

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will look into

SHRI S. S. SURJEWALA (Haryana): may be pennitted to say one thing. During the Question Hour, I did not think it proper to disturb the proceedings. I want your protection, Sit. 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 receprocaol..... (*Interruptions*).

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. It was decided earlier that the matter would be raised becuase 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 (Kamataka): 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 VIRUMBI:

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 Cauwry 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 Kamataka 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 that 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 Kamataka, 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

agreeable to frame a scheme under section 6A of the Act for the effective implementation of the Interim Award of the Tribunal. The scheme will be sent within the next eight weeks to the party-States for their comments, and thereafter, will be finalised by the Union of India and placed before Parliament in accordance with law". This was the commitment made by the Attorney-General before the Supreme Court. Though a period of more than fifteen months have lapsed, they did not do anything. Sir, last week, I had the opportunity to meet the Prime Minister twice. I had brought this matter to his notice on 16.7.98. The Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, Dr. Kalaingar, had sent a fax message to him. I would like to quote that fax message:

"Dear Prime Minister.

I draw your kind attention to my earlier letter date 13.7.98 on the subject of notifying the "Scheme" framed by the Government of India under section 6A of the Inter-State Water Disputes Act, 1956 for implementation of the Interim Award dated 25.6.91 of the Cauvery Water Disputes Tribunal. As early as 19.4.97, the Government of India committed before the Supreme Court that the Government of India would frame a scheme under the act and the scheme would be sent within eight weeks to the States, and thereafter, would be finalised. Even after a lapse of fifteen months after making a commitment in the Supreme Court, the scheme is yet to be notified despite repeated requests in person or through letters to you and to your predecessor. The Attorney-General, on one pretext or the other, sought adjournments on eight occasions. I understand that the issue of notifying the scheme is pending consideration of the Cabinet for quite sometime. I appeal to you to kindly ensure to have the scheme finalised and notify it before 21.7.1998. I request you to kindly instruct the Attorney-General to report the compliance of its earlier commitment by

the Government of India before the Supreme Court on 21st July, 1998 without seeking further adjournment. I look forward to your kind positive response and cooperation in this matter. "This fax message was signed by the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu and was sent on 16.7.98. The Same evening, I met the Prime Minister and handed over a copy of this fax message to him to see that it was immediately implemented. But, sir, to my surprise and to the surprise and agony of the people of Tamil Nadu, it has not so far been notified. Sir, today is the 20th of July, 1998. 24 hours are left. The hearing of the case is posted for tomorrow.

If the Government is not going to notify it, it means, crores of farmers in Tamil Nadu will be affected very severely. I, therefore, demand, through you, Sir, that the Government of India should come forward and notify a scheme. The Government of India should notify the scheme, as accepted by it in the Supreme Court, in the Official Gazette of India, and place it before the Parliament, as required under the law, and also inform the Supreme Court accordingly. Otherwise, it may lead to unnecessary frustrations and agitations. After having said all these things, I appeal, through you, Sir, to the Government to make a *suo motu* statement, why they have not done it so far and why there is a delay in notifying that. Sir, I want you to see that it is notified immediately; failing which, the Government of India may have to face some sort of agitation from the Tamil Nadu farmers. I don't want any agitation to take place. If an agitation takes place, it will affect both the parties. I again and again request, through you, Sir, the Government that it should notify it; the Government should not keep mum. Last time, they kept mum. The Prime Minister was actually under pressure to make an announcement in this august House about the postal strike. At that time, I demanded R lor workers. We too stood by the workers. That was in respect of the demands of the workers. This is in re

spect of the demands of the agriculturists. I made a demand earlier also. Unfortunately, the Government of India, and the Prime Minister, did not respond to the request made by the Members hailing from Tamil Nadu. Therefore, I request, through you, Sir, the Government to notify the award as well as the scheme and place that before the Parliament, and to also inform the Supreme Court Accordingly. I once again thank you, Sir, for allowing me to speak on this matter.

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM (Tamil Nadu): Sir, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to speak on the Cauvery issue. As far as the Cauvery issue is concerned, the Government has not taken into consideration the viewpoint of the Karnataka Government. When the matter came up for hearing last time before the bench of Chief Justice Verma, Chief Justice Punchhi, Justice Agarwal, Justice Anand and Justice Bharucha, there was a particular observation made by the bench. While adjourning for further hearing of the suit, the bench observed that it would be appropriate to give necessary time to the Union of India to try and resolve the controversy between the two States and to file the scheme within a period of three weeks. Mr. Chairman, Sir, when, last week, the same matter came up before the House, their reply was, "There is no concerned Minister." Now again I am asking the same question of the Union Government whether it is going to file the scheme tomorrow before the Supreme Court or not. That is my first point. The second point is whether they have prepared the scheme or not. If they have not prepared the scheme, then there will be a contempt of court. I request the Government to file the scheme because the matter is posted for hearing before the Supreme Court. In the last hearing, there was an observation made by the Attorney-General: "The Union of India is agreeable to frame a scheme under Section 6A of the Inter-State Water Disputes Act, 1956 for effective implementation of the Interim order of the Cauvery Water Disputes

Tribunal dated June 25, 1991." I want to know whether the Government is going to give a direction to the Attorney-General to file the scheme or not. Section 6A of the Act of 1956 deals with the power of the Union of India to frame a scheme to implement the decision of the Tribunal, including the establishment of any authority with the necessary power, including the right to hold, acquire and dispose of the property. I want to know whether the Government of India has taken, under Section 6A of the Act, any steps in this regard. After the hearing, the Irrigation Minister, Mr. Nage Gowda, said, "We will abide by the Supreme Court, direction." My question is whether the Government of India is going to comply with this Order or not. I want to make a request to the Union Government, and also to the Prime Minister, in this regard. The matter is pending before the Supreme Court. It is not just an order of a District Court. It is an Order of the Supreme Court. It is not an issue on which they can take a unilateral decision.

