom of licence and the liberty of the people that is involved in it. I think that it is in that context only that we are thinking of the present measures because correlations of these three only make the validity to the present Bill definitely useful. Shri Rudra Pratap Singh has complained about the lack of uniformity of the censors. I think with the appointment of whole-time members we will be able to achieve that uniformity. He talked at length about nudity and kissing. I think I have made my views known on this subject in the meetings of the consultative committee. It is in the broad context as Khosla Committee has tried to see these things that they have to be seen. Covered nudity and covered vulgarity can be worse than nudity. That is what is happening today.

Shri Tombi Singh has drawn our attention and rightly so that we must declare our national film policy. I have said just now how I am looking at the scene and what are the ingredients of the national film policy. Shri Gowder has talked about censorship by the State Governments. This issue was discussed at length in the Constituent Assembly when censoring and films were made central subjects and taken from the Concurrent List. I

might quote a little from the speech of Dr. Ambedkar:

"Mr. President, Sir, the object of bringing this entry which was originally in the Concurrent List to the Union List is two-fold.

Firstly, to prescribe as far as possible a uniform standard for sanction of films, and

Secondly, to prevent an injury being done to any producer of a film whose film may not be sanctioned by any particular province for reason of some idiosyncrasy or some standards which are extra-ordinary character and do not conform...".

I think this speech holds good even today and particularly in his State politics which is dominated by cinema. I think the present situation where censorship is a central subject is correct but while appointing six members we are going to post two of them at Madras and they must know the local languages of the region because only then the censorship will be possible. Since India is making many films we have provided in the Bill assessors to assist the whole-time members. Our policy will be to have the Chairman and two members in Bombay; two members in Madras and one member in Calcutta so that they are able to look after all the films made in those areas. My friend Mr. Reddy had asked me to see that people knowing various languages are appointed on the censor Board. Well, we will try to do that as far as possible. Some friends have asked me about the pre-censorship of the scripts. It is not an impracticable suggestion but it does not serve much purpose because films are not made by scripts. They are made as films developed.

श्री टी० सोहन खान : जैसा थाप ने
बतनाया कि यह बुरे में नहीं होना चाहें श्री
उम में तब्दीलियां करने हैं

श्री झाड़ा के० गुजराल बाद में भी करने हैं, नहीं बाद में ही करने हैं। जो निश्चित होना है उसमें कुछ नहीं होना है। निश्चित में जानना है कि मोहन चाल जी ने किसी से दान्नी दिखाएँ। अब दो-तीन दिखाई उस के बाद क्या हुआ? यहाँ वह चीज पानी है।

सोहा मान जी ने यह भी कहा है कि स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के द्वारा सिनेमा हाउसेज का ले लिया जाय। मैं उस के लेने के हक में नहीं हूँ। मेरिन इन बातों पर न हूँ कि स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स जो सिनेमा लेना चाहती है वे अपने सिनेमा हाउसेज खोलें। इसमें कसबा लगाया जाय क्या कि प्रग-सिनेमा हाउसेज की जल्द है। उसी सिनेमा हाउस के ऊपर फिर। फिर और कसबा लगाया इसका कोई फायदा नहीं है। (व्यवधान)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU I shall bring a Punjabi film to him

SHRI I K GUJRAL Let him please do so That is why I have succeeded in persuading five or six States to set up cinema corporations to make more cinemas, because ultimately that will be more useful than just investing moneys in cinemas which have already been made.

