

जमीन लेनी पड़ेगी। लेकिन आज हमारे सामने सवाल यह पैदा हो रहा है कि जो गांव हैं उन में सुविधाएँ नहीं हैं इस लिये लोग शहरों में आ रहे हैं।

जमीन ख़ूब तो नहीं है वह तो बढ़ नहीं सकती। पापुलेशन तेजी से बढ़ती जा रही है। अगर गांवों में उनके इन्फ़्लायमेंट के लिए हम कोई दूसरे साधन वहां उपलब्ध नहीं कराएंगे तो उन्हें शहरों में ही आना पड़ेगा। (समय की घंटों) इसलिए यह जरूरी है कि ग्रामीण आंचलों में नये-नये रोज़गार उपलब्ध कराये जायें और ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों की जो आवश्यकताएँ हैं उन्हें भी पूरा करें। मेरी राय में खेती से संबंधित जो उद्योग हैं वे गांवों में ही लगें तथा उनकी रोज़मर्रा की जरूरतों की वस्तुएं ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में ही बनें। केवल तभी गांव के लोगों का शहर में जाना रुक सकेगा।

आपने मुझे दो मिनट का समय दिया इसके लिये धन्यवाद।

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION ON THE POINTS ARISING OUT OF THE ANSWER GIVEN IN THE RAJYA SABHA ON THE 12TH NOVEMBER, 1986 TO STARRED QUESTION 124, REGARDING ART OBJECTS FOR THE FESTIVAL OF INDIA

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI (Maha-<sup>\*</sup> rashtra): I am grateful to the Chairman for allowing us to discuss this vital question, which was discussed during the last two or three weeks. It is regarding sending of some priceless architectural objects abroad. At that time the Chair had desired that we should have a half-an-hour discussion so that the Members can raise pertinent points. Sir, I assure you I want to raise the level of this discussions. I am not interested to level personal criticisms against x, y or z. But I must say that I am agitated particularly over the manner in which the new blitz krieg on culture is being unleashed in this country during the last two years, and there has been a sudden upsurge in the cultural exposition of our monuments and priceless articles abroad. I am just trying to 1388 R. S. —11

follow its logic. In this connection would like to draw the attention of the hon. Minister to a discussion held in the Lok Sabha last year on 16-4-1985, when these objects were on their way to USA. The Minister of State in the Ministry of Personnel at that time had replied to the debate. I would like to peruse that debate and highlight what was found out in that debate. But before doing that I would like to say that the 'Festivals' whether they are held in USA, France, Japan or even in USSR, as it is being held there now, are meant to project the Indian culture and heritage of immense importance. But what is the result? I am sorry to say it is a public relations exercise of projecting some images. I will go to that point later, but now I would point out that in the process, it seems, various articles from the Harappan period, Maurya period Gupta period, Kushan period, Chola period etc. have been sent abroad. Here I would like to quote what the hon. Minister had stated in that debate. He said: "There is no question of sending some of our priceless things." This is what the Minister has stated in his reply to an hon. Member on that day. Then, Sir, suddenly the articles have already been despatched. So my point is: who was responsible for the despatch? The Minister has also mentioned in the discussion that there was some procedure in sending these articles. Some two weeks back the Minister himself said that there is a committee which consists of the Director of archaeology and other experts like Karl Khandelwala, Dr. Sunder Rajan, etc. We are really lucky and grateful to the late Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

Sir, even the rarest of the articles like "Pasupathi" and "Buddha" from Patna were on the way. Actually the Commissioner of Indian Culture ordered that these should also be sent. She has given instructions to send these articles. But protests were made by various experts and these articles were stopped. That is why this country saved at least one or two rare articles.

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

Sir, about Deedarganj Yakshi, once Rabindranath Tagore said that Deedarganj Yakshi is a crowning achievement of the Indian culture. This Deedarganj Yakshi got a scratch on her cheek. This is what has happened.

The Minister has also stated in his reply to the hon. Member that certain objects have been excluded and this is only an insignificant contour. But I want to say is that Deedarganj Yakshi and other articles have already left this country for U. S. A. and got damaged and came back and whatever the Minister has stated in the other House remained only in the books of the Lok Sabha.

Then, Sir, the idol of Rama from Parithur....

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): Not Parithur but Paruthiyur.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: I am sorry, I cannot pronounce your names properly.

TMs idol was to be transferred, but there were protests from the people of that area because "Ram Navami" festival was going on. I am told that the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister has also protested. I do not know whether he ultimately acquiesced to the directive.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: It was not sent.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: That is very fine. We are lucky.

In this connection I also want to raise about some other articles, because there is a large literature and critical observations by various newspapers and magazines like the "Indian Express", "Maharashtra Times", "India Today" and "Current". I do not want to quote all those things. But I only read the headings what they have written.

The Chairperson of that organising committee was called "Czarina". This is one. It was said that her critics viciously label her "Cultural Attila" of the Huns period. This is second.. Again \* in "India Today". ' a very nice article was written.

THE MINISTER OF HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT AND MINISTER OF HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Are you raising the debate'ta a high level?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Yes, that level is coming but the point is—Mr-Minister, unless the role of the Chairperson, the arrogance of the Chairperson is brought in, this debate will not

be completed. My basic point is about 4 the culture. I am not concerned with who is concerned but the point is—suppose, you as a Minister tomorrow order for something which is not in the interest of the country, then, it is our genuine and sanguine right to bring that fact before this House. Though when I mean, I want to raise the level, I am not alleging any personal motives. That is what I want to say. But what the newspapers have stated, I have to quote because otherwise the Members will not correctly appreciate.

