

- (23) Shri Pratap Singh Negi.
- (24) Shri Rajaram Dadasaheb Nim-balkar.
- (25) Dr. Laxminarayan Pandeya.
- (26) Shri E. V. Vikhe Patil.
- (27) Shri M. S. Purty.
- (28) Shri Ram Prakash.
- (29) Shri Ram Swarup.
- (30) Shri M. S. Sanjeevi Rao.
- (31) Shri M. Ram Gopal Reddy.
- (32) Dr. Govind Das Richhariya.
- (33) Shri Babu Nath Singh.
- (34) Shri Somchand Solanki.
- (35) Shri K. Suryanarayana.
- (36) Shri T. V. Chandrasekharappa Veerabasappa.
- (37) Shri N. R. Vekaria.
- (38) Shri Sukhdeo Prasad Verma.
- (39) Shri C. T. Dhandapani.
- (40) Shri Y. B. Chavan.

and 20 from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make ;>. report to this House by the last day of the first week of the next session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of 20 members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee." Sir, I lay a copy of each of the Bills on the Table.

THE GUJARAT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1974

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN): Sir, I beg to move:

That the Bill to authorise payment and appropriation of certain further sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of the State of Gujarat for the services of the financial year 1973-74, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.

Sir, this Bill is with regard to the Supplementary Demands of Rs. 35-19 crores voted by the Lok Sabha on the 22nd March, 1974, and the expenditure of Rs. 122.1 crores charged on the Consolidated Fund of the State of Gujarat for the year 1973-74, of which the details are given in the Bill.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): We shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 and 3 and the Schedule were added to the Bill.

Clause 1. the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI Y. B. CHAVAN: Sir, I move: "That the Bill be returned."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

ON POINTS ARISING OUT OF THE ANSWERS TO STARRED QUESTION NO. 413 GIVEN ON THE 13TH MARCH, 1974 RE TIME CAPSULE

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: Now, we have half-an-hour discussion. Shri Pitamber Das.

श्री पीतांबर दास : श्रीमन्, मैं कालपात्र के अभिलेखों के लेखकों के संबंध में तारांकित प्रश्न संख्या 413 के राज्य सभा में 13 मार्च

[श्री पीतांबर दास]

1974 को दिये गए उत्तरों से उत्पन्न बातों पर चर्चा आरम्भ करता हूँ।

उस दिन हाउस में जो प्रश्नोत्तर हुए थे उनमें माननीय मंत्री जी ने शुरू में बताया था कि टाइम कैप्चूल में जो मसाला गया है, वह, इंडियन कौंसिल आफ हिस्टोरिकल रिसर्च से जैसा भी आया था, वैसा का वैसा ही अंदर भेज दिया गया, माननीय मंत्री जी ने उसे पढ़ा नहीं था। बाद में, फिर से सवाल पूछा तो उन्होंने उत्तर दिया था कि मैंने उसे पढ़ा था लेकिन काफी दिनों बाद पढ़ा था। श्रीमन्, मुझे ऐसा लगता है, अगर माननीय मंत्री जी बही स्टैन्ड अपना रखते, कि मैंने पढ़ा नहीं था, तो शायद स्थिति सुधर जाती। जब उन्होंने पढ़ा ही नहीं था तो जो भी प्रश्न उनसे पूछे जाते वे बराबर यह कहते चले जा सकते थे कि मैंने पढ़ा ही नहीं, मैं क्या बताऊँ? लेकिन उन्होंने बाद में कह दिया कि मैंने पढ़ा था। तो जब उन्होंने पढ़ा है तो फिर यह सवाल उनसे पूछे जा सकते हैं कि जनाब, आपने पढ़ा था तो बताइए कि क्या उसमें राष्ट्रपिता की हत्या का कोई जिक्र है कि नहीं। उस दिन मंत्री जी ने कहा था कि हम एक एक वाक्य नहीं बता सकते। मैं वाक्य नहीं पूछता। मैं पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उसके अंदर राजगोपालाचारी, जो प्रथम गवर्नर जनरल थे—और इसी मियाद के अंदर थे जो मंत्री जी ने बताया है इतिहास की, उसमें उनका जिक्र है या नहीं? डा० राजेंद्र प्रसाद का कोई उल्लेख है या नहीं? डा० राधाकृष्णन का कोई जिक्र उसमें आया है या नहीं? क्या जिक्र आया है यह मैं नहीं पूछ रहा हूँ। क्या उनका नाम भी कहीं आया है? डाक्टर भग्वेडकर, जो हमारे संविधान के बनाने वाले थे, क्या उनका नाम भी उसमें है? श्री लालबहादुर शास्त्री, जिनका बलिदान हो गया ताशकंद में, क्या उनका नाम भी उसमें है या

