

[श्री श्रीनारायण दास]

हैं चाहे विज्ञान के क्षेत्र में या टैक्नोलोजी के क्षेत्र में या किसी अन्य क्षेत्र में और जिन के आधार पर वह कोई आविष्कार करता है उसको उसका प्रतिफल तो मिले लेकिन जो उसका परिणाम हो, उसका प्रतिफल समाज को भी मिलना चाहिये। मंत्री महोदय ने कहा है कि जो यह सिद्धान्त है वह भी इस विधेयक के पीछे स्थापित किया गया है और इस बात का खयाल रखा गया है कि जहाँ हम किसी व्यक्ति के आविष्कार के जो अधिकार हैं चाहे धन के उपाजन का अधिकार हो या प्रतिष्ठा प्राप्त करने का अधिकार हो, उसे प्रतिष्ठा का और चाहे धन का, दोनों का लाभ व्यक्ति विशेष को भी मिले और साथ ही साथ देश में जो उद्योग धंधा चल रहा है या देश की उन्नति करने का या देश में समृद्धि लाने का जो वैज्ञानिक या टैक्नोलॉजिकल आविष्कार हो रहा है उसमें भी उसका उपयोग पूरा पूरा हो। यदि ऐसा हो तभी मैं समझता हूँ कि हमारी पेटेंट प्रणाली सफल सिद्ध हो सकती है।

यह सवाल उठ सकता है कि किस हद तक व्यक्ति के अधिकार की रक्षा की जाए और किस हद तक उसके अधिकार का हनन किया जाए ताकि समाज का अधिक से अधिक लाभ हो, समाज उसका अधिक से अधिक उपयोग कर सके। एक दृष्टिकोण जो इसके पीछे है यह है कि अपने देश में जब हम कोई कानून बनाते हैं पेटेंट का तो उसमें न केवल अपने देश के आविष्कारक के अधिकारों की रक्षा करते हैं बरन दूसरे देशों में जिन लोगों ने आविष्कार किया होता है वे भी अगर उस कानून के अन्तर्गत पेटेंट कराने की कोशिश करते हैं, उनको कहाँ तक इसकी सुविधा प्रदान की जाए। हमें देखना चाहिए कि हमारे देश के रहने वालों ने जिन्होंने आविष्कार किया है उनके अधिकारों की रक्षा करते समय, उनकी मोनोपली होने से हमारे देश को कहाँ

तक लाभ होगा या कहाँ तक हानि होगी और दूसरे देशों के जो आविष्कारक हैं और जिन्होंने हमारे देश के पेटेंट का अधिकार प्राप्त किया होगा उनके अधिकारों की रक्षा पेटेंट होने के जरिये से किस हद तक हो और क्या वह हमारे देश के लिए मुफीद है या नहीं है। शुरू शुरू में जब दुनिया में उद्योगों का प्रचार हुआ या विज्ञान का प्रचार हुआ तो बहुत ऐसे से पिछड़े हुए देश थे जिनमें उद्योगों का या साइंस का वैसा प्रचार नहीं था, वहाँ ऐसा वातावरण नहीं था कि कोई व्यक्ति विशेष ऐसा आविष्कार कर सके। इस वजह से विदेशी आविष्कारकों ने इस खयाल से कि कि कोई हमारे आविष्कार का फायदा दूसरे देश वाले उस आविष्कार के आधार पर वस्तुओं का निर्माण कर के न उठा लें, विदेशों में जा कर अपने अधिकारों का संरक्षण कराया।

17 hrs.

हमारे देश में कभी यह समझा जाता है कि आविष्कार नहीं हुए हैं। लेकिन ऐसी बात नहीं है। फिर भी हमारे देश में अपेक्षाकृत दूसरे देशों के आविष्कार बहुत थोड़े हुए हैं। अभी हमारे देश में जो पेटेंट कानून है उसके अन्दर विदेशी आविष्कारकों ने ज्यादा से ज्यादा पेटेंट ला का उपयोग किया है और अपने आविष्कारों का संरक्षण कराया है। मैं समझता हूँ कि जो देश पिछड़े हुए हैं या जो देश विज्ञान और टेक्नोलॉजी में धागे बड़े हुए हैं उनमें बहुत से विदेशी आविष्कारकों ने अपने आविष्कारों को पेटेंट कराया है।

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The hon. Member may continue his speech tomorrow.

