

12:10 hrs.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE*[English]***Thirty-Seventh Report**

SHRIMATI CHANDRA TRIPATHI (Chndauli) : I beg to present the Thirty-Seventh Report (Hindi and English versions) of the Estimates Committee on the Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs—Revision of Form and Contents of the Demands for Grants, and Minutes of the sittings of the Committee relating thereto.

12.11 hrs.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO
MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC
IMPORTANCE**

[English]

Reported damage caused to invaluable pieces of art sent for exposition at Festival of India held in France and the United States of America

SHRI PIYUS TIRAKY (Alipurduars) : I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Human Resources to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon :

“The reported damage caused to invaluable pieces of art sent for exposition at the Festival of India held in France and the United States of America and the action taken by the Government in that regard.”

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE

(SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO) : I welcome this opportunity to clarify the position in regard to the damage to the art objects sent for the Festival of India in USA and France.

Patterned after the highly successful Festival of India organised in U.K. in 1982, the Festivals in USA and France were organised on a larger scale and spread over a wider canvas. In brief they envisaged a unique exposure of India's rich cultural heritage with a view to promoting greater awareness among the American and the French and thus creating an appropriate climate of goodwill and understanding for mutual exchanges in the future.

The events of the Festivals of India included 12 exhibitions of classical art and paintings. The art objects were collected from several private, autonomous and Government museums, with their consent. Several objects which were initially listed for display were dropped, taking into account the adverse conservation report or in view of the fragile condition of the art objects. On the recommendation of the Evaluation and Expert Committee, certain art objects such as Pasupati seal, Dancing girl of Mohanjodaro, Torso from Harappa, excluded. In deference to public sentiments, idols of Rama, Sita and Lakshmana were not sent abroad.

In respect of the objects sent abroad, adequate precautions were taken to ensure maximum safety. Apart from the insurance cover on wall-to-wall basis, every care to adhere to international practice has been exercised for packing, handling, transportation, etc. Security precaution e.g. provision of security guards, experts accompanying consignments, were observed.

Director, National Museum has furnished a statement of 26 art objects sent to the Festival of India exhibitions in USA and France which suffered some damage. The final position will be assessed after the return of the art objects from San Francisco some time in the next fortnight.

[Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao]

Of the 26 art objects so far reported as damaged, 19 were sent to USA and 7 to the exhibitions in Paris. The damage to the sculptures and terracotta art objects, consist of minor scratches, tiny-chip marks and small cracks. Except in the case of 7 objects sent to Paris, the damage was noticed by the National Museum to have occurred during the return journey to India in transit. The damage to the 7 objects sent to Paris was detected in Paris before they were packed for being sent back to India. Photographs were taken by the French authorities and the French insurance company who had covered the risks also inspected the damage.

The insurance company in India have also been notified of the damage. On the basis of the recommendations of the Evaluation and Expert Committee, the damage will be assessed for determining and finalising claims.

The medium of the exhibition plays a major role in the promotion of art and culture. Soon after Independence, the National Museum ventured on the exhibition "5000 years of Indian Art" abroad in 1947-48 to U.K. at the Royal Academy of London. A slow but steady trend of sending exhibitions abroad emerged since then. In the seventies the cultural exchange programmes provided a further fillup to the exhibitions sent abroad to Hong Kong, Japan, Belgium, USSR and other places. We also received several reciprocal exhibitions from Italy, USSR, France and Mexico. Some of these viz. "Computer" and "Daja" from FRG, "Original French Modern paintings" and "Rodin" sculptures and drawings" from France, "Modera Masterpieces from Philadelphia Museum (1980) USA, Thracian Gold from Bulgaria" were first rate exhibitions well appreciated by the art lovers of this country.

Based on our experience, guidelines in regard to sending exhibitions abroad are being further reviewed. The exhibitions should be as far as possible on reciprocal basis. This can not be always ensured

unless the heritage of the other country is comparable to ours. As regards the exhibits to be sent abroad we are of the view that objects which are either very fragile or unique or too precious to part with even temporarily will not be sent. Similarly the objects in worship will also not be sent out. However, the final decision in these matters will rest with Government who will no doubt take all aspects into consideration.

An art object is priceless not only in itself but is also creates goodwill, and a general awareness of the philosophy for which we have stood for thousands of years. There can, however, be no disagreement with regard to taking precautions so that art objects are not damaged. All care would be taken in sending them but the risk of damage can not be completely eliminated. The Government would, therefore, take all the care that is humanly possible while sending abroad our precious art objects.

12.16 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

SHRI PIYUS TIRAKY : India is a country of religions. All the sculptors, idols and deities anywhere in the country, whether they are in jungles or in maopis or in hilly areas, are revered, honoured and worshipped. So, any time, if our country wants to exhibit these inside the country or outside, every care must be taken to know the sentiments of Indian people. Indian sentiments are very great and religious. They worship them and you acknowledge the sentiments of the Indian people now they show their respect to small idols or sculptures or the ancient arts. Whenever any idol or art piece of deity or other such things go outside the country, the Government of India must see that the receiving country must show equal reverence to them ; they should also see whether the receiving country is ready to show or give equal reverence to those things sent from our country.

