

कि पाकिस्तान को मिला है। जो कुछ हमें मिला है और जिसका हम इस्तेमाल ही नहीं कर सकते हैं पाकिस्तान के साथ लड़ाई में, तो उसके लिए हमने किस हद तक तैयारी कर ली है और किन जगहों से कर ली है। अंग्रेजों को यह निश्चित सी नीति नज़र आ रही है कि पाकिस्तान हमें परेशान करे और मौका लगे तो वह उसको हमारे साथ लड़ा भी दे।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य और बोलना चाहते हैं।

श्री काशीराम गुप्त : जी हां।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : तो आप कल अपना भाषण जारी रखें।

15 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

THIRTY-SEVENTH REPORT

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will now take up Private Members' Business.

Shri Hem Raj (Kangra): I beg to move:

"That this House agrees with the Thirty-seventh Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 18th March, 1964".

Shri H. N. Mukerjee (Calcutta Central): Sir, could I make a submission?

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Let me put it to the vote of the House.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Before that, could I suggest that the time allotted for the resolution which Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri is going to move might be extended? Now the time allotted for that resolution is 1 hour 15 minutes. My suggestion to the House is that it might be discussed

very well for 2½ hours or at least 2 hours.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: We will see when we take it up.

Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi): It is a very important resolution. The subject matter of that resolution is the burning point of the day.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does he want to move any amendment?

Shri H. P. Chatterjee (Nabadwip): It is there in the sheet.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: I suggest 2½ hours for the resolution of Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Does the House agree to the suggestion contained in the amendment that the time for the resolution of Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri should be extended to 2½ hours.

Shri Raghunath Singh: Yes, Sir: It is a very important matter. The refugee problem is the burning problem of the day.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The question is:

"That the motion be accepted by the House with the amendment of Shri H. N. Mukerjee that the time for the resolution of Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri be 2½ hours instead of 1 hour 15 minutes."

The motion was adopted.

Shri P. R. Patel (Patan): Sir, on a point of order. I have given notice of an amendment.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We have not yet taken up the resolution.

15.03 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: NATIONALISATION OF FILM INDUSTRY—contd.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up further discussion of

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

the Resolution moved by Shri R. G. Dubey on the 6th March 1964. He may continue his speech. 59 minutes are left for the discussion.

Shri R. G. Dubey (Bijapur North): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, after I introduced the resolution regarding the nationalisation of film industry, I tried to go through such material as was possible within the short time at my disposal. The more I think about it, the more I am convinced that some radical measures are necessary to improve this industry. I must confess that I do not want to maintain any dogmatic or rigid approach to this problem but, all the same I do feel that some improvement, far-reaching improvement, is necessary in this industry. The other day I listened with interest to the reply given by Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, our friend and guide, and in the course of his reply he mentioned the role of love and romance in film industry. I am in agreement with him when he says that we could not have a puritanical approach and some latitude has to be given to the film industry. At the same time, he also said that he would not like the exhibition of any vulgarity by the industry.

Our film industry must have a two-fold purpose, namely, entertainment of the people and education of the people, specially in the present context of our country with its border situation, the problem of defence, the socio-economic philosophy of a welfare State. So, our film industry must rise to the occasion, must be able to produce such films which take us in the direction of progress. From this point of view, I tried to go through the material and I shall quote what the *Screen* itself has stated in this connection.

"The quality and subject-matter of their productions can be assessed from the titles of their pictures. Some of the beautiful titles are "Jeb Khali Maro Tali",

"Ek Ladki Ek Diwana", "Dil Leke Bhaga", "Loot Liya Husnvalone", "Zara Ruk Ja", "Aage Dukaan Peeche Makaan", "Tu Bhi Kya Pyar Karega", "Dil Bhi Tera Hum Bhi Tere", "Ladka Football Khele, Ladki Hockey Khele," "Bombai Ki Billi", "Tu Nahin Aur Sahi" etc."

The reason is, I am told, every year some 50 to 60 productions are brought into the film world. Any person can take to film production. There is no code or regulation guiding the person wanting to take to film production. There is also monopoly in the film industry.

Take the top actors in the country, for example. Dilip Kumar may be a good actor. But I wonder whether he could also claim to be a very good producer or director, as our great Bengali friend Satyajit Ray who produced *Aparichita*. Yet, Dilip Kumar has entered the world of film production. Raj Kapoor and his whole family, brothers and sisters, have taken to film production. So also some of the other top actors, who have made film production their family business. Therefore, we come across monopoly in film industry, as a result of which the quality of the film suffers.

So far as the Western countries are concerned, the stories for films are taken from basic literature, the writings of Shakespeare and others. In Bengali also some of the films are based on classics and they have won international prizes, specially *Aparichita* of Satyajit Ray. Of course, the West Bengal Government is giving financial help to the film industry. But the same cannot be said of films in other parts of India. Most of the films produced in the country are the worst films. They do not give any material for thinking, any food for thought.

I am told that about Rs. 80 crores are invested in the film industry and Rs. 50 crores will be the yearly earning. 1,20,000 people are working in the industry. What is the condition of the industry? At the lower level it is very bad. At the top level, it is common knowledge that some of the film actors and actresses are paid something like Rs. 5 lakhs to 6 lakhs, in black money of course. It is common knowledge but we are not able to check it. Because it is black money we cannot levy any tax. Rs. 5 lakhs or 6 lakhs is enough to produce a good film.

