RAJYA SABHA

Tuesday, the 30th April, 2002/10 Vaisakha, 1924 (Saka)

The House met at eleven of the clock,
MR. CHAIRMAN in the chair.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUSTIONS

इंदिरा लिफ्ट-सिंचाई योजना

*501. श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: क्या जल संसाधन मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि:

(क) क्या देश के विभिन्न राज्यों में इंदिरा लिफ्ट-सिंचाई योजनाएं प्रस्तावित हैं, यदि हां, तो तत्संबंधी राज्य-वार ब्यौरा क्या है;

(ख) क्या राजस्थान में चम्बल से सवाई माधोपुर और करौली जिले में लिफ्ट-सिंचाई के लिए "इंदिरा-लिफ्ट योजना" सरकार के विचाराधीन है; और

(ग) यदि हां, तो तत्संबंधी ब्यौरा क्या है?

जल संसाधन मंत्री (श्री अर्जुन चरण सेठी): (क) से (ग) विवरण सभा पटल पर रख दिया गया है।

विवरण

(क) से (ग) सिंचाई राज्य का विषय होने के कारण, सिंचाई परियोजनाओं (लिफ्ट-सिंचाई परियोजनाओं सहित) के साथ-साथ बाढ़ नियंत्रण और जल निकास परियोजनाओं (लिफ्ट-सिंचाई परियोजनाओं सहित) की प्राथमिकता, निष्पादन, प्रचालन और अनुरक्षण सहित इनकी आयोजना, अन्वेषण, वित्त-पोषण का उत्तरदायित्व मुख्यतः संबंधित राज्य सरकारों का होता है। अंतर्राज्यीय नदियों पर लघु-सिंचाई स्कीमों तथा वृहद एवं मध्यम लिफ्ट स्कीमों की केन्द्रीय जल आयोग में तकनीकी-आर्थिक मूल्यांकन की आवश्यकता नहीं होती है।

विभिन्न राज्य सरकारों द्वारा तकनीकी-आर्थिक मूल्यांकन के लिए अंतर्राज्यीय नदियों संबंधी 8 वृहद और 6 मध्यम लिफ्ट-सिंचाई स्कीमों की विस्तृत परियोजना रिपोर्टें केन्द्रीय जल आयोग में भेजी हैं और उन पर राज्यों के साथ पत्राचार चल रहा है। इसके ब्यौरे विवरण पर दिए गए हैं। (नीचे देखिए)

राजस्थान सरकार ने चम्बल से जल ले जाकर के सवाई माधोपुर और करोली जिलों में सिंचाई सुविधाएं मुहैया कराने के वास्ते इंदिरा लिट-सिंचाई सकीम (वृहद) नामक परियोजना प्रस्ताव तैयार किया था और तकनीकी-आर्थिक मूल्यांकन के लिए इसे जून, 2000 में केन्द्रीय जल आयोग को प्रस्तुत किया गया था। केन्द्रीय जल आयोग की जांच (स्क्रीनिंग) समिति द्वारा 2.1.2001 को इस परियोजना पर विचार किया गया था तथा समिति में लिए गए निर्णय के अनुसार, परियोजना आयोजना में मूल कमियों को दूर करने तथा संशोधित विस्तृत परियोजना रिपोर्ट पुनः प्रस्तुत करने के लिए यह परियोजना रिपोर्ट 12.3.2001 को राज्य सरकार को वापस भेज दी गई थी। ये कमियां इस प्रकार हैं:—

1. चम्बल नियंत्रण बोर्ड के साथ अंतर्राज्यीय मुद्दों का स्पष्टीकरण और समाधान।

2. सिंचाई आयोजना में कमियां अर्थात् मृदा सर्वेक्षण रिपोर्ट न होना, 10 दिवसीय आधार पर कार्य तालिका तैयार न होना, कमान क्षेत्र सर्वेक्षण मानचित्र तैयार न होना।