If they are sent for making a laughing stock or they are likely to get damaged or

they will be handled carelessly, then India should refuse to send such things which are very rare in our country. It is no good to replace them or at any cost given to them. It should not be that some sort of insurance is done and if gets damaged, then the person concerned will get money out of that. It should not be for selling purposes. They are very precious things and we worship them. The government should know that Indian people worship them and this is our culture: it amounts to our culture. If they are going to be damaged or mishandled or carelessly handled, then the sentiments of the Indian people will be injured and they will accuse the government and the people who are taking part in it.

We hold so many melas in our country for this purpose and a lot of money is spent on them. How much money are we going to spend? I have come to know that about 2000 artistes are going to participate in the country. They have already participated in the U.S.A., in France and perhaps they are getting ready to go to the U.S.S.R.

Who are those artistes? Who decided on the names and on the list of the people, and about their performance, because the people do not know, and even Parliament does not know. I demand from the Minister that the artistes who will be participating in future, their names their performance—all may be placed before the House. The country should know that such and such participants are going to be abroad, to expose the Indian culture. So, that in one question.

Secondly, were the experts were all unanimous before sending the articles or the exhibits abroad? If they have suggested that some exhibits should not go, because it touches their sentiments, then why did the Government not take their advice and stop such articles from being sent? The Government have accepted here that 26 articles have suffered some sort of damage, some stains or cracks got discoloured or some such damage. These sculptures are 4000 years old, and if these idols if get smuggled or dis-coloured

how can they be replaced? It is not the money. I have already said that the money does not count. You must be very careful, that these sentiments are not touched.

You have already said that this is done on some reciprocal agreement. Has any country agreed to show your exhibits? Have you made any list of those objects which you want to get from them and I want to know whether your list has been agreed to by that country or not. In so agreeing how many articles or exhibits have you accepted? How far have you shown your generosity in spite of so much objection coming from the art circles, and the public sentiments also? This should be cleared and people should be assured that no such things can happen in the future.

Lastly, does the Government while entering into any agreements, before agreeing to send the articles, ensure the safety, safe landing, safe handling and safe return of the articles also? Has any such agreement been made before conducting such festivals outside India?

Lastly, we do not object—at least I have not objection—if exhibits or sculptures from other countries are brought and exhibited here, we also think that it is a good exercise, but we must be careful with our culture. As we know, and you know, we have a culture which is separate from the world culture. We have an ancient culture. Our culture cannot be mixed with other cultures and the people of our country have some sentiments and we have also to some times follow the sentiments, but very often we become the laughing stock. So, I want the Government to be careful about it. Our culture should not be disrespected to anywhere whatever may be the economic condition of the country may be. We are proud of our culture, we have a rich culture, from every point of view and this is my last request. Art objects of 3000 B.C. or 1300 AD should not be taken away from India. We have special reverence for them and they should remain in India. That is my request,

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY (Mehboobnagar) : I am happy at the outset that a scholarly person like Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao is to answer this question. This is a question of vital cultural importance to our country. Since he is from Andhra Pradesh, I am aware of his academic attainments and cultural interests. Therefore, I have said this.

As you are aware, even before most of these invaluable art objects were taken to France and the United States for exposition as a part of India Festival, Mr. Unnikrishnan and myself tabled a notice last year about the manner in which some of these priceless art treasures were being sought to be taken, about the lack of security and safety to these art treasures. I am sorry to say that all our fears, all our forebodings and fore-warnings have come true. I would like to know the hon. Minister whether the original list of 441 pieces which was proposed for despatch to these countries included such invaluable inestimable things like Budha of Sarnath, Mother Budha of Rastrapati Bhavan and Pasupathi. Is it not a fact that this decision to take them was nipped in the bud by the personal intervention of none other than the former Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Even at that time, we did warn against the dangers involved in taking such an art piece like Didarganj Yakshi. I am afraid, that was taken before we could warn the Government. After we spoke in Parliament, the then Minister assured us at that time that every care was being taken to see that no damage would be caused whatever. The extensive insurance policy was being gone for in this context.

I learn, in a letter to Shri Charan Singh, our former Prime Minister, our Prime Minister stated that the Members who raised this question in the House were not aware of the modern methods of preservation and protection. Now, we know who knows more about these methods.

From the answers it is clear that as many as 26 pieces of art have been subjected to damage. To me it is not

damage ; it is destruction, nay desecration. Has it been examined what pieces of art were subjected to damage? Mankuwar Buddha which has been insured for Rs. 5 crores has been subject to damage. Then, another piece was Flying Gandhavas which had been insured for Rs. two crores ; another piece from National Museum, New Delhi was Shiva Vamana which was insured for Rs. 25 crores ; and this piece Didarganj Yakshi was insured for Rs. 25 crores. I will agree that this is a big sum but the Minister certainly would agree that it is very difficult to price these articles. The total insured amount of the damaged pieces is well over Rs. 40 crores. I would like to know whether it is not true that the experts of the Government of India did place on record their strong and vehement objection to some of these articles being taken for exposition. . . . (Interruption).

DR. KRUPASINDHU BHOI : I am on a point of order, Sir. Is he speaking on Calling Attention or he is speaking on Demands ?

AN HON. MEMBER ; Sir, under what rule he is on a point of order ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER ; Mr. Bhoi, kindly take your seat.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Sir, we asked for the experts' opinion but even at that time the Minister was hesitant to disclose.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please put questions Mr. Jaipal Reddy.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Therefore, I would like the hon. Minister to take the House into confidence in regard to experts' opinion that was recorded even before they were taken abroad. The Minister knows fully well that attempt was made to take the idols and when we brought this to the notice of the Government through this House, that was stopped. The idols were removed from the temples, they were brought to Delhi; they were only not transhipped because objection was strongly raised in this House.