Then Sir, there it seems, there is another aspect of this. All along, the Director of Archaeology, Mr. Sihare (*Interruption*). I do not know his name

SHRIMATI JAYANTI NATARA/AN (Tamil Nadu): No, he is the Director of National Museum.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: He has raised certain objections. He had; a cross dialogue with the Chairperson as to why should it not be sent, why should it be kept here, what protection should be taken etc. Then Karl Khandelwala observations are there. Then, ultimately, one Archaeologist, Dr. Sunder Ranjan has stated that all these articles are very important. But the point is—they have to be seen in the origin of the country from where

they come. They look better there, instead of taking risks and taking these priceless articles abroad.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, in an article in 'Maharashtra Times', very recently an interview was taken with the Chairperson and I found from the interview that the attitude which has been seen in this is so egoistic that it is stated: "What is there? These articles go, does not matter—we have got an exchange." Then the correspondent asked that Chairperson, Madam, the people are very poor on this side and so many crores of rupees are being spent. "Is it not proper? We perform Ram-lila, we perform Gokulasthmi. There are Embassies abroad. Expenditure of a country goes on." Madam, I am coming to the point. There must be some priorities for the expenditure of the Government of India and on this, j idea, we have got a difference of opinion with this Government and particularly, with your department. That is why, I say, Sir, that now the Minister "will be better equipped with the information because this discussion took place one year back. I want to know whether agreements were done with U. S. A., France and now with U. S. S. R. about the safety of the articles and their commitment to send their rarest pieces in this country? This is a point which I want to know because here this. Chairperson has stated, many countries send articles here. But, Sir, if I am right, and from whatever I could gather from various articles that I read is that France in previous period had refused to send Mona Lisa from Louvre De Paris.

Prof. Nurul Hussain was the Minister of Education -when this conflict came up. Then, in U. S. A. it is, the same thing. The other points which I want to say is when these articles I are sent, Mr. Minister, we again say, we want to have a discussion on a higher level but the difficulty is, when the Chairperson moves on a rider-les, horse what can be done. Mr. Minister, in the USA when that "Apple" exhibition was held—what I

that exhibition was called, I do not remember correctly—certain quotations were given. Quotations in this country are usually given of Rabindranath Tagore, Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Nehru and Dr. Radhakrishnan. There are many persons in this country who have said something on these quotations given in the Calendar of Events circulated in the USA. Here, Sir, the quotations given were not of these great idols of this country, as I may call them, but of the Chairperson in her own name as Pupul Jayakar. Am I right on that? I want to know thij from you. Mr. Narasimha Rao perhaps our thinking and our approach to God might be the same. I do hope so. What she has said about Lord Shiva—as the Calendar says—I do not know whether you have that information with you. We understand, Sir, Lord Shiva as a fabulous incarnation of non-dimension God. But, Sir, this Chairperson—what culture she has herself inherited, God knows—has stated. "He is an erotic ascetic." I am really flabbergasted. If Lord Shiva can be described as an erotic ascetic, what is the culture of this country? What is the God whom we are worshipping? So this type of callousness, total callousness, total vulgar exhibition of ego has been seen in all these exhibitions which have been organised abroad. As for this blitzkrieg which is now being unleashed, which is being dumped on this country, I do not think regimentation of culture by a fiat of the Government will lead us anywhere. The Government cannot bring, by any law, the culture to, what you call, a higher level among the students or the people of this country.

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, many other speakers want to take part in this discussion and I am allotted only 25 minutes. Sir, I am told that Zonal Cultural Centres are being organised in the Seventh Plan and an investment of Rs. 70 crores is expected to be made on these cultural activities or blitzkrieg, whatever you may call it, in whatever good words you may call it. I may not be able to get so many nice words to call it. But I just make a

[Shri A. G. Kulkarni]

hurried calculation. At present in this country, for the second consecutive year we have drought conditions in the southern States and flood damage in the northern States. Last year in the drought we found out that about Rs. 10, 000 are required to have one pump-set or a borewell. I can say that this expenditure, when 40 per cent of the people are living below the poverty-line, would really be useful for crores of people could get fresh drinking water. Is it necessary that we should have this type of cultural exhibitions or this type of consumerism? Sir, here I am really surprised about one thing. Mr. Mani Shankar Iyer -I do not know who he is—says that he wants to change the lumpen mass and make them have cultural ideas so that they will be elevated in their minds. This is what Mr. Mani Shanker Iyer said. "The Prime Minister's aide, Mr. Mani Shanker Iyer... " s—Oh! He is a Prime Minister's, aide. I thought he is some advertising man. Really I did not know who he was. I do not want to ridicule him. He might be an intellectual giant, God knows. — "... says, the intention is to divert the lumpen from the cinema to folk art". Mr. Minister, our whole life is spent in folk art itself. Right from birth we are having dances in our rural areas. I do not want to be taught, I do not want to be shown, folk art in Delhi bringing all these artistes, 6000 artistes, and organising an *opna utsav* and spending Rs. 10 crores. It is something callous, waste of money...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:  
That is from a higher level. You have gone to a different subject.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: You must understand the higher level, our emotion and our agitation. What higher level is it? I can only say cultural exchanges should be there but at what cost? In the statement it has been mentioned that various articles have

been either missing or damaged— Kunal handkerchief etc. And from the reply which was given I calculated, the damage came to Rs. 35 crores. The point I want to make is henceforth at least the views of the experts, particularly the Director of the National Museum, the committee, etc. should be scrupulously followed, no politics should be injected and no single person should be authorised to take a decision against the wishes of experts in this matter. There are various articles. I am not going to take the time of the House mentioning them. But there is one article. Shah Jahan's *fonaal*. It is not included here, but in other reports, in the CBI reports, it is mentioned that they are inquiring into how this Jahangir's or Shah Jahan's *rumaal* has been missing. Then there is mention of small scratches, etc. You gave a reply. Mr. Minister. You know, beauty is beauty. Just because there is a small scratch, the beauty will not be lost. In Mona Lisa's figure her nose is cut a little. Does it cease, being Mona Lisa and does it become something else? The question is: How are you going to protect them from damage? It is said here that escorts were sent, insurance was taken, etc. Now, is this Rs. 35 crores going to be recovered? And how? How much is stolen in US? Because, I do not believe in that country. They will remain silent. These are priceless articles. Therefore, I feel you do have these cultural exchanges but have them inside this country; don't have a leap abroad. We are very poor people. We cannot afford the cost. Mr. Minister, come to the practical platform where the priority is to remove poverty rather than go in for a Blitzkreig like this. We do not need these cultural exchanges. We have inherited enough culture right from our forefathers from thousands of years back. Whether it was Zar or Zarina, her directions are not necessary for us and for the people. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): Now, the Minister. Yes, Mr. Narasimha Rao.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO:  
I have been let off so easily?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): You have to reply first, according to the rules here, and then they will seek clarifications.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: If the Minister replies first, that would be better.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I thought that all the honourable Members would be giving me the benefit of their advice first.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): I also thought like that. But I am told that the convention is that the Minister replies first and then the others ask for clarifications.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I think it would be better if they ask for clarifications first and then I reply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: YES, YES.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): I think that would be better.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I agree. I hope the other honourable Members also agree to this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Yes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): In that case, I will call Mr. Gopalsamy now. Yes, Mr. Gopalsamy.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, with a painful heart, I would like to say.....