The interest that the producers have to pay to the financiers is so much that out of that amount they could produce another film. We often say that we should not interfere with the industry, we should not come in the way of proper talent and that the industry should have enough freedom to function. But what is the position of the producers? I am told by authorities, by people who should know that there is no freedom for the producers and they are entirely dependent upon the financiers, either Multanis or others; I do not know. I am told that the financiers even stipulate a condition that such and such actor or actress should be engaged. Not only that, even the stories are changed and mutilated. At the last stage, after the production is complete and the film is to be exhibited, the distributors have to be consulted and in some cases they insist on some changes in the film. So, really speaking, there is absolutely no freedom to the producer.

Shri Shanta Ram, who is really one of the greatest producers and directors in this country, feels that something must be done to improve the situation. I understand that Shri S. K. Patil, our ex-Minister of Food and Agriculture, headed the Film Enquiry Committee and that Committee had made some recommendations. I would

just read the relevant portion from that:

"Also the second film inquiry committee, with Shri S. K. Patil as its chairman and Messrs M. Satyanarayan, (Dr.) R. P. Tripathi, V. Shanker, V. Shantaram and B. N. Sircar as its other members, which published its report in October 1951, observed several serious mal-adjustments in the structure of the Indian film industry and concluded 'that evils in the industry having crept far too deep into the system' it would be unable to reform itself. As such, it recommended that for the stabilisation of the industry firstly there should be a film council formed by the Government. It will have regulative and supervisory powers over the entire industry and serve as its guide, friend and philosopher. Secondly there should be a production code administration as in USA. The work of the PCA will be to examine scripts so as to ensure that the films produced conform to standards of decency, good taste and public education. It will guide producers during production of a picture and scrutinise publicity materials."

More than six years have passed since these decisions were taken by the Government but neither the Film Production Bureau nor the Film Institute has been set up so far. This is the position. Even the recommendations of the Film Inquiry Committee have not been given effect to though six years have passed.

There is enough material to prove that the industry is in a hopeless condition. On the one hand, you see top actors and actresses earning Rs. 5 lakhs to Rs. 6 lakhs—that money is black money and the Government gets nothing by way of income-tax—on the other hand, I am told, the junior artistes are not paid the salary for many months. The producers are in

[Shri R. G. Dubey]

a very bad condition. On the one hand, the financier is after them, hands at their necks; on the other hand, because the actors and actresses, particularly in the film industry in the South, enter into contract for 30 or 40 films at a time and therefore with great difficulty they can spare a day in the whole month, the producer has always to be on their track, on the look out for the person. The result is that production suffers and the cost of production goes up. Even though Rs. 80 crores are invested, Rs. 50 crores is the annual earning and 1-20 lakh persons are employed, the foreign exchange earning, I am told, is hardly Rs. 1.75 crores. This is the position.

Take it from any point of view. Neither they teach good morals nor the condition of the rank and file, the junior artistes in the industry is satisfactory; so we must put a stop to it. Many film journals, important directors and producers also feel that some kind of a regulation is needed. They are for nationalisation, but I am not for a rigid approach. I am prepared to be guided by the hon. Minister who has a wide and broad outlook on this affair. But there is a case established to show that some radical measures are necessary. Even if those recommendations which were made long ago are implemented, I think, some good service will have been done to the industry.

The only person, I think, who tries to teach the actors and actresses the proper code of discipline is Shri Shantaram. As you know, he never picks up the same actors and actresses for his new story. He always picks up a new person, younger man, a junior artist and trains him, directs him and then puts him on the stage. Take the case of Sandhya; she was not known to anybody. But in some cases the same set of actors and actresses are monopolising the scene. That is the kind of thing that is there. So, with these few words I request

the hon. Minister to consider all these aspects. I am not for a rigid approach—I repeat it again—but I do want that the Patil Committee's recommendations should be implemented without any delay.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Resolution moved:

"This House is of opinion that Government should take steps to nationalise the Film Industry."

One hour is the time that we have got. 45 minutes more are there. How much time would the hon. Minister require?

The Deputy Minister in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting (Shri Sham Nath): 15 to 20 minutes, Sir.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then, five minutes to each hon. Member.

Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to support this Resolution moved by my hon. friend, Shri Dubey. This demand has been the demand not of the progressive forces of the country but of all those who sincerely believe that the film industry should flourish in this country. At present all the film producers are in the hands of the big tycoons and whatever film they wish to produce is judged from the point whether it would bring a box to the millionaires who advance the money for producing the film. This is a sad state of affairs and this is really a tragedy for this country that our producers who have a good vision and noble idea, who can produce good films to uplift the society cannot produce a good film because they are not financiers or because they are always in a state of bankruptcy.

I remember, this question was brought up in this House some years back by many hon. Members very forcefully. Their idea was only to see

that our country had better films. There are producers like Balraj Sahni, Satyajit Ray and others who believe sincerely in producing a picture which uplifts the society, which reflects the real life of so many people in the country or which touches on problems of national and international importance. Those pictures cannot be produced because they have no finances. I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what is being done to see that our film industry improves. Is it not a fact that at present most of the films which are produced in the country are really third-rate films? The hon. Minister may say that they are, after all, for entertainment. But even entertainment at times should be educative.