Last week also on the advice of Dr. J. Jayalalitha we met the Prime Minister on behalf of the AIADMK. A delegation of all our MPs met the Prime Minister regarding Cauvery water issue. I appeal to the Prime Minister to comply with the order because the matter is posted for hearing on 21st July. It is an order of the Supreme Court and the Central Government must comply with that order. If the Central Government is going to seek again an adjournment, our State is not going to get anything. When the matter came up for discussion last time, Shri Venkaiah Naidu and other Members were saying, "We are going to talk with the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu and the Chief Minister of Karnataka." This matter has been pending for more than 20 years. The Chief Ministers have been meeting again and again. But we are getting nothing. We have got an order from the Supreme Court. We are not asking for any help, from the Karnataka Government. It is an order of the Supreme Court. When an

order is passed by the Supreme Court, why is the Union Government not taking any action? Mr. Chairman, Sir, the matter is posted for hearing before the Supreme Court tomorrow. At least, the Union Government or some Minister or the concerned Minister must give some reply. Last time we raised the same points. Last time when I requested you, Mr. Chairman, you said, "There is no minister concerned". At least now, before the other Members are going to discuss the matter, the concerned Minister must come and state whether they are going to file a reply or not. I request. Sir, through you, the Government to make a statement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the House is here and is hearing everything.

SHRI N. THALAVAI SUNDARAM: After my speech, at least, the Leader of the House must give some reply because the matter is going to be heard by the Supreme Court tomorrow. We have only 24 hours' time.

Now the Karnataka Government had filed an appeal against the Tribunal award. That was dismissed in 1995. So, there was no *locus standi* for the Karnataka Government to raise the issue again and again. We have got a *pucca* order. At least, the Government of India should take the necessary steps. I request the Prime Minister or the concerned Minister to give a reply within five or ten minutes. Thank you.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Sir, we are passing through a peculiar time. This is the malady—I don't know whether I am right or wrong—of a coalition structure. Taking the weaknesses of the Government, the coalition partners, one and all, demand their pund of flesh. What is happening is that we are losing our reasoning under pressure. The matter is in the Supreme Court. It is *sub judice*. But here is a demand that the Government should stand up and say whether it is going to place a scheme or to seek an

adjournment before the Supreme Court. Sir, this is a very strange circumstance. How can the Government stand up and state on the floor of the House whether it prefers an adjournment or not (*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have made your points. Let him make his points.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Sir, I have not interrupted him. Unfortunately, a picture has been painted that Karnataka is taking away the water without giving it to Tamil Nadu. Actually, we cannot stop it. It has to go to Tamil Nadu and finally to the sea. We cannot stop it. We don't have that much storage facility at all. What is the position of Karnataka? Tamil Nadu with 52% basin area, contributing only 32% of the basin flows, has as much as 42.3% of its own area under irrigation, claiming 70% of the basin flows. Karnataka with 42% basin area, contributing 53% of the basin flows, has only 19% of its own area under irrigation. This is the disparity. We contribute the water and we are not allowed to use it. Karnataka is a power starved State today. Once upon a time Karnataka was a leading hydel power producer. Today we are suffering because all our projects are stopped. Today Karnataka produces only 42 megawatts and 17 megawatts, totalling 59 megawatts, whereas Tamil Nadu is producing 1,200 megawatts from the same water. Now we are starved even in power generation.

Coming to the Tribunal order. Section 6A of the 1950 Act has been extensively quoted here. That is a provision to implement the Tribunal order. There is no final order of the Tribunal. It is an Interim Order. Section 6A does not speak of any interim order at all. They are going to the Court, filing an application and putting pressure on the Court and the Government to come out with a scheme. What is the scheme? Shri Virumbi has said, "Karnataka has violated". There is a Tribunal Order that Tamil Nadu has to be given 205 TMC of

water every year. Even after the Order, against 205 TMC of water, Karnataka released 332 TMC of water in 1991-92, 367 TMC of water in 1992-93, 223 TMC of water in 1993-94, 372 TMC of water in 1994-95, 244 TMC of water in 1996-97 and 268 TMC of water in 1997-98. Every year more than 205 TMC of water was released. In the year....*{Interruptions}*.

SHRI N. THALAVAI
SUNDRARAM: Sir

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Mr. Sundaram, you have made your point. Let him make his point. He heard you quietly. You hear him quietly.

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Only in the year 1995-96— it was a drought year—when there was no water in the Cauvery, 183 TMC of water was released for Tamil Nadu. Sir, there was 197 TMC of water at Bellagunda which was short by 8 TMC of water. This 8 TMC of water was not impounded by Karnataka. It was impounded by the rain God, Varuna. He did not give water in that year. Barring that year, Karnataka has not violated at all. What is the scheme which is being talked of? This scheme has to be approved by the four States, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Kerala and Pondicherry. All the four States have not agreed to it. There are differences. The scheme has not yet been finalised. The Government of India cannot become a dictator. Without taking the consent of all these States, can the Government of India go before the Supreme Court in these circumstances and say, "We will implement the scheme and gazette it?"

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI:
Mr. Hanumanthappa, will you yield?

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: No. They say, "If a scheme is not placed before the Supreme Court tomorrow, crores of people will be affected". How can it be? They say, "If a scheme is placed before the Supreme court, 205 TMC of water will flow to Tamil Nadu." Even this year—we are in July and there are still two or three months of

monsoon—Karnataka has already released 67 TMC of water. Karnataka has no capacity to hold water. All the water, whether rain water or any other water, is going Tamil Nadu. We have not violated any Order. Because of the weaknesses of the Central Government and because of the dominance of certain parties, Tamil Nadu is putting pressure on the Government. This kind of attitude on the part of Tamil Nadu is uncalled for. The Government of India should not come under any pressure.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI (Karnataka): Sir, we just now had an opportunity to meet the Prime Minister. All the MPs of Karnataka met him just now. He has heard the case of Tamil Nadu. He has also heard the case of Karnataka. He has promised to look into the matter. As Prime Minister, he will have to take into confidence all the State to implement the scheme. There is one difficulty in notifying it. Even the Tribunal has said that during a period of distress any party could approach it and the order could be modified. Evidence part is already over. The Tribunal is likely to give its final verdict within a year. If they notify a scheme, it would create problems with

the proceedings, it will not help' at all. As Shri Hanumanthappa has said, uptill now 202 TMC of water has already gone to Tamil Nadu. There is 67 TMC of water with Mettur Dam. There are still three or four rainy months. Tamil Nadu will get nearly 400 TMC of water. Nothing will harm the interests of the Tamil Nadu farmers. But the farmers of Karnataka have not been able to raise even one crop dry-cum-wet. And we are contributing major water to the river basin. This is the situation. Sir, I would like to say one more thing. Right from the beginning we have been insisting that there should be a national water policy. Sir, an award was given by the tribunal between Punjab and Haryana. What happened? The then Prime Minister, Mrs. Gandhi, gave an order overruling the award of the tribunal. That has still not been