3. पम्प हाउस और मुख्य लाइन को ऊपर उठाने संबंधी विस्तृत डिजाइन नहीं भेजी गई है।

4. पेयजल का कोई प्रावधान नहीं किया गया है।

5. मौजूदा मूल्य स्तर पर परियोजना की लागत को अद्यतन किया जाना है।

6. लिफ्ट स्कीम के लिए विद्युत की आपूर्ति के वास्ते राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड की सहमति।

राज्य सरकार द्वारा संशोधित विस्तृत परियोजना रिपोर्ट अभी प्रस्तुत की जानी है।

विवरण

मूल्यांकनाधीन नई लिफ्ट सिंचाई परियोजनाओं की राज्य-वार स्थिति

15.04.2002 के अनुसार

क्र.सं.	परियोजना का नाम	राज्य का नाम	वृहद/मध्यम	नदी/बेसिन	लाभान्वित जिला	प्राप्ति की तारीख	लाभ (हजार हेक्टेयर)	स्थापना लागत (करोड़)	श्रेणी
1.	नेत्तमपदु लिट सिंचाई स्कीम	आंध्र प्रदेश	वृहद	कृष्णा	महबूब नगर	11/2000	10.926	134.30	ए
2.	कालवा कुर्थी लिफ्ट सिंचाई स्कीम	आंध्र प्रदेश	वृहद	कृष्णा	महबूब नगर	11/2000	20.234	380.00	ए
3.	भीमा लिफ्ट सिंचाई	आंध्र प्रदेश	वृहद	भीमा/कृष्णा	महबूब नगर	1/96	83.78	744.00	बी
4.	तावी पंप हाउस और तावी लिफ्ट नहर-ई और एम	जम्मू और कश्मीर (कश्मीर क्षेत्र)	वृहद	तावी/रावी/सिन्धु	जम्मू	9/2001	13.660	13.563	ए
5.	सिंगतलुर (हुलीगुड्डा) लिफ्ट सिंचाई स्कीम	कर्नाटक	वृहद	तुंगभद्रा/कृष्णा	गोदेज बेल्लारी	7/98	16.188	123.00	ए
6.	बासापुर लिफ्ट सिंचाई स्कीम	कर्नाटक	मध्यम	तुंगभद्रा/कृष्णा	धारवाड़	11/96	2.267	9.36	ए
7.	कोयना कृष्णा लिफ्ट सिंचाई	महाराष्ट्र	वृहद	कृष्णा	सांघी	1/87	85.78	259.10	बी

क्र०सं०	परियोजना का नाम	राज्य का नाम	वृहद/मध्यम	नदी/बेसिन	लाभान्वित जिला	प्राप्ति की तारीख	लाभ (हजार हेक्टेयर)	स्थापना लागत (करोड़)	श्रेणी
8.	तंजनपुर लिफ्ट सिंचाई	महाराष्ट्र	मध्यम	गोदावरी	अहमद नगर	2/94	2.74	23.47	ए
9.	किरीमिरी दाकर लिफ्ट सिंचाई स्कीम	महाराष्ट्र	मध्यम	वारधा/गोदावरी	चन्द्रपुर	3/2000	2.04	27.89	ए
10.	सोनापुर (तोम्ता) (लिफ्ट सिंचाई स्कीम)	महाराष्ट्र	मध्यम	वारधा/गोदावरी	चन्द्रपुर	9/2000	2.034	14.43	ए
11.	हरनघाट लिफ्ट सिंचाई स्कीम	महाराष्ट्र	मध्यम	वेनगंगा/गोदावरी	चन्द्रपुर	11/2000	3.65	44.11	ए
12.	जंगमहाटी लिफ्ट सिंचाई	महाराष्ट्र	मध्यम	हुमल नाला/कृष्णा	कोल्हापुर	6/98	5.47	4.29	बी
13.	पिपल्दा लिफ्ट सिंचाई	राजस्थान	वृहद	चंबल/गंगा	सवाई माधोपुर	9/96	14.87	11.39	ए
14.	भूपाली पंप नहर-ई आर एम की क्षमता बढ़ाना	उत्तर प्रदेश	वृहद	गंगा	वाराणसी	8/97	34.605	60.53	सी