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Do not say anything about heart. The Health Minister is sitting here.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, actually I wanted to tell only this thing first: Our honourable Minister, Shri Narasimha Rao, is a person for whom I have got the greatest respect. He is the champion of the cherished ideals of protecting our heritage and civilization, and the philosophy of our own country. So, Sir, I think you will share my views.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): Just a minute. I would like to quote the relevant rule regarding Half-an-Hour Discussion for the information of the honourable Members.

"Half-an-hour' Discussion—Rule 65:

A Member who has given notice may make a short statement and the Minister concerned shall reply shortly. Any Member who has previously intimated to the Chairman may be permitted to put questions for the purpose of further elucidating any matter."

This is the rule and this is the convention. Anyhow, I am calling Members to speak now. Yes, Mr. Gopalsamy.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Sir, when I said, "with a painful heart", I was really pained because our honourable Minister, Shri Narasimha Rao said something. But, on the floor, of this very House, I initiated a debate last year through a Calling Attention Motion on the very same subject of sending our priceless art objects to the "United States in the name of the Festival of India. At that time, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, Shri Jaswant Singh, myself and some others of this House strongly protested against this and criticised the policy of the Government of sending these priceless and valuable treasures of this country and we said that they should not be moved out at all. I do not agree, with Mr. Kulkarni because the honourable Minister picked up one point and asked whether they should be moved inside or moved for domestic exchanges or something like that. They should not be touched at all. These treasures should not be touched at all and they should be preserved.

Art objects, dating back to the Harappan Age, Maurya Age, Gupta Age, Kushan Age and up to the Chola Age, were sent. But what happened? Actually, an Expert Committee, at that time gave its views and said that many of these works of art should not have been allowed to go out of this country as they were priceless treasures. This was the view of the Expert committee. Even then these art objects were sent. We in this House and Mr. Unnikrishnan and Mr. Jaipal Reddy in the Lok Sabha warned the Government and protested and here on the floor of this House we said that these art pieces should

[Shri V. Gopalsamy]

not be sent at all. But what we expected and forewarned has now happened. At that time, we pointed out that there was every possibility of damage. Here I want to get one point clarified because Mr. Kul-karni was referring to the idols of the Paruthiyur Kalyanasundareswarar Temple in Tamil Nadu. When those idols were about to be sent, the Sankaracharya of Kanchi also protested and, Sir, a case also was filed in the High Court and the people throughout Tamil Nadu were very much agitated. Many articles appeared in the Press, saying that the Rama Navami festival was being celebrated without Rama. At that point of time, I stated on the floor of this House that you should not send these idols. The Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu did not give his consent at all. I want to put the record straight. But when he was in the hospital in America, the Indian Ambassador persuaded, rather pressurised; then Mrs. Pupul Jayakar from the Government side stated; we have got the consent of Tamil Nadu. When I pointed out this thing, about taking all these idols to the United States. Sir, millions and millions go to temples. They worship God. I am a rationalist, because I belong to D. M. K. But I respect the feelings of those people. They think that even a stone of the compound wall of a temple gets sanctity; it is their feeling. Then, at that time the then Minister, Mr. Singh Deo. stated that they had been insured. I asked him; is there any insurance for sentiments? Could the insurance be a substitute for sentiments? Sir, it will be interesting to point out during the lunch interval, because throughout the discussion Mr. Kamalapati was listening to the debate with rapt attention, he talked to the Minister; "What are you doing, what foolish things are you stating and is it not ridiculous to send idols. stating and is it not ridiculous to send idols to foreign countries? Instead of exporting commodities are you exporting these goods? Mr. Kulkarni spoke about an erotic ascetic which was described in the United

States. Sir, in the Washington Post there was a damaging write-up. They criticized it by saying that the Chinese had ping-pong diplomacy in the previous years, now the

Indians have started their diplomacy, displaying the acrobatics of Siva. And 1 by the side of the write-up, a cartoon of Nataraja was picturised. Anyhow, those idols they had not sent. But, Sir, since Mr. Narasimha Rao will not tolerate any such thing, I am drawing his attention to this matter.

Damage could happen. Now, damage has happened due to neglect and callousness, I can say. Even if there is no neglect, there is no callousness, there is every possibility of damage; that is my point. Even though Vrad the people who were entrusted with these art objects been very careful, there was a possibility of damage, because when the art pieces were sent to lapan they were all sent in one flight. Now the report says that these art pieces that were taken in a truck got damaged due to tempests or something<sup>1</sup> like that. Damage took place; My point is not about the callousness and negligence. Ever if you show the utmost care, when you are taking these things there is every possibility of damage. So the Government has committed an unpardonable blunder. A wrong has been committed. Who is actionable for this? About two thousand or three thousand years ago these art pieces were found. Who is responsible for this? At least 27 of the rare statues and paintings have returned with visible scars of damage. The rarest of them all—the famous Didarganj Yakshi carved out of sandstone by Mauryan sculptors 2, 200 years ago and currently valued at Rs. 25 crores—has now a pock-mark size chip on her left cheek. I don't agree with this valuation "Now it has a pock-mark size chip on her left cheek. " The question is not where the damage is and whether it will be beautiful or not. That is not my point. It looks beautiful or it does not look beautiful. That is not my point. Any amount of damage to these priceless invaluable treasures is an uneompensa-table damage. "The magnificent 5th-century A. D. Chalukyan Flying Gan-dharva has a deep gash below the right leg of the female figure. " I am quoting from the latest issue of India Today. "The exquisite 5th-century A. D. Man-kuwar Buddha belonging to the Gupta period has scratches on the lobes of its right ear. " I want to know whether this report is a fact or not. "A 3000-year old