We have not been able to produce even good films for children. There is a society for producing films for children, that is, the Children's Film Society; but even that society has not been able to produce good films. Recently, a very good film has been produced by Shri Utpala Datta, the famous producer of the two dramas which are being shown in Delhi, namely, *Titash ekti nadir nam* and *Ferari souj*. He has produced a film known as *Ghoom-bhangar Gan*. That was censored only because it showed how the millowners were cruel to the working people, how they tried to crush their movement, how they tried to defeat them and beat them hollow. This was objected to by the Censor and they wanted to censor the film in such a way that the entire charm of the film would have been lost.

What has been happening to the film producers like Utpal Datta, Satyajit Ray, Balraj Sahni and the late lamented Pramathesh Barua? Unless they played in the hands of these big tycoons, the sharks, they were unable to get any money. Is it not high time that the State should come forward and help the growth of the film industry when we are heading towards the Fourth Five Year Plan and are on the verge of completion of

the Third Five Year Plan and when we want good films to educate our people both for the Plan and for the defence of the country?

I must mention here another producer, Hemen Gupta. He wanted to produce a film on NEFA and how our jawans fought. He came here to Delhi and wanted some help from the Defence Ministry. The Defence Ministry people said, "You will be helped but you will have to pay a sum of Rs. 7 lakhs." Imagine a person like Hemen Gupta who is a professor, who has taken it as a mission for his life—he is not a film producer of the type who produces trash films—who wanted to produce a good film, who had taken the courage to produce such a film to glorify the deeds of our jawans being told, "Pay us Rs. 7 lakhs to produce this film" when he was to be helped by the Defence Ministry people.

Those producers today want help from Government. They want patronage from the Government. This is the only way, that is, the film industry should be nationalised. I hope, Government will try to bring forward a piece of legislation.

As long as nationalisation is not possible there should at least be control. Finances should be given to the good producers to produce good films; otherwise, what will happen is that the same kind of films will be produced which will be considered as third-rate films and we will be unable to send those films abroad.

With these words, I request the hon. Minister to say something about this. Let us know his idea about the nationalisation of the film industry. We do not want nationalisation of the film industry because we are surrounded with the idea of nationalisation but only because we want to nationalise the people of this country so that they may move forward with the slogan of peace and defence of this country.

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur):
Mg. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I want to support this Resolution whole-heartedly, not in a halting and hesitant way in which the mover of the Resolution or the hon. Member who has preceded me has spoken about it.

I have my reasons for the nationalisation of the film industry. My first reason is this. We want resources for our Plans. We nationalised the Life Insurance industry in order to get more to finance our Plans. I do not see any reason why this flourishing industry which can bring some money into our exchequer for making our Plans more ambitious, more comprehensive and more far-reaching should not be drawn into that net. I think this will be one of the great national urges for the nationalisation of this industry.

The second one is this. In every country of the world, you find that the film industry works at two levels. There is the commercial level and there is the aesthetic or artistic level. Go to Italy, go to France, go even to the United States of America and go to the United Kingdom and you find that there are film producers who care more for standards of good taste, the standards of good morals, the standards of good aesthetic representation than for commercial results. Everywhere you find that. But in this country of mine which is known for spiritual values, the film industry is tied up only with one thing and that is money-making. In our country there is a producer, a man of genius, like Satyajit Ray. But what use have we for him? We do not have any use for him. We have only use for those persons who can give us commercial entertainment which appeals to the lowest common denominator of human decency, of human taste and human conduct. That is the kind of thing which we want.

My third reason is this that the film industry has come to be associated

all along the line with the black money and I tell you it is corrupting the people all along the line. An actor—I do not want to mention any name—would demand Rs. 6 lakhs or Rs. 7 lakhs or Rs. 8 lakhs for appearing in a picture, but he would sign the contract for Rs. 50,000. We are sanctifying the black money by keeping this film industry unchecked, uncontrolled, unsupervised and unsuspected. We are giving a fillip to this kind of bargaining which is done below the table and which is not done across the table. I think, our country needs that this kind of thing should be put an end to.

Now, our Finance Minister has said that he will have a Monopoly Commission. I think there is, more or less, monopoly in this industry also, the monopoly of the big actor, the monopoly of the glamorous heroine, the monopoly of the financier—the monopoly of all those persons—and I think if anyone goes into this, he will see that it is something which needs looking into.

I submit very respectfully that the film industry should hold the mirror up to our nation. How many films have been produced in our country which are motivated by patriotism? How many films have been produced in our country which give a vision of spiritual light? How many films have been produced in our country which give a vision of greatness of this country? There are very few films. Most of the films are boy and girl affair. My hon. friend was referring to some director who always had new heroes and heroines in the films. I do not want to give the reasons for those things. But I say that this thing has become too much of a racket and I think it is the duty of the Government to put an end to any racket, whether it is in business, in banking, in education, in films or in anything. The Government must put an end to that.

There is one more point which I want to make. It has been said that

we should have a Films Council. What will the Films Council do? We know the working of these Councils. This Films Council will prove to be a stick with which you cannot kill a lion or an elephant. It will be an infructuous, ineffective, institution. It has been said that we should have a Production Bureau. What will the Production Bureau do? They will get round the Production Bureau also. The money bags of this industry will get round everybody. Therefore, what I want to say is, if we want to build a great India, a self-reliant India, an India which is rooted in the Indian values of life, an India which looks forward, an India which also looks backwards to her golden past, an India which wants to have clean entertainment, an India which wants to have wholesome standards of morality and if we want to build that kind of India, the best thing is to nationalise the film industry. When I go about, people ask me, "What about our young men? They are suffering from indiscipline." I say, it is our fault; it is not their fault and it is the fault of the films...

Shri P. R. Patel (Patna): What about leaders?