17.01 hrs.

ANTI-INDIAN PROPAGANDA BY PAKISTAN*

Dr. L. M. Singhvi (Jodhpur): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, I have not asked for

this half an hour discussion touching on the omissions and commissions of external publicity of India merely because criticism of external publicity currently a hobby horse, much in vogue. I have asked for this discussion because I am greatly concerned, distressed and pained by the gross and utter inadequacy of our external publicity and a pervasive lack of understanding of and sympathy for the Indian standpoint abroad.

The discussion arises from answers given by the External Affairs Ministry to three questions on the 8th November 1965. The first question related to Pakistani propaganda in the United States and the answer was:

"At different stages of the Indo-Pakistan conflict, India's case has been understood in varying degrees in the United States. However, the major newspapers in that country acknowledged the fact that the present conflict was started by Pakistani infiltration. Sino-Pak collusion has also been exposed."

Another question, No. 106, was asked about the anti-Indian propaganda by Pakistan in the United Kingdom and again the answer was:

"Pakistan's charges of Indian atrocities in Kashmir have been denied by the spokesman of the Government of India and by the Indian High Commission in London. Indian missions abroad have exposed Pakistan's lies in their handouts and other publications. Many foreign journalists have visited the front areas and seen the situation for themselves."

As if handouts and brochures are the end-all and be-all of publicity techniques.

There was another question in respect of special envoys sent to foreign countries and certain details of ministerial visits abroad.

If I may submit, I am not so naive or wishful to assume that good publicity abroad alone can perform the functions of a magic wand. I am not making any such assumption but the point is that the quality of our diplomacy which is none too high in itself, none too satisfactory or gratifying in itself is greatly impoverished by the poor quality of our publicity abroad. It is remarkable, Mr. Deputy-Speaker, that whenever there is a time of crisis, we find that the publicity services are caught napping or unprepared. This has almost invariably been true whenever a crisis has come about. The country could scarcely condone the lapses of our external publicity at the time of the Chinese invasion of India; it can condone even less the blunders and the great omissions of external publicity at a time like this when we were locked in a life and death struggle our neighbour who had invaded, our territory.

Sir, for a nation at war, effective publicity is a strategic weapon. It is crucial for our morale at home as well as for effective diplomacy abroad. The question that this House should consider is whether these various answers which have been given to us from time to time are satisfactory enough, whether external publicity has been utilised even in a small measure in the form of a strategic weapon abroad. While our men fought bravely and heroically on the battle-front, in the air and in the fields, I think the external publicity machine of our country failed in a dismal manner abroad. While our jawans laid down their lives valiantly, our case went somewhat by default in the foreign countries of the world. The voice of India was faint and feeble; it was muffled; it was inaudible. When the infiltrators came into Indian territory, the fact was not immediately and promptly reported in the press of the world, not indeed in our own press. It was a sinful omission of a sleeping government. When the invasion of Chamb took place, we did not take

[Dr. L. M. Singhvi]

sufficient care promptly to project this abroad so that Pakistan could not indulge in its false propaganda against us. A false impression even during the war was created by Pakistan, that while they were being licked by our forces in reality, they created an impression abroad that they were really licking us, and people sent frantic telegrams and enquiries from abroad, as to whether, actually speaking, fighting was going on in Connaught Place or whether Pakistani columns were marching towards Delhi. Is this not a great proof, proof positive, of the dismal failure of the external publicity machine? Our missions abroad did neither have the maps nor the awareness of the places where fighting was going on. It was because they were steeped in complete and unforgivable ignorance. It is true that the foreign press, some of it at any rate, is steeped in prejudice; those countries have old scores to settle with us; they cannot forgive us our freedom and the way in which we won it. It is always keen to even the score perhaps because we have been sometimes fearless critics of those governments and their policies.