black plaster cast bull, one of the rarest discoveries of its kind, had a part of its horn shorn off. The 16th century Devi Mahatmya series of paintings had a hole in one of them and pieces of brown paper stuck on others. And half a dozen ancient terracotta figures that reflect the maturity of early Indian art have new chips and cracks—modern day contributions to the country's heritage. "Against the wishes of these experts, Mr. Khandelwala and others, these pieces were taken. It was against their wishes. The curators from the United States came here like raiders of our museums. They came here like raiders. They raided our museums.

Sir, it is a country which produced great Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru who projected the image of India. Pandit Nehru projected the image of India and our ancient heritage, culture and civilisation through his book, the *Discovery of India*. But what did the Government do through this ridiculous action. We have taken all these pieces of art from one corner of this country to another corner of the globe—Japan and then to the United States and France—like street vendors. Now we are going to send these things to Soviet Russia like street vendors. My point is that the damage could be done. This is the point. Mr. Narasimha Rao will not tolerate it because more than us, he has got the greatest love, affection and respect for all these pieces of art of our heritage. I want to stress that when you are sending or handling these pieces, such things should not happen any more. What are we going to do? The Minister said that they would be covered by insurance. But money was not a substitute. So, all these 27 of the rare statues and paintings have been damaged. No country will tolerate this thing. Sir, reciprocal exhibitions were promised at that time. May I know from the Government what sort of exhibitions the United States conducted here? One expert has stated that what we have got here; is nothing but garbage from the United States. Sir, it is as if we are going to dismantle even Taj Mahal and put it in a plane and take it somewhere so that the viewers could see the Taj Mahal. Let them come here. They should come here and

see. You make propaganda that we have got such and such valuable pieces in our country, a country with ancient heritage, culture, art and architecture which they cannot find anywhere in the world and that they can come and see it in our land. That should be our attitude. The place of origin is here. Let them come here and see those valuable pieces here. Therefore, Sir, I am not going to ask you because some of my friends will ask you as to what action you are going to take. Anyway, you will give some answer. Damage is damage. Whatever action you may take, whoever may be asked to give some explanation or something like that, the damage or what has happened cannot be compensated. Therefore, these art pieces should not be sent at all hereafter. That should be the attitude of the Government. You make propaganda. You can go to the Soviet Union and you can have your exhibition with photographs....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): The hon. Member's speech is interesting. Yet, I have to remind him about the time.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Just one more minute. Sir.

Therefore, Sir, our hon. Minister should appreciate our feelings. These art pieces should not be sent hereafter anywhere. Let the people come here, the place of origin. That is my request. I hope the hon. Minister will accept our demand.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATA-RAJAN: Mr., Vice-Chairman, Sir, in my humble opinion, it is not only the image of India that is important and an issue but also the issue of protecting the images themselves. And it is in this context that I rise to share a few thoughts about the damage that has occasioned such wide controversy.

Sir, I also had an occasion to read the debates that took place last year before these objects were sent, and it was clear that a great controversy raged over whether priceless artefacts dating back to three or four thousand years should be sent out of

[Shrimati Jayanihai Natrajan]

the country. And at that time, it was also stated that a Committee of Experts has been constituted to see that no damage would be done and that insurance was also being organised to see that these priceless artefacts were protected. Sir, now, I think, the time has come when we can no longer debate the issue. The question has once and for all been answered, and the answer is not a satisfactory answer. It is very painful to all of us that damage has been caused. It is immaterial as to who was responsible. And I agree respectfully<sup>1</sup> with the hon. Member who spoke before me when he said that it is immaterial; it cannot be compensated in terms of money. And the question of who was responsible is not an issue here. What is an issue is that no matter what action we have taken to protect it, we did not actually protect these priceless artefacts which are, in fact damaged. One point that might be relevant at this juncture is that in the reports, the Government themselves have accepted that 27 articles have been damaged in one way or the other.

Sir, if you take into account the Deedarganj Yakshi alone, it is 5 ft. tall, a human figure, delicately delineated and of beautiful polish and patina. The most remarkable feature about the Deedarganj Yakshi, according to the reports, is that though it is 2,200 years old, the master sculptors who conceived it and executed it achieved a gloss and patina that is unrivalled and cannot be matched anywhere in the world. Many experts have wondered for years how *this* patina was achieved that has not dimmed or been marred or lost one whit of its lustre over 2,200 years, despite being buried. And today we are in an agonising position that there is a chip on the left cheek of the Deedarganj Yakshi, which is irreparable. And what has been caused, therefore, is not damage but destruction.

Sir, it has been stated in certain sections of the press, from reports that the damage was not caused in the United States, that while it was packed there was no damage noticed and the blame, if any, should be laid at the door of the National Museum

who was responsible for unpacking and reinstalling the Deedarganj Yakshi.

But, Sir, at the same time we hear of other reports by the Director of the National Museum there, Dr. Sahare, who was bitterly opposed and has always been opposing the sending of this Yakshi and other priceless objects abroad or even disturbing them in any way and he has squarely disclaimed any kind of responsibility for the damage caused to the Yakshi, in a three-page letter to the Ministry of Culture. Yet another section has, I am only dwelling at length to discover various reasons why the damage could have been caused, yet another reason and this is the most shocking reason, that has been advanced to some people I talked to is that certain people in an exercise to find out how this patina has remained undiminished over the years, had actually deliberately created a small chip in order to subject the sculpture to a chemical analysis and find how the gloss and colour and patina was obtained, which has remained unchanged over all these years. This may sound far-fetched if after one year from now a learned scholar, an art scholar or a scientist submits a report of exactly how this patina was achieved 2200 years ago then it may be too late to discuss the issue. The question, therefore, Sir, is that what exactly do we achieve by sending these objects abroad.