implemented and disputes are going on. So, these matters cannot be decided by courts. After all, water is the national wealth. And all farmers, whether of Tamil Nadu, Kerala or Karnataka, must get justice and they must get adequate water. Two-thirds of the water is going into the sea. We should think of ways of stopping it and instead think of using it fully. Then, everybody will be satisfied. On the question of adjournment and particularly the way it has been sought for, naturally they have a right to pressurise the Government. They are a part of the Government. Their Ministers are there in the Cabinet. According to me, being in the Government they cannot raise such *questions...*(*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI:
We are not.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: Of course, you are not. I will reply to you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: In this House everybody is speaking as members of their parties and not of the Government.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: Of course, they have got their legitimate rights. The matter is pending before the Supreme Court. We cannot raise it in this form and pressurise the Government, whichever be it. We should be fair enough and we should give a free hand to the Prime Minister so that he will be able to take a reasonable and just decision. That can only be done by calling all the Chief Ministers, by discussing with them and sorting things out. Only then will it be practical. As far as the point which the DMK leader has made is concerned, I repeat that in January, 1989, when I was the Chief Minister of Karnataka and Mr. Karunanidhi was the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu, we both solemnly affirmed at a public meeting that we would not go to the court, that we would negotiate, that we would be good neighbours and that in the larger interests of the farmers of Karnataka and Tamil Nadu we would sort out the matter amicably amongst ourselves. We also said that we would not even approach the Central Govern-

ment. To that extent, we agreed with each other. If we approach this matter with that spirit, this problem can be solved. I assure my friends of Tamil Nadu that no harm or damage has been done. Water is there. During this year as well as in the coming year, they will get ample water. Within this time the final order of the tribunal also will come. But if it is notified, it will create so many obstacles in the finalisation of the order. It will also create bad blood and a bad climate between the two States especially between the farmers of the two States.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Sir, first of all, I thank you for giving me an opportunity to represent my views and those of my party. Both the Members from Karnataka were referring that the matter was *sub judice*. The problem is that this is something which the Government has to do. An interim order had been passed by the Supreme Court and more than 15 months have elapsed after that interim order has been passed, but both the Central Government and the Government of Karnataka have not implemented it. They should either be held for contempt or we should pressurise the Government to obey the order of the Supreme Court. The fact is that the Supreme Court has passed an interim order saying that the interim order the tribunal should be notified. That order is being flouted. This is the law of the land. This is what the Supreme Court has directed. This is what Karnataka and Tamil Nadu, after so many rounds of negotiations of litigation, have finally arrived at. And the Central Government sits there and remains a mute spectator totally abdicating its responsibility....(*Interruptions*) I am not yielding, Mr. Bommai(*Interruptions*) Sir, I would like to be allowed to continue(*Interruptions*) I am not yielding, Sir.. ..(*Interruptions*)

SHRI S.K. KRISHNA (Karnataka):
Sir, I am on a point of order(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: When she is not yielding, you cannot speak....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: I may be given an opportunity to correct the position.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right. You can correct it later on ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I am not yielding to Mr. Krishna also. ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let her speak. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Sir, I am raising a point of order. ...(*Interruptions*)... Sir, I am on a point of order

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, I did not interrupt anybody. Sir, I seek your protection. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Sir, I seek your protection too.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact, he can raise the point of order anytime. That is true.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Let him state under which rule he is raising the point of order. Sir, I am requesting you to please ask him to state the rules under which his point of order arises. I have not said anything unparliamentary. I do't know under which rule his point of order arises. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Sir, I am not on that point at all.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Let him state the rules under which he is raising the point of order ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Sir, she should be allowed to conclude her speech.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Krishna, please sit down. I know that this is an emotional issue with all of them. That is why it was decided that you would do it

calmly and we will allow one Member from each party. If any party has to speak on it, then its Member can put forth its view here. But, if you start interrupting, again the whole thing will get worked up. We will not reach any

conclusion. The whole idea of this debate is you may speak; they may speak and a message may go to the Government. If the Government wants to respond, then it will do it. But, don't try to say that he is wrong and he is wrong. They think you are wrong and you think they are wrong. Everybody has a right to speak. You should not correct a Member when he is speaking. When Mr. Bommai was speaking, I did not allow anybody to interrupt. Please don't try to correct her or she should not correct you when you will be speaking. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Sir, does your observation which you were pleased to make, bar me from raising the point of order? What does the rule say? ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Number one, you have not quoted any rules. Number two, if every Member tries to raise a point of order, then there can be ten points of order on your point of order. That is what we have seen in this House. The question is to keep the tempers down so that Members may hear one another and put the point of view before the Government which has to take a decision in this regard. So, that kind of an atmosphere should be created. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Sir, I wanted to raise a point of order, but I obeyed your orders.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Many Members have points of order ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI S.M. KRISHNA: Sir, I obey your orders and in protest I stage a walk out.

[At this stage, the hon. Member left the Chamber.]

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE
(SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): Mr.

Hanumanthappa, you should stop him. ...
(*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: If they are not able to meet our argument, they will have to walk out. ...
(*Interruptions*)...

Sir, I will say what I like. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA (Karnataka): When the hon. Member was not allowed to raise the point of order, he staged a walk out. Why is she objecting to his protest?

SHRI K. RAHMAN KHAN (Karnataka): We are prepared to meet her argument.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has a right to stage a walk out. Please don't comment on that.

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA: Sir, he walked out in protest. ...(*Interruptions*)... What is wrong in it?

MR. CHAIRMAN: I request the hon. Member not to provoke other Members. Please confine yourself to your points.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Excuse me, Sir, when Mr. Hanumanthappa and Mr. Bommai were speaking, there were many points of view which they expressed, which we differed from very patiently, but we kept silent in deference to what you said. Sir, it is parliamentary conduct, when I am trying to make a point, somebody wants to raise a point of order and you have not permitted it. If they walk out, if I express a view that they are not able to meet an argument, there is nothing wrong in it. Sir, if I have done something wrong, please pull me up. I can express a view that Members from Karnataka are unable to meet our argument.