I learnt—it is for the Minister to confirm or conflict—that while carrying these pieces in the United States of America, the tyre of the truck had burst which could have possibly caused damage to these pieces, and this raised serious question as to the effective manner in which packaging was done. I am told that no proper packaging measures were adopted. Techniques like reinforcement were not really applied. In the last few years, as many as 741 items were taken abroad. It is a kind of cultural depre-dation—I do not know what should I call it. I do not want to use strong expressions. Our Minister would not like such strong expressions.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I like strong expressions as long as they are appropriate.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Sir, our Minister is not only conversant with culture, he is also conversant with foreign policy issues, defence issues and issues concerning Home Affairs. I would like to know as to what was the impact of these Festivals held in the United States and in France. We are trying to improve our political relations with the United States. I would like to know whether this improvement has been properly reflected in the promise of supply of AWACS to Pakistan. I would also like to know whether the prices of the aircrafts, such as, Mirage 2000 we are buying from France, have come down a bit on account of these things. Therefore, it is not merely a question of cultural exchanges. I plead for a policy, a comprehensive policy, on national art treasure. Last time the Chairperson of the Festival of India was referred to in various terms by the Members of the House. The Chairperson was referred to as a cultural commissar. Now the Chairperson has been promoted to the mighty position of the Cultural Adviser to the Prime Minister. Should the Chairperson be now called cultural Tsarina of India? Is this the kind of promotion policy adopted in the area of culture? I would like the Minister to react to all these questions.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary.

I have already seen your letter. You are supposed to seek permission.

(Interruptions)

That is around ten O'Clock.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY (Katwa) : Nowhere it is written.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Let us see that.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Nowhere it is written.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He has to give advance notice under. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Where is it written—10 O'Clock?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The purpose of advance notice is that we have to refer it because unnecessarily you cannot make use of a confidential letter.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : If this is your argument; I do not accept.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Even for that. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : I have given the document. I will quote it and whatever is there that will go on record.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No, no.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Why not ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You have to give advance notice. You have to give by 10 O'Clock.

You cannot make any allegation.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
What allegation ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I cannot allow.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
Allegatory or non-allegatory, I do not know.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You cannot refer the names. The person is not here. I cannot allow.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
What person ? That is why I gave notice. Had the person been present here I would not have given notice.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You have not given sufficient time.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
How much time is to be given ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : By 10 O'Clock, you have to give.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
You cannot say like that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : It is not admitted.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
I begin and when I come to that we will see.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Confidential letters. . .

PROF. MADHU DANAVATE :
When you come to the bridge we will cross.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : In Calling Attention you cannot refer to names.

AN HON. MEMBER : He can.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Why not ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He can if he gives sufficient notice,

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
What is meant by 'sufficient' ? You tell us that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The Convention we are following, apart from rules.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
I do not know. If you want to specify time, you show me the Rule.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : At least one hour in advance of the commencement of the House.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
What is meant by sufficient ? You may tell me that.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I am defining this. It is one hour before the House starts.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
I gave it one hour before the Calling Attention. How can you define ? What is the rule ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No, no, this was not given by 10 O'Clock.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY :
Where is it written ? For this, nothing, no 10 O'Clock business.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I quote Direction 113(B) on page 71 :

"Notices of adjournment motions calling attention to matters of urgent public importance, motions of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers, . . .

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: No, no.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : "questions of privilege, or any other notice required to be given before the commencement of the sitting on the day on which the matter is proposed to be raised in the House, shall be given by 10.00 hours on that day."

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Before commencement of the sitting. Here notices which are required to be given before the commencement of the sitting of the House here in the Hand Book under 43 it is prior notice before the subject is taken up.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Prior notice. That is why Direction has been given.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : These are two different things altogether. Do not take away the rights of the Members as these are minimal.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No, I cannot allow you.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Such interpretations should not be there.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Let it be decided first.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Let it be decided first.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : No, no. Whatever we have got, as it is minimal rights. More and more they are restricting.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I rise on a point of order.

If you take the past precedents, even in the midst of debate that is going on, at that time, I have myself given to the Speaker that these are references which I am likely to make and I am giving the authentication; that I take the full responsibility of whatever it is.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : That is there.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : That was done in the course of the debate.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : It is clearly mentioned in the Direction.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : That is about the notices to be given. *(Interruptions)* These are various notices given. . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Even there where you want to refer you have to give sufficient time.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Even in the course of the debates also, it has been given Shri Unnikrishnan and I have given. . .

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Only previous intimation has to be given.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Direction 113B talks of notices.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Notice, Call Attention has also been mentioned here.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Kindly see notice of adjournment. Everything is given.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Call Attention, it is clearly mentioned.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He has to give intimation *(Interruptions)* There is a difference between intimation and advance notice.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : That is what I have given.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : What you are saying is with reference to Call Attention. He is not at all referring to that. In the course of any statement of speech or in the course of the debate if any one quotes from any paper, no one else has got right to get up and say that we would like that Paper to be laid on the Table of the House and if he has given in writing even during the course of the debate, it is perfectly all right. What you are saying is about the Call Attention notice.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No, this is when he is making some allegatory remarks against certain persons.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : What allegatory remarks? The document that I may refer to is the letter of the Director of the National Museum where he has indicted the Cultural Adviser.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He cannot refer to the names in allegatory sense.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : That is to go on record. What is there?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If there is an allegation it will not to on record.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : What allegation? I am not making any allegation. I want to know something.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You are involving certain persons.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : What is there in this?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : No, when it is a Confidential letter. . .