My hon friend Shri Sharma talked of the extra expenditure involved. I think there was a great deal of contradiction in what he said On the one side, he was very much concerned about the social impact of films and on the other side, he was more concerned about the couple of lakhs of rupees which would be spent on censoring of films. But I can assure him that most of it will be recovered because two are going to increase the censorship fee also and so it is not as if in the end the exchequer will be losing money on this

I think I have a covered most of the points raised in this debate I shall only conclude by saying that as a result of this debate my hon. friends on both sides of the House may kindly

treat with considerably more seriousness the cinema scene as such and help us and the society in evolving a comprehensive film policy which to a very great extent fortunately has been spelt out in the Estimates Committee's report The Estimates Committee's report has been very wholesome and useful and we are trying to evolve a policy based on that

MR CHAIRMAN The question is "That the Bill further to amend the Cinematograph Act, 1952, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration"

The motion was adopted

Clause 2 was added to the Bill,

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA I beg to move,

Page 2, omit lines 4 to 10 (16)

I have moved this amendment because in my opinion there is no need for a revising committee because there is already another committee for the purpose I hope the hon Minister will accept it

SHRI I K GUJRAL. I am unfortunately not in a position to agree with my hon friend. The question of a revising committee came in because some people used to file appeals. Uptil now, our procedure is that appeals are disposed of by the Ministry and the Minister either after seeing the films himself or after taking the advice of some of the experts We are now institutionalising it We are going to have a panel of about 12 learned people who know about films and about law, out of these 12 we shall choose a panel of two or three every time an appeal comes, and the Minister will follow the advice of this panel in disposing of the appeal I think this is better institutionally than any discretionary powers given even to the Minister

MR CHAIRMAN. I shall now put amendment No. 16 to vote.

[Mr. Chairman]

Amendment No. 16 was put and negatived.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is, "That clause 2 stand part of the Bill".

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 3—(amendment of section 3)

SHRI R. R. SHARMA: I beg to move.

Page 2, lines 14 and 15,—

for "five other whole-time members and six honorary members"

substitute—

"five honorary members." (3)

Page 2, lines 22 to 24,—

for "and the other whole-time members shall receive such salaries and allowances as may be determined by the Central Government and the honorary members"

substitute—

"and the other members including honorary members" (4)

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

Page 2, lines 14 and 15,—

omit "and six honorary members" (7).

Page 2,—

omit lines 16 to 19 (8).

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA: I beg to move:

Page 2,—

for lines 13 to 15, substitute—

"(1) for the words 'not more than nine other members ap-

pointed by the Central Government', the words 'five other whole-time members and 12 honorary members appointed by the Central Government to look after the performance of the regional Committees in five regions, namely, Calcutta, Delhi, Bombay, Madras and Gujarat where five regional committees shall be constituted' shall be substituted;" (17).

Page 2, line 18—

for "three" substitute "five" (18).

Page 2, line 19,—

after "industry" insert—

"as artists, technicians and workers in any of the five regional centres, namely, Calcutta, Delhi, Bombay, Madras and Gujarat." (19).

श्री मनोरंजन हार्जा : महापति जी, मैंने अपनी अमेन्डमेंट्स में यह चाहा है कि क्लाम 3 में 5 दूसरे होल-टाइम मेम्बरों तथा 6 अानरेरी मेम्बरों के स्थान पर केवल 5 अानरेरी मेम्बरों) कर दिया जाय। अभी मन्त्री महोदय जवाब देते बकन कह रहे थे कि यह बहुत छोड़ी रकम क बात है मैं ऐसा महसूस करता हू कि इस मामले में ज्यादा आर्थिक बोझ न लाया जाय। मैं तो यह चाहता हू कि इस की तनकवाहों पर खर्चा न बढ़ा कर सरकार इन्फ्लेस्ट्री में लगे हुए उन लोगों के लिये जो काम करते हुए डिमॉबिलिड हो जाते हैं, या जो बाघ में रण-बाउन हो जाते हैं जिन को कोई पूछने वाला नहीं होता, उन की सहायता के लिये आप कोई कण्ड बनाते बलविध प्रवर्धन के लिए भवन बनाने के लिये धनराशि की व्यवस्था करने, इस इन्फ्लेस्ट्री में सम्बन्धित उद्योगों को खोलने की व्यवस्था करते। मेरे दोस्तों अमेन्डमेंट बहुत महत्वपूर्ण हैं और मेरा अकुरोस है कि सरकार इन हूँ स्वीकार करे।

श्री मूल चन्द्र डागा : समापति महोदय ,
क्लाज 3 में कहा गया है—

which shall consist of the Chairman and not more than 9 members. What is the amendment? You want that there should be 5 members and 6 more honorary members. That means 11 members—it is compulsory.