Sir, culture is no doubt the matrix of human activity, *sh*". I make bold to disagree with the hon. Member who initiated the discussion when he said that we are too poor to dwell on culture. Sir, I beg to disagree. Nobody is too poor to dwell on culture. Culture is the way we escape from the harsh realities of our life and find that life is worth living still. Therefore, culture is the matrix of all human activity. But, Sir, at the same time, if it is an objective that we are trying to achieve through culture if it is a message that we are trying to send abroad that India has arrived, Sir, culture can only create affinity between the countries, but it will always yield precedence to self-interest. For example, Sir, no matter that there was a strong umbilical cord between the United States and the Britain at the time of the Second World War, because of the Cultu-



ral affinity it did not rush to join the war against Russia until Pearl Harbour was bombed.

Sir, similarly, if India is looked upon with respect, if our voice is heard with respect abroad, it is for various important reasons that we are the tenth biggest industrial nation in the world, that we are in terms of skilled manpower the third best country in the world. For various indisputable reasons India is looked upon with respect not because we are a force to reckon with but because these achievements have created this great respect for India.

Sir, in actual terms, what we have achieved in terms of black and white with foreign exchange earnings, as the hon. Minister has stated in a written reply to an unstarred Question is that the foreign exchange earned on account of sales of handlooms and handicrafts and Indian food items during the festival *melas* was equal to Rs. 52.15 lakhs, orders to the tune of Rs. 295.25 lakhs on handlooms, handicrafts and textile items have been executed so far.

Sir, I also understand that Blooming Dale, one of the biggest Department Stores in the United States has now set aside four billion dollars to buy goods from India. Sir, this is in black and white in figures of earning. What we have achieved from the festival in terms of expenditure the United States is supposed to have spent Rs. 25 crores on the Festival of India. Government of India has spent Rs. 5 crores on the Festival of India in the U. S. A., and two crores on the Festival of India in France. We have more than compensated the cost. There is no damage incurred in terms of rupees. But what about the destruction that has been caused to the art objects themselves? As the hon. Member said, insurance cannot compensate. Deedarganj Yakshi had been insured for Rs. 25 lakhs. But insurance cannot compensate for destruction or damage even for Rs. 25 crores. No amount of insurance can compensate for this and no amount of figures in black and white can compensate for this."

Finally, I want to say that a suggestion has come forth from the experts that if

we must send our objects, first of all we should not send. The place to view our priceless artefacts is the country of the origin. If people want to see, they should come here. If these objects have to be sent, then we have to set up a committee and consider their recommendations. I understand that before the Festival of India last year a committee of experts—particularly Dr. Karl Khandawala—were seriously opposed to sending these objects abroad. I do not know who ultimately took the decision to send them but obviously it was a wrong decision because we now see the results. Therefore, the recommendations of the Committee should be considered and due weightage should be given to see that these objects are not needlessly sent abroad.

Thirdly, perhaps, the hon. Minister could consider whether if these objects have to be sent as a cultural exchange abroad, maybe, we could draw up a list of those objects, which can be transported without damage and which we can really take care that damage does not occur, and such objects alone can be sent abroad.

In conclusion, I would again like to reiterate what I said in the beginning that it is not the image of India alone that is important, but the images of India themselves. Thank you.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am daunted to have to follow in the eloquent footsteps of my charming friend yet again. I also resist the temptation of reminding the hon. Minister of what he had said during the Question Hour that day that it is not as much as how much damage has been caused; it is how little damage has been caused and...

SHRI P. V. NARSIMHA RAO: Again going back to that? I do expect a senior Member like Mr. Jaswant Singh when he again cites from what has been said on a previous occasion, to quote it in full or not to quote it. I had said on the floor of the House at that moment itself what I really wanted to say, what I really said and what I really meant. I do not think

[Sbri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

there is any need for further distortion of that. You could please go on to the next point.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is a useful opportunity to...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Between him and me, we have always maintained certain levels. So, I would expect him to do that.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: It is always interesting to hear him, and it was so when he was External Affairs Minister.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: It is a useful opportunity to come to know what the Government of India really means when it says what it does.

However, to come back to the question of cultural diplomacy, I must admit to a somewhat ambivalent attitude to this whole question of cultural diplomacy. If we have already gone to the extent of actually sending art objects for exhibition to the U. S. A. which I believe is the only developing country of the world, and if we are politically non-aligned, then why not be culturally non-aligned as well and send them to the Soviet Union too? As far as that goes, I think the rationale of the Government of India is perfectly acceptable. Culturally non-aligned seems to be a plausible enough cultural policy. I am however, struck by one great apprehension here. I had voiced it even on an earlier occasion before that Festival of India was exported to the United States of America. I had then expressed reservation about the relevance and the effectiveness of the Ministry of Culture in this whole field of administration or interpretation of our culture. I cannot help—with all respect to the hon. Minister—reiterating that very fear and I would request the hon. Minister to clarify this aspect and set our doubts at rest. Are you really autonomous enough to be able to lay down to whoever runs the cultural field of this country, to lay down to them, to tell them, to guide them? Does your voice actually carry? Does anybody listen to it? There's a very *gooff*

reason why I say this because I am somewhat perplexed by what is happening in the name of culture in our country.

I believe, Sir, that it has been usurped, this whole field has been usurped, by some unemployed and largely unemployable Delhi socialities. Now, the difficulty is that this coterie of dilettante, culture-vulture, shawl-draped, dandified, ethnic chic-aping, have not only usurped the field of culture but they have also arrogated to themselves the sole right to become the only interpreters of it. This maverick lot are now behaving as if they are the art administrators. That we have a Ministry of culture in this country is a good thing. But the Ministry of Culture, for instance, in France, to which we also exported an exhibition, was at one time headed by Mr. Andre Marlaux himself, who exemplified who embodied, in his own right the French culture...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: We will compare notes later, whom we like and whom we do not like.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, much has already been said. I would like to join with other hon. Members. There is a detailed list here given, in answer to the earlier question, on what damage has been caused. I think, the nucleus, the central core, of the concern of Parliament is really that this damage has been caused, and this damage is now irreparable. It is irreparable. You can mend a fence. You can darn a torn piece of cloth. But as the hon. Minister would know, in Sanatan thought, a murti when it is *khandit* can no longer be an object of veneration.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Object of worship, not veneration.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I stand corrected.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Please quote the shastras correctly.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I bow...