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : For that, I have given notice. I know that, Sir. I have given notice because this kind of obstruction may come in. I knew, I apprehended and I gave prior notice.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If you refer the name of any person and make allegation, I cannot allow because the person is not here. That is why, I can't allow.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Why? If the person is not here, what will you do for that?

(Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : He is not making any allegation.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I don't like, that is all, You carry on.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Sir, I will do what I want to do.

Sir, I am not taking much time to describe what has happened.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You have to take five minutes only for this.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Before beginning, I must congratulate one Bengali dally, *The Anand Bazar Patrika*, for bringing this to the notice of the people long ago, on 9th September. The details are with all of us—27 objects have been damaged and the damage cost would be to the tune of Rs. 38 crores as per the insurable value. That is the information. That is not the problem. Money cannot determine the value of the masterpieces. What I want to know is, we had a discussion before that you should not send certain things. A commitment was given that proper care would be taken. Now; the normal question that would come to anybody's mind is : Who are the people? Is there any Expert Committee appointed to decide about which items would be sent to these places? Who are they? Whether any opinion was heeded or flouted by somebody who acted arbitrarily and at his or her will decided certain things?

(Interruptions)

Sir, I have a document with me. This is a letter written by the Director of National Museum, Dr. L.P. Sihare, on October 21st, 1986. It beings like this :

“With reference to the letter from Shri Mani Shanker Iyer addressed to Shri Y.S. Das, Secretary, dated October 9, 1986, the additional factual position regarding the Didargun, Yakshi,

Mural of the Hukka and Golconda Roomal, is as follows :—

The expert committee appointed by Department of Culture, Ministry of Human Resources Development was totally against sending several rarest masterpieces including the Didargunj Yakshi to Washington D.C. . . .”

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Names won't go on record if there is an allegation.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He is quoting from the document, Sir.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : What allegation I am making ? I will lay it on the Table of the House

“As has been established now, without waiting for official decision of the Government of India as to whether or not such items should be sent, she had already made commitment in advance to the Director of National Gallery of Art.”

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : CBI inquiry should be made.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Now, Sir, it further states :

“Pressures were also brought on us to send the RAMPURVA BULL which is displayed at the Rashtrapathi Bhavan along with Didargunj Yakshi, which are the two greatest masterpieces of Mauryan Art of 3rd century B.C.”

The Chief Conservator of National Gallery for Art, Mr. Corey, said, ‘You won't touch it’.

Now, Sir, the Minister has said and it has been referred to, that certain things. . .

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : These are confidential matters. You cannot refer to them.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Then, what for this Parliament is ?

SHRI ANIL BASU : It may not be palatable to the Government.

But I do not understand why the Chair is not allowing.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : It is a common knowledge that nobody is denying the necessity of sending certain objects broad for exhibitions or cultural exchanges or good-will for which exhibition is arranged. But we have to apply our judicious mind as to which one we should send and which-one we should not. And everybody knows that the objects which may not have damages can be sent. But the very old objects. . .

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Is there any object which cannot be damaged, which is undamageable ?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Where the risk is involved, you should not send it. You cannot send a heart patient in the air to fly. Doctor says, don't fly.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : For instance, the Congressman!

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : In this case, the damage to the Yakshi seems to have been caused due to its very fragile polished surface and the character of delicate, soft and porous sand-stone which could not sustain the jerks, tension, etc. They flouted the expert committee opinion. Who is this authority which took this decision, I want to know. Why was this sent abroad, to show what ? One should not exhibit one's everything to everybody. Something which is delicate and sensitive should be kept concealed. We have rich heritage. With the use of judicious mind, certain things should have been concealed. That is an important thing. Why was this bankruptcy of enthusiasm, I want to know. Was it to show everything to placate somebody ? I do not know. In the name of culture, it

[Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary]

is destruction. We should get clear reply on this.

About Hooka, nobody has taken any care about it. We are talking about our heritage, culture and all this. Did we take the care it requires? Hooka was brought from Calcutta. It was handed over to the proper authority. But while packing it for sending abroad, the Munal was missing. Who was responsible for it. What enquiry has been made? Has anybody been found responsible and any action taken? While packing, it was found missing. Then, the person who received it, Miss Taneja, hurriedly left for Moscow without enquiring about the Munal where it is. Somebody has to take the responsibility. These are masterpieces which are invaluable.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : They took precaution. They filed a police report and forgot.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : That is too late also. Everything was delayed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Now, you put question, if any.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : I am talking about their carelessness. I may say about the Golconda Roomal, though it is not conneted with it. It was towards the end of 1983, the National Museum had to send it. The Roomal did not go. Where is this Roomal then? (*Interruptions.*) People who were there were thieves. Now; this Golconda Roomal when it was being shifted, proper listing was not made that this was also there. But, when it was missing nobody is responsible for all this? What kind of enquiry has been made, I want to know.