पहले यह व्यवस्था थी कि उन को 4 हजार रुपये तनख्वाह मिलेगी, लेकिन अब इन 11 मेम्बरों को 3 हजार रुपये तनख्वाह मिलेगी,

The Chairman will get at least Rs. 4,000 per month.

इस के पीछे आप का उद्देश्य क्या है ?
आनरेरी—मेम्बरज के लिये कहा है—

You have said that there should be 6 honorary members. What should be the qualifications? Nothing has been said that these will be the qualifications of honorary members. What is the purpose behind it? I have not understood it. What is the report of your Committee?

“We are firmly of the view that the present system of entrusting the preview of films to a panel of honorary examinees consisting of persons who have little sense of responsibility and who have been appointed in the exercise of Government's patronage should be completely done away with”.

This is the suggestion of your Committee. Now I have not understood why you want to have 11 members. There were only 9 members and that was to be the limit.

Now you want that there should be 11 members. That is the mandatory provision. One Chairman and 11 members. That means 12 members. That means a heavy expenditure.

एक तरफ कहते हैं कि हमारे पास पैसा नहीं है दूसरी तरफ बल्की-वाडीज बना रहे हैं—आप की इच्छा क्या है ।

For the words ‘not more than 9 other members’ you have substituted ‘five other wholetime members and six honorary members’. It means 11.

इन पांच मेम्बरस की पे वा क्या होगा ?
खोसला कमेंटी ने कहा है—

Each member will not free house accommodation and other things; then Rs. 3,000 per month.

एक तरफ पैसा नहीं है दूसरी तरफ आप ने सात वाडीज बना दी है ।

I have not understood this. The Examining Committee, Revision Committee, then Board, then Appellate Tribunal and then Government.

उस के बाद सर्वमेट के पास जायेगा एक फिल्म को पास कराने के लिए 6 जगह जाना पड़ेगा—यह क्या बिल आप ने बनाया है । ठीक है आन मुझे कह दो कि मैं प्रेम न करूँ मुझे बँड जाना पड़ेगा—लेकिन आप कर क्या रहे हैं —

If I make a film first it will go to the examining committee; then it will go to the revision committee; then it will go to the board. Afterwards it will go to the appellate tribunal. Then it will go to the Government. You must not use your powers and that Government is the best which governs the least. Then seven assessors will be there. One examination committee and then a revision committee and then the board.

कोई पीरियड मुकरिर नहीं किया गया है, कोई लिमिटेशन नहीं है । —

17 hrs.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: On a point of information. At every stage what is the amount of contribution that is required?

SHRI M. C. DAGA: It says here: where any film... the Government can call for the record. There is revision power with the Government. It says here: the present censor board is not an independent body; its decisions are liable to be set aside by any order of the Government. Therefore it is condemned... यह सब क्या है —

दिने आदाय्या को दन नाम पर लगाना चाहते हैं। इंडस्ट्रीका इस तरह की व्यवस्था में बहुत दिक्कत होंगी। अपन के बोर्ड के पान इस तरह से कोई पावर नहीं है। अगर बोर्ड बनाना है तो उसे पूरी पावर दायिए।

It says here: the assumption that mistakes will be rectified by a higher authority arouses almost universal condemnation

आप के बोर्ड के नाम कोई पावर नहीं है। एक फिल्म को पान करने के लिए उस को पांच कमेटिया के सामने जाना पड़ेगा इस के पीछे लाजिक क्या है? आप उतना बड़ा बोर्ड क्या बनाना चाहते हैं उतना भारी भरकम खर्चा रखने का क्या फायदा है। आजकल आनरेरी मेम्बर क्या नाम दाने है?