नहीं? हम उसका कांटेंट नहीं जानना चाहते कि उनके बारे में निन्दा की गई है या उनकी प्रशंसा की गई है। क्या हमको केवल इतना भी नहीं बताया जा सकता कि उनके नाम भी उसमें हैं या नहीं, जब कि मंत्री जी ने उसको पढ़ा है?

श्रीमन्, मंत्री महोदय ने यह कहा था कि 30 साल तक उन रिकार्ड्स को जाहिर नहीं किया जा सकता। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह 30 साल जो उन्होंने कह दिया यह कहां से कह दिया? कोई ऐसा नियम है क्या? उन्होंने कहा कि अभिलेखागार द्वारा प्रस्तुत जो भी हिस्टोरिकल रिकार्ड्स हैं, उनको हम 30 साल तक नहीं जाहिर कर सकते। मुझे ऐसा खयाल पड़ता है कि 30 साल इसलिये उनके दिमाग में आ रहा है कि मौलाना अबुल कलाम आज़ाद ने जो आत्मकथा लिखी है उसमें उन्होंने इच्छा व्यक्त की थी कि मेरे लेख के कुछ हिस्सों को 30 साल के बाद खोला जाए।

यह मुद्दा उन की चीजों पर लागू हो सकती है, क्योंकि यह उनकी इच्छा थी। क्या मंत्री जी यह कहना चाहते हैं कि इंडियन कौंसिल आफ हिस्टोरिकल रिसर्च ने भी यह इच्छा व्यक्त की थी कि हमारी चीज किसी को न दिखलायी जाय? श्रीमन्, जब मंत्री जी ने स्वयं पढ़ लिया है, तो फिर वह चीज गुप्त कैसे रही। यह बात समझ में नहीं आती है। अगर वह स्वयं उसको नहीं पढ़ते, तो वह गुप्त रहती, लेकिन अगर उन्होंने उसको स्वयं पढ़ लिया, तो फिर क्या कारण है कि उनको तो पढ़ने का अधिकार हासिल हो गया और जो पार्लियामेंट के सदस्य हैं, उनको हासिल नहीं होता? हमको यह चीज क्यों नहीं बतलायी जाती कि वहां पर क्या रखा गया है? वे बार बार केवल यह कहते चले आ रहे हैं “दि मिसमिनिस्ट्रि ऑफ नाट करेक्ट”।

श्री एरा शेफियन जी ने लोकसभा की मेज पर एक ड्राफ्ट रखा है और माननीय मंत्री जी ने

यहाँ इसका जिक्र किया है। अब यह प्रश्न उठता है कि जब उन्होंने एक ड्राफ्ट रखा है और उसमें कुछ बातें लिखी हुई हैं तो फिर भी क्यों बारबार मंत्री जी यह कह रहे हैं कि दि मिसिगिविस आर नाट करेक्ट ? मंत्रीजी यह कह रहे थे कि विरोधी दल वालों का यह प्रचार-मात्र है, बदगुमानी है। तो मैं माननीय मंत्री जी को सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ और जानना चाहता हूँ कि वे ऐसा क्यों नहीं करते कि उस चीज को यहाँ पर रख दें जिससे श्री ऐरा शेषियन साहब का भी कांटीडिक्शन हो जाय और जो उनकी ओर से यह कहा जा रहा है कि यह तो विरोधी दल वालों का प्रचार-मात्र है, उसका भी खंडन हो जाय। Why does not he take the wind out of their sails? मंत्री जी उस चीज को सदन के सामने रख दें ताकि जो आति पैदा हो गई है, वह अपने आप दूर हो जाएगी।

एक अंतिम बात मैं और कहना चाहूँगा। आज ही-लोकसभा में एक अनस्टारर्ड क्वेश्चन था। क्वेश्चन नम्बर 4457। यह प्रश्न श्री लिमये जी का था। इस प्रश्न में उन्होंने यह पूछा था :

The Unstarred Question No. 4457 by Madhu Limaye was;

"(a) Whether the authority for preparing a historical review of the happenings in the post-Independent years and burying it in the Red Fort area of Delhi was derived from any Act of Parliament and its Resolution or any Article of the Constitution;

(b) whether the Indian Council of Historical Research is authorised by any statute to prepare such a document; and

(c) if the answer to (a) and (b) is no, will the Capsule be dug out and placed before the Parliament for comment and approval?"

