

RAJYA SABHA

Thursday, the 3rd August, 1989/the 12th
Sravana, 1911 (Saka)

The House met at eleven of the clock,
Mr. Chairman in the Chair.

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Inter-State disputes on Sharing of River Waters

*241. DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI:†

SHRIMATI RENUKA
CHOWDHURY:

Will the Minister of WATER RESOURCES be pleased to state:

(a) what are the details of the existing inter-State disputes pertaining to sharing of river waters and since when each of them has been going on; and

(b) what steps are being taken by the Central Government to settle them?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. M. JACOB):

(a) and (b) The major inter-State water disputes are in respect of Cauvery, Yamuna upto Okhla and the Ravi-Beas waters. The dispute on Yamuna is under discussion with the States concerned. The Government of Tamil Nadu had requested a reference of the Cauvery water dispute to a Tribunal for adjudication. It is reported that the matter is being reconsidered by that Government. As regards the Ravi-Beas waters, the Tribunal has given its report and the co-basin States have submitted references through the Central Government seeking clarifications and further observations.

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: Sir, as per the hon. Minister's answer there

†The Question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Dr. Yelamanchili Sivaji.

is no dispute about sharing the waters of river Krishna among several States. Then why is the Telugu-Ganga project not being cleared so far—for some silly reason?

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Sir, it is not true that some silly reasons are there for not clearing the Telugu-Ganga project. For this project actually the Government of India tried on several occasions to convene meetings of the concerned Chief Ministers of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Maharashtra. But some of them could not participate in the meeting, and efforts are still continuing to make them participate because we think that there should be a consensus among the Chief Ministers of the States concerned for clearing that project.

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: When the Bachawat Award was there it is binding on all the States. There is no point in going in for appointing another tribunal. The hon. Minister told that there are no silly reasons. But for every project in Andhra Pradesh the Government is seeking clarifications time and again. For example, for the Telugu-Ganga project they sought clarifications for 43 times from the State Government. On Vamsadhara they sought clarifications for 43 times. On some projects like Pulichintala the Government is not serious enough to clear them. There is no dispute on sharing the waters. For Polavaram ..

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question is about inter-State water dispute. How does that supplementary come out of this?

DR. YELAMANCHILI SIVAJI: My supplementary is, when the Bachawat Award was there it is binding on all the States. Then what is the point in the Union Government saying that they tried to convene meetings once again? Is it to revive a dispute or to engineer a dispute between various States?

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Sir, the hon. Member was asking the question in such a way as to give the impression that all the projects not cleared in Andhra Pradesh are inter-State disputes. Sir, ac-

tually his own Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh took the view that he need not come to the meeting at all because it is not a dispute and that they are within rights so far as the Telugu-Ganga project is concerned. Sir, the Chief Minister of Maharashtra and Karnataka seriously objected to this view and said that it was against the spirit of the Krishna Tribunal Award and, therefore, it has to be deviated from the original position. The water was supposed to be given for the supply of drinking water to Madras city. The Andhra Pradesh Government wants this water for irrigation of Rayalseema and other areas. Others are getting anxious about its outcome in later years. The Maharashtra Government and the Karnataka Government have objected to it. As far as I can see from the records, the whole trouble with this project is this. The Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister himself has written on 13th September. I will read one sentence out of his letter. "I feel there may not be any need for a joint meeting of the Chief Ministers of the States." When there is an objection raised by one Chief Minister or the other and there is a dispute in this matter, it is our duty to see that the Chief Ministers agree. It is a good project and my Government will make the maximum possible efforts...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are willing to expedite it.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Yes, Sir.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Part (b) of the question is: "What steps are being taken by the Central Government to settle them?" They have combined part (a) and part (b) of the question in their reply. They say: "It is reported that the matter is being reconsidered by that Government. As regards the Ravi-Beas waters, the Tribunal has given its report and the co-basin States have submitted reference..." It is only the report that we go by. The Government claim that they have no other dispute. I want to digress a little and take them back. What is the major issue they have so far as the Telugu-Ganga Project is concerned?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He has already answered it.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: I missed that. I have a right to ask. He can answer again.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No. No. Mr. Ajit Jogi.

