

As a consequence the answer to part (b) has to be amended as follows —

Vithalbhai Patel House 5 instead of 3
Shram Shakti Bhavan 2 instead of 1
Transport Bhavan 5 instead of 3

In answer to a supplementary question by Shri Dahyabhai V Patel in respect of Liftmen recently removed from service, it was stated that it was not true that they had been in service for six months to one year. It has been found that Shri Om Prakash whose service was terminated on 18-3-1968 had more than 6 months' service, from 11-4-1967, if the broken periods of his service are added up, though each continuous spell of service was less than six months. I regret for the inaccuracies which crept in my previous answer.

CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED CONTROVERSY BETWEEN THE
GOVERNMENT OF MADHYA PRADESH AND
THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA OVER THE
DISTRIBUTION OF THE NARMADA
WATERS

SHRI A D MANI (Madhya Pradesh) Madam, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Irrigation and Power to the reported controversy between the Government of Madhya Pradesh and the Government of India over the distribution of the Narmada Waters.

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (DR K L RAO) Madam I wish to submit to the House that there is no controversy between the Government of Madhya Pradesh and the Government of India regarding the distribution of Narmada waters as the Government of India is not a party to the dispute. Its sole aim in such matters is to bring about

an amicable settlement of river disputes between the States concerned in the overall national interest.

The House is aware that since 1963, the development of Narmada in the States concerned namely Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Gujarat, has, unfortunately, been hindered by differences amongst the States over the sharing of waters of Narmada and other connected problems.

In 1963, discussions were held at Bhopal between the Chief Ministers of Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat and the Union Minister of Irrigation and Power and an agreement was arrived at but as this was not ratified by the Madhya Pradesh Government, the entire problem had to be reviewed again. With the concurrence and at the request of the Madhya Pradesh Government, a high powered technical committee headed by Dr A N Khosla and consisting of four eminent engineers of the country was set up in 1964. The Committee made elaborate enquiries and submitted a unanimous report in September, 1965, containing their recommendations on the various problems connected with Narmada. A summary of the recommendations was laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on 22nd September 1965.

The Madhya Pradesh Government, however did not agree with the recommendations of this Committee. Further discussions had therefore to be undertaken. The Union Minister of Irrigation and Power visited the States, met the Chief Ministers of Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Gujarat and Rajasthan and held discussions with them in May-June, 1966.

Later, officers of Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Rajasthan met under the Chairmanship of Shri M R Chopra, the then Chairman of Central Water and Power Commission in July-August 1966, and held protracted discussions for a number of days but could not come to any agreed conclusions regarding the distribution of waters. They agreed, however on one important aspect,

namely, the utilisable flow in the Narmada river.

As a further effort, the Union Minister of Irrigation and Power had a meeting with the Chief Ministers of Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat and Maharashtra and the Irrigation Minister of Rajasthan on 18th December, 1967. At this meeting the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh stated that the water requirements of Madhya Pradesh had increased on account of introduction of hybrid and high yielding varieties of crops. It was felt that this aspect of the question might be discussed by experts in agriculture and irrigation. It was agreed that this should be done within a month and the Chief Ministers should meet again on or about the 20th January, 1968.

The Madhya Pradesh Officers were informed that whatever information the State Government would like to be considered by the Central Government Officers should be sent in advance of the meeting but no information or data was received. Nevertheless, four senior officers of the Central Government went to Bhopal and met the Madhya Pradesh Officers on the 18th and 19th January, 1968. After some discussions, the points on which further studies or information were required were listed and it was agreed that these studies should be completed and information forwarded

"During the last four years, an enormous mass of information and data in respect of the developments on the Narmada has already been furnished to various Committees appointed by the Centre and no purpose would be served by adding to this mass. There is not much new basic data to be furnished. All that is now required is to use and interpret these data in the light of the new agricultural policy and the recently introduced agricultural techniques. This is best done by mutual discussion across the table and I suggest that your experts should visit Bhopal for the purpose as early as possible."

The Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh further suggested that the experts should pay a visit to the Narmada Basin and observe the trend of recent development. Accordingly, the Central Government Officers visited Madhya Pradesh on March 20 and 21 and inspected the irrigation developments in some areas selected by the State Government Officers which were served by tubewells. Thereafter, discussions were held between the Central Government Officers and the Madhya Pradesh Officers at Bhopal. Madhya Pradesh Officers handed over some notes regarding crop patterns, water requirements etc.

A further meeting of the officers of Madhya Pradesh and the Centre was held on 10th and 11th April, 1968, at New Delhi. During the discussions on the 11th morning, the Madhya Pradesh officers insisted that a record of what they stated should be made, then the Central officers' view should be recorded and then they should be

allowed to record their rejoinder. They also insisted that the Central Government officers should affix their signatures to these records.

The demand of the Madhya Pradesh officers that the Central Government officers should record their views and also affix their signatures to the record was most unusual and inappropriate, particularly as the Central Government is not a party to the dispute.

After the round of discussions was completed, the Central Government would have naturally issued a summary record of discussions.

In spite of the repeated requests of the Central Government officers to continue the discussions, the Madhya Pradesh officers refused to proceed further and left the meeting.

Thus, it is evident that in spite of our continued best efforts, no agreed solution for Narmada has been arrived at so far.

In regard to the settlement of river disputes it may be of interest to quote the principles suggested by the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations:

"The only practical way of settling such controversies of rivers passing through more than one State would be by agreement reached by give and take in a spirit of good neighbourliness and accommodation."

It is our endeavour to continue the efforts for an amicable settlement as early as possible and to avoid action under the Inter-State Water Disputes Act. I would, therefore, appeal to the concerned States to view the problem in the larger national interest and arrive at an amicable solution, so that the immense potential wealth of Narmada, which is lying undeveloped so far, may be harnessed soon for national prosperity.

SHRI A. D. MANT: Madam, I want to ask two questions. May I ask them separately or together?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please ask the question.

SHRI A. D. MANI: Madam, I am surprised that the hon. Minister should now say that there is no concave recovery between the Government of India and the State of Madhya Pradesh. I have got with me a sheet of statements issued by the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh about the attitude of the Government of India. I would like to ask him what his reactions are to the charges made by the Chief Minister against him and his Ministry. The charges are that Dr. Rao is a committed party to the question of a high dam and in the connection the Chief Minister has pointed out that in the Report on Narmada—Gujarat State, Vol. I of 1964—it has been specifically stated that Dr. Rao visited the site in 1957 and it was he who brought for the first time the question of a high dam at Navgaon. The second charge made by the Chief Minister was this. I have great respect for Dr. Rao and his integrity and I do not want to cast any reflection on his integrity. The second charge brought against him is that he is interested in a high dam at Nagarjunasagar and that if a high dam is granted at Navgaon, automatically the high dam at Nagarjunasagar goes.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL (Gujarat): How?

SHRI A. D. MANI: It is for him to answer. May I ask him, when these charges are made publicly by a Chief Minister that he is an interested party, that they cannot expect justice at his hands, why cannot the Government refer to the Supreme Court for advisory opinion the question of having a high dam down-stream on rivers? This is a very important point.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): This is a technical matter.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I want him to answer. If any decision is given by Dr. Rao it will not be accepted by the people of Madhya Pradesh

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Mani, you do not give the answer.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I am asking for his reaction. My second question is this. There was a meeting between the officers of the Madhya Pradesh Government and the Government of India on 18/19th January 1968. A summary record of the proceedings was prepared. Another meeting was held on the 21st of March. There the Government of India officers said: 'We shall not prepare any summary record of the proceedings.' Why was this unusual step taken? Dr. Rao referred to the U.N. practices. He knows very well that when two States have discussions, a summary record is prepared and approved by both the parties. Why was this not done, which has created a lot of suspicion in Madhya Pradesh?