आज ही इस प्रश्न का इस प्रकार का जवाब आया है।

"(a) & (b) No statutory authority was required either in regard to Government's decision to embed the Time Capsule in connection with the celebration of the 25th Anniversary of India's Independence or for entrusting the preparation of the historical documentation to the Indian Council of Historical Research.

श्रीमन्, मैं एक चीज यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि इंडियन इंडिपेंडेंस की पच्चीसवीं एनीवर्सरी मनाने के प्रोग्राम के बारे में एक समिति नियुक्त की गई थी, उस समिति का मैं भी एक सदस्य था। मैं यह जानना चाहूँगा कि कैप्सूल गाढ़ने के लिये क्या इस समिति में कोई प्रस्ताव हुआ था? अगर नहीं हुआ, तो क्यों नहीं हुआ मैंने जो प्रश्न पूछे हैं, वे सीधे सादे हैं। मुझे भाषण करने की आदत नहीं है, लेकिन मैं अपने इन प्रश्नों का कैटिगरिकली और सैटिसफैक्टरी जवाब चाहता हूँ। इवेसिव जवाब नहीं चाहता हूँ।

(c) Does not arise."

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HASAN): Sir, I thought I had explained at great length when this matter came up in the House the other day that the contents of the Capsule did not lend themselves to the misgivings that are there in the minds of the people and of the hon. Members. And, therefore, I took the view....

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: Sir, on a point of order. If the same answer is to be repeated today also that was given on that day, then this discussion will be meaningless.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAIU): You please hear him first.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: Therefore, Sir, I venture to submit that if individual questions are put to me enquiring whether such and such a thing is there or not, or such and such other thing is there or is not there, then it means that I would be asked either to say yes or to say no, in which case my whole case which I would attempt to place for your consideration and for the consideration of the House that it would not be desirable to put the text of the various documents before the House, would be going against the whole argument. But, Sir, there are one or two points which the hon. Member has asked and about which I would like to draw his attention to some information which I have already given to this hon. House and which, may be; the hon. Member has not noticed.

Sir, a question was put by some hon. Members in this House, a Starred Question, on 29th November, 1972. The question asked was whether the Government proposed to embed similar capsules for some other national leaders also and, if so, the details thereof and, if not, the reasons therefor? To this I replied—I am just attempting to refresh the memory of my hon. friends here—that it is proposed to embed two more time capsules, one on 30th January 1973 on the occasion of the anniversary of the martyrdom of Gandhiji and another to mark the completion of 25 years of Indian Independence. The precise contents of the Capsule are still to be worked out. Then, Sir, the point that I am trying to make out is that this matter had been placed before the House. It was not something that I have thought of as a result of the controversy that has arisen. I had kept the House informed in November 1972 that there was such a proposal. Sir, this is also in reference to the last point which has been raised

by my hon. friend regarding its approval by the Committee. I do not remember which Committee the hon. Member is referring to.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: The Committee that was appointed by the hon. Prime Minister in which the Chief Ministers of all the States were there, the Party leaders in Parliament were there and some more persons also.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: Sir, in that Committee this matter did not come up. At least, I do not remember it. I would not like to make such a categorical statement.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS : It did not come up.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I would not like to give such a categorical reply. As far as my memory goes it did not come up in that Committee. But, Sir, I did mention in this hon. House in November 1972.

Sir, I would also like the hon. House to recall that we had decided and we did do this, *i.e.*, embed a Capsule on the 25th anniversary of Mahatmaji's assassination. Sir, therefore, does it stand to reason that the Government would try in any way to ignore such a momentous event in the history of our country?

Sir, as regards the name of our former President, whose pupil I have had the honour to be, Dr. Radhakrishnan, his whole speech delivered in the Central Hall on 14th August, 1973, the duration of which is 13 minutes, has been put in the Capsule. This information I have also given to this hon. House.

SHRI PITAMBER DAS: Since you have replied about one person, why not answer about all the persons?

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: You will be contradicting your own statement if you answer to one point and do not reply to other points.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : Will the hon. Members bear with me? They want to clarify the points and I am not ignoring....