श्री पी० वी० नरसिंहराव : जो खंडित हो गई है उसकी पूजा नहीं हो सकती है और हमारे देश में हजारों मूर्तियां ऐसी हैं जिनको यहां के लोगों ने कई कारणों से भंग किया है। उनकी पूजा नहीं होती लेकिन आज भी वे कला खंड माने जाते हैं।

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Our hats off to you. You are an authority on this. That is way we are pleading with you.

i

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Sir, without any reservation, I bowed to his superior wisdom. (*Interruption*) It is true. I think, the hon. Minister is right. There is a definite distinction between these two words 'veneration' and 'worship'. I admit it. But the point is that when you talk in terms of damage to art, objects sent abroad, you are in essence not taking in terms of insurance, you are not talking in terms of possible monetary return by way of insurance claims, you are talking of a very essential desecration and that desecration is irreparable. Now take the example...

6 P. M.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Again your etymology is going off the rails. Don't say 'desecration', say 'damage'. Desecration is an act, wilful act, damage is something that happens. Please, there is a very clear distinction between the two. If desecration has taken place of our idols, of our art pieces, it is in this very country that it has taken place.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Here, with due respect I would like to differ. I chose this word deliberately because my earlier friend has said that there is a theory...

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: That is your view. Some thing has happened why it happened, on that you can have your views, but please do not use the word 'desecration' because this is not desecration, this is damage. Damage may be wilful for certain purposes, that is what he said. But when you call it a 'desecration', I think you are going far beyond the scope of this discussion. Desecration is something about which I would be very happy to discuss with you.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Madhya Pradesh): Whether desecration has taken place or damage has taken place, the net result is the same.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: The end result is always the same in many many matters, but the point is, you have to make a distinction between one act and the other. You have to make a distinction between the intention and the result of the act. The result may be same. So, there is a distinction and I do feel that Mr. Jaswant Singh is so subtle that he could not have used this word without having thought over it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN): Desecration is an insult to the idol. (*Time bell rings*)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will conclude now. After that flattering reference it would be difficult for me to persist with this esoteric discussion on the etymology, or on meanings involved, and therefore, I would like to go on to the specific questions that I have and would request the hon. Minister to clarify them.

Now I had started by saying that I share some difficulty about being sufficiently reassured that the Ministry for Human Resources Development is actually autonomous enough, is actually capable enough of being able to influence the total situation in the field of culture and art administration in the country. We would in this House like to know the correct position. Otherwise, this whole exercise, this whole debate is an exercise in empty vapourisation. I do not see any reason why we are pillorying the hon. Minister if decisions are being made elsewhere.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: That you do everyday.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I will now come to my second question to which I would like to seek clarification from the hon. Minister. This is a question about which even the great ability of the hon. Minister would not be able to deny when I am going to state now is like maternity, an established fact, that there is a dispute existing between the Director of the

[Shri Jaswant Singh] National Museum and some other people who are eminent in the field of culture and art administration. This is not a happy situation. I do not speak about the eminence or lack of eminence of any one or the other because it is not a measurable quantity. Who knows more about culture, who is more eminent, who is more worthy—is not something for me, certainly not for an unlettered and uncultured man like me to determine. Therefore, we appeal to you to please let us know if there is a controversy that has arisen between the Director of the National Museum officially, admittedly a principal art administrator, at least, in the bureaucratic sense and someone else or some others? If it had then this is not a happy situation. This has resulted in some very unseemly and unbecoming exchanges in public in India International Centre and elsewhere. This does not fill us with reassurance as far as the total field of art administration is concerned. Therefore, while admitting that such a dispute is existing what's the Ministry of Human Resource Development doing so that this situation does not persist? I would also like here, as a sub-enquiry into that main enquiry, to know whether in respect of the damage to these art objects sent abroad, the National Museum authorities are holding that the Festival of India Committee is responsible for these damages. Now I would disagree a little bit with my previous speaker that there is a little point to be served in now trying to fix responsibility. I think a great purpose will be served in attempting to fix responsibility, because if we do not fix responsibility then I think see the administration is not performing its duty. So whereas the National Museum authorities are saying that it is the Festival Committee who is responsible, the Festival Committee, in turn, is saying "we know nothing about the damage"; therefore who is responsible? These are priceless national assets and we would like to know who, in the view of the Ministry of Human Resource Development is responsible for this dereliction of duty—if not "damage" or "desecration" let us call it "dereliction of duty".

Now I would also here like to know

what you are going to do to ensure—because as I started by saying I have an ambivalent attitude to this aspect of cultural diplomacy, if we are non-aligned politically, why not we be non-aligned in culture and send them to the Soviet Union? So I would like to say if you have taken the decision to send them to the Soviet Union—a very thoughtful suggestion was made by the previous speaker—please let us identify those objects which can become exchange objects, whether it is the Soviet Union or it is subsequently some other country because we want to now take culture to the Australians also. We have had very interesting cultural exchanges with the Australians during the Prime Minister's recent visit there, so you may tomorrow decide to send them to Australia, let us at least have identified items which can be culturally exchanged.

Then the hon. Minister did reply that a committee is being formed and he took one or two names and then he said, "the Committee will comprise of 'eminent' Indians". I would appreciate if the hon. Minister would just share his thoughts with us as to who is in this Committee and what is the qualifying criteria for this adjective "eminent".