Shri D. C. Sharma: . . . which give glimpses of life which are not always very wholesome. I say, in the interest of the youth of our country, in the interest of the future generation of our country, we should try to nationalise this industry here and now. There should be no hesitation about it and, I think, it should be nationalised at three levels, the production level, the distribution level and the exhibition level. Unless that is done, we are not going to have this kind of clean entertainment.

श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा (कोटा) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं इस बिल का विरोध करता हूँ क्योंकि अगर सरकार सारे ही धंधों का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने लग जायगी तो शायद प्राइवेट सैक्टर वालों का तो यहाँ रहना ही बिलकुल मुश्किल हो जायेगा और सारे.

2575 (ai) LSD—6.

गुलाम बन कर जी हुजूरी में आगे, पीछे फिन्ते रहेंगे ।

जहाँ तक राष्ट्रीयकरण का सवाल है मैं मानता हूँ कि कई एक धंधे ऐसे होते हैं जिनको कि सरकार को अपने हाथ में लेना चाहिये । जो की इंडस्ट्रीज हैं उन को सरकार को जरूर अपने हाथ में लेना चाहिये ताकि हमें धोखा न हो जाय । जहाँ तक फिल्म उद्योग के राष्ट्रीयकरण का सवाल है मैं उसके खिलाफ हूँ अलबत्ता यह चाहूंगा कि सरकार इसकी देखरेख रखे कि वे देश को समयानुकूल अच्छी तस्वीरें बना कर दें । सेंसर बोर्डम आदि जो समितियां बनाई हैं वह इसलिए बनाई हैं कि फिल्म निर्माताओं को फिल्म निर्माण के बारे में उचित पथ प्रदर्शन करें । लेकिन हम वहाँ पर आज क्या हो रहा देखते हैं ? हमारे डाइरेक्टर्स अथवा जो फिल्म निर्माता लोग हैं वे आज भी पुराने ढर्रे की चिसी पिटी वही मार, धाड़ या सस्ते प्रेम वाली कहानियां गढ़ कर तस्वीरें बना रहे हैं । इन फिल्मों की चैकिंग करने के लिये जो सेंसर समितियां बनी हुई हैं वह सेंसर बोर्डस करते यह हैं कि जो असली चीजें होती हैं वह तो फिल्मों में से निकाल देते हैं और इस तरह की मनगढ़ंत चीजें उनके अन्दर रहने देते हैं । मेरा कहना यह है कि जमाने की चाल के अनुसार फिल्मों को बनाना चाहिये, इतना ही नहीं बल्कि संकटकालीन स्थिति के अन्दर इस तरह की घटिया किस्म की नाच, गाने की फिल्मों को बन्द कर के सिर्फ डिफेंस के बारे में ही फिल्में दिखानी चाहिये ।

अभी देश में कृषि उत्पादन की कमी है तो आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि कृषि उत्पादन को देश में बढ़ाने के उद्देश्य से उस प्रकार की फिल्में देश में बननी चाहियें और प्रदर्शित होनी चाहियें लेकिन यह नहीं कि किमानांको को दिखा रहे हैं कि बम्बई में क्या हो रहा है और कलकत्ते में क्या हो रहा है,

[श्री श्रीकार लाल बेरवा]

किस तरह लड़कियां नाच रही हैं और किस तरह से डांस हो रहा है। यह बिल्कुल नहीं होना चाहिये। ज़माने की रफ़्तार के साथ ही हमारे देश में फिल्में बननी चाहियें। लेकिन आज ऐसा हो नहीं रहा है। आजकल जितने भी नवयुवक हैं, जिनकी भी हमारी बहनें हैं वह जिस तरह के भड़कीले और फैंशनबल कपड़े आदि एक्टरों और एक्ट्रेसज़ को पहने देखते हैं उसी तरीके से वे भी कपड़े पहनते हैं और उसी तरह से एक दूसरे के गले में हाथ डालना शुरू कर देते हैं क्योंकि उन पर स्वाभाविक रूप से उन चीजों का बुरा असर पड़ता है।

एक इस तरह की वाडिया फिल्म थी। हम ने उनके विरुद्ध कई दफे हो हल्ला मचाया और मांग की कि उन फिल्म के प्रदर्शन पर सरकार को प्रतिबन्ध लगा देना चाहिये लेकिन गवर्नमेंट हमारी बात सुनती नहीं है। कारण इस का यह है कि जो सेंसर बोर्ड होते हैं और जिनके कि जिम्मे फिल्मों को सेंसर करना होता है उनको यह फिल्म निर्माता भूस दे देते हैं, सेंसर वालों की जबें गरम कर दी जाती हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सरकार इस बारे में कोई निश्चित पग उठाये ताकि इस तरह की भद्दी फिल्में बनना बंद हो जाय। ऐसी फिल्मों को जिन का कि हमारे देश के नवयुवकों, माताओं और बहनों पर बुरा असर पड़ता है उन्हें तत्काल बंद कर देना चाहिये।

फिल्म-निर्माताओं के द्वारा कौसी फिल्में बनाई जाती हैं, इस के बारे में मैं अभी आप के सामने निवेदन करता हूँ। किन्तु मैं आप को बताना चाहता हूँ कि सरकार का अपना विभाग फिल्म-निर्माण में किस नीति पर चलता है। २६ जनवरी, १९६३ को स्वतन्त्रता-दिवस के अवसर पर जिस परेड का आयोजन हुआ, उस में राष्ट्रीय स्वयंसेवक संघ ने भी भाग लिया और उस के कम से कम दो हजार स्वयंसेवक उस में शामिल हुए। यद्यपि उन

की परेड सब से अच्छी थी, लेकिन फिर भी उस से सम्बन्धित भाग को फिल्म से निकाल दिया गया। आखिर इस बात का क्या कारण है कि जिस दृश्य का लड़कों पर अच्छा असर पड़ सकता था, उस को फिल्म से निकाल दिया गया ?