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Sir, on a point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Yes, what is your point of order?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Sir, he is speaking about the momentous events. My point of order is: What is there for the Government, therefore, to hide the contents of the Capsule?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: Mr. Niren Ghosh, this is no point of order.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: Then, have you something special to hide? This is the point of order. Is it not relevant?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: This is not a point of order.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: Sir, it is for you to give your ruling on the point of order, I will not venture to comment on this. Sir, the point is, I am reading out the information which I have already given to the House. I was referring. Sir, to this question which had been put to me in this House in November, 1972 in which I had stated that the precise contents of the Capsule are still to be worked out. Then I sent a reply in fulfilment of this assurance in which it said: One Time Capsule was embedded on 30th January, 1973, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the martyrdom of Mahatma Gandhi at Gandhiji's Smriti. The details have

already been sent to the Parliament Affairs Ministry vide so and so. The second Time Capsule has been embedded on 15th August, 1973, at the Red Fort. The details of contents are given in an-nexure. Now, the annexure is:

(1) A 10,000-word account both in English and Hindi of important aspects of history of India from 15-8-1943 to 15-8-1972—calligraphed on parchment;

(2) An illustrated calendar of important developments since Independence on copper plates;

(3) Voice record on copper stamping of the following important speeches delivered in the Constituent Assembly at mid-night of 14/15 August, 1947:

(a) 'Tryst with Destiny' speech by Shri Jawaharlal Nehru, duration 11 minutes, both Hindi and English;

(b) 'Vande Mataram' sung by Pandit Onkar Nath Thakur.

(c) Swearing in of the Members of the Constituent Assembly conducted in Hindi by Dr. Rajendra Prasad, duration 13 minutes;

(d) Dr. Radhakrishnan's speech at Central Hall on 14th August, 1947, duration 13 minutes;

(4) Coins of ten rupees and fifty paise and postal stamps issued on the occasion of the Silver Jubilee of Independence.

(5) Micro film of the Constitution of India along with Preamble in all the national languages.

(6) Micro films of the project report of Bhakra Nangal Dam;

(7) 13 portraits of important national leaders, etching in half tone on copper plate, based on the portraits in the Central Hall of Parliament House.

[Prof. S. Nurul Hasan]

(8) Small modules of Vijayanta Tank, Ishapore Rifle and Bharat Earth Mover.

Sir, I have not given the text either of the first item, namely, a 10,000-word account of important aspects of Indian History or of (2) an illustrated calendar of important developments since independence on copper plates. Therefore, Sir, when I quoted from something else which I had already submitted for the consideration and information of the House then, Sir, I beg to submit that I am not contradicting myself.

Sir, another point was raised about the question of 30 years. Sir, I am afraid I must confess that I was not able to explain my point on that day and I am therefore grateful to the hon. Member for having given me this opportunity. It is not that I had said that these records will be kept confidential for 30 years. This was not the point I was attempting to make; what I was attempting to make was that even though there are historical accounts there is a source material of history which may be of interest to the country or the nation. Nevertheless that account is, under the normal rules of the National Archives, kept confidential even from historians and the public generally for a period of 30 years. This 30-years rule is not a rule only for some aspects of the papers of Maulana Abul Kalam Azad but this is a general rule which is observed in our Archives.

Sir, I now come to what I consider to be the principal question of the hon. Member, that is to say, why is it that you are not laying these documents before the House. Sir, my reason is that whenever a historian is called upon to prepare a document there is a certain amount of selectivity involved in it. It

is almost impossible for different individual historians or even groups of historians always to agree on the same presentation, the same manner of presentation and on the same selection of aspects, events, individuals and so on. Secondly, if I had placed this matter before this hon. House the intention I am sure would not be that the House would convert itself into a Board of Historians and then start debating as to which facts are important and which facts are not important, how a historical fact should be presented and how another act should not be presented. This work will in any case at any time have to be given to competent scholars and historians. My submission is that the Government entrusted this work to competent scholars and the Government took care not to edit or modify or to temper with the evaluation of the scholars. If I had done that then I would certainly have been guilty of impropriety. I selected a competent body to which I made a reference. They prepared their account. They told that they were preparing this account for being embedded in the capsule. They did their best and then gave the account. It would not have been proper for me to sit in judgment over what has been written by others. Then, Sir, any student of history knows—and I may be forgiven if I venture to bring in my personal training into this matter—that whenever a historian looks at an account written in an earlier period he treats it as a source material. Now, the value of the source material would depend, basically, on whether the source material was prepared in consultation with others or it represented the thinking of one or two or a board or a group of historians. This is an essential feature on the basis of which the value of a historical work is judged or the histori-