My most important point is about reciprocity in cultural diplomacy. I do not want to take too much time by giving illustrations. For instance we had a Festival in Japan recently exhibiting priceless exhibits of our Buddhist past, Buddhist inheritance. I hold that in turn, reciprocally, Japan did not respond in a like manner. They were ready—I am equipped to give examples but it will take time—to send their priceless Buddhist objects to Chicago Museum, but not to US. Likewise we had this Festival in the United States of America, usefully, I am sure, as I started by saying, that country being a developing country. But what did the United States of America, in turn, send us by way of reciprocity, as art objects? And now that we are thinking in turn of sending yet another Festival to the Soviet Union, therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister if we are going to expect any items from, say, Hermitage, in what was earlier known as St. Petersburg and now Leningrad. Are any of the items going to come from Hermitage? Are any objects

going to come to us from the Pushkin Museum? Unless there is reciprocity, and it is difficult to evaluate reciprocity on a value basis, it can only be evaluated on the basis of the quality of its importance to that nation's cultural life; it becomes a one-sided exercise. I would request the honourable Minister to assure us on this particular aspect.

Now, Sir, there are many other points in this field of administration of art and culture in the country. I had started by saying that this whole field of art administration and culture has been usurped by unemployable Delhi socialites. I would now request in conclusion—the Minister to reassure this House that he will undo this usurpation so that the culture of the country is safe and it does not become the preserve of a few. Thank you.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, I am very grateful to the Members who have participated in this short but very meaningful discussion. There is a little preface which I would like to start with. They have been discussing this as if the entire process of cultural exchange in the field of exhibitions has started a year or two ago— I would like to put the record straight by saying that the first exhibition which was sent from here was in 1948, and since then we have been having a steady series of cultural exchanges, exchange of exhibitions, with several countries. Therefore, the first thing to be noted in this discussion is that this has been an ongoing process and there has been no *blitzkrieg* there has been nothing absolutely and startlingly new that has been started. So, in this ongoing process if for some years we have sent and some other years we have not been able to send or they have not been able to reciprocate, that does not mean that what has been done during the last two or three years is new. In fact, the cultural exchange, with the U. S. A., with France, with Britain, were decided when Mrs. Gandhi was our Prime Minister, and what was one was in pursuance of the decisions taken then. I would very, briefly, Sir, without going into too many details, say that in 1947-48 the Royal Academy of London held an exhibition entitled "Five Thousand Years of Indian

Art." It is then that the process started. Then, in 1959 we had it with Germany, in 1964 with Japan, in 1965 with USA, and in 1971 with Canada. In all these there was no immediate reciprocity such as we are going to have with the U. S. S. R. now, but reciprocity was there in the sense in? \*, on the whole, objects were sent from here, exhibitions were sent from here and exhibitions were also received from the other countries. It is not just one year this the next year that, as is happening with the U. S. S. R. but, on the whole, there have been exchanges between one country and another, between our country and each of these other countries. The Government; also received several reciprocal exhibitions from Italy, GDR, France and Mexico. So, Sir, what has been done is, in programme which was decided long, long ago. If in a particular case care was not taken or less care was taken than should have been taken, these are matters which we can keep aside here and go into separately. The fundamental question, the basic question that has been raised here is. Should we or should we not send our art artefacts, or pieces of art to exhibitions abroad? This is the point.

The answer to that is, number one, that we have been doing so ever since the independence, if not before. And if this question is to be raised at all, if the decision has to be reversed, it has to be in a totally different context, under totally different considerations rather a damage here, however serious it may be. It is not because of damage. For instance, an idol in a temple, a live temple, is worshipped there. That idol you cannot pull out from there and send abroad. So, that point was well taken, and it was respected when it was pointed out that this just cannot be done, and it was, not done. So, even when the committee said that this could be sent, Government said this could not be sent.

The question of how much autonomy Government has in cultural matters has been raised by Mr. Jaswant Singh. I do not use the word "autonomy" for the Government. I use the word "authority." Therefore, - we are responsible for everything that is in the Constitution of India. But when it comes to matters of expertise,

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Kao]

we do not arrogate to ourselves expertise. We only act in very general terms and what the experts say. But we always reserve the right to differ and take a decision which may not be endorsed by the experts. And there can be a difference of opinion among experts themselves. Then the decision becomes at once easy and difficult for Government—easy because use when—there are different once easy and difficult for Government—, easy because when—there are different views, we can always use our common sense and say that one of the views is correct or seems to be correct; difficult because we are really in no position to take a kind of substantive decision on merit when two important sections of artists or experts differ. But we do have to take a decision: they cannot take a decision. The final decision will have to rest with Government and Government will have to take responsibility for that decision. This, I think, is the common method which Government adopts in taking decisions. And, therefore, apart from the basic question whether we should do it or not do it, all the other questions, all the other points fall in place.

With regard to certain objects, the report says that these objects were never sent abroad. If they have been missing, they have been missing in India. Because there is a complaint, the matter has been thrown up. Wherever they have been lost, you cannot lump them together and put them in this. So, those things have to be set apart, those which have been damaged or lost here. We have done that.

Sir, I am quite sure that damage is something which nobody wants. But the question is: Do you or do you not take the risk of sending these objects? When you send these objects, when you do decide to send them, then, you take a risk, whatever the precaution, whatever the packing, whosoever is responsible. Of course that point is very important; who is responsible is important because if a lapse has taken place at one point, then, we will have to pinpoint that, we will have certainly to ascertain where it has taken place so that in case we continue to take the same deci-

sion in future, these things are avoided. If we reverse the decision then, there, is really nothing else to do.

But damages can also take place within the country. As I said, for various reasons, hardly any idols in this country, are found in their pristine purity or original shape or form which they had when they were made, either a hand is missing or a nose is missing or a leg is missing. They did not go all the way across the seas to get damaged. It does not take anything except a particular kind of sadism to damage these things. There are people who are so sadist that anything beautiful they see, they cannot stand. They will not rest until they have damaged them. This is one kind of human nature we have in all countries. Therefore, damage by itself is not uncommon.