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA: We are not confronting her. We have expressed our views and they are expressing their views. (*Interruptions*) There is no question of meeting a point. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: We are ready to meet that. It should be removed from the record. (*Interruptions*)-

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down.
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA: Things were going very calmly.
(*Interruptions*)

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, only half-a-minute. (*Interruptions*) Observations made by the hon. Member are not acceptable to them. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, please permit me to continue. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree with you. That is right. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Virumbi, will you agree on her observation that Karnataka Members are unable to meet the argument? Should it go on record? (*Interruptions*) Is it not provocation? (*Interruptions*) Are we unable to meet? We are ready. You cannot say that. (*Interruptions*) This is not the way. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree with you. (*Interruptions*) When I am standing, everybody should sit down, please. (*Interruptions*) Jayanthiji, the question is, when some Member gives an argument, others also give argument. We should not say, "You are not meeting my argument." Then, quarrel starts. Let us understand. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: All right. I will not say. I just want to make my point. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not unparliamentary. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Expunge it, Sir. What is our position? (*Interruptions*) I am sorry. What is our position when she said we are not meeting the argument. (*Interruptions*) I request you let it not go on record. (*Inter-*

ruptions) Whatever she wants to say, let her say. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: She has agreed. (Interruptions)

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: Unnecessarily she is ... (Interruptions)... We expressed our sentiments. (Interruptions) This should not happen in the Council of States.

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA: Please do not challenge any other Member. (Interruption) We have not come in her way. While speaking, please, do not challenge any other Member. Please speak. We are so happy. When we are speaking ... (Interruptions)...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARA-JAN: If I have said anything unparliamentary, please expunge it. Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Let me tell you, Jayanthiji. It was not unparliamentary but it provokes. We should have seen, we wanted to keep the atmosphere of the House cool. If you go on saying that you are not right and I am not wrong, it is difficult. It is an emotional issue for both of you. You should not say, "You are not able to meet a point."

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARA-JAN: I respectfully agree with whatever you say. I only want to make one point if you permit me. All of us were silent. Excuse me. Sir, Mr. Hanumanthappa made a remark that the people of Tamil Nadu are united in a passionate urge to see that this is implemented.

Mr. Hanumanthappa and Mr. Bommai said that we are exerting pressure because we are in coalition. What is that we should listen to? You are casting aspersions upon our passions. (Interruptions) I wanted to say that you did not agree with me. (Interruptions)

PROF. VIJAY KUMAR MALHOTRA (Delhi): When you were standing, nobody else objected. (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARA-JAN: What kind of attitude; They can question our motive!

MR. CHAIRMAN: No motive. Jayanthiji, please do not provoke anybody. Do not comment against any individual or anything. (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARA-JAN: I know, Mr. Chairman is standing. (Interruptions).

MR. CHAIRMAN: You should please state your case. Please sit down. This is not good. Do not provoke anybody. You state your case. (Interruptions).

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARA-JAN: I just want to make my point. I do not want to enter into an argument. I want to make my case.

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त: मुझे एक मिनट दे सकती हैं जयन्ती जी।....(व्यवधान)... सदर साहब , इस इश्यु के बाहर की बात कहनी है। मैं अभी हनुमन्तप्पा साहब से मिला था और उनसे कहा था कि आनरेबिल मैंबर अभी प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर उठा रहे थे। उन्होंने प्वाइंट आफ आर्डर के सिलसिले में कोई रुल कोट किया नहीं था। लेकिन निहायत अफसोसनाक बात जो हुई है वह यह हुई है कि against the ruling of the Chairman he walked out. It is very sad. It does not happen in Rajya Sabha at all. और मेरा ख्याल यह है कि हमारे यहां की वजादारियां जो हैं तबाह हो रही हैं सब, इसका ख्याल रखेंगी मेहरबानी करके. This is not the way. Nobody does it.

{نیتاسدن "شری سکندر بخت": مجھے ایک منٹ

دے سکتی ہیں جی۔۔۔ "مداخلت"۔۔۔ صدر صاحب۔ اس

ایشو کے بابر کی بات کہنی ہے۔ میں ابھی ہنومن تھپا صاحب

سے ملاتھا اور ان سے کہتا تھا کہ آنریبل ممبر ابھی پوائنٹ آف

آرڈر اٹھا رہے تھے انہوں نے پوائنٹ آف آرڈر کے سلسلے میں

کوئی رول کوٹ کیا نہیں تھا۔ لیکن نہایت افسوسناک بات

جو ہوئی وہ یہ ہوئی ہے کہ: }

against the ruling of the Chairman, he walked out. It is very sad. It does not happen in Rajya Sabha at all.

اور میرا خیال یہ ہے کہ ہمارے یہاں کی وضع داریاں جو ہیں

تبہاہ پوری ہیں سب اسکا خیال رکھیں گی مہربانی کر کے:

This is not the way. Nobody it.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I just want to continue with what I am saying. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA: I told him what I had to say. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point is, the Leader of the House is deeply concerned with the decorum of the House. He did not quote any rule. He had not quoted any rule. So, I said, "You hear; do not do it." But, he walked out against my decision. For that he is pained. If the Chair is not respected, what happened the other day? Then the House cannot continue with respect and decorum. His

attempt is...(*Interruptions*)... I know it is your attempt also...(*Interruptions*)... I know about your attempt also...(*Interruptions*)... Sometimes under emotions we do certain things. I forgive Mr. S.M. Krishna for what he has done.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, may I continue with ray point? Sir, I was just attempting to point out that it is wrong to say that this matter cannot be raised here because it is *sub judice*. The point is that we are now agitating over here for implementation of the Supreme Court order by the Government which the Government is failing to do. That was the issue and calling this issue *sub judice* is just a red-herring. It has got no relevance to this case at all. Secondly, Sir, I -was astonished to hear the view put forward in this House that karnataka is contributing water. Sir, water is a precious national resource of the

country. We do not need the Supreme Court to say that the river waters are common to everybody. But even so. Sir, in the Supreme Court AIR of 1991 Justice Sawant said, "Though the waters of an inter-State river pass through territories of the riparian States such waters cannot be said to be located in one State. They are in a state of flow and no State can claim its exclusive ownership of such waters as to deprive other States of their equitable share." So, I find it a little difficult to accept this theory that they contribute water. The water does not belong to any particular State. It would be dangerous to base our arguments and base our negotiations upon such a theory because this would give the upper riparian States an impossible advantage. The whole country would be sent to anarchy if we allow this kind of an argument to take place. Therefore, I would like to straightaway refute that theory. I would like to say that this is a wrong word to say that the upper riparian States contribute water and are entitled to a greater share of river waters. This would be very dangerous for the neighbourly relations between the States. I request the House to reject this theory. Finally, Sir, I just want to say something about the 1924 Agreement which governed the distribution of Cauvery Water between Karnataka and Tamil Nadu and according to us what was provided for in 1971 was a reiev of certain clauses. But the basic features, the most important features of the 1924 Agreement should just continue. Sir, tempers are already extremely high. Without going into any further details-all my colleagues from Tamil Nadu have raised this important issue-I would just like to say that Tamil Nadu has been extremely patient. The people of Tamil Nadu have waited from 1971 to see that this Agreement is properly implemented. Thirty-one times negotiations have been conducted between the States. It is not as if we rushed to court, it is not as if our tempers were so high and it is not as if the people of Tamil Nadu were unreasonable. Thirty-one times negotiations were

