

[Placed in Library. For
(a) to (c) See No.LT.-
1308/98]

Memorandum of understanding between the Government of India and Engineering Project (India) Limited

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): Sir, on behalf of SHRI SUKHBIR SINGH BADAL I lay on the Table a copy (in English and Hindi) of the Memorandum of Understanding between the Government of India (Ministry of Industry, Department of Heavy Industry) and Engineering Project (India) Limited, for the year 1998-99.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-880/98]

RE. QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

SHRI JAYANT KUMAR MALHOTRA (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I wish to raise a matter of privilege. When Members come into this House or the Lok Sabha, they have equal privileges. But we have noticed and it has been happening for quite some time that there are a lot of Members, ex-Ministers, ex-Chief Ministers or even present Ministers come into the House or near the precincts of the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha with armed guards, with guards who are armed to their teeth. In fact, the other day, when we were coming down the stairs of the main entrance and we found black cats, about 20 of them, surrounding a car with weapons pointing at us. I think all the Members who are here are provided security by the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha and we are under your protection and therefore, there should not be any difference at all. I think this matter should not be referred to the Privileges Committee and this entry of guards, entry of armed personnel, should be prevented in the precincts of Parliament.

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (Delhi): Sir,....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you referring to this issue or something else?

प्रो० विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: इसी के साथ... (व्यवधान)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is a matter of privilege. Are you joining him?

प्रो० विजय कुमार मल्होत्रा: सभापति महोदय, मैं इसी पर बोल रहा हूँ। (व्यवधान) खिलाफ नहीं बोल रहा हूँ। इसी इश्यु पर प्रिविलेज की बात कर रहा हूँ। आप सुन लीजिये (व्यवधान)

Please let me say something, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN, On privilege, only a person who has given notice will be called and not anybody else. (*Interruption*). I would like you, Mr. Sikander Bakht, to say something. As the Leader of the Opposition, you were deeply concerned with it.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): Sir, I do not have anything to say about the privilege part. But I would certainly bring to the notice of the Home Minister all these things on which I agree with the hon. Member that it should not happen here. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MD. SALIM (West Bengal): Sir, it is not a question of the Home Ministry. It is Parliament precincts, Lok Sabha and Speaker and Chairman. You should take a decision first. Security concern, of course, is there.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त: सदर साहब, आनरेबल मैम्बर ने बिल्कुल ठीक कहा है।

[[شری سیکندر بختہ صدر صاحب کی طرف سے
مجموعہ بارگاہی تحریک کہا ہے]]

The entire parliament House comes under the administrative concern of the Speaker. That is true.

मगर ब्लैक कैट्स का यहाँ आना, कहाँ तक आना, इसके लिए हुक्म होम मिनिस्ट्री ही दे सकती है।

[[مگر بلیک کیٹس کا یہاں آنا-کہاں
آنا-اس کے لئے حکم ہوم منسٹری ہی
دے سکتی ہے]]

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will look into it.

SHRI S. S. SURJEWALA (Haryana): may be permitted to say one thing. During the Question Hour, I did not think it proper to disturb the proceedings. I want your protection, Sir. I have asked several times. I am very sure, I have information, that the Government has not formally handed over that Australian wheat case to the CBI. Therefore, I would either like you to force the Government to answer correctly because it is being very vague that they have come to know that.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: That part is over now.

SHRI S. S. SURJEWALA: I want a half-an-hour discussion on that. It may be permitted, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Send the notice, we will decide on that.

Now, Mr. Virumbai.

RE. CAUVERY WATER DISPUTE

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBAI (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Chairman, Sir, today, I have again to raise the Cauvery issue here since I could not get any receprocal.....(Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. It was decided earlier that the matter would be raised because tomorrow would be the last day. It was decided that on Member from the DMK, one from the AIADMK, one from the Congress, one from the JD, one from the TMC and one from the BJP would be called. Others, no. Others have already spoken. It was decided that it should not be a general debate but only referring to the issue.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Karnataka): Please make it two for us.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. Then I will have to allow two for others also. (Interruptions). No. it was decided like that.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBAI: Sir, I did not get any response from the Government. I do not want to go into the previous history because it will take a lot of time. The Cauvery Water Disputes Tribunal declared its Interim Award on 25.6.1991 itself. Through this Award, they wanted to ensure 205 TMC of water for Tamil Nadu's purpose. That is, the Karnataka Government should release 205 TMC of water from June every year. Out of that, 6 TMC water is to be released to Pondicherry. At the same time, it was also decided that the State Government of Karnataka should not increase the irrigation area over 11.2 lakh acres. These are the contents of the Interim Order. This Interim Order was published in the gazette on 10.12.1991. Sir, the State Government of Karnataka have persistently violated the Interim order. Therefore, in 1992, the State Government of Tamil Nadu filed a suit in the Supreme Court under section 6A of the Inter-State Water Disputes Act 1956 for framing a scheme and its notification in the official gazette. In between, in the months of June and July, 1996, we were very much affected. Therefore, the State Government of Tamil Nadu filed an Interlocutory Application in the Supreme Court on 8.7.1996 praying for a direction to the State Government of Karnataka to release the prescribed quantity of water, as per the Award of the Tribunal since the State Government of Tamil Nadu could not get even fifty percent of water for which it was entitled during June-July 1996. Actually, the Supreme Court had advised the two Chief Ministers to have a dialogue. Accordingly, the two Chief Ministers held discussions, that is, the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu as well as the Chief Minister of Karnataka, on five occasions from August 1996 to January 1997. But they could not agree with each other. The fact of the failure of talks was reported to the Supreme Court on 4.2.1997. On 9.4.1997, the Attorney-General of India, had committed before the Supreme Court and I would like to quote that. "The Union of India is