DR. K. L. RAO: I would say at the outset that as a mediator, I am subject to be abused by both the parties. I am very glad that so far Gujarat has not made any abuse. About what the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh has said, I would not like to say anything on the subject because it is natural that a mediator should be attacked by a party. With regard to the specific questions asked regarding the high dam, the position is this. In 1946 the then Governments of C.P. Berar and Bombay requested the CWPC to undertake the investigation of the project on the Narmada river because they had no staff of their own. Then the CWPC investigated a number of sites. They investigated as far as 7 sites, starting from Barge in Madhya Pradesh to Broach in Gujarat.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Who were the members of the CWPC then?

DR. K. L. RAO: There were a number of officers and I was also there in that group. That was the

preparation stage, the stage at which plans were prepared. The year 1957 and all those years were years of preparation. Whenever a project is prepared, naturally they would like to do their best. It is a fact that I went to the Gora site. There is no project in India—I am proud and am very happy to say that—there is no place in India which I have not visited and I feel privileged in my life that such a great opportunity had been offered to me. I went to Navgaon, I went to Gora sites and I found that the Gora site was absolutely useless. For example, in Chambal, at the time of construction of the Gandhisagar dam, though some money had been spent. I thought that the project site was not good and we changed it entirely and we are very happy about it. So about the change of site, there is not anything surprising in it. During the preparation stage of this project report, there were two canals suggested. One was a low level canal at 160' level and another at 200' level. The CWPC was dealing with the subject. The Ministry of Irrigation and Power constituted a committee of high calibre engineers like Mr. Dildar Husain and Mr. Narasimhayya of Mysore—very elderly people—and it came to the conclusion: 'No two canals.' They wanted the whole dam to be done at one stage with 320' level. That is what they recommended. This was, in 1959 and 1960. Meanwhile the Gujarat Government came forward. They had a great engineer, Mr. Danak, a very intelligent man who was working in the combined State of Bombay. He suggested that the dam should be at 425' and nobody objected to that. Naturally a dam which is at the very lowest point of a river course, what you call the terminal site, should be as high as possible. That is the general principle. Very interestingly, in 1963 when we had the discussion at Bhopal, the Chief Ministers of Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat agreed to 425'. I have a signed document with me.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Who was the Chief Minister?

DR. K. L. RAO: I do not want to tell the name. This happened in 1963. Later on, as I submitted in the statement, though the Khosla Committee was appointed at the request of the M. P. Government and with full concurrence of the M. P. Government, they said: 'No, the suggestions of the Khosla Committee are not acceptable'. The Khosla Committee suggested that the dam should not be 320' as suggested by the CWPC or 425' as was later agreed but it should be 500'. That is the latest Khosla Committee recommendation. As a mediator I observed a very strict principle. There is not a single press statement where I said something about the Narmada project or any other dispute outside. I always do it only at the time of the confidential meeting of the Chief Ministers. There I have to make some suggestion. There it is that I made and if one Chief Minister of any State wants to say 'Therefore he is biased' I cannot help it.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): What do you mean by confidential meeting? I do not think they keep any confidence at all.

DR. K. L. RAO: I accept what the hon. Member says. Of course I do not know this. I am not a politician. I do not want to say what I suggested at that meeting. In fact my approach was considered good even by the then Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh. Then I made some suggestion at that stage, not accepting the Khosla Committee suggestions in full, which if I reveal now, the Gujarat C.M. will blow me up. I have made some suggestions. When you come to the Centre, we have to make some adjustments. So I suggested something. That is how the high dam business has come. If I have suggested a high dam. I would feel proud of it. There is nothing wrong in it. When the Bhakra dam was first made, it was 100' lower and

later on, when our study showed that the only place where the Sutlej water could be stored was at the present Bhakra site and once it leaves there it is not possible to store any more water and the water would go to waste to Pakistan, we said: 'No, the dam shall be higher' and it is built higher by 100'. Similarly in Koyna dam, after the work started, not at the investigation stage, we increased the height by 70' because we felt that the power demand of Maharashtra required the increase in height. There is nothing wrong in it. If there is any economic consideration, any sound engineer will do it and therefore I submit that there is nothing much objectionable in building high dams.