conducted at the level of the Chief Minister with the Prime Minister, Sir, then finally after a great negotiation a Tribunal was appointed. Much argument was conducted in the Tribunal. Sir, it is a fact that after joining the Tribunal, after appearing before the Tribunal, after interim orders of the Tribunal were passed, Karnataka enacted the Cauvery Basin Water Protection Act by which they sought to nullify the orders of the Tribunal in an illegal way. The Supreme Court held that Act of the Karnataka Legislature is constitutional and *ultra vires* and struck it down. After that again we went back to the Tribunal. We requested the Tribunal to pass an interim order. More than eight interlocutory applications have been filed by the Government of Tamil Nadu in desperation. After the Tribunal passed an interim order for relief, that order has not been implemented. Then the Tamil Nadu Government moved the Supreme Court and fifteen months ago the Supreme Court passed an order. Eight times the Attorney-General of India-whichever may be the Government-has taken adjournment for no proper reason. I do not want to say anything about it. Eight times adjournments were taken. Now tomorrow is the last day. Sir, the Government is in contempt of the Supreme Court orders. There is no use of anyone saying, "Let us talk further; let us conduct negotiations." What negotiations have been conducted for twentyfive years and for thirtyone times? Orders have been passed by the Cauvery Tribunalorders-have been passed by the Supreme Court and orders have been passed by every authority. If Karnataka continues to flout these orders and then argues to say that interim orders cannot be notified, it is something which has already been raised at several fora and argues also. This is no longer a question in dispute before the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court has said finally that this order should be implemented. Therefore, I would like to say that I can also quote figures. I have also got the figures.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have already taken more than three minutes.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, I have to add one more sentence. I can also quote figures but I am not going to do it because standing over here, in this august House, we cannot trade figures back and forth and disagree with each other's figures. Therefore, I am not going to do that. All I am trying to say is, we are not here for any political reason. This is the cry over the last many years because Karnataka is refusing to release the water in time. They are building reservoirs and dams to keep the water for their own summer crops and denying water to our crops and as a result, much loss has been caused to the people of Tamil Nadu and to the farmer of Tamil Nadu. This should not be allowed to continue. To say that we cannot keep water...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, you have finished... (*interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, please allow me to finish in one sentence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: To say that we cannot keep water and to say that water will overflow, I would say that Tamil Nadu is not a drainage area for overflowing water and for floods. Sir, 205 tme is a matter of right which has been ordered by the Tribunal and which has been ordered by the Supreme Court. Therefore, we call upon the Government of India to respond immediately. Tomorrow they have to let us know. I also think that it is very unfair to talk about pressure, twentyfive years of pressure. We have not exerted any pressure. Even now that we are seeking the implementation of the order which is our rightful demand and the lifeline of the people of Tamil Nadu, call upon the Leader of the House to respond now and tell us whether the Centre is going to notify the scheme which has already been farmed. What'

will be the Centre's position in the Supreme Court tomorrow so that we will be able to satisfy ourselves that the law of the land is being protected? Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Ven-kaiah Naidu.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY (Karnataka): Sir, I would like to say a word under Rule 258 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States. Here, there was some misunderstanding. Sir, a wrong message should not go to the country that one of the hon. Members of this House has defied. It should not go, Mr. S.M. Krishna was a former Speaker of Karnataka Assembly. Naturally his conduct has been exemplary so far. He was under the impression, I feel from the that took place, and in your wisdom, you have done a correct thing. I did not find any mistake or anything of that sort. Now, Sir, what I wanted to say is, a wrong signal should not go. This is my submission. What had happened? He raised a point of order. He did not mention the rule under which he raised it when it was being asked by an hon. Member.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Or, by the Leader of the House also.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: It has happened like that. What had happened? I feel from the conversation which took place here, he did not *...(interruptions)...*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can tell you what you are going to say now. It would be, it is here in the book "Rajya Sabha at work", under Points of Order, it is said, "...On his formulating a point of order, the Chair decides whether the point raised is a point of order, if so, gives his decision there on, which is final. Members cannot protest against the Chair's ruling; to do so is a contempt of the House and the

Chair. Rulings given by the Chair cannot be discussed in the House nor can any clarification or explanation sought thereon..." Sir, I do not allow *...(Interruptions)...*No.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: I fully agree with you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may not, in this whole process *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Sir, I am not disagreeing with you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: As a matter of fact, I have totally forgiven and forgotten what he has done. By doing this, you will be doing harm to the institution and not only to me but also to him.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Before making a submission, I would like to make one point clear.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can talk to me in my Chamber, not *here....(Interruptions)...* No, you cannot talk here. *...(Interruptions)..."You can talk to me in my Chamber. ... (Interruptions)...*No, please *...(Interruptions)...*

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: I am not defending him. I am defending you. Sir. That is what I am submitting *...(Interruptions)...*

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have already forgotten the whole thing.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: But, Sir, tomorrow newspapers will raise this issue saying that he defied you. It will send a wrong signal *...(Interruptions)...*

MR. CHAIRMAN: But do you mean to say that he did not defy.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: No, no, what I am saying is that you have forgiven him. It is great on your part *...(Interruptions)...*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Forgotten.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY: Yes, you have done that. Now, what I am saying is that there has been some misunderstanding *...(Interruptions)...* What I am submitting is *...(Interruptions)...*

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please do not discuss this issue here. It will create more problems *...(Interruptions)...* Please *...(Interruptions)...*

श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक (उत्तर प्रदेश): श्रीमन, मेरा एक निवेदन है आपसे ।....(व्यवधान)...

श्री सभापति: किस बात के लिए?