श्री अजीत जोगी: मान्यवर, सौभाग्य या दुर्भाग्य से मध्य प्रदेश एक ऐसा प्रान्त है जहाँ स नदियाँ निकलती हैं और दूसरे प्रान्तों में चली जाती हैं। इसलिए हमारे प्रदेश की कोई भी बड़ी योजना तब तक लागू नहीं की जा सकती है जब तक समीपवर्ती जो सात प्रान्त हैं—उत्तर प्रदेश, बिहार, राजस्थान, महाराष्ट्र, गुजरात, आन्ध्र प्रदेश, उड़ीसा—इनसे हमारे मसले हल न किए जाएं। मैं यह जानना चाहूँगा कि मध्य प्रदेश की जो सारी बड़ी विचाई की योजनाएँ हैं इसलिए लम्बित हैं क्योंकि समीपवर्ती प्रान्तों से उनका विवाद तय नहीं हो रहा है। तो क्या केन्द्रीय सरकार की ओर से कोई ऐसी पहल की जायेगी जिससे इन प्रान्तों के मुख्य मंत्रियों को, सिचार्ज मंत्रियों को और अधिकारियों को साथ बैठकर, किन्ते अन्तर-प्रान्तीय विवाद हैं उनको शीघ्र हल किया जाए जिससे मध्य प्रदेश जैसे पिछड़े प्रान्त की विचाई योजनाएँ जल्दी मंजूर हो सकें।

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Sir, in Madhya Pradesh, as the hon. Member, Mr. Jogi, correctly said, there are lot of projects in which the disputes are with the neighbouring States. But the intensity of the disputes is not so very great because the Chief Ministers are very co-operative with them. I hope that most of the projects may be cleared successfully in the months ahead. If the hon. Member asks about a specific project, I can give him information about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mention specific projects. महाराष्ट्र से भी कई प्रोजेक्ट्स स्लीयर हो गए हैं।

श्री अजीत जोगी: गुजरात को छोड़कर बाकी किसी से नहीं हुए हैं। ... (व्यवधान) ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can mention specific projects. जितने हमारे बड़े प्रोजेक्ट्स हैं दूसरे स्टेट्स के विवाद के कारण तय नहीं हो पा रहे हैं। उनके विषय में अगर यहाँ से पहल की जाए तो जल्दी हो जाए। आज पहल की जाए कि जल्दी हो जाए।

श्री महेन्द्र सिंह लाठर: अध्याक्ष महोदय, मैं हरियाणा, पंजाब के पानी के मामले को लेकर खड़ा हुआ हूँ। पिछली प्रधान मंत्री श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी ने एस०वाई०एल० कैनल की अव्यवस्था रखी थी, उस वक़्त कहा था कि यह तीन साल के अन्दर बन जाएगी। अध्याक्ष जी, आज उसे पूरे दस साल हो चुके हैं और एस०वाई०एल० कैनल पूरी नहीं हुई है। हरियाणा को करोड़ों रुपए का नुकसान हो रहा है। मैं सरकार से यह बात जानना चाहूँगा कि जब पिछले इलेक्शन से पहले कांग्रेस की सरकार ने सारे सरपंचों और पंचों को ले जाकर एक करोड़ अठ्ठारह लाख रुपया खर्च किया था एस०वाई०एल० प्रोजेक्ट की डेवलपमेंट दिखाने के लिए कि कितनी तरक्की से वह चल रही है... टारगेट मुकर्रर किए जा चुके हैं, लेकिन आप तक एस०वाई०एल० कैनल पूरी नहीं हुई। इसी तरह से मिरसा कैनल पर ब्रिज बनना था लेकिन अक्टूबर तक काम ही शुरू नहीं हुआ। तो मैं बड़ा प्रश्न समझूँ कि कार की एस०वाई०एल० कैनल को मुकम्मिल करने की नीयत नहीं है? अगर है तो कितना और टाइम लगेगा? यह 40 करोड़ का प्रोजेक्ट था जो आज 400 करोड़ का हो चुका है। हमारे प्रान्त को करोड़ों रुपयों का नुकसान हो रहा है। क्या सरकार उसको पूरा करेगी?