Now, having decided that we should continue with the practice of sending and receiving pieces of art in exhibitions, the other decision, which is absolutely concomitant with this should be that this kind of risk which we are running should be minimised. We should try to eliminate that risk, but in any event minimise it. You cannot perhaps eliminate it, whether it is from place 'A' to place 'B' in the same country or from country 'A' to country 'B' but we should try. That is what we are doing. As I said in answer to the question the other day, we have not come to the conclusion yet—I am not saying that this decision endures for ever, but at this moment I cannot say of all the questions that have been raised, after all the answers have been given, after all the risks have been exposed—that a reversal of the decision is warranted. I don't think so. I honestly feel that the fall out of a country sending its best art objects outside for exhibition is something much greater than asking people to come and see them here. After all what a country has to send out depends on what a country has. It is not money. We are talking of art. We are talking of priceless objects, not taking in terms of money..

So, naturally, if there is another country which agrees to send its own art objects of a corresponding rarity to us, I do not see how we can say you send your best, we will send you our second best. But if they say so that India should send its best and they will send their second or third best. I can assure you that this will not be accepted. With the USSR this reciprocity has been very well worked out and very well conceived. In fact, it is our people and our experts who have given a list of what they want from the Soviet Union. I don't think we could take any more care about the rarity, about the real value and about the worth of the objects that will be shown here from the Soviet Union. It is open to the Soviet authorities to say that article 'A' article 'B' article 'C' can be sent, but article 'I' cannot be sent. Similarly it is open for us to say article 'X' article 'Y' and article 'Z' can be sent, but article 'U' cannot be sent. So, we have the autonomy and at the same time reciprocity. Both are built into this agreement. Therefore, there should be no difficulty in working this out. But I say again that you have to set off that one per cent risk of damage with the positive outcome, positive fall out of goodwill between the two countries. On this, I don't think I can convince those who have the other view.

SHRI v. GOPALSAMY: May I interrupt for a second please? Did we get the reciprocity from Japan and the US?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Yes. Sir. As I said, not exhibition to exhibition so far. But Japan has sent their objects to us. And, of course, when it comes to the USA much more is involved than the reciprocity. What is involved is what they have and what we have. So, let us not go into that. The point is that in the case of those countries which have a kind of heritage comparable to ours, there will be reciprocity with them. There are some countries with which we cannot really have the potential for reciprocity. If we say with respect to science and technology, it means that there are two above

us. If we are tenth in something, it means that nine are above us. How is number ten going to impress number one? So, Sir, there are certain things in which we are priceless, there are certain things in which other countries look to us to send our exhibitions to them. They come to see them here. They also feel very happy if we send them there. So reciprocity has its own limitations.

One film on "Gandhi", to produce which the difficulties we underwent as Government, I remember very vividly that one film had stormed the entire world and made non-violence, peace and Gandhiji's message known to millions and millions and millions of people which hundreds and thousands of books written on "Gandhi" and "Gandhism" could not have done. I have seen with my own eyes queues in New York and so many other places.

So, Sir, an art object is priceless not only in itself, not only it is basically priceless, but it also creates a goodwill and a generally positive feeling about the philosophy for which we have stood for thousands of years, I really do not see anything wrong in exporting and showing it abroad subject to the risks involved but subject to the condition that the risk should be minimised.

I can certainly assure the House that if over the years we find that there is a law of diminishing returns that has set in, we are giving away more than we are receiving that the goodwill which we are earning is not really commensurate with the risk of damage that we are running, then, I would be the first person to advise the Prime Minister not to send anything. I am second to none in that. But then we have to weight the pros and cons. At the moment, we have not come to the conclusion that we should stop these things from being sent.

We are going to have a massive thing\* with the U. S. S. R. in the next two years and it is meticulously being planned. In fact, in this case, I may take the House into confidence and say that we are

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

finding it difficult to maintain reciprocity in certain areas, not in the areas of art objects, but the scale which the Soviets are proposing and the scale which we are proposing and the disparity between those scales is rather difficult to bridge. But I am sure that we will sort it out.

S<sub>3</sub> these are the parameters, subject to - which we have to look at this and I have no doubt that we will take every care about differences that are there.

Sir, show me two art critics in this country who entirely agree with each other. And show me two experts in this country or any country whose views are identical. Then, one of them will become redundant. No critic wants to become Tedundant.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY; That is why they are experts.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: We go by their advice. We are not experts. Therefore, expert advice has to be taken.. Under the Indian Evidence Act, in section 45, the opinion of an expert witness has been described, has been defined and its limitations also have been defined. When it can happen in a court of law, it has to happen at the Government level also.

Honourable judges disagree. The decisions of today of a court, may be High Court or Supreme Court, can be overruled by a higher Bench tomorrow. So many judgements come which are conflicting with each other from different High Courts. Now these are the facts of life. If there is a difference between experts, I do not see how we have a right to become shocked so much. We Will certainly resolve all the differences. I am in touch with the experts.

Even before coming to this House, I was consulting Dr. Sihare whose name has been freely mentioned here. He is not alien to us. He is one of the family. So there is no question of any difference of opinion becoming a difference of personalities as it seems to have become

with Mr. Jaswant Singh. He has someone in his view. Therefore, all the descriptions that he gives, he sees to it that the description fits that person.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH; Sir. because of the preconceptions of the Minister he is fitting my words into an image. I described nobody. I described a situation.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Very good. If all the descriptions of the personality, appearance and his dress and everything does not fit in with a person and it is all abstract in his view, let it be so. I will not go into any further details. I have lots of details here—who said what, who did not say what? They are giving slips to me but I will not go into that because those really are not issues. The only two issues, one, will you stop exporting our exhibitions and in the exhibitions, our priceless art objects? The answer is: Yes. to the extent of certain things, we will say these art objects shall never go out of the country, barring those, we are open at the moment. The decision is, the condition is that there should be reciprocity. (Interruption)

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: That is fine.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Havim; decided to send them, what is the care that you are going to take? The answer is all care would be taken but there is an outside chance of a little damage. That risk cannot be completely ruled out. But I would assure the House with all the emphasis at my command that we shall take all the care that is humanly possible and perhaps, much more than what has been done before. Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI G. SWAMINATHAN); The House stands adjourned till 11.00 A. M. on Monday, the 1st December, 1986.

The House then adjourned at thirty one minutes past six of the clock, till eleven of the clock on Monday, the 1st December, 1986.