ए —भूपाली की विभिन्न अवस्थाओं के अंतर्गत परियोजना
बी —जल संसाधन मंत्रालय की सलाहकार समिति द्वारा टिप्पणियों के अधीन स्वीकृत
सी —जल संसाधन मंत्रालय की सलाहकार समिति द्वारा आस्थगित

Indira lift irrigation scheme

†*501. SHRI MOOLCHAND MEENA: Will the Minister of WATER RESOURCES be pleased to state:

(a) whether lift irrigation schemes are proposed in various States of the country; if so, the details thereof, State-wise;

(b) whether 'Indira Lift Scheme' for lift irrigation from Chambal in Sawai Madhopur and Karoli districts in Rajasthan is under Government's consideration; and

(c) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI): (a) to (c) A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

(a) to (c) Irrigation being a State subject, the responsibility of planning, investigation, funding alongwith priority, execution, operation and maintenance of irrigation projects (including lift irrigation projects) as also flood control and drainage projects primarily rests with the concerned State Governments themselves. Minor irrigation lift schemes and major and medium lift schemes on Intra-State rivers do not require techno-economic appraisal in the Central Water Commission.

Detailed Project Reports of 8 major and 6 medium lift irrigation schemes on inter-State rivers have been submitted by various State Governments for techno-economic appraisal in the Central Water Commission and are under correspondence with them. The details are given in the enclosed Statement (*See* below)

The Government of Rajasthan had formulated project proposal namely, Indira Lift Irrigation Scheme (major) for providing irrigation facilities in Sawai Madhopur and Karoli Districts by lifting water from Chambal and submitted to Central Water Commission in June, 2000 for techno-economic appraisal. The project was considered by the

†Original notice of the question was received in Hindi.

Screening Committee of the Central Water Commission on 02.01.01 and as decided in the Committee, the Project Report was sent back to the State Government on 12.03.01 for attending to basic deficiencies in project planning and resubmission of modified detailed project report. These deficiencies relate to:

1. Clarification and settlement of inter-State issues with Chambal Control Board.
2. Deficiencies in irrigation planning *viz.*, absence of soil survey report; working tables on 10 daily basis not prepared; command area survey map not prepared.
3. Detailed design of pump-house and rising main not furnished.
4. No provision for drinking water made.
5. Cost of project to be updated at current price level.
6. Concurrence of State Electricity Board for supply of power for the lift scheme.

Modified Detailed Project Report is yet to be submitted by the State Government.

Statement

State-wise status of new lift irrigation projects under appraisal

As on 15.04.2002

Sl. No.	Name of Projects	Name of State	Major/ Medium	River/ Basin	District Benefited	Date of Receipt	Benefits (Th.Ha.)	Estt. Cost (Cr.)	Category
1.	Nettampadu Lift Irrigation Scheme	Andhra Pradesh	Major	Krishna	Mahaboob Nagar	11/2000	10.926	134.30	A
2.	Kalwa Kurthi Lift Irrigation Scheme	Andhra Pradesh	Major	Krishna	Mahaboob Nagar	11/2000	20.234	380.00	A
3.	Bhima Lift Irrigation	Andhra Pradesh	Major	Bhima/ Krishna	Mahaboob Nagar	1/96	83.78	744.00	B
4.	Tawi Pump House and Tawi Lift Canal-ERM	J&K (Kashmir Region)	Major	Tawi/ Ravi/ Indus	Jammu	9/2001	13.660	13.563	A
5.	Singatalur (Huligudda) Lift Irrigation Scheme	Karnataka	Major	Tunga-bhadra/ Krishna	Godage Bellary	7/98	16.188	123.00	A
6.	Basapur Lift Irrigation Scheme	Karnataka	Medium	Tunga-Bhadra/ Krishna	Dharwad	11/96	2.267	9.36	A
7.	Koyna Krishna Lift Irrigation	Maharashtra	Major	Krishna	Sanghi	1/87	85.78	259.10	B