But this is not the whole story, certainly; we would be deluding ourselves if we ascribe to that version for the failure of our external publicity. It has been said time and again by highly responsible spokesmen of foreign governments, highly sympathetic to India, that our external publicity is extremely ineffective; it is slothful; it is indolent; it is lackadaisical; it is somnolent; it sleep-walks if ever it walks.

The greatest testimony, I would say, was furnished when, on his return from Europe, Shri Satya Narayan Sinha, Minister of Communications and Parliamentary Affairs, testified in very eloquent and very stinging terms to the inadequacy of our publicity. What Shri Sinha, a cabinet colleague of the hon. Minister of External Affairs, said in no uncertain terms was that our external publicity was

extremely inadequate and did not redound to the credit of the Ministry of External Affairs. At the best, our external publicity was at this particular juncture a hastily, halting, doodling improvisation, and at the worst it was worse than a mess. All-round negligence has characterised the entire scheme of our external publicity. There has never been a full and comprehensive appreciation of policy, of resources, of techniques, of organisation of this very vital sector of our diplomatic function. What is worse, it has been enmeshed in bureaucracy.

The House would recall that the late Prime Minister had appointed a committee known as Shelvankar Committee to go into the question and I am told that the Shelvankar Committee submitted a long and detailed report as well as several projects for improving and streamlining the scheme of our external publicity. I should like to know how many of these recommendations have been implemented and in what manner. When we found that we were locked in war, we were invaded by China and later on by Pakistan, we were victims of one of the worst collusions on the Asian continent, our voice was inaudible in South-East and East Asia. We did not have powerful transmitters and did not care to purchase them with all possible promptitude. What is more, our external publicity has yet to be emancipated from the shackles of bureaucratic mentality. It has yet to be freed from the bondage of bureaucracy. Unless that is done, we cannot have a resilient and energetic external publicity service.

We have a very difficult task. We have as our enemy one of the worst liars in the international world. We have to demolish the edifice of the false word delicately built by Pakistan and its patrons in the Councils of the world. We have to disabuse the minds of our friends, both present and potential, from the bewildering and befuddling mass of different versions given

by Pakistan against us. Ordinary measures will just not do. What we have had so far are nothing but ordinary routine measures. The External Affairs Minister must consider it his primary concern now to overhaul the external publicity machinery. Unless he is able to do that, the quality of diplomacy on behalf of India will not improve. I would go to the extent of suggesting that a definite procedure should be evolved for better coordination. He should give us a picture of the resources position in this respect, whether he finds the appropriations made for this sector inadequate. He should tell us whether he has re-examined the various techniques used by our external publicity machine and whether the manning of our external publicity is woefully inept, whether people who have no flair for this kind of job, which is highly specialised requiring skill, happen to man this job abroad for us today. He should tell us about the basic policy he is going to adopt in this matter. Much will depend on whether he is able to reassure the House in respect of his plans for re-organising our external publicity on a satisfactory basis.

The need for Ordination cannot be over-emphasised. The Minister of External Affairs and the Minister for Information and Broadcasting seem to be at sixes and sevens most of the time. Lack of coordination was evident in respect of our internal broadcasts—I am not touching on that for the moment. I would only say that, that co-ordination seems to be wholly lacking in the most vital task of projecting the image of India abroad. If so, why were they ever sent? If not, why this carping criticism?

Mrs. Lakshmi Menon herself conceded that she was not in agreement with sending so many delegations abroad. I have here a record of the debate in the Rajya Sabha, where she is supposed to have said:

"In fact, so firm was my faith and confidence in our missions abroad that I was opposed to the Government's action in sending

goodwill teams of parliamentarians abroad, because they would merely hamper the good work which our missions were doing. Moreover, these teams would depend entirely on the missions and could hardly be expected to do anything independently."

