

SHRI MADHAV RAO SCINDIA : Regarding operations, how it will affect the working of the Railways, I will certainly answer it. But the assessment of Sales Tax losses or possibly the Sales Tax Revenue is not something on which the Railway Department has to say.

(Interruptions)

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DAS MUNSI : May I know from the hon. Minister whether the mobilisation of the Sales Tax Resources is the constitutional right of each State Government. Pending the decision of the Sarkaria Commission about the relations between the States and the Centre. While the Planning Commission has accused and alleged the State Governments for failing to mobilise the resources, I want to know whether it is not a basic fact that as between the Government of India and the State Governments, in consonance with the spirit of the Constitution of India, the States should not be deprived of their legitimate resources of the Sales Tax and that the Railway Ministry is bound to carry out the instructions of the State Governments in this regard without depriving their rights. Therefore, I would like to know from the hon. Minister as the ticketless passengers are not permitted to travel in the trains, but the goods will not travel in the trains without paying Sales Tax to the States. Why the Railways would not make some arrangements to meet this problem?

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA : I would like to reiterate that our primary responsibility is to transport goods; and we will do our best to cooperate with all the other Ministries, all the other departments and all the State Governments, insofar as it does not affect the mobility of our wagons, or our movements. I would like to mention here that Railways are a very important part of the economic infrastructure of our country.

MR. SPEAKER : It will mean that we will have to refer this question to some other Ministry.

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA : We have increased the mobility of wagons.

(Interruptions) I would beg to differ from the hon. Member. We have issued a circular to Railways that all possible help should be extended to sales tax officers. They should be given access to all records. They can even extract information from our records: all cooperation should be given to them. I think this is being done now in all the Railways.

SHRI SOMNATH RATH : Will the Railway Department insist on the production of clearance of sales tax before they are booked ?

PROF. N.G. RANGA : That is right; it should be their duty.

SHRI MADHAVRAO SCINDIA : This is the entire question. We are saying that it is not possible to do so.

PROF. N.G. RANGA : We expect the State Governments provide security assistance to the Railways. Should there not be reciprocity from the Centre also ?
(Interruptions)

Telugu-Ganga Project

*246. **SHRI NARSINGRAO† SURY-AWANSHI :**
SHRI SRIKANTHA DATTA NARASIMHARAJA WADIYAR :

Will the Minister of WATER RESOURCES be pleased to state :

(a) what are the salient features of the proposed Telugu-Ganga Project and when it is likely to be approved;

(b) whether the above project ensures full share of Krishna water to Karnataka; and

(c) if not, whether Government will consider the proposal to remodel the project to fully protect the interests of Karnataka State ?

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND) : (a) to (c) The Telugu Ganga Project is estimated to cost Rs. 637 crore,

as per the project report of September, 1983. It envisages conveyance of 15 TMC of Krishna waters upto Tamilnadu border for Madras City Water Supply and irrigation of about 2.34 lakh hectares in Andhra Pradesh by utilising about 29 TMC of surplus Krishna waters and 30 TMC of Pennar River waters. It will be considered for clearance when its techno-economic viability is fully established and its inter-State aspects are resolved. The share of Karnataka in Krishna waters is governed by the Tribunal decision, and the State's interest will be kept in view while processing the Telugu Ganga Project.

SHRI NARSINGRAO SURYAWANSHI : My question is this :

- (a) What was the project inaugurated on 25th May 1983 in the presence of the Karnataka Chief Minister Shri Ramakrishna Hegde; was it the Telugu Ganga project, or the project for drinking water supply to Madras City ?
- (b) Was the Telugu Ganga project in accordance with the 1977 agreement; if not, has Government of India accorded approval to the Telugu Ganga project ?
- (c) Is the statement of the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh that he has full rights regarding the use of excess water correct ? If not, will it not encroach upon the share of Karnataka in the surplus water ?

[Translation]

SHRI BALKAVI BAIRAGI : Hon. Speaker, Sir, the Ganga has been sandwiched between Rama and Shankar. On one side, there is Rama Rao and on the other Ram Krishna Hegde.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : It is not the Ganga which has been sandwiched between Rama and Shankar; it is the Telugu Ganga. (Interruptions).....What can poor Shankar do !.....(Interruptions)

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY ; Telugu Ganga has stuck up.

[English]

He prejudices the issue. Telugu Ganga has not stuck up in spite of Mr. Shankaranand.

[Translation]

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : You do not get stuck up in it. Mr. Reddy.