हम देखते हैं कि जो अच्छी फिल्में होती हैं, जो धार्मिक फिल्में होती हैं, जो लोगों पर अच्छा असर डाल सकती हैं, उन को उड़ा दिया जाता है, उन को प्रोत्साहन नहीं दिया जाता है लेकिन बाजे-गाजे और नाच-रंग की फिल्में बनाई जाती हैं। सरकार इन बातों को कंट्रोल नहीं करती है। अगर फिल्म उद्योग का राष्ट्रीयकरण करने के बजाय उस पर कड़ी निगरानी रखी जाय, उस पर प्रतिबन्ध लगा दिया जाय, तो हमारी फिल्मों में बहुत कुछ सुधार हो सकता है। फिल्मों पर ज्यादा टैक्स लगा कर आमदनी भी काफ़ी हो सकती है। सरकार उन लोगों को इतनी फैंसिलिटीज़ क्यों देती है ? वह उन का सेंसर-टैक्स और इनकम टैक्स क्यों माफ़ करती है ? उन पर पूरा टैक्स लगाया जाना चाहिये, चाहे देखने वाले फिल्म को देखें या न देखें।

मैं निवेदन करूंगा कि ज़माने के रफ़्तार के मुताबिक फिल्में बनानी चाहियें और जब तक देश में संगठ-कालीन स्थिति है तब तक नाच-रंग की फिल्में बनाने पर प्रतिबन्ध लगा दिया जाना चाहिये और केवल डिफेंस, कृषि और हमारे देश की इंडस्ट्रीज़ के बारे में फिल्में तैयार की जायें। ऐसी फिल्मों से ही हमारे देश का उत्थान हो सकता है, न कि राग-रंग वाली फिल्मों से। इसलिये आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि फिल्म-निर्माण पर सरकार की कड़ी से कड़ी निगरानी होनी चाहिये।

15:32 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

फिल्मों के क्षेत्र में जो मानोपली है, उस को भी समाप्त करने का प्रयत्न करना

चाहिये। एक ही फिल्म-निर्माता कई व्यक्तियों के नाम से फिल्में तैयार करवाता है और स्वयं सब फायदा उठाता है। सरकार को इस और की ध्यान देना चाहिये।

प्राजकल-फिल्मों के नाम "आख-मिचौली", "भकेली मत जाइयो", इस प्रकार रखे जाते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि फिल्मों के नाम धर्म, डिफेंस या कृषि के आधार पर होने चाहिये और ऐसे नाम नहीं होने चाहिये, जिन का न सिर है और न पैर।

जो जांच समिति बनी हुई है, फिल्मों पर उस का कड़ा कंट्रोल होना चाहिये और उसमें से अच्छे अच्छे, योग्य व्यक्ति नियुक्त किये जाने चाहिये।

Shri Bade (Khangone): I oppose this resolution which has been brought forward by my hon. friend Shri R. G. Dubey. I do not understand why he wants nationalisation of the film industry. The duty of Government is to govern only and not to poke its nose everywhere. Nationalisation means that Government will take over the whole thing, and that brings corruption in its wake. Whenever Government go in for nationalisation, there is corruption and the nationalised industry is always put to a loss.

Of course, instead of the film industry being nationalised, some more restrictions should have been placed on it according to the needs of the country. But what is happening today? Of course, I realise and I have seen in the olden days there were what were called *nautankis* in the villages and *padka damashas* etc. were going on. But, now, the cinemas have taken their place. Today, we find cinema theatres and hotels everywhere even in the villages. Of course, they are necessary for the agriculturists, because they provide some entertainment.

The first aim of a cinema picture is entertainment and the second one is education. Government should see whether the film is educative or not, but at the same time they should also see that the film is entertaining. But I find that there is no uniform policy followed by the censor board in this regard. I had read in one issue of the *Filmindia* that there was a restriction that the height of the breast should be only so many inches and no more, and the censorship board had effected some cut in one of the films because the breast was higher than the prescribed limit. I also read that there was a restriction that the mouth of the hero should go near that of the heroine only up to so many inches and no more. But I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether he has ever seen any of the American films from Hollywood complying with these restrictions. All the boys in Indore and everywhere else studying in the colleges usually go to see only English pictures, and in fact, they count how many times there are kisses, and then they come and chit-chat about it.

Mr Speaker: All of them come to the hon. Member and chit-chat?

Shri Bade: I have heard the boys saying all these things, because one of my hobbies is to teach the students.

Mr. Speaker: They must come and report to the hon. Member?

Shri Bade: I am submitting to the hon. Minister that instead of nationalising the film industry, there should be more restrictions on the American films or prohibition of the American films which are spoiling the psychology of our youth.

श्री कशी राम गुप्त : माननीय सदस्य तो हिन्दी में बोला करते हैं। फिल्मों के बारे में वह अंग्रेजी में कैसे बोलने लग गए ?