If this is the view of the Minister of State in the External Affairs Ministry, why on earth were these delegations unleashed on so many countries of the world? What real objects have they fulfilled? Is it a fact that they have really brought no better understanding and sympathy for India's cause abroad and this is really hampering the work of professional diplomats abroad?

I would conclude by striking a note of caution to the minister: Unless he is able to re-arm this whole machinery of external affairs, unless he is able to bring in fresh talent, people who have a flair and aptitude for this kind of work, he will never be able to perform the task which he is called upon to perform for the sake of India at this very critical juncture. I wish him godspeed, but I should sound this note of caution, because I think this is one of the most distressing and painful facts which emerge from a perusal of what did happen in the Press and world public opinion at the time of Indo-Pakistani conflict.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Three hon. Members have sent in slips to me. They may put a question each. Shri Prakash Vir Shastri.

An hon. Member: He is not here.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): Sir, my question consists of two parts. Firstly, I would like to know specifically what priority Government attaches to external publicity in its conduct of business abroad. Secondly, I would like to know how the Government co-ordinates the handling of the foreign correspondents stationed in India, in what manner and in which form it is done and what role the Ministry of External Affairs plays in handling these correspondents, their work, their conduct and their professional work here in India?

Shri B. K. Das (Contal): May I know whether it has come to the notice of the Minister that Pakistan sometimes is publishing wrong maps—one such map was published during the Kutch conflict—if so, to prevent such maps being published by Pakistan, what steps Government are taking in that respect?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Shri Swaran Singh—

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati) Sir, I have sent in my name:

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I have not received.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Sir, when an hon. Member of this House says that he has sent in a slip, you should accept his word.

Shri Hem Barua: I do not tell a lie for this.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Alright, he may put his question.

Shri Hem Barua: Sir, I have got a letter from some Indian students doing their studies in USA, in the California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California. They write like this:

"Being Indians, we urge, through our Indian Government and fellow citizens to concede that Kashmir problem is not yet solved. We must reconsider the whole situation with an open mind and prepare ourselves to accept that Kashmir is a negotiable area."

In the context of this letter, may I ask the Government if they are aware of the fact that our publicity is so weak, vacillating, lopsided and haphazard that Pakistani propaganda swamps even Indian students doing their studies in foreign countries; and if so, whether our diplomatic missions abroad have taken the trouble of explaining our position vis-à-vis the Kashmir issue to the thousands of Indian students doing their

studies in foreign countries; if not, may I know the reasons for it?

The Minister of External Affairs (Shri Swaran Singh): Sir, this half-hour discussion relates to replies, as Dr. Singhvi pointed out, to three questions about which reference has been made in the notice of the hon. Member. The hon. Member has referred to the points mentioned in those questions also. I would say a few words on the last point that Dr. Singhvi raised, namely, the advisability of sending missions of Members of Parliament to explain India's views point to various countries. It is a fact that some controversy has also arisen in the Press about this and the hon. Member has made some observations. This was also made in the course of the debate on external affairs. That is a matter upon which, if we take a purely theoretical view, there can be two view points. But I put it to Dr. Singhvi himself, who has gone to various countries on occasions more than one, as to whether it does or does not make a difference if a public man, an elected representative of the people, a Member of Parliament goes abroad and explains the view point at various levels.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: Send them in a quite way; do not unleash them in large numbers, like this and then condemn them officially.

Shri Swaran Singh: Do not be misled by this kind of propaganda. There is no question of unleashing. They are welcomed by the various countries where they go. They carry the prestige that this Parliament enjoys all over the world, and Members of Parliament belonging to both Houses going abroad and then representing the country's views will have a powerful impact upon the people there, upon the Government there, upon Parliaments where such Parliaments exists and at various levels which control and which formulate public opinion in other countries.

This is something which has not been undertaken by us alone. It is a well-known fact that Members of Parliament have been entrusted with this task of explaining the view point of the countries to which they belong and when they go out in delegations abroad their performance is generally creditable from the point of view of the countries which they represent and they have generally succeeded in improving the relations between the two countries and also in projecting the viewpoint of the country, not only at the governmental level but also, if I may use that expression, at peoples' level.