I have not understood the logic behind. What are your arguments? Then, there is no limit as to how much time a committee will take.

मैं चाहता हू कि आप इस पर फिल्मों और कीजिए। एग्जामिनरिंग कमिटी में कितना टाइम लगेगा, रिबीजन कमिटी में कितना टाइम लगेगा, हर कमिटी कितना टाइम लेगी।

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA: I agree with Mr. Daga that there should not be so many committees, but I disagree with him regarding the number of honorary members. I have proposed in my amendment that there should be five other whole-time members and 12 honorary members appointed by the Central Government to look after the performance of the regional committees in Calcutta, Delhi, Bombay, Madras and Gujarat, where five regional committees shall be constituted. I have given my amendment from the practical point of view so that the cause of the cine industry might be served better.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Mr. Daga has not fully read the whole thing. Uptill now we had a wholetime Chairman and a board of honorary members. Then we have the examining and revising committees. At present these committees comprise of panels of honorary members, drawn from various sections of the society. Naturally the responsibility they owe to the board is limited. We call upon them to sacrifice a part of their time to come and see a film. The result is, the composition of the committees varies from film to film and there is no uniformity in the application of policy. That is why sometimes a film is rejected and another more licentious film gets through. How we are changing it. We are going to have a Chairman and 5 wholetime members. We are making it compulsory that every film must be seen at least by one wholetime member, who will be primarily responsible to enforce uniformity of the policy. Then we have 7 assessors drawn from various language areas. Every film will be seen by one wholetime member and 2 assessors. If there is difference of opinion between the wholetime member and the assessors, it will be referred to the revising committee where at least two wholetime members will sit. Our basic approach is that responsibility should be fixed.

The composition of the Board will be Chairman, five wholetime members, 3 more from the industry and 3 more drawn from educationists and people with cultural sensitivity. This Board will lay down the policy. The real work will be done by the wholetime members.

Coming to the volume of work, on an average, the board examines 450 films a year, i.e. 40 to 50 films a month, i.e. 2 to 3 films a day. It is not very light work. As a matter of fact, one of the suggestions made to the Khosla Committee was that there should be 20 wholetime members because they thought the load was so much. In order to save money we have thought of only six for the time being. I hope they can cope with the load.

So far as the methods and procedures which should be followed are concerned, kindly keep one thing in mind. The procedures are laid down in detail in the rules and directives. My attention has been drawn to the total load India makes about 450 feature films. It also makes 1,000 short films. India will be importing approximately 200 foreign films, which we had stopped for some time. So, the total load of films to be seen is about 1,500 to 2,000 films a year. This is the dimension of the problem. I hope my friend will appreciate this basic issue.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Importation of American films is another scandal.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I have a great deal of weakness for Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu. But he looks too heavy when he sits and talks. If he stands and talks, it will be good for his health and I can reply better.

Shri Hazra has also raised more or less the same point why we should not stick to the honorary people. I have said just now that our experiment has not succeeded and the entire spirit of the Khosla Committee Report is that this experiment of

totally depending on honorary people is not successful.

SHRI M. C. DAGA: You have prescribed the qualifications of the three members from the film industry. What about the others?

श्री श्री केशवगुजराल : श्री ज्योतिरमोय जी ने जो बातें कही हैं उसका हम चेज नहीं कर रहे हैं। उसको आप पढ़िए। आप कह लें कि क्या के लिए मैं फिर कह देता हूँ और अगर कर्नियर नहीं है तो मैं कन्वेरिफाई कर देता हूँ कि जो बाकी चीजें लिए जाएंगे वे वहीं लिए जाएंगे जो एग्जिनेट में आकर लेटर्स, कन्वर्ष एंड एजुकेशन हों।

MR. CHAIRMAN: I shall now put all the amendments to clause 3 to the vote of the House.