[English]

It is true that there was an agreement in 1976, at the initiative of the then Prime Minister between the three States, the basin States: Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Maharashtra. The main concern at that point of time was the provision of drinking water supply to Madras. That was the main consideration when the 1976 agreement came into being. I don't think from the record as available regarding the agreement of 1976 that at any time the question of irrigation was considered; it was simple and pure agreement in order to provide water to Madras. The concerned components with reference to this aspect were considered and provided in the agreement. Naturally, all the three States agreed to give 5 TMC each, total 15 TMC for this purpose and then as to how this could be done was further considered. Then came the 1977 agreement. The 1977 agreement also between the three States and also Tamil Nadu being a party says, yes, we agree to give this water to Madras city, but it will be from Srisalam Reservoir which will be taken in open channels and so much water, 15 TMC: the capacity of the channel will be so much and it will be taken to the border of Tamilnadu. This agreement came into being by the concerned officials of the State Governments including the Secretary of the Ministry of Irrigation, at the Centre. The concerned States ratified this agreement except Andhra Pradesh, who said, "No, nobody can dictate terms on our right to utilize water for irrigation purposes, yes, we do agree to providing water to Madras City, but our authority including making use of water for irrigation purpose or for any other use, nobody can challenge or put any condition." So, subject to this, Andhra Pradesh also ratified this agree-

ment. Now, a question comes up as to what is the legal position of this agreement? It had been ratified by Andhra Pradesh on a condition, What is its legal effect? I do not want to go into it; and the main problem started then. Andhra Pradesh was very keen to utilize this water for irrigation purpose but this is to be done within the award of Bachawat Committee. Andhra having taken a stand that as we have the right to utilize water.....

AN HON. MEMBER : Surplus !

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : Not surplus; I am coming to that. Andhra says surplus water, but the Bachawat Committee does not refer to the word 'surplus' it says.

(Interruptions)

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : Absurd. *(Interruptions)* You are misleading the House.

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY : You are misleading the House. We are very sorry to say this. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : You are purposely misleading the House.

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY : You are misleading the House. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : If you have got any objection to it, you can refer the matter to me.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : We can get you a clarification.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I can only ask him to clarify.

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY : He is misleading the House. We have to point out.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He is misinterpreting the award.

MR. SPEAKER : You can come under 115. Sit down.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : We can allow. We have done it before. We can do it again. You can raise any question. You can refer it to me. Yes, please ? *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : It is all right. Please sit down.

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY : I want to point out.....*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down now.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : The hon. Minister is partial.

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY : Let me point out....*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Why do you not sit down. Sit down.

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY : This is not proper.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : What is proper, or not proper, is one's own opinion, but we have to discern what the facts are and we can only.....

(Interruptions)

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : We cannot interpret a judicial decision.

MR. SPEAKER : He has to say according to his opinion. But you can challenge his opinion.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He cannot misinterpret the Bachawat Award like that.

(Interruptions)

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S.
DEO : He is misquoting the agreement.

(Interruptions)

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY : What I am saying is, *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : Will you take your seat, Mr. Raghuma Reddy ? I say, you can challenge it. You have a right to do it. Why are you making this ? But you have got every right to do it. You cannot check everything in the House like that. I am not stopping you .

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : He is misquoting.

MR. SPEAKER : That is your opinion.

SHRI M. RAGHUMA REDDY : It is not proper on his part.

SHRI S. JAIPAL REDDY : It is contrary to the decision.

MR. SPEAKER : That is your opinion.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDY : I raise point of order. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : You are welcome to give a notice under 115.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDY : He is making a statement which is not correct.

MR. SPEAKER : I cannot make it according to your wishes. He has to answer the question.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : There is a simple question that the Minister has to answer a question. And in that answer, if he makes something which is wrong, according to your wish or point of view, you can refer it to me. We cannot ask him now. We can ask for a discussion. No problem. But you cannot check him like this. I cannot go according to your wishes.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S.
DEO : Kindly will you....*(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : This is nothing.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S.
DEO : Please listen to us, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : There is no point of order during Question Hour.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S.
DEO : I am not raising a point of order. *(Interruptions)*

MR. SPEAKER : You are ordering.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You have wanted much of my time.

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S.
DEO : We are not contesting what you say. All that we are saying is that when a Minister replies to a question and he refers to a particular Award he cannot misquote from there.

MR. SPEAKER : You can refer it to me.

(Interruptions)

SHRI V. KISHORE CHANDRA S.
DEO : But we have a right to point out.

MR. SPEAKER : You can refer it to me under 115. You can refer it to me. You have a right. You have the right to do. You can challenge. You can do it. You can challenge it.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Venkatesh, is this the way the House is run ? You are an able Parliamentarian. What are you doing ?