Shri Hem Barua: Popular level.

Shri Swaran Singh: Yes, popular level, as Shri Hem Barua says. Today, these days, we have a British Parliamentary delegation belonging to both parties....

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: They have come at our invitation.

Shri Swaran Singh: It does not make any difference whether they go at their invitation or on our proposal; that does not make any difference at all. We have heard from some of our colleagues who have come back.....

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad (Bhagalpur): Even though the Prime Minister has sent us, the Minister of State has condemned it in the Rajya Sabha. A nice thing indeed! How is it that a Minister of State says things different from the Prime Minister? It was said that this is hampering the work.

Shri Swaran Singh: I have not seen the whole statement but I may say that quoting a sentence may not probably be doing justice to the whole statement that was made by the Minister of State in the other House. The discussion there did not relate to the envoys; that related only to publicity. And if I may say so, sending out these missions is not just publicity. It is really much more than publicity. This enables

the Members of Parliament to explain the view point of the country to various leaders at party levels, at governmental level, even to opposition parties and, therefore, the canvass is much bigger and publicity is only one part. Their going there will receive some publicity and publicity is important but their function is even more basic, fundamental and solid than just writing in the newspapers or appearing in the TV programme or radio programme.

So, I am very sorry that these delegations have been unnecessarily criticised. If I may say so, our colleagues have gone abroad and let us wait for their return. Some of them have actually come back and the reports they have given to me are very very encouraging. Some more are going. Let us, on behalf of the House, wish them all success in this difficult mission.

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: I am not opposed to sending them; I am opposed to the manner in which they are sent.

Shri Swaran Singh: Is the criticism about the statement made by the Minister of State or about sending the delegation? If the criticism is only about the statement made by the Minister of State, I have already said that it was made in the other House in another context. Let us discuss the substance of it rather than be deflected from our approach by any statement which has been made by the Minister of State.

Dr. M. S. Aney (Nagpur): Does not the hon. Member think that the condemnation of our delegation by one of the Ministers is likely to affect our prestige outside?

Shri Swaran Singh: This will not. The fact of the concern expressed by such a senior Member and my making a statement that they are doing very useful work will have a much more powerful impact than any other statement and the fact that members going abroad will meet important pub-

[Shri Swaran Singh]

lic men there government leaders, members and others, that itself will have its own effect.

So, I will strongly appeal that the House should really give strong support to the threads about the Members going abroad, particularly when they belong to all sections of the House. Let us not be deflected by the criticism which is mostly unjustified. Unfortunately, politicians are easy targets of criticism and when they take a hand on a somewhat unconventional basis in serving the country in spheres in which they are not normally functioning, there is always some criticism from all types of quarters and we, in the House, should really counteract that criticism rather than fall a victim to it.

We have got responsible Members of Parliament and they know their job. They can stand on their legs. I have no doubt in my mind that this experiment will succeed. It is not a novel one. On several occasions many hon. Members have gone—sometimes alone; sometimes in groups—and generally their performance has been good. We should not hesitate to mobilise all our resources for putting across India's viewpoint and Members of Parliament are important sections of our way of life and of the system under which we work. We should bless their efforts rather than criticize them because I think it is not fair to the Members who are going abroad and who have under taken these trips in a spirit of serving the country.

Shri Hem Barua: Do you not have anything to say about those who are proposing to go abroad? There is nothing to say about them?

Shri Swaran Singh: There are some delegations also which are going abroad. Most of these took shape when I was away. So, I am trying to pick up the composition and the destination of many of these groups. But I am fully satisfied with the steps that

have been taken to organise these missions on behalf of Members of Parliament. It is a very good step and I have full confidence that they will bring credit not only to themselves but to the country and will succeed in putting across our viewpoint in a very admirable manner.