Another thing is, these are very valuable and important things and symbols of our past. We have to protect them. Not only have they been damaged but as I said, certain people are there whose intention is

to usurp certain things. They are thieves. Another example, I must give you. In Bisharpur Temple in Rajasthan one 2,000 years' old Shiv Ling was there. That was stolen and when the thieves were carrying it the vehicle went out of order. Pollee caught them. There was a Minister of Rajasthan.**

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No I would not allow you to quote that name. (*Interruptions.*) Don't bring in anything.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : You get the facts. The police were told by the Minister to give the Shiv Linga to certain people who will be worshipping. Then what happened? But when that was returned, it was duplicate not the original Shiv Linga made of Neelam. This kind of thing happened here also. There are reports of certain articles that when returned from the festival, they were duplicate and substitutes, and experts in the museum were asked to certify them and they refused to certify. I want to know whether this is a fact or not.

This is very important considering our linkage with the past, considering how we are looking at the future expansion and growth of our culture.

I want to know what kind of action we are to take against those who inflict such kind of damages. I have nothing to say anything personally against anybody. Somebody may be very old. I have respect for old age. But if instead of being the protector of our culture, one acts like the 'YAKSHI' of our culture, we have to take them to task and the hon. Minister has to give a concrete reply. I am not satisfied with departmental enquiry. Let there be concrete public enquiry to bring out the facts of what actually happened, who are responsible, what are missing, how we must take care of our things and how to decide what things to go and no to go. I will be laying this on the Table. I have given a copy. I conclude.

* Not recorded.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I will examine. That is all right.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : This is official document.

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO) : I am grateful to the hon. Members that when compared to the occasion when this matter exploded in both the Houses last time, issues have been narrowed down. I have given a whole history of the exchange of exhibitions between India and other countries. In view of that, this is nothing more than an on-going process, nothing new has been done in 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985 or 1986. Therefore, one aspect of whether we should have these exchanges or not has been more or less settled in the sense that this being an on-going process, until we decide that we do not want these exchanges, until we want to put a stop to these exchanges, until then, the exchanges would go on. We will get exhibitions from abroad here. We will send exhibitions to other countries from here. This, I think, will continue to be the method which we will follow, which we have followed so far.

Having said that and settled that point, the next question while we are sending these exhibitions, how do we send them, what is the care you take in order to save our art objects from being damaged ?

Our dictionaries are full of words. But there is a difference in the shade of meaning of each of these words. Damage is not destruction and destruction is not desecration. Depredation is another word starting from D and that is the only common thing between it and others.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am sorry a senior Minister like that is speaking with this degree of indifference. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : We are going into the basics. If the hon. Members co-operate, let us go into the

basics. Let us understand the difference between damage and destruction. I am sure in any number of laws damage and destruction have both been mentioned. If they had been identical, they would not have been mentioned separately. And desecration is something which has a very special connotation. Desecration, if anything, if I may submit to the hon. Members, has been happening in this country itself. It has not happened to our objects in any other country. One hon. Member also said that we have a great reverence for our art objects and we worship them. I really do not know if we really worship all the art objects in the National Museum here. Worship is, again, a different matter. Worship is done in a temple. Worship is done in a religious institution, religious centre where worship is allowed. We do not worship *Didarganj Yakshi*. We do not worship *Roomal, Munal and Kunal*. We have a certain reverence. What is it from India for which other countries have reverence ? Shall we really face this fact, face this question squarely ? If there is anything in India which is respected in all other countries uniformly, it is our culture, it is our heritage.

Sir, I had been to Seattle. I relate to hon. Members my own personal experience. The largest number of people, the Americans, the local people who congregated at the Exhibition were those who wanted to know the root of our science, in that portion of the exhibition where Aryabhata was shown ; in that portion where the discovery of Zero was described. They went there. They did not go to our modern sections because most of our modern sections are well, we get them from them. They did not have to see anything. Go to Germany or any of the Oriental Institutions in Germany you will find still the Ramayana, the Mahabharata, the Vedas and the Upanishads and all those great old texts being researched upon even today. They are not running after what we have in modern India; because modern India is something which is trying to come up to the levels of modern West. We are actually trying to catch up with them and to the extent we have done so we are proud of it. They

[Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao]

also feel happy but there is an element of patronising attitude there. But when it comes to heritage of 5000 years, they have nothing but reverence and respect. That is the kind of thing which we are trying to send abroad because goodwill is created thereby. These being the parameters, we want to see that whatever care needs to be taken, is taken.

Now, the next question is what do you send? What do you not send? I have given a description of what we cannot send under any circumstances. There are certain objects which we just do not want to send. We do not want to send them even temporarily. So we will just not send them. Then there are some objects which are in such fragile conditions that if we send them, they cannot come back without damage or even destruction. Therefore, we would not send them. Thirdly, there are some objects, idols etc. which are concerned with religious sentiments, of the people and in uprooting them and sending them abroad, we do not see any particular advantage. On the other hand there is great commotion in the country, a big hue and cry. Therefore, we would not like to send them. We have categorised article which cannot be sent. Among the articles which can be sent, there could be a difference of opinion. I can have my opinion. Mr. Jaipal Reddy could have his.