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Sir, SYL Canal is totally financed by the Government of India. And this matter will be looked into.

श्री महेन्द्र सिंह लाठर: 10 साल हो गए हैं, 40 करोड़ का प्रोजेक्ट 400 करोड़

का हो गया है, कब तक इसको पूरा करेंगे।
When are you going to look into it?

SHRI MUKHTIAR SINGH MALIK:
When shall it be completed?

श्री सुरेन्द्र सिंह: इसकी प्रोग्रेस रिपोर्ट क्या है? कब तक पूरी हो जाएगी?

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Sir, the hon. Member himself has accepted the fact that it has gone up to Rs. 400 crores. That is why, Sir, I said that it is a Government of India....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You tell them what is holding it up. Money is not holding it up. Something else is holding it up.

श्री सुरेन्द्र सिंह: 40 करोड़ का 400 करोड़ हो गया प्राइस ऐस्केशन हो गई है। इसको कब पूरा करेंगे?

SHRI M. M. JACOB: All efforts can be made, Sir, to complete it early. (Interruptions)

SHRI MUKHTIAR SINGH MALIK:
The question is when shall it be completed.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Sir, the Government of India is planning to complete the SYL Canal as early as possible, by June, 1990. But, in the meantime... (Interruptions)...

MR. CHAIRMAN: That must be sufficient. Dr. Abrar Ahmed Khan.

डा० अब्रार अहमद खान: श्रीमान्, राजस्थान एक ऐसा प्रदेश है जहाँ अक्सर अकाल पड़ता है। आज भी सारे देश में वर्षा हो रही है तो राजस्थान ही ऐसा प्रान्त है जहाँ कि बारिश ने मूह मोड़ रखा है। उसी राज्य के संबंध में अंत-राज्यीय विवाद भी चल रहे हैं जिनके संबंध में आपके माध्यम से मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि जमुना जल के संबंध में राजस्थान एक लंबे समय से जमुना जल के पानी पर अपने हिस्से

के लिए क्लेम कर रहा है। सेंट्रल वाटर एव पावर कमिशन के चेयरमैन की अध्यक्षता में एक कमेटी बनी थी जिस अपनी रिपोर्ट अप्रैल 1985 में जल संसाधन मंत्रालय को सौंप दी थी। इसकी निष्पत्ति के लिए मुख्य मंत्रियों की बैठक 12 अक्टूबर को बुलाई गई थी परन्तु वह पोस्टपोन हो गई। तो मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से जानना चाहता हूँ कि शीघ्र ही इस मीटिंग को बुलाकर आप निपटारा करेंगे?

दूसरे गंगा कंट्रोल बोर्ड की 14-1-88 की मीटिंग में पंजाब वाटर को राजस्थान के इरेटिक एरिया में डाइवर्ट करने के लिए यह डिसीजन हुआ था कि सी० डब्ल्यू० सी० इसकी विस्तृत जानकारी लेकर रिपोर्ट देगा। इस संबंध में क्या जानकारी है? सी० डब्ल्यू० सी० कब तक अपनी रिपोर्ट देगा?

तीसरे, टेहरी डैम के पानी पर राजस्थान 10 प्रतिशत का हिस्सा क्लेम करता है। तो इसके संबंध में राजस्थान सरकार ने जल संसाधन मंत्रालय को लिखा है। तो इसके बारे में क्या कार्यवाही कर रहे हैं?

अंत में सिद्ध मूल की बिवाई योजना और तोहार बिवाई योजना और चंबल के सिफ्ट फेज के जो प्रस्ताव माननीय मंत्री जी को भेजे हैं उनकी क्या स्थिति है?