Sl. No.	Name of Projects	Name of State	Major/ Medium	River/ Basin	District Benefited	Date of Receipt	Benefits (Th.Ha.)	Estt. Cost (Cr.)	Category
8.	Tajnapur Lift Irrigation	Maharashtra	Medium	Godavari	Ahmednagar	2/94	2.74	23.47	A
9.	Kirimiri Darur Lift Irrigation Scheme	Maharashtra	Medium	Wardha/ Godavari	Chandrapur	3/2000	2.04	27.89	A
10.	Sonapur (Tomta) (Lift Irrigation Scheme)	Maharashtra	Medium	Wardha/ Godavari	Chandrapur	9/2000	2.034	14.43	A
11.	Haranghat L.I.S.	Maharashtra	Medium	Wain-ganga/ Godavari	Chandrapur	11/2000	3.65	44.11	A
12.	Jangam Hati Lift Irrigation	Maharashtra	Medium	Humal Nala/ Krishna	Kolhapur	6/98	5.47	4.29	B
13.	Pipalda Lift Irrigation	Rajasthan	Major	Chambal/ Ganga	Sawai Madhopur	9/96	14.87	11.39	A
14.	Increasing capacity of Bhupali pump Canal-ERM	Uttar Pradesh	Major	Ganga	Varanasi	8/97	34.605	60.53	C

A—Project under various stages of appraisal
B—Accepted by advisory committee of MOWR subject to observations
C—Deferred by advisory committee of MOWR

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: सभापति महोदय, मंत्री महोदय ने अपने उत्तर में 14 लघु और वृहद लिफ्ट इरीगेशन स्कीम बताई हैं। मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि यह जो 14 लिफ्ट योजनाएं पिछले दो साल से लंबित पड़ी हैं, इन पर केन्द्रीय जल आयोग ने कब-कब बैठक की है, कब-कब इन पर विचार किया है? अब तक इन योजनाओं पर केन्द्रीय जल आयोग ने क्या-क्या कार्यवाही की है? और यह जो योजनाएं पिछले दो साल से पड़ी हुई हैं, जब ये योजनाऐ बनी थीं उस समय की लागत में आज कितनी वृद्धि हुई है? इस पर भी कोई विचार किया गया है या नहीं?

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Sir, fourteen lift irrigation projects were submitted by different State Governments to the Ministry of Water Resources. The Central Water Commission examined these projects. The Commission had pointed out some deficiencies in these projects. These projects were then sent back to the respective State Governments for compliances. So, unless these deficiencies are rectified by the State Governments, it is difficult for the CWC to clear these projects. The Commission in the case of the Indira Lift Irrigation Scheme identified about five or six deficiencies. So, unless we receive rectified reports on these deficiencies, the CWC could do nothing. We are awaiting replies from different State Governments. The moment these replies are received in the Ministry, we will certainly examine and clear the projects.

श्री मूल चन्द मीणा: सभापति महोदय, मैंने राजस्थान में चम्बल से सवाई माधोपुर और करौली जिले के लिए एक सिंचाई लिफ्ट योजना के बारे में पूछा था। मैं मंत्री महोदय से यह जानना चाहूंगा कि क्या केन्द्रीय मंत्रिमंडल ने अभी यह फैसला लिया है कि राज्यों में सिंचाई के लिए आर्थिक सहायता दी जाए, उसको उदार बनाया जाए? राज्य सरकार पहले जो लिफ्ट योजना के लिए अपना 1/3 हिस्सा खर्च करती थी, क्या अब केन्द्रीय सरकार ने उस पर सौ प्रतिशत आर्थिक सहायता देने का कोई निर्णय लिया है? मैं यह भी जानना चाहूंगा कि इंदिरा लिफ्ट इरीगेशन स्कीम के ऊपर कितनी लागत आई है? मुझे एक पुराना उदाहरण याद है कि आचना परियोजना जो वर्ष 1977 में एक करोड़ रुपए की बनी थी, उस योजना पर सौ करोड़ रुपए खर्च हो गए। इसलिए मैं मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहूंगा कि इंदिरा लिफ्ट योजना जो बनाई गई है, जैसा आपने बताया कि इसमें जो देरी हो रही है उस संबंध में ओब्जेक्शन लगाकर आपने साल भर पहले राज्य सरकार को पत्र भेजा है, तो क्या आपने पुनः राज्य सरकार को इस बारे में लिखा है कि वह इस योजना को जल्दी भेजे?