(Interruptions)

Therefore, apart from what has been done by the Government, I would like to know if there is any other way. Either stop the Exhibition—that is one way and that is not going to happen until we take such a decision; or while you are sending exhibits, you categorise some objects which cannot be sent, eliminate them; put them aside. Coming to the objects which can be sent, we have an Experts Committee. That Experts Committee give us an opinion whether something should be sent or not. I have said categorically in my statement that in spite of the Experts Committee's opinion—the opinion of the Experts

Committee in this country, not only in this but on all other matters, are taken into account—but the final decision rests with the Government. *(Interruptions)* Even where we can *(Interruptions)*... please listen to me, please go into this in greater detail. Where even we take a decision based on the Expert Committee recommendation, the responsibility is ours, it is not the responsibility of the Expert Committee. Experts can differ, experts can give different opinions. We have seen Expert Committees coming up with different opinions, legal experts give different opinions, art experts give different opinions.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Only one specific question Sir. Was there a difference among experts in regard to Deedarganj Yakshini? I stated this last year also that there was no difference of opinions among experts.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I have already answered this whether there is a difference or not. The final decision rests with the Government. That I have already said. I have said it in my statement. I have not glossed over it. I am not going to hide behind the Expert Committee.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : You might have seen our complaint was that the final decision was not taken even by the Government.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : It was taken by the Government.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : It was taken by the Chairperson who was not competent to take the decision.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I insist that it was the Government's decision. You can criticize the Government's decision. Don't bring a person into it. It is the Government's decision, you can criticize it. *(Interruptions)* . . . I am taking responsibility for the decision from whichever quarter it came.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : If you go on putting questions like this, how can I run the House ? How can the Minister reply ?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : He is very accommodative, don't worry.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He may be accommodative, but I cannot allow. I won't allow.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : If you cannot accommodate, I will not hide behind you. I am prepared to come out with all the facts,

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Why the Expert Committee reports are being violated and on what basis ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I will tell you that the Expert Committee reports are not flouted always, but they are not followed always also. They need not be. (*Interruptions*) . . . I thought that we were really going about it logically. If it is again taken into by-lanes I have no objection . . . (*Interruptions*) . . . I am trying to argue . . . (*Interruptions*) . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He clearly told that it is a Government's decision. It is not the Chairperson's decision. If at all there is anything, you ask him. Why are you bringing other persons in ?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : I am on a point of order Sir. When I raised this issue last year, the Minister who answered the question was Mr. K.P. Singh Deo. I would have asked his resignation, but he has since been dismissed. What shall I do ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : This is not a point of order.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : It is all right. I can give some credit to Mr. Jaipal Reddy if that is any consolation to him. They can always raise these matters

before the event and say, "did we not tell you this," after the event. This is always there. It is like some journals which go on predicting and predicting and out of hundred things if two things happen, then saying did we not tell you ? This is that kind of a thing. I very readily concede the credit of having raised this issue to Mr. Jaipal Reddy. If he only tries to follow my logic, because we are trying to come to some conclusion, he would know that this is not a matter of rhetoric or anything like that. The logic is Government is taking a decision and not the experts. I would put a hypothetical question. Suppose there had been a unanimous decision to send a thing and that is damaged, would you condone ?

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : We would try to know whether that could not be avoided.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : We do not condone, but we can understand.

AN HON. MEMBER : If a patient dies after taking every care, what could one do ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : That is what I am saying that every care has been taken. (*Interruptions*) We are mixing two things. One is the care aspect and the other is the authority aspect. Let us not mix them. So far as the authority aspect is concerned Government takes the authority and the responsibility. So far as the care aspect is concerned we say according to what has come to our notice all care was taken but I agree . . . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : The care was not taken properly. The person in-charge was merry-making. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please sit down. Let the Minister complete,

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I am coming to the point on which there is a controversy. On the authority side I have taken the responsibility and it is Government's decision. There the matter ends. On the care side I have also said from past experience we will have to improve the care that has to be taken. I have said that in my statement. There is always room for improvement. So far as we are concerned we have gone into it. In regard to this Munal which was lost here and which did not leave the shores of India there is an investigation.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : How long ! Eighteen months have passed since the complaint was filed.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Mr. Reddy will know there are no time-limits for investigation. *(Interruptions)* Things could be discovered after two years. I am not an astrologer. After I am satisfied that it is untraceable I will come to this House and say it is untraceable, it has been lost in the National Museum in Delhi and we are going to fix responsibility and punish the person concerned. *(Interruptions)*

Many things are lost in this world. When they are lost you do not go about beating your breast. Certain steps are taken after they are lost but we are not still convinced that they are lost finally. We are taking steps. I went into this case especially because I expected these things would be raised. I have not come to the conclusion that the time has come when I should report to the House that it is untraceable and lost. When that time comes I assure the Members that I will not keep them in suspense.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Why did the Government over-rule the expert committee ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : We do not give reasons for the Government over-ruling the expert committee.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : If you over-rule and a particular thing happens then you have to take the responsibility.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Sir, I rise on a point of order. Under the system of parliamentary democracy the executive, namely, the Government is accountable, answerable to Parliament and the Minister says that he will not narrate the reasons why the Government over-ruled the expert committee.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : There is no point of order.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : The expert committee opinion was that this particular things should not be sent. Government over-ruled them.

*(Interruptions)***

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Nothing goes on record. There is no point of order.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : There is no point of order in this. Government takes into account all relevant factors before taking a decision and it was done in this case also . . . *(Interruptions)*.