श्री रमा शंकर कौशिक: मेरा आपसे केवल यह निवेदन है कि श्रीमन आपने उस बात को भुला दिया, यह बात सही है। लेकिन इनका भी कहना सही है कि मैसेज जाएगा। नेता सदन ने जो बात रखी है कृपा करके उसको अगर हटा देंगे तो यह बात हल हो जाएगी, जो यह चाहते हैं।

श्री सभापति: देखिये यहां पर इस बारे में कुछ मत कीजिये।

You will unnecessarily be entering into another privilege issue against yourself. Now, Mr. M. Venkaiah Naidu.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU (Karnataka): Sir, before I speak on this issue, I would like to draw your attention to the comments made by Jayanthiji regarding the general capacity of the Members of Karnataka. Unfortunately, it is going on record. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I did not say that ...(*Interruptions*)...:

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Yes, you said that. You said, "Members of Karnataka are not able to defend or counter arguments ...(*Intemptions*)..."

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I said, "Mr Krishna".

SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA: See the record. Sir ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please let him speak. I know somebody may feel hurt when she says...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Sir, he is saying ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Venkaiah Naidu, I would request you to speak only about Karnataka's case and do not refer to what one party said and what the other party said. We should not enter into arguments. You have a case. You put your case.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, I am not entering into any argument at all. But, please try to understand, tomorrow when it will be published in newspapers that one of the hon. Members of this House has cast aspersions about the capacity of the Members of Karnataka, it will rouse regional passion. You know that I am holding a different post at party level. I am not trying to raise any regional issue here. As a Member from Karnataka, I have got certain responsibilities to fulfil, that is, to defend the case of Karnataka, to argue the case of Karnataka, to highlight the case of Karnataka and also to put forth the viewpoint of Karnataka. But, at the same time, I do not want anybody to cast aspersions ...(*Interruptions*)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree with your point.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Secondly, Sir, this issue should not merely be seen either from a regional angle or from a political angle. As Members of the respective States have got every right to represent their case, they have represented it to the Prime Minister. The other side has also represented its case to the Prime Minister. All of us met the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister has given a patient hearing to both sides. Let the Government take some decision tomorrow. Some Members — I would not like to name them — have made remarks that, "It is a weak Government. It is a coalition Government." But, I would like to draw their attention to the fact that this order of the Supreme Court was passed in April, 1997. Now, it is July, 1998. Who was in power all these days? It was not this Government which was in power. The Members who were making speeches were in the Government yesterday. They could not do it because there is a practical difficulty. It is not so easy just say, "Okay Government will do it tomorrow". It is not that much easy, and that much possible also because of the very fact, as the hon. Member said, that from 1970 to 1990 the negotiations went on.

went on, went on, but they could not find a solution. When the same parties, friendly parties, were ruling both the State of Karnataka and the State of Tamil Nadu, I mean Karunanidhi and Bommai; Karunanidhi and J.H. Patelji, they could not come to a conclusion because local political compulsions, regional aspirations and also the political issues, which are also involved, have made it very difficult to come to a final conclusion. Today, fortunately - as stated by other hon. Members - there is enough water. There is no reason to be tense. There is no reason to get agitated. I recognise the fact that - from my hon. friends from Tamil Nadu - the Supreme Court has given an order and it is the duty of the Government of India to come forward or appear before the Supreme Court with a proposal as to what to do in this regard. But, at the same time, I only tell them, that the present situation is that there is plenty of water.

The second thing is that unless you are able to formulate a National River Water Policy, there cannot be an end to this dispute. Any number of disputes at the State level which have arisen - are not going to solve the problem even if tomorrow the Prime Minister calls the Chief Ministers of both the States, unless they see reason, the problem cannot be solved. Sir, the scheme was formulated by the earlier Government and not by this Government. It was sent to Tamil Nadu, it was sent to Karnataka. Karnataka said, 'No, we do not agree with the scheme'. The Centre cannot enforce this forcibly. If you give that power to the Centre, what will happen to other related issues, you can understand and imagine. It is not only a matter between Karnataka and Tamil Nadu, it is a matter even between Karnataka and Pondicherry, they are also involved in this. They also have their own viewpoint. I only urge upon the Government of India to call these States, talk to them and make them see reason. This is one point. Or, secondly, abide by the final orders of the Tribunal, whatever the

Tribunal is going to say. The Tribunal was set up in 1990. Already more than 7½ or 8 years have passed. The Government of India should urge the Tribunal to expedite the proceedings and come to a conclusion. Both the States should be in a position to agree to the final conclusion of the Commission. This is the only solution. You cannot find a ready-made solution, an immediate solution. Members should not accuse the Government by saying that this Government is weak. This is a coalition Government. There was a coalition earlier also. Coalitions have come to stay in this country. At the same time, there is no alternative to this Government also. My only request is, 'please do not arouse regional passions, do not make a political issue out of this issue'. This can be an emotional issue which may hurt the interests of both the States as well as the country. We have seen enough of it earlier, as to what happened earlier.

I request the Government to come with a meaningful solution to this problem and take the House also into confidence. Tomorrow they have to inform the Supreme Court, they will inform the Supreme Court. After they inform the Supreme Court, I request them to come to the House and take the House also into confidence.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now, one Member is left. Shri T.M. Venkatachalam. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SMT. JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I heard someone speaking. I was listening to the hon. Members. I just want to put the record straight. ...*(Interruptions)*... I want to apologize. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. CHAIRMAN: She wants to apologize. 7..*(Interruptions)*... You don't even want her to apologize ...*(Interruptions)*... Why do you stand every time?

SMT. JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I did not mean to hurt. I was surprised to hear my friends. By no stretch of imagination, did I for a minute mean to

hurt the feelings of my colleagues from Karnataka for whom I have great respect. I did not refer to any of them. My only reference was to the stand of Karnataka, legal stand of Karnataka on the Cauvery water. I did not make any reference to the Members from Karnataka. If a wrong impression was given, I apologise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right, thank you. Now, Mr. Venkatachalam.

SHRI T.M. VENKATEACHALAM (Tamil Nadu): Regarding this Cauvery issue our colleagues, Shri Viduthalia Vir-umbi and Smt. Jayanthi Natarajan, have explained everything. I do not want to repeat that matter. The Cauvery issue is a very serious issue in Tamil nadu, so the Prime Minister has to intervene in this matter and take necessary action as soon as possible. I want to say one thing that the 'Contribution Water' list has been given by hon. Shri Hanumanthappa. It is only the overflow water during the heavy rainy season and not the water released as per the Tribunal order. So, when the rainfall is more, the water will come automatically. There is no facility to reserve the surplus water in the existing reservoir as they say. So, we want implementation of the Award of the Tribunal. The Prime Minister should take necessary action regarding this matter. The Tamil Nadu people are eagerly expecting a favourable order from the Central Government. Once again, I request that this matter may be considered as soon as possible. Thank you. Sir. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: I just want to keep the record straight.