DR. V. VENKATESH : I want him to answer.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER ; I am trying to make him answer.

[*Translation*]

SHRI V. TULSIRAM : Mr. Speaker, Sir, you see to it.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : No question of seeing.

.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI V. TULSIRAM : It will not help if you get annoyed like this. It is the question of water.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : This is what I am telling you that you have a right and you can challenge it.

SHRI V. TULSIRAM : You allow a discussion.

MR. SPEAKER : When did I refuse ? You give in writing.

SHRI V. TULSIRAM : You are very kind. Telugu and Karnataka need your help.....(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : When did I refuse ?

[*English*]

We can allow a half-an-hour discussion on this.

[*Translation*]

What is there in it ? No problem. . . . What is the dispute about. You speak out what you want to say. If he feels that he has said something wrong he will admit it; if you feel that what he has said is right, you admit it.

[*English*]

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : Let me make it clear to the hon. Members from Andhra Pradesh that I am equally concerned with the interest of Andhra Pradesh in this case. Let there be no doubt or fear in the minds of the hon. Members especially from Andhra Pradesh that the Centre is going to neglect the interest of any State

including Andhra Pradesh. If they would have just listened to me a little more, they would have come to the conclusion that the Centre is also equally interested in Andhra Pradesh. But they just exhausted their patience.

[*Translation*]

SHRI V. TULSIRAM : We have understood you and do not want to understand you any more. Had we prayed to Lord Shankar, he would have blessed us as he is very kind. But you are very difficult; you have hed up Telugu Ganga for such a long time.

[*English*]

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : May I appeal to the hon. Members from Andhra Pradesh not to argue the case adversely and lose a good case?

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI : It is already lost.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : It is in your hands.

I said that it should not be taken that I am imposing something of my own. I am merely stating the facts and with reference to the facts I stated something which was written in the award itself.

For the benefit of the hon. Members and you, Sir, I quote from Chapter VII Clause V sub Clause (c) on page 52 of the Report of the Tribunal :

“The State of Andhra Pradesh will be at liberty to use in any water year the remaining water that may be flowing in the river Krishna but thereby it shall not acquire any right whatsoever to use in any water year nor be deemed to have been allocated in any water year, water of the river Krishna in excess of the quantity specified.”

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : You can ask a discussion on this.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : May I appeal to the hon. Members not to be impatient on this? I am merely quoting. I did not introduce any meaning of mine. I just read the provision. Now you are interpreting it. I am not interpreting it.

AN HON. MEMBER : It is flowing to the sea.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : It is in the interest of the country to utilise the water that is flowing to the sea. I agree with the hon. Members that this nation cannot afford to waste water which is scarce and precious. If water is flowing to the sea without being used, we must make use of it....(*Interruption*).

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA ROA : That is what we are doing.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : That is what I am saying and you are not prepared to listen to me.... (*Interruption*)

MR. SPEAKER : Again you are speaking.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : This cannot be done unless the Chief Ministers of all the three States come together to resolve the differences.

MR. SPEAKER : Next question now...

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : I have already admitted it for discussion....

(*Interruption*)

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : Sir, you have not given us even a single opportunity to ask a supplementary.... (*Interruption*).

MR. SPEAKER : I have given you a full discussion. I have allowed you a discussion on it. What else do you want?

SHRI AMAL DATTA : You should not lose your temper like this, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : This is unnecessary. Something should be done. I have to make

it heard. That is all. It is for you. I am not getting it for myself. You have demanded it.

[*Translation*]

Even otherwise, I have bad threat today but you are forcing me to speak and it may go worse.

[*English*]

Seizure of rare Idols in Mathura

*248. SHRI SUBHASH YADAV
Will the Minister of HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state :

(a) whether rare idols worth Rs. 1 crore were seized during raids in Mathura during the last week of October, 1985;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the action taken in the matter?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION AND CULTURE (SHRIMATI SUSHILA ROHATGI) : (a) State Police have reported that following a raid on a house in Mathura on 27/10/1985 they seized some statues, the value of which has still to be assessed.

(b) The seized objects which are in police custody are said to include stone sculptures and terracotta figures. Detailed inventory has yet to be prepared.

(c) The Police have registered a case against the accused.

[*Translation*]

SHRI SUBHASH YADAV : With regard to the reply given by the hon. Minister, I want to state that he has not categorically said in his reply whether anybody has been arrested or not. I want to bring to his notice that this is a highly organised gang and, I think, his Ministry is not taking this matter seriously, because it is now more than a month since this seizure was made, but the value of the