Regarding the suggestion about reference to the Supreme Court, I have already said that there are two ways of resolving a dispute. One is by going on trying to continue and find out some accommodation between the parties. That is what we are trying. Another is to go to the Court under the Inter State Waters Disputes Act. We have not yet decided finally. We are still continuing though by starting the process I am doing, I am subjected to a lot of criticism by various people and the press in general say: 'For how many years you will go on like this? You must come to a conclusion'. Still we are continuing because we hope there may be a way-out of the impasse because we know that the Narmada problem is a simple one and the solution will be simple provided there is a spirit of accommodation.

Regarding the summary record, whenever there are any meetings held with the Centre, we always issue a summary report. There is no question about it. We always do that. What the Central officers were objecting to was the new procedure suggested by which their views are to be expressed and the signatures affixed. That they will not do, because they are there not as a party.

[Dr. K. L. Rao]

Tomorrow, suppose Gujarat if they come and present another proposal, they cannot go on signing another set of proposals. That is why they said there is no question of our expressing our views or affixing our signatures. Yes, we always issue a summary record of discussions held and this is always done. Why it was not done at Bhopal, I do not know. Perhaps they did not want it, and probably there was nothing that emerged there which warranted the issue of a summary record. And the Bhopal meeting was not a big meeting either. In fact it was not brought to my notice; the Madhya Pradesh Government did not bring it to my notice as to why a summary record was not kept.

SHRI A. D. MANI: I have got the statement here.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI (Gujarat): I completely agree with Dr. Rao where he said that Narmada waters are a national asset. The hon. Minister, Dr. Rao, has taken, throughout this matter, a completely impartial, a strictly impartial attitude. To question his integrity or to charge him with political motives is unwarranted, unjustified, and it is hitting below the belt. Dr. Rao just now stated that the whole question should be considered from the point of view of national interests, and I wish that Madhya Pradesh Government also considered it from the interests of the nation as a whole. The scheme which the Madhya Pradesh Government suggested would have resulted in waters from 10,000 square miles below Narmadasagar, that is, 30 per cent. of the catchment area at Navgaon, going waste to the sea if they were unharnessed; number one. Number two; the Khosla Committee had estimated that actually the irrigation requirement of Madhya Pradesh was only 7.89 million acre feet. All the same they allocated to Madhya Pradesh 15.6 million acre feet; they went much beyond double the

quantity actually required and they gave 15.6 million acre feet. Of course . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please come now to the clarifications that you seek and do not make a speech now.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: I am coming to them.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please put your questions for clarification. Otherwise we shall be taking an unduly long time on this Calling-Attention matter—if each one wants to make a statement.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: No, Madam, this is a matter of vital importance; this is a matter of life and death to the people of Gujarat. How can we allow it just to pass like this?

I do agree that under the Khosla Committee recommendations 94,000 acres would be submerged.

श्री राम सहाय (मध्य प्रदेश) : यह आप केवल गुजरात के लिये ही क्यों कहते हैं ! यह आपको मध्य प्रदेश के लिए भी कहना चाहिये ।

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: No, no, my dear friend . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. You please seek the clarifications that you want.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: Under the Khosla Committee Report 94,000 acres would be submerged and under the Madhya Pradesh Government scheme 25,000 acres would be submerged but under the Madhya Pradesh Government scheme for every acre submerged only 2.2 acres extra would be irrigated whereas . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: May I take it that you have no points to seek clarification on and that you have only information to give?

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: No, no, I am giving the information with a view to eliciting further information.