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Sir, the hon. Member wanted to know about the sharing of Yamuna waters with Rajasthan. Sir, a meeting at the Technical Officers' level has been held, and there are differences of opinion about the criteria of sharing waters. A meeting at the Chief Ministers' level was to be held. In the meanwhile, as the hon. Member mentioned, the Chairman of the Central Water Commission has been requested to review the position with the States in the light of the National Water Policy to narrow down the differences. As soon as we are able to narrow down the differences we will be able to bring up the report on Ganga flood waters for Rajasthan which

is under preparation, and the hon. Member can expect the report very shortly. Regarding Sidmukh and Nohar projects, they are being cleared shortly from the techno-economic angle. So, I hope they will be cleared soon.

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : सभापति महोदय, क्या सरकार इस बात पर विचार कर सकती है कि रीवर वाटर नेशनल ग्रिड फार्म किया जाए और इन मुद्दों पर आम सहमति से एक नेशनल कांसेंसस बनाया जाए? इसको लेकर जो विवाद हो रहा है वह हमारी राष्ट्रीय एकता पर कुप्रभाव डालती है और हमारी पैदावार को भी कुप्रभावित करता है। बिहार में बराबर बाढ़ से तंगी हो जाती है और दूसरे हिस्सों में बिना पानी सुखा पड़ जाता है। देश तो एक ही है इसलिए क्या सरकार हमारी इस बात पर विचार करेगी कि एक नेशनल ग्रिड रीवर वाटर का बनाया जाए। and national consensus of all the political parties will be formed. Will the Minister kindly reply to this?

SHRI M. M. JACOB: As Mishraji is a very senior Member of the House and a knowledgeable person, he has given really concrete suggestions in this regard. Of course, it is not a dispute, but there is a solution to the dispute. Sir, one point in this connection I would like to mention, since he has mentioned it. As I see the papers of pending disputes of various States not agreeing on certain things, I feel, Sir, that there should be some authority, river basin authority, not a separate State handling authority, and if two or three States can form a river basin authority, then this authority can actually solve many of the issues as Mishraji has mentioned. I seriously take his suggestion and pursue the matter as early as possible.

SHRI CHATURANAN MISHRA: But what about creating a national consensus on this question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That he has said.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: That is what I thought that itself is a sign of consensus. So, I said, I will pursue the matter.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Sir, when the question was asked by my friend from Andhra Pradesh, the whole trouble is starting with Andhra Pradesh itself. The Bachawat report was there. The Krishna water was to be shared. Sir, the Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister and the then Tamil Nadu Chief Minister were good friends but they fell out again on water sharing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your question?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Then it was Karnataka and Hegde again fell out with N. T. Rama Rao. So, Sir, my question is coming that instead of waiting for the...

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You also did fall out with the Congress but joined again.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: ... Andhra State, consider that other States concerned are also vital whose irrigation potential has to be increased. Maharashtra particularly is very poor in irrigation potential. So, will the Minister finally take a meeting? Whether the Chief Minister attends or not is his business. Otherwise he is politicising the matter and the sufferers are Maharashtra and Karnataka, that is one point. And the second point that I want to know from him, Mr. Chairman, is why the costs of various projects are escalating. Every State has paucity of funds. Instead of asking for more water, the effort should be to provide adequate funds. I see from my own State itself that we provide 10 per cent to 15 per cent funds each year. It will take 10 to 20 years and by that time the costs will be escalated. So, whether it is the national grid as stated by my friend or some other grid, what is required is massive investment and coordinated management. How to arrange it without disturbing the States' autonomy is for the Minister to indicate. But what I ask is, don't wait for the Andhra Pradesh Government to clear or attend any meeting. If they don't attend, it will be at their cost.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What is your question?

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: And, whether the money problem will be taken care of?

MR. CHAIRMAN: About money problem he is asking.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Why not my other problems? If a Chief Minister is not going to attend, are we going to wait? We are concerned that Krishna water is being unnecessarily wasted. The project is to be completed by 2000 AD. Why should we wait? We are not prepared to wait.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is your question whether he will call meeting of the Chief Ministers.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: That is what I am asking. Let Mr. Jacob say what he wants to say.