cal source is judged. This, in any subsequent period, if and when it is at all discovered will be, I have no doubt, examined by the future historian as a source material, and he will I am sure. I have even more advanced tools of examination and evaluation than we have at the moment. Therefore, I have no doubt that this will be one of the considerations that a group of historians of the future will have before them as to how to evaluate the source which has been prepared in this particular manner.

Sir, it is for these reasons that we did not come forward and place the text of any of the three capsules that have been embedded during this period.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN (Kerala): I want to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister some of the glaring points relating to the whole episode. When the Minister stated that in any piece of history, when it is written, there is an element of selectivity which any historian would like to use, that is true. But let us not forget the claim of the hon. Minister that this work was entrusted to a competent body of historians, which I would like to challenge. For example, the original draft in any case was prepared by Prof. Krishnaswamy of the Madras Christian College whose version has been published. It has been published in a journal. Social Scientist. Most of the extracts are published by Prof. Krishnaswamy himself and these have been handed over to the Director at Archives, Government of Tamil Nadu. The whole thing came out. There are obvious falsehoods in the draft, such as—land reform implementation in India has been completed. No historian of any political hue or colour can come to this conclusion that land reform implementation has been completed. Similar is the case about economic developments.

This document makes wild propaganda in favour of the ruling party and the Government. It has nothing to do with historians. There is difference between fantasy and history. The document which has gone into the time capsule is not history, but fantasy. If fantasy cannot be differentiated from history, if there is a document where evidences are shifted to different positions, then I think something....

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): You are giving your views or you are asking a clarification?

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: I want to ask a clarification whether these facts are correct, whether the original draft was prepared by Professor Krishnaswamy, whether the original draft which he published and circulated in various forms is the type of document which has gone into the capsule, in the original form or in an amended form and whether the Government will re-examine the so-called expert body which is the ICHR. The ICHR consists of quite a number of historians whose political views are very close to the Government of India. It is a creature of the...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): You are going back to your views.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN : I want to know whether the ICHR is a creature of the Government of India or not, whether under the rules of the ICHR and constitution the Government has the power to direct the ICHR about the various activities, whether the Government would take care that when an important document is being put in the time capsule on the 25th anniversary of the martyrdom of Gandhiji, a person should speak the truth. He claims that it is time for truth. Was it not the duty

[Dr. K. Mathew Kurian] of the Government to examine whether this document contained truth rather handing it over to a creature of the Government of India, without even implementing the Government's own power of direction.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: My hon'ble friend has made certain charges against the distinguished body of scholars who are members of the Indian Council of Historical Research....

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: Not all of them.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I am grateful to the hon'ble Member for accepting some as distinguished historians.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: There are scholars and scholars.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: The hon'ble Member, Mr. Niren Ghosh, would not be more correct. I concede there are scholars and scholars.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): You did not try to improve upon Dr. Kurian's statement.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: He is quite right, Sir, that there are scholars and scholars. But, Sir, this is a body in which there are Professors of eighteen Universities —

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: I do not want names.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: You need not give the names.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: There may be good scholars in the I.C.H.R. But how could such a body produce such a bad document?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kurian, allow him to develop his thoughts. He does not want names.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : If he does not want, then it does not matter. If this is a body of very eminent scholars, it would have been very wrong on the part of the Government then to examine what they had written and to attempt to correct it. As I said, I am myself a student of history. But it would not have been right on my part to wear two hats on such an occasion. Then, we could have been accused of attempting wild propaganda. We did not examine what had been written. We did not amend it. We did not doctor it. We did not edit it. We did it in good faith because we felt here is a body which was competent which could have asked any scholar to prove the draft. Therefore, there was no question of examining its draft. And in any case the draft that came to us was a single draft and I have no reason to suspect that this is not a properly prepared draft. I do not agree with the allegations against the Council.

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: What about the statement on land reform? That is the specific point. It is written there that land reforms have been completely implemented.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: I have already made my point in connection with the question that was put by the hon'ble Shri Pitamber Das that it is not proper for me, Sir, for reasons I have submitted to go into each individual point..