Coming to publicity, these two questions relate to two countries, the UK and the USA. This morning several questions were asked on this very subject matter during the Question Hour, namely, the publicity in UK, the role of certain foreign correspondents here, what has been appearing on the BBC. Also, some mention has been made of the reports that have appeared in the United States press. These two countries have never shown understanding of India's case on Jammu and Kashmir. Let us face the problem squarely. Is it purely on account of our failure on the publicity front that UK and USA have taken a view on this vital question of Jammu and Kashmir which is not consistent with our stand on that issue? I would like to say without any hesitation that publicity has not played any vital role in shaping the attitude of the Governments of UK and USA in relation to their attitude on the question of Jammu and Kashmir. Ever since this matter has been in the Security Council, from the year 1948, there has been a consistent approach to this problem of Jammu and Kashmir which, we feel, has never been appreciative of India's standpoint and India's view in relation to Jammu and Kashmir. The present aggression took place in Jammu and Kashmir and we have to view the projection on the publicity front of this aggression and the facts of Jammu and Kashmir in the background of the general attitude that has been taken by those countries on the question of Jammu and Kashmir. I know that there are several other differences on major matters of policy. India has pursued a policy of peaceful co-existence and non-alignment. India has always believed in planned

development. Even on these two issues, there has not been good understanding of our view-point in the United States and also, to a large extent, in U.K. So, to a very large measure, the external publicity projects our view-point, and if in a country in which it is projected there is already a certain attitude which is not sympathetic to our stand, which really goes counter to our way of tackling these problems, then we cannot expect to get the type of publicity which would please us. And we are all oriented on account of historical associations, on account of a number of things, always to these two countries in particular because most of us, particularly the older amongst us, have had our education and training in that system and we are over-sensitive to what appears in a British newspaper or in an American newspaper. Therefore, we are somewhat more sensitive to what is mentioned there than is justified by the facts of the situation. If the U.S.A. or the U.K. does not see eye to eye with us on the question of Kashmir, why should we any way feel wobbly about it? We should not unnecessarily develop cold feet when something appears in print there which is not to our liking. We should project our view-point as best as we can. But if in spite of that they take a view which is not liked by us, we should ignore it.

Sir, in this respect, I would like to tell you my own experience. In the last Security Council debate which took place in New York, Mr. Bhutto made a very long speech; he spent about an hour and a half in spelling out the "genocide in Kashmir", "the arrests of the student who demonstrated". . .

Shri Hem Barua: The so-called genocide.

Shri Swaran Singh: This is all imaginary. You know it; you do not require to be corrected on that. It was a very long speech full of invective,

full of all the epithets that could be raised, condemning us and condemning what is happening here. And I may tell you—it might interest you and the House—that the next day, I think, the biggest disappointment that must have been felt by Mr. Bhutto must have been that a word of this was reported in any American newspaper the next morning. Mostly, I believe, it was on account of the fact that the Pakistan Foreign Minister over-played his hand and he used such vituperative language and used such invective that they thought the best way to deal with that was to ignore it completely. The other Members of the Security Council who spoke thereafter did not make a single reference to the happenings inside Jammu and Kashmir.

So, in matters like this, when other Governments are concerned, when the press in other countries is concerned, they have got their own viewpoint which they project to their own people in a form, in a manner, which appeals to them, which catches them and which gives the juice, as the Americans call it, to their readers.

Shri Hem Barua: Mr. Bhutto calling us Indian dogs got a wide publicity there.

Shri Swaran Singh: It was not mentioned in any newspaper in the United States because immediately they corrected this and what went to the press did not contain that. It did appear in the British papers. But it did not appear in the American newspapers.

Shri Bhagwat Jha Asad: But some one of your colleagues was defending sion that it thinks proper.

Shri Swaran Singh: No one is trying to defend anybody. We have to place facts before the House and it is for the House to take any decision that it thinks proper.

[Shri Swaran Singh]

So, I do feel that there is considerable forces in this fact that we will have to deal with the foreign correspondents in a more coordinated manner.

I would like to repudiate any suggestion that might be made—in fact, it has been made—that there is lack of co-ordination between the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting and the Ministry of External Affairs. There is complete coordination; almost everyday meetings take place between the officers concerned and all the information is exchanged and it is the co-ordinated effort of both that is projected abroad.