In respect of all these objects, Government did not come to the conclusion that they are fragile, that they cannot be sent. They did not come to that conclusion. They came to the conclusion that they can be sent. This is all hindsight that is taking place here . . . *(Interruptions)* Something has been done and now you ask me why that was done . . . *(Interruptions)*. We can differ from the expert committee . . . *(Interruptions)*.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please take your seats. If you go on shouting like this, how can he finish ? This is calling attention.

Mr. Minister, you wind up if they are not listening.

*Not recorded.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : In the case of an object, we have to set off one thing against another. There is a Committee, there are negotiations for instance with the USSR. Dr. Sahare has given to the USSR authorities a list of what we would like to have from the USSR. Same thing happened from the other side. We come to an agreement and sometimes we say : "Look, we cannot part with these things". They also say that they cannot part with certain things, Whatever is agreed upon between the two parties will be sent. In the exhibition in question Certain things were demanded and certain things were suggested for being sent there. On that question, the Expert Committee and the Government have certain inherent differences. The view of an expert who naturally wants the thing not to go from here, who wants the thing to be in the National Museum itself is a little different. Please appreciate that . . . (*Interruptions*). I want this to be appreciated. This is something which will be useful for all time. The point of view of an Expert Committee and the point of view of a Government which takes an overall decision cannot always be identical. They can be and are most of the time, but not invariably. It is possible that the Government in the normal course says : "All right, the Expert Committee does not want it to go, we need not let it go." But in each case, the Government follows its own criteria. The criteria are much wider than those followed by the Expert Committee. This is precisely what I want the hon. Members to appreciate. In a particular case a country may want a particular object to be sent. They know something about that object as we know about their objects. Dr. Sahare feels that something coming from Russia would have a great value of appreciation in this country, in that case, as far as possible, it will be the endeavour of the USSR Government to oblige us. In the same way, if some object has been particularly named by them, it will be our endeavour to oblige them to the extent possible unless we are convinced that that object is so fragile that it is absolutely impossible to send it, only then we have to take another decision.

I have already said that the Government's parameters for decision may or may not coincide with the expert Committee in all cases. I am very clear about it. There is no mincing of words in that case . . . (*Interruptions*). It is not a political decision . . . (*Interruptions*). It may be a diplomatic decision in a way. Anyway, there is a political decision involved in it because it is between two countries.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : You decided to send Rampurva Bull to Washington DC, but the Director, National Modern Art Gallery, Washington, told you not to remove it from Rashtrapati Bhavan, and, therefore, it was not sent . . . (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I want to be absolutely clear. I do not want anything to be left unsaid. Government reserve to itself the power including the power to take a decision on the basis of considerations, which may not be exactly the same as the considerations which weigh with the Expert Committee. Let it be absolutely clear. Let it be clear to the country ; let it be clear to Parliament. I have not . . . (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Saifuddin Chowdhary, how many people can speak ? You are speaking ; he is speaking. What is this ? So many people are speaking. No, no. How can he answer ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I have understood their question. I want to answer it. Mr. Saifuddin, please sit down. I am answering the question. There is no need for any interruption. I am prepared to face all the points. I am prepared to clarify all the points. Now what is being said, in effect, is that about an expert committee being final. But even according to the Indian Evidence Act, the opinion of an expert has certain limitations.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Why ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Yes ; I will show a pile of decisions of the Supreme Court. I think Somnath Ji would bear me out, that an expert's opinion cannot be taken as final. It has to be taken as a parameter, in coming to a decision.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : The political authority must apply its mind.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO ; Yes ; that is what I am saying. The authority has applied its mind to all the recommendations of the experts committee. In some cases, on the recommendation of the experts committee, we have said that certain things shall not go. *(Interruptions)* No ; I have already given you the number. *(Interruptions)* We are on a serious subject ; we want to have this out. You see, I have already said in my statement : "Regarding articles a, b, c and d, on the recommendation of the experts committee, we said : these will not go. Regarding articles e, f and g, in spite of the recommendation of the experts committee, Government decided, in view of the considerations Government had, i.e. between two countries, between two nations, between two Governments, that they should go. *(Interruptions)* This is a matter which rests with the Government. Whether you agree or not, is not the question. *(Interruptions)* Yes ; the question is : Government has taken a decision. It is a Government decision, Sir. There is no doubt about that. It is a Government decision, and we stick to that decision.

I am also very clear in my mind that for future also, we can always discuss what more can be taken ; we can always discuss where things have gone wrong. We are looking into that. We would like to minimize as far as possible the damage ; but I have said it in so many words that damage cannot be completely ruled out. In fact, damage cannot be completely ruled out even from a site of excavation to the site of the museum. In this country, damage has been done, even while transshipping an object from one place to another. If within the country it cannot

be ruled out, how can you rule it out in the case of another country ? But we would like to have as far as possible, as far as it is humanly possible, within the powers of the Government, to ensure that. . . *(Interruption)*

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Have you made a list of the objects ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Why do you go from one end to the other ? If you want to know anything about the factual listing, and not listing, I am prepared to give you that information. We are on a different point. We are on a basic point.

*(Interruptions)***

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No ; Mr. Jaipal Reddy, I will not allow anything to go on record. Whatever it is, I will not allow. I cannot allow this kind of things. It should not be done like this. There is a limit for that. You go on putting questions, when the Minister is replying on a Calling Attention. How will he answer that ? No. This is not the way. Three persons are standing and putting questions. How can he answer ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Sir, I will wind up now. Yes, Mr. Jaipal Reddy.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : Is it not a fact that we did not have any reciprocal arrangement with the United States. . . .