1.00 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please. Don't raise anything more.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: Sir, if you give me permission. I want to set the record straight. That is all. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Then others would start.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: I am not referring to anybody. I want a part of the UF

Government. It is my duty to point out. It is only from that point of view. I am not making any reference to any Member. I only want to put the record straight. Otherwise, it would be wrong.

I only want to say that in 1997, the Attorney-General represented before the Supreme Court that the Central Government would frame a scheme, sent it to the States and, with their consent, place it before the Supreme Court. Accordingly, the Central Government framed the scheme and sent it to the States, to the concerned States. The States had given their own comments. Some have agreed; some have not agreed. Therefore, the Central Government would have to go into all that and take a decision.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right.

SHRI S.R. BOMMAI: No direction was given by the Supreme Court.

MR. CHAIRMAN: that is all right. The Government will look into it. Now, the House is adjourned till....

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, you were to call the Leader of the House.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: What about the response from the Government?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the House will respond at 2 o' clock.

The House then adjourned for lunch, at one minute past one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at two minutes past two of the clock. The Deputy Chairman in *the Chair*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mrs. Jayanthi is smiling at me.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: I am very happy to see you. Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I know that you want me to protect you from the floods of the Cauvery in Rajya Sabha. It took almost one hour.

Sikander Bakht Saheb, are you going to speak on the Cauvery;

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): No. I know nothing about the Cauvery.

میں نے آنرےبل ممبرس کی تقریریں سنی ہیں جو کاویری ڈیسپوٹ کے संबंध میں یہاں ہوئی ہیں۔ میں نے ان کے خیالات، ہر پارٹی کی طرف سے بولے ہوئے شخص کے خیالات پرائم مینسٹر تک پہنچا دوں گا۔

{نیتا سدن "شری سکدرخت": میں نے

آنریبل ممبرس کی تقریریں سنیں جو کاویری ڈیسپوٹ کے

بارے میں یہاں ہوئیں۔ میں یہاں پریپورے وقت موجود رہا

ہوں۔ بہت غور سے سنا اور میں ان کے خیالات پر پارٹی کی

طرف سے بولے ہوئے شخص کے خیالات وزیراعظم تک

پہنچا دوں گا۔

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: No, no, that is not enough, Madam. Tomorrow is the Supreme Court hearing. What is the Government going to do? ... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just one by one. Are you not satisfied with one full hour's discussion? ... (Interruptions) ..

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: I know it. I have nothing further to add.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: No, Madam, this is not acceptable. ... (Interruptions)

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: I have listened to all the speeches of the hon. Members, and I am going to convey all their views to the Prime Minister... (Interruptions) ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let the atmosphere in the House recede.

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Are you not going to issue a notification? ... (Interruptions)

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: I have nothing further to add.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: This is not fair. (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat.

Jayanthiji, Sikander Bakht Saheb is the Leader of the House. He is neither the Minister administering the water resources nor the Prime Minister to give an assurance on what is to be done on this.. (Interruptions) ...

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Then, the Minister concerned should come.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Let the Prime Minister come. ... (Interruptions) ...

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: The Minister concerned does not come when Special Mentions are made... (Interruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Just one minute. While I am trying to find a redressal of your grievance, is it proper for you to put that kind of a ban? Then, all the water of the Cauvery will flow in the House. Don't put that ban.

Shri Sikander Bakht Saheb, you know the reason that tomorrow the Supreme Court decision will come. It is a time-bound thing. As you have to convey it to the Prime Minister and he has to take a final decision, please convey to the Prime Minister that the Members from all sides are very agitated and very concerned about it.

Please take some steps for immediate redressal of their grievances. (Interruptions)

SHRI S. VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI: Madam, I have raised this issue twice. Today I have raised it for the third time. I have also handed over a copy of the Chief Minister's fax to the Prime Minister himself. Since they have not yet been able to take any action, in protest, on behalf of the DMK, we stage a walk out.

(At this stage some hon. Members left the Chamber.)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARA-JAN: Madam, the Government has to decide what stand they are to take. The Government should already have known what stand they are going to take. (Inter-ruptions)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If you had given any Special Mention, I would have known about it.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARA-JAN: Madam, the Government should already have known what stand they are going to take in the Supreme Court tomorrow. There is no need to consult. The Government should know what stand they are taking. This matter had been adjourned fifteen months ago. Eight times adjournments have been taken. The Government cannot abdicate its responsibility like this. Surely, the Leader of the House will have to know what stand the Government will take tomorrow. This is a very urgent and pressing problem for the people of Tamil Nadu.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think I will let Sikander Bakht Sahib leave from this House so that he can have some consultation with the Prime Minister.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARA-JAN: Madam, in protest against the callous indifference of the Central Government towards the people of Tamil Nadu, I stage a walk out from the House.

(At this stage the hon. Member left the Chamber.)

SHRI R. MARGABANDU (Tamil Nadu): Madam, since the Government has not come forward with a definite answer in spite of repeated requests, this shows the Government is not responding to our request at least to say what the stand of the Central Government is. As a protest we stage a walk-out.

(At this stage the hon. Member left the Chamber.)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me only be concerned that, after all these walk-outs, there is enough quorum in the House.

श्री बालकवि बेरागी (मध्य प्रदेश): मैडम, सिकन्दर साहब को याद दिलाइए कि यह कैसे सिकन्दर हैं? एक सिकन्दर वह था, हुजूर, जो यूनान से चला और कई नदियां पार करता हुआ हिन्दुस्तान आ गया और आप कस्बेरी का मसला तय नहीं कर पा रहे हैं।

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त: आप जो कह रहे हैं, मैं वह सिकन्दर नहीं हूँ..... (व्यवधान)...

{نیتا سدن "شری سکندر بخت": آپ جو کہ

رہے ہیں میں وہ سکندر نہیں ہوں۔۔۔ "مداخلت"۔۔۔}

उपसभापति: यहां कावेरी को पार नहीं करना है, कावेरी को बांटने की बात हो रही है।..... (व्यवधान)...