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वह अंग्रेजी की फिल्में ज्यादा पसन्द करते हैं।

श्री त्यागी (देहरादून) : उन को "किसिड" का तर्जुमा भी मालूम नहीं है ।

Shri Bade: That is because I am not a fanatic on the language question. I have to speak in Madhya Pradesh in Hindi, and sometimes in the High Court I have to speak in English also.

An Hon. Member: My hon. friend is speaking in the High Court today?

Mr. Speaker: Now, he is in Hollywood!

Shri Bade: Those Hollywood films are brought here. My request to the hon. Minister is that when the American films are imported here, our censor board should see whether they are according to standards laid down. Nowadays, whenever there is a lot of rush for the English films, the Indian films also attract crowds, and these Indian films also begin to imitate the Hollywood films. In fact, we have seen some shabby scenes even in Indian films.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): How many kisses were found in Indian films?

Shri Bade: Of course, in India, it is prohibited. But you find them in the American films . . .

Mr. Speaker: What did Dr. M. S. Aney say?

Shri Bade: He wanted to know how many kisses were found in Indian films?

Mr. Speaker: Dr. M. S. Aney is still interested on this subject even after the age of 80; it seems no age is past that temptation.

Shri Bade: If the industry is nationalised then what will happen? We shall be seeing only the pictures of the Ministers like Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and Shri T. T. Krishnamachari and others in the films.

Even today, we find that pictures to depict what is happening actually are not being produced. For instance, there is no film to show what has happened in East Pakistan. There is no film to indicate what we should do when India is attacked. No films are being produced at all on these subjects. So, I submit that some restrictions should be placed on the film industry in regard to the nature of the films that they should produce.

Another important thing which I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister is in regard to the film on Goa which has been prepared by Shri Telkar. Sanction has not been given for that film by the Ministry so far simply because that picture depicts how there was persecution of Hindus when the European people came here in the beginning. After all, it is a matter of history now, and those things are written in history books also, but still that film is not allowed to be exhibited because it is thought that the Western countries might be displeased, and, therefore, Shri Telkar's film is not being encouraged at all.

I oppose this resolution which seeks to suggest nationalisation of the film industry. I submit that there should be no nationalisation at all because nationalisation means corruption. Instead, there should be more restrictions on the Indian films which only look to the income which they get. I have seen Marathi films, and they are quite good; Bengali films are also very good. So, there should be no nationalisation at all and there is no need for it. But I would submit that the American films which are imported here should be properly censored and made to conform to certain standards and only those films which are very entertaining and which are very educative should be imported.

श्री ह० च० सोय (सिहमूय) : माननीय अध्यक्ष महोदय मैं इस प्रस्ताव का विरोध करता हूँ। इस का कारण यह है कि मैं समझता

हं कि फिल्म इंडस्ट्री में जो खराबियां हैं, वे उसका राष्ट्रीयकरण किए बगैर भी दूर की जा सकती हैं। यह बात जरूर है कि हम लोग अक्सर सुनते हैं कि फिल्म इंडस्ट्री में जो बड़े-बड़े आर्टिस्ट्स काम करते हैं, वे ऊपर से जितने रुपयों पर कंट्रैक्ट करते हैं, प्रसल में उन से दस, बीस गुना रुपया लेते हैं। इस शिकायत के बारे में सरकार को जांच करनी चाहिये। मैं समझता हूं कि यह एक प्रकार का भ्रष्टाचार है, जो वे लोग करते हैं। लेकिन इसी तरह का भ्रष्टाचार बड़ी आमदनी केंरने वाले, बड़े बड़े इंडस्ट्रियलिस्ट्स भी करते हैं, जो कि टैक्स इवेजन करते हैं। जो टैक्स इवेजन हो रहा है उसको अगर हम रोकना चाहते हैं तो वह भी अन्य तरीकों से रुक सकता है। जो लोग ब्लैक मनी कमा रहे हैं, बड़े-बड़े आर्टिस्ट कमा रहे हैं, उसको भी बाहर लाया जा सकता है, उसको भी रोशनी में लाया जा सकता है।

हम कहते हैं कि गन्दी-गन्दी कहानियां दिखाई जाती हैं तथा दूसरी तरह की चीजें जो नहीं दिखाई जानी चाहियें, दिखाई जाती हैं। इस तरह की चीजों पर रोक लगाने का कार्य सेंसर बोर्ड का है और उसको सजग होना चाहिये। अक्सर देखा जाता है कि जो कहानी चल जाती है, वह हिट कहलाने लग जाती है और उसी कहानी के आधार पर बर्जनों फिल्में बनाने लग जाती हैं। यह जो चीज है देखने वालों के साथ कृग्रल्टी है। यह जो कहानी बगैरह तमाम चीजें हैं इन पर सेंसर बोर्ड को कड़ी निगाह रखनी चाहिये। एक ही कहानी को, एक ही ढरें की स्टोरी को उसको दोहराने देना नहीं चाहिये। इन तरीकों से राष्ट्रीयकरण किए बगैर जो बुराइयां हैं, उनको दूर किया जा सकता है इसलिये मैं इसका विरोध करता हूं।

Shri Sham Nath: Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is not the first time that a reso-

lution like the one under discussion has been considered in this House. Last time, it was in 1962 that a non-official resolution was moved here, but it was opposed by Government and was ultimately withdrawn by the Mover with the leave of the House.

