

SHRIMATI SAVITRY DEVI NIGAM: May I know, Sir, if the Corporation has expressed its inability to carry out this project with the money which has been allotted to it?

SHRI ANIL K. CHANDA: I have said sufficiently clearly that the present scheme is not yet before the Government.

SHRIMATI SAVITRY DEVI NIGAM: May I know, Sir, if the hon. Minister has seen the news published in the various newspapers about this scheme and the points which have been mentioned in the statement?

SHRI ANIL K. CHANDA: I have seen reports in the Press; they also said that no official approach has yet been made to Government.

*292 to *294. *The questioner (Shri B. N. Bhargava) was absent. For answers, vide cols. 1970-75 infra.]*

PRIME MINISTER'S VISIT TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES

*295. **SHRI BAIRAGI DWIBEDY:** Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state the names of the countries which he intends to visit before or after the ensuing Commonwealth Prime Ministers' Conference at London?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): During the Prime Minister's visit to the United Kingdom he will go to Paris for a few hours to meet the French President. The Prime Minister may also visit Cairo while returning to India.

SHRI BAIRAGI DWIBEDY: May I know, Sir, if there is any possibility of drawing the attention of the countries to the approach of China to the boundary dispute?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He asks whether there is any possibility of your drawing the attention of the Premiers concerned to our dispute with China.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: No possibility is ruled out, but the question of desirability also comes in.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: May I know, Sir, if the Prime Minister's attention has been drawn to a newspaper report that President Ayub Khan proposes to discuss the question of Kashmir with the Commonwealth Prime Ministers and if the Prime Minister has received any official intimation to the effect that such is sought to be discussed there?

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: I have seen that newspaper report; I have received no other intimation.

WHITE PAPER II

*296. **DR. A. N. BOSE:** Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether his attention has been drawn to the discrepancies which occurred in the headings, dates and contents of the communications exchanged between the Governments of India and China and published in White Paper II and in the handouts issued by the Press Information Bureau; e.g., the headings and dates on pages 3, 8 and 54 of the White Paper and the corresponding headings and dates in the handouts and the contents of page 54, para 2 of the White Paper and the corresponding contents of the handout; and

(b) whether proper care is being taken that such discrepancies do not occur in future?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): (a) Yes. The errors in the Press handouts were mainly of a typographical character. The handouts were based on telegrams received from our Embassy in Peking. Later when the White Paper was compiled the errors were rectified by reference to the original communications which had by then arrived.

(b) Yes.

DR. A. N. BOSE: I beg to point out that all the errors were not of a typographic nature. In some cases the dates are different, for example the date and the contents of paragraphs 1 and 2 on page 54, vary from those given in the corresponding matter appearing in the handout. According to the latter statement, it reads, ".... intruded into China's air space above the Tibetan region and the southern part of Sinkiang circling and carrying out reconnoitring activities".... but in the White Paper it is not the 'southern part' but 'south-western part'. Moreover, Sir, there is some difference in the words, "Memorandum, Message and Note" and these three words are indiscriminately used in the handouts and the White Paper.

SHRI JAWAHARLAL NEHRU: The answer has been given. Long telegrams come which contain some mistakes. We are anxious to issue them as soon as they come. It is the original text which is more correct.

*297. [The questioner (Shri P. L. Kureel urf Talib) was absent. For answer, vide col. 1975 infra.]

EXHIBITION OF THE FILM 'PRITHVIRAJ CHAUHAN'

*298. SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any representation regarding the exhibition of the film 'Prithviraj Chauhan'; and

(b) if so, what action Government have taken thereon?

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (DR. B. V. KESKAR): (a) and (b) Last year a report in a local paper appeared against the exhibition of the film 'Prithviraj Chauhan'. After enquiry in consultation with the Central Board of Film Censors Government

felt that any action under the Cinematograph Act, 1952 was not warranted.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: Is it a fact that in this film wrong historical facts have been given?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: That is correct, and that is exactly our difficulty. The distortion of facts or the wrong emphasis on certain aspects of history is something which is very difficult for the censor to check. At the same time, when we examined all this we found that there are two versions regarding this particular event of Indian history. One version was the one on which the producers have based their film. We felt that while we ourselves did not very much like the portrayal of this particular film, it would not be possible for us to interfere or to ban the film for that purpose.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: In view of the fact that a tremendous amount of public interest was aroused here in Delhi, does not the Government think it proper to ban that film so that the relations between the two communities may not go from bad to worse?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: I do not agree with the hon. Member. The film is one in which the character of Prithviraj and Mohammad Gouri has been portrayed. The allegation is that it has portrayed Mohammad Gouri unnecessarily as a very cruel and ruthless person. There might be difference of opinion regarding this question but there is a traditional and well-known version which portrays Mohammad Gouri in that way. I may or I may not agree with it but whether Government can interfere with such portrayals is a very different question to decide. And that is the reason why we did not interfere with it.

SHRI FARIDUL HAQ ANSARI: Is it or is it not a fact that this is not only a portrayal but a wrong historical fact has been given? Is it not a fact that this happened because