Mr. Minister, I know that we have the Appropriation Bill. Before that I have seven Special Mentions, which would require about half an hour. I will try my best to get them completed in half-an-hour, provided there is not flooding again. Yes, what is your problem?

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: Madam, I am on a point of procedure. I am seeking a clarification.- Up to Thursday, in the List of Business, as part of the Government, it was listed that the Department of Environment and Forests would be discussed. Suddenly in the List of Business that we have received today, we have found that it is removed and these two Bills are listed. To the best of my knowledge there was no Business Advisory Committee meeting. Normally, if there is any additional business from the Government side, we have it listed as a Supplementary Business, but never have we seen that a business, which is already listed in the List, goes out just like that. So, could you clarify the position? How it happened and that too without the formal Business Advisory Committee taking place?

†[] Transliteration in Arabic Script.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are two aspects of it. One is that we had taken a decision to discuss certain Ministries, out of which two have been already discussed and two have remained. Environment and Forests was to be discussed on Thursday or Friday. They could not be taken up. So, it was a left-over business for this week. But, by that time, the Appropriation Bill was not ready for us to discuss. It was still in the Lok Sabha. So, was the Finance Bill. You know very well that the Finance business has a precedence over any other business. The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs brings the business. Rajya Sabha only properly arranges it on different days and time in the Business Advisory Committee meeting. Since no Business Advisory meeting took place and this Narcotic Bill was to be discussed, I do not know how the Ministry of Environment and Forests was dropped. Because it was brought from the earlier List of Business, it should have been carried over.

Today, the Appropriation (No. 3) Bill is with us. It was decided that we would discuss the Appropriation Bill. I agree with you that they should have issued a supplementary list of business soon after a decision was taken in the morning because many Members would like to participate in the discussion on the Appropriation Bill; and also on the Finance Bill then it comes up tomorrow or day after tomorrow. I would like to inform the Secretariat that whenever such a decision is taken for whatever reason, they should issue a supplementary list of business.

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु(पश्चिमी बंगाल): एप्रोप्रिएशन तो लिखा है, मेरी प्रब्लम एप्रोप्रिएशन से नहीं है।

उपसभापति: मिस एप्रोप्रिएशन है?

श्री नीलोत्पल बसु: मेरी प्रब्लम इसमें से है कि

How did they drop the discussion on the Ministry of Environment and Forests altogether from today's "List of Business"?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is not dropped. It will be taken up.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: But there is no mention of it in today's 'List of Business'.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Kerala): It has not been printed in this order paper. It has been dropped. That is the point.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: It is not a good precedent.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is a wrong precedent. It has happened. They will do it. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs can take care of it. Unfortunately, we do not have the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs around the House.

SHRI NILOTPAL BASU: That is the problem. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is not around here.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I would like to inform Sikander Bakht Sahib that it is a serious matter. We should have the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs around here to listen to the grievances of Members. Now, if somebody comes and makes an announcement and goes back to the Lok Sabha, we have no problem. But we have enough and very competent Members from this side who can be appointed as the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs. Mr. Venkaiah Naidu can be appointed as the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs so that he can stop showing us the Rules book and he himself will be following the rules more often!

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: Madam, I agree with you. But the difficulty is that we are left with very short time. Therefore, some reshuffle has to be done so that we can get through the most important business. Even the Narcotic Drugs Bill to be piloted by the Finance Minister is being put off because of that reason. However, we will take care of that and will ensure that nothing of that sort happens again.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: They are not complaining of the Narcotic

Drugs Bill, but they are complaining about the discussion on the working of the Ministry of Environment and Forests.

SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT: The discussion on this Ministry will come up soon after the Appropriation Bill and Finance Bill are passed.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think Mr. Venkaiah Naidu has come specially to listen to this matter. Now, we will go ahead with Special Mentions.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: Madam, you are very clear. We agree with your observation that Appropriation Bill and the Finance Bill get precedence over other matters. We fully agree with that. But, at the same time, don't drop the other item which has already been listed. Please give an opportunity to the Members to speak on the working of the Ministry of Environment and Forests. That is our only submission.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Agreed. We will have a discussion on the working of the Ministry of Environment and Forests as well as on the working of the Ministry of Industry.

SPECIAL MENTIONS

Dilution of Jute Packaging Order

SHRI JOYANTA ROY (West Bengal): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to bring, through you, to the notice of the Government a very serious issue concerning 2 lakhs of jute workers and more than 40 lakhs of jute works of the State of West Bengal. Madam, as you know, the jute industry is a labour-intensive industry. Jute is the only major cash crop of the State. The Parliament has enacted a law in 1987 known as the Jute Packaging Material Act which protects the traditional industry of the State from the onslaught of the synthetic lobby. According to the provisions of this Act, 100 per cent of the foodgrains including sugar and 50 per cent of cement and fertilizers, particularly, urea have to be packed in jute sacks. Unfortunately, right from the beginning, a section of the

officers of the Ministry of Textiles have made this law a farce. Madam, we are seriously concerned. On 2nd of June, the Standing Advisory Committee constituted under this Act decided, ignoring the ground reality, that the entire cement industry and the fertiliser industry be exempted from compulsory jute packaging. Worse still, 20 per cent in respect of packing of sugar was further diluted. What is astonishing is this. On 1st of June, our State Labour Minister, on behalf of the State, met our Prime Minister and submitted on behalf of the State Government, a proposal. The hon. Prime Minister assured him that everything would be looked into and they would see that the law-enforcing agency was strict and any violation of the law would be dealt with firmly. But, on the following day, the Standing Advisory Committee resolved otherwise! Madam, some say that this industry is a dying industry and it has got no future. But the Expert Committee report says otherwise. If you go through the findings of the Central Jute Research Laboratory and the Indian Jute Development Council report, it is known to all that this biodegradable and eco-friendly product has got a very good, very bright, future. And, already, diversified Jute products have got a worldwide acceptance.

Madam, I think that the Jute Corporation of India is not purposeful now. The Government should come forward to make it purposeful. The JCI has been doing nothing. Last year, when jute was harvested, the entire small and marginal farmers were put to utter exploitation. The price of raw jute came down to below the support price. And this time, again, harvesting time has started. At this time, the decision of the Standing Advisory Committee is another blow to this industry and to the jute grower. Therefore, the Government should come forward to protect the jute grower and the jute industry from total ruination. Madam, as per the report of the Central Jute Research Laboratory and the Jute Development Council, the