Sir, I have very carefully listened to the speeches in favour of the Resolution. Various reasons have been advanced in favour of the proposition to nationalise the film industry. While I admit that the industry is not in a very healthy state, that the quality of films produced here is not very high and that there are complaints regarding evasion of taxes, I would not say that all those evils would be eliminated by the nationalisation of the film industry.

First of all, I wish to point out certain constitutional difficulties in our way. As the House is aware, the film is a medium of expression and any curtailment of freedom of expression would infringe the relevant article of the Constitution. Article 19(1) (a) guarantees certain fundamental rights—freedom of speech and expression. The Mysore High Court has held that freedom of expression extends to the screen also. This being so, any action in compliance with the Resolution under discussion will be impossible unless the Constitution is suitably amended.

My next point is, Sir, that film-making is an art. It is the art of screen play-writing, direction, acting, photography, music, editing etc. So the production of films by Government and their regimentation will not be conducive to the growth of art.

The third point concerns the nature of film production as a business. An Inquiry Committee was appointed some years back. That Committee considered the various aspects of the matter. It estimated that the average income from a film was less than Rs. 3 lakhs while the average cost

[Shri Sham Nath]

amounted to about Rs. 3.25 lakhs. In recent years, these figures have gone up very greatly. Nowadays a colour film in Bombay costs anything between Rs. 25 lakhs and Rs. 1 crore and a black-and-white film between Rs. 10—20 lakhs. There are no reliable statistics regarding the failure of films. But it is generally believed in the industry that about 60 per cent of films released fail to recover the cost incurred on them. The percentage of films which prove flops has been put at 25 in the case of Bombay and Madras and 10 in the case of Calcutta. Films which have proved hits at the box office are only about 3 per cent in Bombay, 5 per cent in Calcutta and 10 per cent in Madras. Thus by nationalising the industry, the Government may have to underwrite heavy losses, and financially it will not be a sound proposition.

Another thing is that largely it is feature films which private producers produce. While I agree that entertainment films are largely produced with an eye at box office returns and not with the object of educating the masses, in spite of this it will not be desirable, in my view, to take responsibility on behalf of the State for entertainment of the general public. It is easier for the State to run a big industry. The State can run railways; it can run airways as we do in India. But in a democracy like ours, if we nationalise the press or the film industry we should try to imagine what reaction it would produce on the minds of people.

I would submit, Sir, that to the majority of Indians films are largely a medium of entertainment and relaxation. I agree that our films should have an educative value also. To achieve this end Government have been trying, and have taken some positive steps during the last few years.

An hon. Member said that the recommendations of the Film Inquiry

Committee presided over by Shri S. K. Patil have not so far been implemented by Government. I would like to correct this misunderstanding and state that almost all the recommendations that the Film Enquiry Committee made have been considered and implemented by the Government.

What those measures, which the Government have taken, are, I think well known to the Members of this House. I would just mention a few of them briefly for the information of those hon. Members who think that the Government has still to implement the recommendation of the Film Enquiry Committee.

One of the recommendations that this Committee made was that the Government should institute State awards for films, and this has been done. The purpose of these State awards is to encourage production of films of high aesthetic and technical standard and of educative and cultural value.

Secondly, we send our good films to various international film festivals, and I am glad to say that a number of these films, particularly documentaries of the Films Division, have won important international awards during the last few years.

Thirdly, Government has set up the Motion Picture Export Corporation of India to promote export of Indian films to foreign countries. Shri Dubey in the course of his speech, referring to this aspect of the film industry, stated that our films earn a very paltry amount of foreign exchange. I agree that our films do not do as well in the international markets as they ought to. The main reason for that is that our films are produced mainly with an eye on box office returns in the country. I have no hesitation in admitting this unfortunate fact, but

we cannot forget that the producers would like to produce only those films which they think will do well as a business proposition. Therefore, in my view, the more important thing is that we should try to educate public opinion. If public opinion does not approve films which have unhealthy trends, then naturally the producers would not produce such films.

One of the hon. Members observed that our producers very largely depend on money-lenders and financiers for their production. This thing was realised by Government, and a few years back, the Ministry of Finance set up a Film Finance Corporation with the object of granting loans to deserving producers.

Then, a Film Institute has been set up at Poona for imparting training in the various branches of the technique of film-making. I may say that the establishment of this Film Institute was also in compliance with one of the recommendations of the Film Enquiry Committee.

Then, there was the Children's Film Society which was formed a few years back.

Shri Tyagi: The less said about it the better.

Shri Sham Nath: I know that the working of that Society was most unsatisfactory, and we have recently requested an hon. Member of this House to be the Chairman of that Society.

Shri Bade: Only by making an hon. Member of this House its Chairman, will it be remedied?

Shri Sham Nath: I have no doubt that under stewardship, the working of that Society will improve.

Shri Tyagi: Are you going to get it registered?

Shri Sham Nath: I think that Society is already a registered body, and it includes some non-official Members and representatives of some Ministries of the Government of India. For the last few years, the persons who were in charge of that Society did not pay proper attention to its working, and the result was that some very undesirable things happened.

Shri Bade: What would happen if the whole industry is nationalised?

Shri Sham Nath: Then we have recently formed a University Film Council the purpose of which is to instil a sense of critical appreciation of films in the students and to improve their taste.

A Film Consultative Committee has been constituted to function as a forum for exchange of views between Government and the film industry and to assist Government in the formulation of policies relating to the film industry.

It would not be correct to say, Sir, that the Government has no control on the film industry. I think Government exercises considerable control over the film industry through the Central Board of Film Censors which sanctions films for exhibition all over the country. There are certain directives which have been issued to the Central Board of Censors, and on the basis of these directives, this Board sanctions films for exhibition in the country.

