

Central Government Public Sector Enterprises from 1967-68 to 1969-70 is detailed below :—

| (figures in crore Rs.) | | | |
|------------------------|---|--------|-------|
| | Equity | Loans* | Total |
| 1967-68 | 155 | 337 | 492 |
| 1968-69 | 191 | 378 | 569 |
| 1969-70 | 277 | 122 | 399 |
| 1970-71 | Figures are not available, as the accounts for this financial year are not yet due. | | |

Cauvery Water Dispute

7487. SHRI C. JANARDHANAN : Will the Minister of IRRIGATION AND POWER be pleased to state :

(a) whether the Central Government had not consulted the Kerala Government while they had put forward certain proposals to the Governments of Mysore and Tamil Nadu for settling the dispute regarding the waters of Cauvery river ; and

(b) if so, the reasons thereof ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI B. N. KUREEL) : (a) and (b) The Government of Kerala have been all along associated with the inter-State discussions so far held to resolve the Cauvery Water dispute amicably.

Uniform Rate of Fee charged by Lawyers/ Advocates

7488. SHRI BIBHUTI MISHRA : Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be

pleased to state :

(a) whether Government have a proposal to move the respective High Courts and the Supreme Court to prescribe a uniform rate of fee to be charged by the Lawyers/Advocates while appearing before Sub-Divisional Magistrates Courts, Munsif Courts, Sessions Courts, High Courts and Supreme Court ;

(b) if so, by what date uniform rate of fee will be introduced ; and

(c) if the reply to part (a) above be in the negative, the reasons therefor ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI NITIRAJ SINGH CHAUDHARY) :

(a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) The High Courts while taking into account the local conditions and the nature of work done by the legal practitioners, have framed rules regarding the scale of fees which may be allowed to them on taxation. Thus, uniformity to this extent is ensured within the jurisdiction of the High Court concerned.

Similarly, the Supreme Court has also framed rules regarding the scale of fees which may be allowed to Advocates on taxation. The scale of fees has been fixed by the Supreme Court separately for Leading counsel, Associate Advocates and Advocates-on-record.

Thus with regard to the scale of fees admissible on taxation there is substantial uniformity.

As regards the fees which legal practitioners may charge from their clients, apart from the fact that local conditions vary, it would not appear to be correct for the Government to prescribe a uniform fee for the services, charged by every counsel dis-regarding the question of his professional competence and standing. Even in other

*Figures tabulated under loans represent the net additional investment by loans after taking into account repayment of loan instalments.