SHRI JAGESH DESAI: If the Chief Minister does not come, will it not be settled at all.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: Here are two ex-Ministers concerned with irrigation. Mr. Shankaranand, who is an expert on irrigation...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You ask him for money.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: There are two parts of Mr. Kulkarni's question. One is, why not we go ahead even if the Chief Minister is not at all interested in coming for a conference. This is a new point which he has thrown up. Hitherto, the practice with the Ministry is that when there is a dispute, it is referred to us. Issues are not really referred but disputes are referred, and if it is a real dispute, tribunals are set up. Here, as I read out earlier, the Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister has objected. Now again Mr. Hegde from Karnataka. His letter to the Prime Minister is here dated 12th March 1988 in which he says "...I therefore, strongly urge you to intervene

and see that Telugu Ganga Project is not cleared. I am sure that you will take all steps to safeguard the legitimate interests of Karnataka and Maharashtra." So, there is divergence of opinion. This is a new situation that has come up and we have to assess and see how best we can do.

SHRI A. G. KULKARNI: You ignore them.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: The second aspect is money. Funding of projects has been planned in such a manner that 37 major projects will be completed in the Seventh Plan in the country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jaswant Singh.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: Sir, I raised my hand first.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I told you before that I decide whom to call. That I have told the House from the very beginning.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: But I raised my hand and my name is not there. That is the difficulty. Therefore, I am complaining.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Calling a Member is not determined by who raises his hand first.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: Then what is the process of calling the Members? We always raise our hand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is my total discretion.

SHRI VITHALRAO MADHAVRAO JADHAV: But I am requesting; I am not questioning your discretion.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: My question is specific to the Ravi-Beas agreement, and my interest is limited only to the interests of Rajasthan. In 1984, a tripartite agreement was signed between the respective Chief Ministers, and it was affirmed by the then Prime Minister, late Mrs. Gandhi, which in Ravi-Beas river waters context, allocated to Rajas-

than 8.60 million acre feet. That was in 1984. This is then subsequently eaten into by the Rajiv-Longowal accord which reopened the whole case and the whole entitlement of Rajasthan. Now I am informed by the Minister, in his reply today, that as regards Ravi-Beas waters, the tribunal which initially comes into being because of Cauvery dispute, has given its report and the co-basin States have submitted references, through the Central Government, seeking clarification. Sir, my question has arisen because Rajasthan's rights to Ravi-Beas do not arise merely on account of riparian States and I do not want to open that entire question. My clarifications that I ask are specific. From 8.60 million acre feet which was the entitlement of Rajasthan, as per that unsatisfactory agreement forced on us—according to us—of 1984, you are into it by the Rajiv-Longowal accord. I am talking of 1984 tripartite agreement. I am not talking about the Rajiv-Longowal Accord.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You put your question.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I would like to know, from this 8.60 million acre feet of water which is Rajasthan's entitlement, how much are you actually giving to Rajasthan? Give me only one year's figures, say, last year's figures. If it is less than 8.60 million acre feet, is it on account of the intransigence of the Government of Punjab, or, is it on account of the incapacity of the Government of India, or, is it on account of the incompetence of the Government of Rajasthan? Part (b); I would like to know...

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you ask the hon. Minister to comment about the different State Governments, he will be in trouble.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Reference has been made to the tribunal and there is this new enunciation of the theory of co-basin States which causes a resurfacing of very contentious issues...

MR. CHAIRMAN: You put your question.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I am putting the question. Has this tribunal recommended a reduction in the share of Rajasthan from 8.60 million acre feet of water? If it has recommended, what is the figure?

MR. M. M. JACOB: Sir, in regard to Rajasthan, the allocation has not been changed by the tribunal. This stands as per the 1981 agreement.

MR. JASWANT SINGH: 1984 agreement.

MR. M. M. JACOB: It is 8.60 MAF. They are not able to utilise it because the Rajasthan Canal is not complete. (Interruptions) There is no reduction in the water allocation. He asked whether there has been any reduction. There is no reduction.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: I raised a very substantial point. (Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Jaswant Singh, his is a categorical statement. You should rest assured. If I were from Rajasthan, if I were in your position, I would have been satisfied and would have sat down.