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Sir, the Indira Lift Irrigation Scheme was submitted to the Central Government in June, 2000. The Steering Committee of the Central Water Commission had assessed this Scheme in January, 2001 itself. As I stated earlier, we are still awaiting compliances from the State Government. The estimated cost of this particular project is about Rs. 675 crores. And when it is fully implemented, it will irrigate more than one lakh hectares of land in Rajasthan, especially in Sawai Madhopur, Bharatpur, Dausa and Tarali districts. I am very much eager to write to the Government of Rajasthan—and I assure him that I will write—but unless the compliances are sent to us by the State Government, the CWC cannot sanction the project.

SHRI MOTILAL VORA: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Minister has stated in his reply that eight major schemes and six minor schemes are under appraisal. The hon. Minister has also said that out of these fourteen schemes, two have been accepted by the Advisory Committee of the MOWR, subject to observation. I would like to know what does he mean by 'subject to observation'? For how long it will remain under observation? It has been pending with the State Governments for the last two years. The State Governments have already sent their reports, and the Advisory Committee has already accepted it. So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister what 'observation' is being done now?

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Sir, 'projects were under various stages of appraisal' have been mentioned in the last column of the statement. 'Subject to observation' means, we have accepted them in principle. The Central Water Commission has asked for some more information from the State Government. As soon as the information is received by the Central Water Commission, it will be okayed.

SHRI MOTILAL VORA: When it has been cleared, and the State Government has already sent it to you, how many more years will it take?

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Sir, apart from the Central Water Commission's appraisal and approval, there are other

Ministries also, for example, the Ministry of Environment and Forests, the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment. So, there are many formalities. As soon as those formalities are completed, it will be cleared finally.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: You are the nodal Ministry, can you give some time-frame as to when the final decision will be taken?

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Sir, I am certainly very much concerned about the delay, as has been expressed by the hon. Members. As I have some duties to perform, the State Governments have also certain duties to perform. So, unless compliances are received in time, it is impossible for the CWC or any Ministry to approve these projects.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, the hon. Minister has said that unless the projects are of major nature, they need not come to the Government of India or to the Central Water Commission for techno-economic appraisal. But the Government of India does not seem to have control over the Inter-State Water Sharing Commission. Totally violating the Bachawat Award, Karnataka, which is upstream of Andhra Pradesh, has formulated and executed hundreds of lift irrigation schemes, which has resulted in scarcity of drinking water in important towns of Andhra Pradesh, like Kurnool. What mechanism has been adopted by the Government to control the upstream States from violating the Awards? What regulation has been imposed on the upstream States to prevent misuse of water? You mentioned that for minor irrigation and lift irrigation schemes, your consent is not required, but the upstream States are violating the Awards. So, what is the mechanism? .....(*Interruptions*).....

MR. CHAIRMAN: No; no. .....(*Interruptions*)..... Let him complete. .....(*Interruptions*).....

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: I am not accusing Karnataka. .....(*Interruptions*)..... I want to know from the Government what mechanism they have devised to come to the rescue of those States which are being deprived of water. Sir, last week, there was a very big law and order problem in the Kurnool district, which was the former capital of Andhra Pradesh. It has got a population of eight

lakh people and they are being deprived of even the basic facility of drinking water. The entire water, allocated by the Bachawat Award, coming downstream, is being impounded. .....(*Interruptions*).....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record, except what Shri Ramachandraiah is saying. .....(*Interruptions*).....

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: I request the Minister to give a categorical reply on this.