One fact that I would like to mention is that it is the report made by the foreign correspondents, i.e., when they report from India as they report from any other country back to their country, that receives definitely more publicity than anything that we can organize through our embassies in those countries or through our Missions or publicity officers in those countries. This reporting is again examined by their editorial boards and they decide ultimately as to what should be projected to the people there. This is a major factor that affects, to a very large extent, the publication that takes places in the various newspapers abroad. I am sorry that the arrangements that were made here immediately after the aggression started were not quite satisfactory. It has been said here also—as my colleague was explaining this morning—that Pakistan had prepared themselves for aggression and probably they had also made preparations on the propaganda front and it naturally took some time before we could organise our arrangements here to make even the factual information available in an assimilable form to the foreign correspondents. We will certainly take more care to ensure that the necessary facilities are made available to the foreign correspondents. The reporters of several countries stationed here, particularly

the Soviet Union and the East European countries, sent objective reports; the coverage there was good and what was projected in the newspapers in those countries was factually correct and they did appreciate India's viewpoint. Some of the newspaper representatives, when they come here, take delight in a lot of drain-inspecting and they find it difficult to send back in their despatches anything which is objective or which gives our viewpoints. I was amazed to find a big coverage given in one of the American newspapers based on the report of an American newspaperman—he talked to one or two persons in private; they whispered something into his ears and on that he made out a big coverage. If that is the standard which unfortunately some of these foreign press representatives adopt then we shall have to give them better information and we shall also have to have some control over them. It is true that the Press enjoys freedom and we give all facilities, but freedom does not mean that they could put across anything in a tendentious manner or give a twist in their favour or load it against us. That is highly objectionable.

Shri K. D. Malaviya (Basti): The tragedy is that they do not care for the Government.

Shri Swaran Singh: There are many newspapers in our own country who are guilty of that type of thing. We have, under our Constitution given the freedom of expression and we are not misled by that because democracy is in full swing here. Even if something wrong appears in our own country, we know who is the writer, what is his background, what is the think that is troubling him and why he is giving that type of presentation. The misleading impressions from something that appears in our own newspapers is not that grave. But in foreign countries when the reporting is selective and very few items

appear, anything tendentious and tortuous does create at any rate momentarily an adverse feeling against us.

Having said all that, I would like to assure the House that I am myself not fully satisfied with all the publicity arrangements that we have got, both mechanical as well as the general approach to it, and we are taking steps to improve them; some steps have already been taken, and we shall take more. I would like to strengthen our publicity organisation both at the headquarters and abroad in a significant manner, and we might be able to take steps before long, and I shall inform the House as soon as we have finalised them.

It is not quite correct to say that the officers in various Missions who are in charge of publicity work are just bureaucrats. A large proportion out of them have got journalistic background, and they were drawn from. . .

Dr. L. M. Singhvi: They have been treated as cast-aways or out-castes as at one time the late Prime Minister himself had observed.

Shri Swaran Singh: I do not accept that. They are doing a good job of work. In fact, some of the foreign correspondents have mentioned to me that they would like to meet our dip-

lomatic section rather than the press section, and that is a matter which we shall have to take into consideration. In several foreign Missions functioning here and in other countries, generally they do not have separate press officers. The press people are a little allergic when they meet people who are designated as press attaches. They want to have political news and somehow they have a feeling that the press people do not have the political news. In several foreign service organisations functioning aboard, even for publicity work, although the officers concerned do the publicity work, they are not designated as publicity officers; some other designation is given to them. All these matters are receiving our attention. I am sure that the strength that we show in our unity, the way that our Parliament functions and gives a lead to the country, all these facts, when they are projected do create a powerful impact and any wrong impression that might be created momentarily by twisted reports of activities in the country is dispelled when the real facts are projected to them. And this effort will continue to be made.

17.44 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Tuesday, November 23, 1965/Agrahayana 2, 1887 (Saka).