श्री जसवंत सिंह : सभापति जी, आप अगर अपनी समुदाल के प्रति थोड़ा नरम हो जाय...

श्री सभापति : मैं यह इमलिये कह रहा हूँ कि कैटोगरीकली रिप्लाय मिल गया, कमिटमेंट हो गया।

श्री चतुरानन मिश्र : समुदाल से हमेशा कैटोगरीकली रिप्लाय ही मिलता है।

श्री जसवंत सिंह : आप अपनी समुदाल के प्रति थोड़ा नरम हो जाय और राजस्थान के पानी के संकट का समाधान कुछ हो जाय यह मैं चाहता हूँ। मैं यह कह रहा हूँ कि जब ये कह रहे हैं कि 8.60 मिलियन एकड फीट आपका इंटाइटलमेंट है और हमने कम नहीं किया। लेकिन क्योंकि राजस्थान कैनाल कम्पलीट नहीं हुई है इसकी वजह से आपको कम मिल रहा है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि

कितना मिल रहा है और यह कम्पलीट क्यों नहीं हुआ ?

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Sir, I have already answered the question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He asked how much you are giving now.

SHRI M. M. JACOB: I have to look into it. I cannot say offhand now. I have to find out what is the exact quantum they are getting. But as I said, there is no change in the position.

SHRI S. K. T. RAMACHANDRAN: Sir, while some parts of the country are starving for water, some other parts are allowing the available water to flow waste into the sea; they are allowing the precious Nature's gift to go waste without allowing others to use it. When this is the situation in the country, is it not a colossal waste of time, energy and resources to drag on for decades after decades the settlement of inter-State river water disputes? Take, for instance the dispute between Karnataka and Tamil Nadu. The question of sharing of the Cauvery water is hanging fire for a long time. The West-flowing rivers from Kerala can be diverted to the East. This will be a Kama-dhenu for the Tamils. My second question is...

M. CHAIRMAN: You cannot put more than one question.

SHRI S. K. T. RAMACHANDRAN: Part (b).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The (b) part should arise from the (a) part.

SHRI S. K. T. RAMACHANDRAN: Will the hon. Minister state what proposals, what concrete proposals, the Government of India is taking to expedite such a settlement? Does the Government of India have any idea of constituting an All-India River Board to monitor the use of inter-State river waters? While we cherish the integral unity of the country, what prevents us from nationalising all inter-State rivers? If the Constitution is the impediment, can't we amend it?

SHRI M. M. JACOB: Sir, I have already answered the first part of his question. I have answered about the Telugu Ganga project.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: He asked about the Cauvery water dispute. (Interruptions) Are you setting up a tribunal?

SHRI M. M. JACOB: About the Kaveri water, Tamil Nadu Government requested the Centre in July 1986 for a tribunal under the Inter-State Water Dispute Act. The request was under examination. But recently we have got a letter from the Tamil Nadu Chief Minister that he is going to meet the Governor of Karnataka on 8th of this month. After that if intervention of the Centre is necessary, he will come back to us. So, we are awaiting what the Chief Minister wants us to do in this connection. This is what the hon. Member wants to know.

SHRI S. K. T. RAMACHANDRAN : This game is going on for the last two decades. When are we going to get water and when are we going get food?

MR. CHAIRMAN : It is a federal system.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA: The river water dispute is a very sensitive issue. It appears there is some confusion and I do not blame the Minister because he is new to the Ministry.