Now, as I was saying under the Madhya Pradesh scheme for every acre submerged, 2.2 acres extra land would be irrigated in Narmadasagar and 4.6 acres in Omkareshwar, while under the Khosla Committee's Master Plan for every acre of land submerged, 59 acres of extra land would be irrigated. So wherein lies national interest I ask the hon. Minister.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I do not think I can give you more time. There are so many Members still to put questions and seek clarifications, and we must finish this Calling-Attention matter fairly quickly.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: May be, Madam, but I must have my say in this matter.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have been speaking for several minutes now. I want to appeal to Members once again that this is a Calling-Attention matter and . . .

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: I was going to raise another point also, about the Tata Chemicals, about the Tata Fertilizer Scheme.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No more please.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: No, no, listen to me please. I submitted . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want to appeal to the House again, and you may continue later.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: About the Tata Fertilizer Scheme I submitted a Calling-Attention Notice; it is not allowed. Then I wanted to ask a question; it is not allowed. What is this?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please take your time but I want to appeal to Members that this is a Calling-Attention Notice. Now, if each one of

you takes ten minutes to make a statement and then seek clarifications we will not be able to . . .

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: But yesterday the Calling-Attention Notice went on for more than one hour.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I am only appealing to you.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: I should be allowed to . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We can be brief and also clear, both. Now if you want to put any questions, please do so.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: On the question of Tata Chemicals when I submit a Calling-Attention Notice it is not allowed. When I want to ask a question it is not allowed. What is this?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is not allowed should be discussed in the chamber of the Chairman, but now . . .

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: I should refer it to the House. Gross injustice is done if I am not . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You must be brief.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: My third point was that in addition to the irrigation facilities got under the Master Plan, 229 megawatts of extra electric power would be generated.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Narmada is in spate now.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, please do not add to the time he takes by making interruptions.

SHRI SURESH J. DESAI: I am not going to take any dictates from the hon. Member in this matter. (Interruptions)

My next point is that 229 megawatts of extra electric power would be ge-

[Shri Suresh J. Desai]

nerated by the Master Plan. Is it a fact or not? And my last point is this. By having a height of 465 to 500 feet the cost of power generated at Navgaon would be 1.15 Paise per unit, as against 2.23 Paise per unit at Harinfal. Is it a fact or not? I would like to know also whether even under the Master Plan Madhya Pradesh would be getting their total requirement of electric power or not. These are the questions, and if this matter is considered from the point of view of national interests, then the Master Plan is more advantageous. I would like to know what the hon. Minister proposes to do about it. It has been postponed and delayed for years together while in the meantime huge quantities of these unharnessed waters go waste to the sea.

DR. K. L. RAO: I would like to apologise to the hon. Member for my inability to answer this question, and if I should answer the question my view should be expressed which . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has given you information. It is not a question.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Madam, while I sympathise with Dr. Rao in the difficult situation that he has to face I must congratulate him on the calm and collected way in which he has been dealing with the matter. I am sorry that some people in the Madhya Pradesh Government—I hope it is not the Chief Minister as reported in the papers—have indulged in unnecessary vilification, if not abuse, of the Minister for Irrigation and Power, who was trying to do his duty as a Minister. Besides, he is an engineer of note and repute. May I appeal to him to use his good offices, as far as he can, to go ahead with a plant that he thinks best, which he is convinced is in the interests of the country, which he thinks will make us independent of foreign aid as far as food is concerned, which will rid us of the un-

happy situation where we have been tied to P.L. 480, to which we have been subjected and because of which this country has taken to walking on crutches instead of standing up erect? May I request him to go ahead and advise his Government to take the right step instead of dilly dallying? This matter has been hanging before this country since 1963 according to Dr. Rao. According to the information that I have—I hope Dr. Rao is aware of it if not he will look up his records and then tell me—this scheme was originally submitted to the Government immediately after independence by Mr. Wacha, a retired engineer of the then C. P. Government—Does Dr. Rao know about it or not?—in which the potentialities of the Narmada project were all explained. And the original scheme was to be implemented at a cost of Rs. 600 crores. Because of the delay perhaps, unfortunately the prices have gone up. In the meantime this country has become short of food, is crying for power and is crying for water. And what is the solution that Dr. Rao, as Minister, as representing the Central Government, has to offer to the country, and to Gujarat which has behaved with such restraint in this matter?