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 7, 8, 17, 18 and 19 were put and negatived.

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA: Sir, the amendment of Shri Daga should be put separately.

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI K. RAGHU RAMAIAH): He is not pressing it.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Sir, on a point of order. Shri Daga has waxed eloquent when he moved his amendment. Then the hon. Minister gave him a dressing down and he also announced that Shri Daga is not pressing his amendment. Don't you call it intimidation? Is it something that should be done on the floor of the House?

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no point of order.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: You must apply your mind to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Daga never pressed for his amendment and his amendment was negatived. It has already been voted and negatived. The mover of the amendment did not want to press it separately. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: The hon. Minister took a quick step, went

[Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu]

to him and came back saying that he is not pressing the amendment.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: This happened under your very nose, Sir. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Daga, are you pressing for your amendment?

SHRI M. C. DAGA: I am not pressing.

SHRI G. VISWANATHAN: According to rules, he cannot withdraw his amendment.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: There is a clear rule that once an amendment is moved, it cannot be withdrawn. Even if there is a single dissenting voice, he cannot withdraw it. It has to be put to vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There is no question of withdrawing it now. Already, with the sense of the House, all the amendments were put together and negatived.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: We called for a Division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No amendment was put to vote separately. With the sense of the House, all the amendments were put to vote together and lost. If Mr. Daga had said that he wanted his amendment to be put to vote separately, it could have been put separately. He does not want to press his amendment.

All the amendments were put to vote together and negatived. So, all the amendments to clause 3 are lost.

Now, the question is:

"That Clause 3 stand part of the Bill" Let the Lobbies be cleared.

The lobbies are now cleared. The question is:

"That Clause 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3 was added to the Bill.

Clause 4—(Insertion of new section 3 A and 3B.)

SHRI R. R. SHARMA: I beg to move:

Page 2, lines 41 and 42,—

for "as many regional officers" substitute—

"not more than three regional officers" (5).

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

Page 2, line 33,—

for "seven" substitute "three" (9).

Page 2, line 39,—

omit "shall not be entitled to any salary, but" (10).

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA: I beg to move:

Page 2, line 31,—

after "fit" insert—

"fifty per cent. of whom shall be representatives of the organised bodies of artists, technicians, employees of cultural institutions," (20).

Page 2, lines 41 and 42,—

for "(4) At each regional centre, there shall be as many regional officers"

substitute—

"(4) At each regional Centre, there shall be two paid members (wholtime) of the Board, who have got profound knowledge in literature, history, culture and customs of the region concerned and not less than two regional officers who shall constitute regional Committees together with the honorary members". (21)

Page 8,—

Omit lines 13 to 20 (23)

श्री राम रत्न झाँ समाज महोदय,
 जैसा कि मैं ने पहले कहा है, हम ने सरकार
 पर बहुत धन-सेमरी खर्चा पड़ेगा। प्रती मान-
 नीय सदस्य, श्री डाया, मेरी बात का समर्थन
 कर रहे थे। पता नहीं, उन्होंने अपनी एम्पे-
 मेंट को क्या बापिन ने लिया। मैं प्रपन।
 एम्पेडमेंट को प्रेम करना है और मंत्र: महोदय
 से प्राप्त करना है कि वह इस को स्वीकार
 करे।

SHRI M. C. DAGA Here a new section 3A is being inserted Here it is said

'For the purpose of enabling the Board to efficiently discharge its functions the Central Government may appoint

Who should make the appointment? Should the Central Government make the appointment or should the Board make the appointment? The functions are to be discharged by the Board but the appointments are made by the Central Government Why is it so? After all it is the Board which has to discharge its functions and you say that the Board shall efficiently discharge its functions and examine the films in different languages under this Act and for that the Central Government may appoint as many assessors as it thinks fit' After all, the Board is meant to discharge the duties. So, it is the Board which should appoint the assessors. Then, why 'as many assessors as it thinks fit' Three should be enough. If you make it 7 what will be the expenditure?