Firstly, the Bachawat Commission's award on the Krishna water sharing was very clear. It only enables Andhra to use the surplus water going waste into the sea. Out of 300 TMC of water, which is estimated to be going into the sea, this project takes only 29 TMC and it is only up to 2000 A.D. That fact has to be kept in mind. Andhras are nationalists in their outlook. They do not want to deprive any State of its legitimate share. Karnataka and Maharashtra are upper-riperian States. Andhra is down below near the sea; it cannot use their water. Only after Karnataka and Maharashtra have used the water it comes to Andhra Pradesh. Sir, it

is not correct when the Minister said that the project has been changed. When Mrs. Gandhi inaugurated this project and handed over the first cheque of Tamil Nadu to the Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister, all the four Chief Ministers from Maharashtra, Karnataka Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh were present. The brochure published on that occasion, the advertisements in the newspapers, the illuminated board there gave complete picture of this project—the contents of drinking water and water for irrigation. He is not correct in saying so. Andhra Pradesh Chief Minister refused to attend the meeting only on the ground that there was no dispute as far as the report of the Bachawat Commission was concerned. However there are apprehensions in the mind of Karnataka and Maharashtra which the Central Government has to clear. If you have a joint meeting, everybody would reiterate his stand and nothing would come out of that meeting. You have to convince each C.M. separately. You have to explain the legitimacy of his stand or somebody else's stand and remove the apprehensions. The apprehension of Maharashtra and Karnataka are genuine. They are not disputing the use of water now and that too up to 2000 A.D., but they feel that after 2000 A.D. when the matter comes up for review, Andhra Pradesh would claim it as a *fait accompli* and demand a share of water for this project. The Central Government has to clear this apprehension. They wanted certain assurances from Andhra Pradesh. When Shri Dinesh Singh was the Irrigation Minister he wanted specific assurances on this count from Andhra Pradesh to allay the fears of Karnataka and Maharashtra. Andhra Pradesh replied on 15th March, 1988, on 12th July, 1988, and on 2nd September, 1988. They have given specific assurances to remove the apprehensions of Karnataka and Maharashtra. Shri Dinesh Singh was satisfied with the explanations and he said that the project would now be cleared. I want to know from the Minister whether he has seen those letters. If you have not seen those letters please see those letters and then tell us whether you will take action on the basis of those letters.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY :
Before he replies, kindly allow me.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I do not want Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh dispute to come up here.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : I will take just one minute. I will just add to what he has said so that he can answer both the questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN : This is Question Hour. You are a senior Member.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY :
All right, you call me later.

SHRI M. M. JACOB : I was just listening to Mr. Upendra's argument. It was not a question, it was just an argument on the question.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA :
I am enlightening you.

SHRI M. M. JACOB : After Madam Indira Gandhi's attempt to solve this issue, the whole problem came from transfer of 15 TMC of Krishna water for Madras city. That was the intention of the agreement first. So Maharashtra and Karnataka are questioning the provision of en route irrigation in the Telugu Ganga Project.

SHRI PARVATHANENI UPENDRA :
That was there from the beginning. It was not added later.

SHRI M. M. JACOB : So now if you are not diverting the excess waters, as Andhra Pradesh is claiming, I understand from the records that Maharashtra and other States may not at all be worried about it; they will be agreeable. This is precisely the reason why we are particular that all the Chief Ministers must sit together and let us have a solution to this.

The second suggestion of Mr. Upendra is that individually you can see them also. I am not against individually meeting the Chief Ministers. I am prepared to meet the Chief Ministers individually and then if there is anything, collectively also. But

don't block it completely and say that you do not want to meet the Chief Ministers. This is the only point I am worried about.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY :
May I just ask a question?

MR. CHAIRMAN : Question No. 242.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY :
I want you to hear my question.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Thirty-six minutes have gone by. I have called the next question.

SHRI M. S. GURUPADASWAMY : I am just seeking your permission.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Everybody knows the whole thing. Question No. 242.

**Inadequate custom clearance facilities at
Nhava-Sheva Port**

242. **SHRI HARVENDRA SINGH
HANSPAL†**

SHRI CHIMANBHAI MEHTA :

Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state :

(a) whether due to inadequate custom clearance facilities at the Nhava-Sheva Port, the exporters and importers have to run from pillar to post to get their consignments cleared;

(b) whether Government propose to set up a full fledged customs house at Nhava-Sheva;

(c) if so, by when and if not, what are the reasons therefor; and

(d) what other steps are proposed to ensure clearance of the consignments without any loss of time?

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE IN THE**

†The Question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Harvendra Singh Hanspal.