16 hrs.

Another point that I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, is that we cannot say that we are not doing anything at all in the form of film-making. We have during the last few years produced hundreds of documentaries under the auspices of the Films Division. These documentaries and newsreels are produced in English and 12 Indian languages and they cover significant events in the country as well as abroad, and they are shown in

[Shri Sham Nath]

about 5,100 cinemas in the country which have an annual audience of more than 100 crores.

Before I end, Sir, I would read out an extract from the report of the Film Enquiry Committee, because it had made a thorough enquiry into various aspects of the film industry. It considered the question of nationalisation also. This is what the Committee had to say on the nationalisation of the film industry.

"It would be as suicidal for thought and expression to follow uniform and regulated patterns in this field as in the realm of books. The regimentation of ideas and art should make beauty subservient to the rule of thumb, culture submissive to the will of the authority and entertainment subordinate to the philosophy of the State. We have no doubt that this would result in the standardisation of art which would be fatal to its growth without making the industry any more efficient; the combination of the two would introduce an unhealthy check on individual initiative and enterprise which are indispensable for idealistic conception and artistic expression."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in view of my submissions in respect of the difficulties in the way of nationalisation of the film industry, and since we have taken very significant, positive measures to improve the standard of Indian films and to eliminate their objectionable features, and considering what a high-powered Committee expressed as its considered opinion on this issue, I strongly oppose the Resolution.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): I want to put one question. The hon. Minister said, though not very convincingly, that after all the film

industry is a business and unless they are allowed to make money, they will not prosper. I would like to ask, if there are such good pictures like *Kabulliwalla* and *Punarjanmam* which are high-calibre films preaching correct values and morals and even if they stand to lose in the box-office, whether the Government would come to their aid and encourage them, and ban such pictures as are box-office hits but have a disastrous effect on the moral, educational and national interests?

Shri Sham Nath: It would be very difficult for the Government to assure such producers of any subsidy in case they lose on the pictures produced by them, but the Government is always willing and anxious to give such assistance as may be possible for it to render to such producers.

Shri Bado rose—

Mr. Speaker: He has spoken already.

Shri Bado: I only want to know whether there is any restriction on the import of foreign films.

Shri Sham Nath: As regards foreign films, there is an agreement with the importers that they could import foreign films on the basis of their past performance during a particular period, and whatever earning there is in respect of these films, it is not allowed to be taken out of the country.

Shri Tyagi: Is there any censorship on them?

Shri Sham Nath: Yes, Sir. There is censorship of the films. No film in India can be exhibited unless it is censored by the Board of Film Censors and certified by them to be fit for public exhibition.

Shri R. G. Dubey: I had made it quite clear even in the beginning that

I do not have any dogmatic or rigid approach to this problem, but I am afraid the Deputy Minister's reply was not quite satisfactory. There are any number of examples. For example, I saw that the Western India Theatres, Ltd., Bombay, had 36 theatres all over the country, but only 13 are left now. I am told that the Company Law Board is making an enquiry into this matter. What I feel is that the Government are not realising the gravity and the magnitude of the problem. I am not saying that the Government should immediately take steps for nationalisation. I ask where is the freedom for the real artists and the producers. The producers and artists are squeezed in between the topnotch artists and the financiers. So, you must create conditions for them so that they could subsist. For that, some re-thinking is necessary. That is all.

Mr. Speaker: Should I put the Resolution to the vote of the House?

Shri R. G. Dubey: I would like to withdraw it.

The Resolution was, by leave, withdrawn.

16.07 hrs.

RESOLUTION RE: MINORITIES
IN EAST PAKISTAN

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up the next Resolution, Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri. The time allotted is 2½ hours. What should be the time for the Mover? 25 minutes?

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri (Berhampur): 25 minutes.

Mr. Speaker: All right; 25 minutes for the Mover and 10 minutes each for the rest.

Shri Tridib Kumar Chaudhuri: Sir, I move:

"This House is of opinion that in view of the continuing insecurity

of the life, property and honour of the minority communities living in the Eastern Wing of Pakistan and general denial of all democratic rights of the people in that part of Pakistan, the Government of India should, in addition to removing all restrictions on the migration of people belonging to the minority communities from East Pakistan to the Indian Union, also take steps to raise the issue of the democratic and human rights of the minorities in the forum of the United Nations under appropriate articles of the U.N. Charter."

I have been impelled to move this Resolution because I have found for the past few weeks from a perusal of the statements that have been made on the subject of continuing migration of minorities from East Pakistan and the problem that this country is faced with, that while there is no lack of sympathy and expressions of righteous indignation against Pakistan, for the atrocities committed against the minorities, there is very little appreciation of the vast and staggering magnitude of the problem that confronts this country and also equally little appreciation of the political and international implications of the oppression that is being perpetrated against the poor and helpless minorities.

It is very plain that the regime of President Ayub which finds itself tottering at least so far as East Pakistan is concerned, is bent upon drowning that parts of Pakistan in a flood of communal passion and violence. It is also equally plain—I should say it is as plain as daylight—that the Government of Pakistan is today bent upon using the minorities as hostages to ransom in order to blackmail India and to blackmail the United Nations Security Council in order to gain its ends in regard to Kashmir. That being the position, I would urge upon Government that they should seriously reconsider their policy with regard to Pakistan, as one Central Minister was recently im-