Then, you come to sub-clause (2) which says:

"The assessors shall not be entitled to any salary, but shall receive such fees or allowances as may be prescribed."

1288 L.S.—12

When you have said, 'The assessors shall receive such fees or allowances as may be prescribed', where is the necessity for the words 'The assessors shall not be entitled to any salary' What is the purpose of these words? You have the Bill with you kindly look into it and see how the Bill is brought before the Parliament

SHRI MANORANJAN HAZRA (Arambagh) I have already moved my amendment No 20 which says

after 'fit' insert—

after 'fit' insert—

"... fifty per cent of whom shall be representatives of the organized bodies of artists technicians, employees of cultural institutions"

I think the idea of my amendment is clear and I do not want to make a lengthy speech

My next amendment No 21 wants

"At each regional centre, there shall be two paid members (whole-time) of the Board who have got profound knowledge in literature, history, culture and customs of the region concerned and not less than two regional officers who shall constitute the regional Committee, together with the honorary Members"

The idea is clear

My third amendment No 22 is Page 3 omit lines 13 to 20

These are my amendments. I want a categorical answer from the Minister and I hope he will enlighten me in this respect

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL. So far as my friend, Shri Hazra's amendments are concerned, they are more or less repetitive. As I have already explained, the scheme of the Bill is to try to introduce the element of whole-time members because on the basis of the Khosla Committee recommendations

[Shri I. K. Gujral]

we have come to definite conclusions that it is not possible for us to function as it is, on the basis of honorary members only. That is why all the amendments. But what Mr. Hazra's amendment suggests will defeat the scheme itself. Therefore, I regret I cannot accept it.

Shri R. R. Sharma's amendment also is similar to the one of Shri Hazra. We have experimented over a number of years on the basis of honorary members and we have not succeeded. That is why we have set up the Khosla Committee on the basis of whose recommendations we are amending this law. We want to introduce an element of whole-time members. My friend Mr. Daga was very much worried about one thing: Why this legal quibble as to whether assessors should be paid or not paid? It is made clear that assessors are not going to be whole-time members; assessors are going to be there whenever they are called to assess a firm; they will get allowance. That is the main spirit behind the Bill.

SHRI R. R. SHARMA: He is confused with the word 'salary' and 'allowances'.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Mr. Daga has a legal mind.

SHRI M. C. DAGA: You have given the provision that the assessors will be appointed by the Board. They will not get salary. Why do you put the words, receive such fees and allowances as may be prescribed? What is the necessity for this? You say already, fees and allowances, as prescribed in the rules.

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: I have already said about this. This is merely legal quibble.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put Amendment No. 5 of Shri Sharma to the vote of the House.

*Amendment No. 5 was put and
negatived*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put amendments Nos. 9 and 10 by Shri Daga to the vote.

AN HON. MEMBER: He wanted to withdraw.

SHRI M. C. DAGA: I want leave to withdraw.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the House?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: No, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, I will put the amendments to vote.

*Amendments No. 9 and 10 were put
and negatived.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will now put amendments Nos. 20, 21 and 22 to the vote of the House.

*Amendments Nos. 20, 21 and 22 were
put and negatived.*

MR. CHAIRMAN: So, the amendments are negatived.

The question is:

"That Clause 4 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 4 was added to the Bill.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we take up the next item on the Agenda-half-an-hour Discussion.

17.30 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

CRITERIA FOR ALLOTMENT AND QUANTITY OF FOODGRAINS ALLOTTED TO STATES DURING JANUARY TO JUNE 1974

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we may take up half-an-hour discussion, Shri Ramavtar Shastri.

[Dr. HENRY AUSTAIN in the Chair].