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): You do not want him to repeat what he has already said.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I am on a point of order. He has not satisfied us. Now you judge the relevancy of my point of order. He said Maulana Azad wrote some portion of history that might be controversial.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: Please examine first that you are making a point of order.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: I must prove the point of order in order to put the argument before you. He said in the National Archives minimum thirty years is the rule. But here a time capsule has been embedded which might be dug up thousands of years hence....

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: We might dig it much earlier.

SHRI NJREN GHOSH: That is a different thing. But the Government of India has taken upon itself this responsibility which anyone, Maulana Azad, zz. Jawaharlal Nehru, Gandhiji or Mr. C. R. Das even, avoided to undertake in writing a piece of history which might be controversial. How can the Government of India take up this responsibility?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): What is your point of order?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: The point of order is: Can the Government play a role which might belong to the National Archives to this time capsule? This is the point of order.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): There is no point of order, Mr. Niren Ghosh. You wanted some clarification. Anyhow, if the Minister wants to add anything-----

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: No, I was only illustrating the argument.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Mr. Advani.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: Sir, I have just heard the hon. Minister trying to explain why the Government or Parliament cannot sit in judgment over something that has been prepared by a body

of scholars. I think his answer did not deal with the main point of Mr. Pitamber Das, namely, why it should be kept secret. This needs explanation and it has not come as yet. In this context, I think that this question as to whether there is any statutory sanction for the Time Capsule is very important. The Government has replied this morning that no statutory authority was required either in regard to Government's decision to embed the Time Capsule in connection with the celebration of the Twenty-fifth Anniversary or for entrusting the preparation of the historical document to the Indian Council of Historical Research. If it is Government's stand that this is secret, my submission is that this secrecy cannot be derived except under statutory sanction. There are hundreds of people who have dealt with the document. Those who have written it, those who have typed it out, those who have converted it into a form fit for embedding in a capsule, all these hundreds of persons know what is there in the Capsule and they are not sworn to secrecy. There is no statutory authority that prevents anyone of them from coming out with a statement saying, "This is what is contained in the Capsule; I swear on oath, I give an affidavit, that this is what is contained in the Capsule". Thus the Government's position is reduced to that of a laughing stock. This point of statutory sanction is very important because of the Government's stand that it is secret, which is absurd. I can understand when he says that he is not prepared to doctor it or change it or amend it. I can understand your saying it even though I feel that if selectivity leads to distortion, then there should be a certain judgment upon that selectivity and it is the duty of the Government as well as the Parliament to see whether that selectivity is properly exercised. I would like clari-

[Shri Lai K. Advani] fication on both these points—on secrecy, and even if there is secrecy, how these hundreds and thousands of people who have dealt with the Capsule, who have dealt with the embedding, .ire to ensure its secrecy. Is it because they are Government employees, they dare not do it? Tomorrow they will not be Government employees and they can do it. They can come forth with a statement giving out everything and saying that this is what is contained in the Capsule. As the Prime Minister said, this was not a bright idea. I think it would be proper for the Education Minister to confess that he feels that it is not proper that Rajendra Prasad's name or Rajaji's name or a reference to the martyrdom of Gandhiji should not have been there.

(Interruption)

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: If it is not a bright idea, dig up the Capsule and destroy it.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: The hon. Member has quoted the Prime Minister only partially.

(Interruptions)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I have mentioned two points. I mentioned statutory sanction which is very important.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Have you got anything to say on these two points?

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN : No, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: He has nothing to say.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: He wants to say something.

PROF. S. NURUL HASAN: No statutory authority is needed. I have

said so in the other House. The hon. Member has read out what I submitted in the other House.

(Interruptions)

DR. K. MATHEW KURIAN: The Government does not know the difference between history and fantasy.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: Dr. Kurian, we have reached a stage when you are repeating your questions and the Government is also making consistent stand on it.

"SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: I am not repeating. I raised a new question. I can understand the Education Minister saying that it is for the Law Ministry to look into it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI V. B. RAJU): Mr. Advani, your questions have been answered. He said, there is no statutory sanction behind this, there is no need for it. For purposes of secrecy, he has already made a mention of it. He has said that is how traditionally things are being done. He has already said it....

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI: No, he has not said it.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: He has said it in reply to an earlier question.

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI : I was only raising two questions. . .

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: He has already replied to your questions. Now the House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at fifty-six minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Tuesday, the 26th March. 1974.