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : Yes ; I have already said. I have said that.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : . . . while we are preferring to have such an arrangement with USSR, Japan and other countries ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I have said that. I have said that. . . *(Interruptions)*

** Not recorded.

KUMARI MAMATA BANERJEE: These questions do not arise.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No ; Mamata Ji, he is putting questions, and the Minister is answering them. Why are you interrupting ? Without his putting the questions, how will the Minister answer ? Mr. Tiraky, now you put your question.

SHRI PIYUS TIRAKY: He has already admitted that some articles have been stolen and missing ; and they have appointed an investigating agency. Has the investigating agency the scope to find out the missing articles world-wide, because we apprehend some interested persons might have stolen and sold them somewhere ?

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I have taken full note of your apprehension. (*Interruptions*) Earlier during these long series of exhibitions, we have received exhibitions from to those countries ; we have sent exhibitions those countries, but it was not strictly on a reciprocal exhibition to exhibition basis. I have made this clear in the House and I am making this clear in this House that so far we did not make it strictly reciprocal. Now we have made it strictly reciprocal beginning with the USSR although I must say that from each of these other countries, we did receive of exhibitions. There is no unilateral thing with any country. We had it from Italy, we had it from Japan ; we had it from USA ; we had it from USSR, all these countries and France ; with all the other countries, we did have exhibitions at different times.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : We did not have anything with Smithsonian Institution which is the most prestigious Institution.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : I am talking of USA and not Smithsonian Institution. It is in USA. That is why we are talking to the Government of USA exactly for the same reason ; for the same

reason as Mr. Jaipal Reddy adduced. We are talking to the Government of Smithsonian, and they do not have a separate government ; so there cannot be diplomatic relations between us and the Smithsonian. This being a on-going process, it will go until a decision to the contrary is taken by the government. (2) We will take all steps to see that greater care than hitherto is taken to see that damage is minimised ; (3) As far as possible, probably even rigidly we have come to the conclusion that it has to be reciprocal, but there is a built in weakness in reciprocity limitation that if another country does not have anything comparable to send to us, then, necessarily, it becomes one sided. We have 5000 years history. It is quite possible that some other countries may not have that long heritage or a history. So, if you say reciprocal, article for article, I want something which is 5000 years old, they will have to smuggle it from here and send it back to us in their exhibition. So, that is another parameter. The other thing is whatever has happened, I have not said that everything has been perfect. There have been lapses ; those lapses are being gone into ; some which have been missing here ; that is being investigated. We will also see—in fact I said in my statement that we are awaiting a final report ; after the final report comes. . .

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : This government should offer an apology.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : No.

SHRI SAIFUDDIN CHOWDHARY : Why not ?

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : You have agreed in the House Committee to an enquiry. We will prove that.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : If you have any information you give it to me. If they have, any information, they are welcome to give it to me. I have taken a full account of the whole thing. I have said it is a government decision. There is no occasion for any apology. These things have to be expected ; this is a part of the whole process. There is no question of

[Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao]

apology. I have given all the parameters. We stick to the parameters; we stick to these decisions. The only one thing which is to be added. . . (Interruptions) No; no, there is no House Committee. I think the House Committee has met here. We know what the House Committee is going to say from your side. There is no need. (Interruptions).

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : It is a reflection to the House.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : No, Sir. What is it.

Mr. Somnath, don't go into trivialities. (Interruptions).

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : We have regard for you. In the midst of agoay you should not say such things.

SHRI P.V. NARASIMHA RAO : No, no. I am not saying anything out of the way. What I am saying is that I have got the best opinion of the best experts in the House. If there are any more opinions, I welcome them. I will take them. I shall go into them. We are going into the matter to the extent it is possible. There is no question of any House Committee. I am not going to have any House Committee. This much I have stated. These are our parameters. These are going to be our parametrs.

I only wanted to add one thing. I am not claiming—I did not claim—that what all needed to be done has been done in this, much more needs to be done. We will go into that. By experience we will learn and that is what we are going to do.

13,27 hrs.

LOKPAL BILL

Motion Re : Report of Joint Committee—Extension of Time

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH RATH (Aska) : I beg to move :—

“That this House do further extend upto the last day of the Budget Session, 1987, the time for presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill to provide for the appointment of a Lokpal to inquire into allegations of corruption against Union Ministers and for matters connected therewith.”

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motion moved :

“That this House do further extend upto the last day of the Budget Session, 1987, the time for presentation of the Report of the Joint Committee on the Bill provide for the appointment of a Lokpal to inquire into allegations of corruption against Union Ministers and for matters connected therewith.”

The motion was adopted.

13.28 hrs.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

[English]

- (i) Need to persuade the Government of Karnataka to release at least 50 TMC of water from reservoirs to Tamil Nadu

SHRI S. SINGARAVADIVEL (Thanjavur) : The farmers in Cauvey Delta in Thanjavur and Trichy districts in Tamil Nadu are facing severe irrigation problems. Agriculture in this areas has been affected adversely almost continuously over the period of last 19 years on account of irregular and inadequate supply of water for irrigation caused by the impending dispute over the sharing of cauvery water. The water which is to be released from Mettur Dam on 12th of June every year was