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Sir, so far as the inter-State water issues are concerned, the Central Government can only persuade the States to have a consensus, and it can only act as a facilitator to resolve these issues. Unless the State Governments themselves agree to share the surplus water, or, water of any particular river, we cannot direct, or, we cannot impose any regulation. Sometimes, various State Governments approach High Courts or the Supreme Court. As a result of this, many issues are pending before the various courts. Sir, as a facilitator the Central Government can only persuade the States to arrive at the consensus over these contentious issues. I can assure the hon. Member that we will do that. He has drawn my attention not only in this House, but he had also written to me. I response, I have had correspondence with the State Government of Karnataka, on this particular issue. They say that there is no violation. So, on this contentious issue, the Central Government can only persuade them to have a consensus. In doing so, both the States can be benefited in regard to the sharing of waters of this particular river, or, any other river.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Sir, I had put a pertinent question. My request was that the Government should come out with a mechanism to control the upstream States, so that they cannot misuse the waters at the expense of the downstream States. What is the mechanism devised by the Government? Just by saying that there should have consensus will not suffice. You should have some mechanism to control the upstream States. .....(*Interruptions*).....

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: We all know that .....(*Interruptions*)..... We all know that water is a State subject. .....(*Interruptions*)..... Fortunately or unfortunately, water is a State subject.

Every State has its own rights. And, unless, there is consensus among States, the Central Government can only try and persuade them to arrive at a consensus.

SHRI AIMADUDDIN AHMED KHAN (DURRU): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to how much money was allotted for the Indira Gandhi Canal in Rajasthan, last year, and how much was disbursed. I would also like to know whether the allotted amount was disbursed properly or not. If the amount was not disbursed, then, the reasons thereofo?

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Sir, this question is regarding lift irrigation scheme and the question put by the Member does not relate to this. .....(*Interruptions*).....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay, that is all right. Shri M.V. Rajashekharan.

SHRI M.V. RAJASEKHARAN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, as far as the implementation of the Bachawat Award is concerned, unfortunately, the Andhra Pradesh Government has taken full advantage of its support to the NDA Government at the Centre and has been violating all rules and regulations for the last so many months and even years. The Minister has very conveniently put the blame on the States, but I would like to know what action the Central Government has taken to stop the Andhra Pradesh Government from going ahead with their irrigation work. Sir, my last question is: If you compare the statistics relating to water resources provided to Karnataka *vis-a-vis* Andhra Pradesh, you will find that Andhra Pradesh has got much larger share, whereas Karnataka is suffering because of the drought-prone areas. Unfortunately, under one pretext or the other, they are trying to prevent us from utilising the water resources on which we have got full right. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether this discrimination is going to be set right or not. Will Karnataka be allowed to take full advantage of the water resources, on which, whether it has got full right or not?

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Mr. Chairman, Sir, I have already replied to the question put by the hon. Member. In fact, we are trying to set up river-basin organisations. The river-basin organisations can adjudicate these issues, but the State Governments themselves do not want to have these river basin organisations. Some of the States feel that by doing so their rights will be taken away. We are trying to pursuade them. Unless those States agree and have a consensus on these issues, such contentious issues cannot be resolved. What I can do is, I would write a letter drawing the attention of the State Governments of Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh to the allegations or the observations made by the hon. Member here.

SHRI M.V. RAJASEKHARAN: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Minister did not answer my question. Shri Chandrababu Naidu is taking advantage of providing support to the NDA Government at the Centre. The Central Government is fully supporting them.

SHRI ARJUN CHARAN SETHI: Sir, it is not true.

*502. [The questioner (SHRIMATI JAMANA DEVI BARUPAL) we absent. For answer *vide* page. 34 infra.]

Civil Aviation Security Training Academy

503. SHRI H.K. JAVARE GOWDA:†
DR. (MS.) P. SELVIE DAS:

Will the Minister of CIVIL AVIATION be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Government are planning to set up a Hi-tech Civil Aviation Security Training Academy;

(b) if so, the estimated cost of the project; and

(c) what are the locational and technical details of the projects?

THE MINISTER OF CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI SYED SHAHNA-WAZ HUSSAIN): (a) to (c) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

A decision has been taken to set up a Centre for Civil Aviation Security for functioning as the apex aviation security institution in the country, a think-tank for innovation in the field of

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri H.K. Javare Gowda.