

MR. SPEAKER: Please come to the question.

SHRI K.S. RAO: Sir, I want to know, through you, from the hon. Minister some details. Several tribunals have been formed earlier. Our experience is that no solution is coming out to solve this case. So I wish to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government is thinking in terms of making all the projects and Inter-State Rivers as national projects.

SHRI MANUBHAI KOTADIA: Sir, I should say that this is a suggestion... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Mr. Speaker, Sir, perhaps the hon. Minister is not aware that the State of Maharashtra is not involved in the Cauvery Water Dispute... (*Interruptions*) I must say that Maharashtra is not a party to the Cauvery Water dispute. Just now the hon. Minister has said that. I am happy that he has called a meeting on 7th April. I want to know from the hon. Minister which are the issues he has noted down for the purpose of discussing between these parties concerned in the Cauvery Water dispute? So that the dispute can be narrowed down and he would also know which are the projects to be implemented and which are the parties which have no objection. All these things will be clear and at the same time, he would be able to find out a solution for the real dispute. Has he noted down any issues before him?

SHRI MANUBHAI KOTADIA: As far as the dispute between Karnataka and Tamil Nadu is concerned, the hon. Member, who was in charge of the Ministry knows very much that the dispute is between Tamil Nadu and Karnataka... (*Interruptions*) The fact is that Karnataka is drawing more water from the Cauvery Basin. That is why Tamil Nadu is protesting that Karnataka is hurting the interests of Tamil Nadu. That is all... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. RAMAMURTHY: Mr. Speaker, Sir, kindly tell the hon. Minister to read the

facts before coming to the House. He is not aware of the facts. The Cauvery Water dispute is hanging fire for the last so many years. I am asking the question now... (*Interruptions*) Is the Minister aware of the fact in respect of the dispute? I want to know from the Minister what are the issues before the meeting for discussion ... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI MANUBHAI KOTADIA: What does he want to know?

MR. SPEAKER: He is asking: "What are the issues?"

(*Interruptions*)

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

[*English*]

Contaminated Foodgrains

*126. PROF. RUPCHAND PAL:
SHRI ANIL BASU:

Will the Minister of FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of Government has been drawn to a report appearing in the Free Press Journal dated 20th and 21st February, 1990 that contaminated foodgrains to the tune of Rs. 900 crores was imported and passed on to the Southern States of the country;

(b) if so, the supplier of the damaged grains;

(c) whether Government propose to enquire into this deal; and

(d) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF FOOD AND CIVIL SUPPLIES (SHRI NATHU RAM MIRDHA): (a) to (d). The news reports appearing in the Free Press Journal dated 20th and 21st February, 1990 have come to the notice of Government.

India imported 2.011 million tonnes of US wheat in 1988-89 at a cost of US \$ 323.932 millions comprising FOB cost of US \$ 243.362 million and ocean freight of US \$ 80.570 millions. Besides, 0.684 million tonnes of rice was imported during this period from Thailand at a FOB cost of US \$ 166.76 million.

The entire consignment of wheat was fit for human consumption according to rules under Prevention of Food Adulteration Act (PFA) which lays norms for determining fitness of foodstuff for human consumption in India. The Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarrantine and Storage, which is essentially responsible for ensuring that grains imported are free from disease which may propagate in the country, found on inspection that there was very minute incidence of ergot ranging from 0.0001% to 0.006% and dwarf bunt ranging from 0.0002% to 0.0006% in 1.028 million tonnes of wheat, as against the PFA limit of 0.05% of ergot and 5% for damaged grains, which include fungus (bunt) affected grains as well. According to the Plants, Fruits and Seeds (Regulation of Imports into India) Order issued by the Ministry of Agriculture in 1984, consignment of wheat to be imported shall be free from Dwarf Bunt and Ergot. Since the imported wheat was required for consumption and not seed purposes, the Directorate of Plant Protection, Quarrantine and Storage under the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation on representation from the Department of Food permitted the use of this slightly infested wheat with proper safeguards only to ensure that the ergot or dwarf bunt affected wheat in no circumstance enters wheat growing areas of the country to obviate any

possibility of its being used as seeds. Accordingly, the use of dwarf bunt affected wheat was permitted under the following main conditions:—

- (i) No wheat infested by Dwarf Bunt should be allowed to be moved to wheat growing States and its distribution through the PDS would be confined to Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh, Orissa and city districts of Bombay and Calcutta.
- (ii) If any wheat affected by Dwarf Bunt is already at any of the ports located outside Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Andhra Pradesh and Orissa and city districts of Bombay and Calcutta the stocks should be moved in sealed wagons to centres in these States; precautions, prescribed by the Plant Protection Adviser (PPA), in the movement of wheat should be observed by FCI.

For disposal of ergot affected wheat the following conditions were stipulated:—

- (i) All such wheat would be discharged at any port in the four Southern States (Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh), Orissa, Bombay Conglomeration/Industrial Suburbs, Calcutta and Goa.
- (ii) The Ergot infected wheat should be milled under supervision at the centres mentioned in (i) above and then allowed to be distributed. The refuse containing the chaff etc. should be burnt, as laid down by the PPA.

The imported wheat was supplied by the following US firms:

1. M/s Louis Dreyfus Corporation.

2. M/s Bunge Corporation.
3. M/s Richco Grain Ltd.
4. M/s Garnac Grain Co.
5. M/s Continental Grain Co.
6. M/s Tradigrain Inc.
7. M/s Union Equity Coop. Exchange.
8. M/s Cargill Inc.
9. M/s Artfer Inc.
10. M/s Marubeni American Corp
11. M/s Feruzzi USA Inc.
12. M/s Mitsui Grain Corp.

The imported wheat conformed to the P.F.A. Rules and transaction did not at any stage reveal anything warranting probe.

[*Translation*]

Illegal Construction of Shops in New Delhi

*127. SHRI BALESHWAR YADAV: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that illegal construction of shops is going on at large scale in New Delhi area;

(b) if so, the details of the measures taken or proposed to check illegal constructions; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI MURASOLI MARAN): (a) and (b). Delhi Administration has reported

that no illegal construction of shops is going on in the New Delhi Municipal Committee area. However, some such activity has been reported by Municipal Corporation of Delhi and Delhi Development Authority.

As and when such cases are detected, necessary action as per the law is taken by the authorities with a view to removing the encroachments and unauthorised constructions. The machinery has been activated in this regard.

(c) Does not arise in view of reply to parts (a) and (b). above.

[*English*]

Definition of Weaker Sections of Society

*128. SHRI M.V. CHANDRA SHEKARA MURTHY:
SHRI V. SRINIVASAPRASAD:

Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Supreme Court has directed Union Government to define the term "weaker sections of the society" and to lay down appropriate guidelines; and

(b) if so, the action taken by Government on the said directive of the Supreme Court?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI MURASOLI MARAN): (a) and (b). The judgement of the Supreme Court delivered on 31.1.90 relates to the definition of the term Weaker Sections of Society in the context of exemptions given under Urban Land Ceiling Act by the Maharashtra Government. The judgment contains some directions to the Government of India and the Government of Maharashtra. The matter is under examination and necessary