SHRI A. D. MANI: Gujarat or Gujarat?

DR. K. L. RAO: I would like to thank the hon. Member for the good sentiments he has expressed of me. It is true that the project of Narmada, as I have submitted in the Statement, was under investigation from 1946 itself. Large numbers of schemes have been thought of and have been framed. Now it is the earnest endeavour and wish of the Government that we should be able to find a solution to this at a very early date, so that we may not allow any more of this precious water of the Narmada to go to waste.

DR. B. N. ANTANI (Gujarat): I will ask a very brief question, Madam. While congratulating the hon.

Minister on his spirit of tolerance and patience in the face of this sort of quibblings from one State or the other—because I am lacking in these qualities myself—I would like to ask him what is the limit of his tolerance and indecision and his non-interference with States? When will the Centre finally come in and decide the matter once and for all? What has the Centre decided after all? In view of the importance of the waters of the Narmada to the Rann of Kutch our patience is exhausted and so I would request the hon. Minister to tell me when the Centre will ultimately exercise its authority and decide this matter?

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: He wants cold water for Kutch.

DR. B. N. ANTANI: No, I am warm enough.

DR. K. L. RAO: I wish I were able to answer that question because it is a very important question and an answer to that will be valuable and in the interest of the nation. But I am afraid I will not be able to answer this without consulting my senior colleagues.

SHRI N. R. MUNISWAMY (Madras): Madam, an impression has been created that Madhya Pradesh is not willing to accept any of the suggestions either of the other State or of the Union Government and as a result the Minister is considering referring the matter to a decision under the Inter-State Water Dispute Act. I would request the hon. Minister to invoke the provision in our Constitution in article 263 for the creation of an Inter-State Council for dealing with inter-State disputes and to bring about coordination between States. Article 263 states:

"If at any time it appears to the President that the public interests would be served by the es-

tablishment of a Council charged with the duty of—

(a) inquiring into and advising upon disputes which may have arisen between States;

(b) investigating and discussing subjects in which some or all of the States, or the Union and one or more of the States, have a common interest; or

(c) making recommendations upon any such subject and, in particular, recommendations for the better co-ordination of policy and action with respect to that subject;

it shall be lawful for the President by order to establish such a Council, and to define the nature of the duties to be performed by it and its organisation and procedure."

So why should not the Minister invoke the provisions of this article and bring about coordination between the States?

That will . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That will do. He has understood.

DR. K. L. RAO: It was under the article—article 262—that Parliament passed the Inter-State Water Disputes Act. This has not been applied so far because river problems are very much more intricate. At this stage I must submit that the development of rivers involves several crores and it is not like a boundary dispute or any thing like that. The development of rivers involves crores of rupees and affects the lives of lakhs of people. Therefore the solution of river problems are generally sought through consensus, through general discussion and agreement between the very people concerned. Under the Water Disputes Act the whole question has to be left to one Judge, appointed by the Chief Justice of India. The whole

[Dr. K. L. Rao]

problem is left to one individual under this Act. Therefore one would hesitate when one is trying to deal with a problem of this nature and would consider whether it would not be better to achieve agreement by discussions among the people. It is only when everything else has failed and it is impossible to get agreement and when it is unavoidable that we try to apply that Inter-State Water Disputes Act.

SHRI U. N. MAHIDA (Gujarat): The opinion of the hon. Minister seems to be that the dispute will be referred to a Tribunal. In view of the fact that a decision under the Inter-State Water Disputes Act will be entrusted to a single Judge and the provisions in this Act are not quite consistent with the original provisions in article 262 of the Constitution, which implies that river disputes are not very susceptible even to decisions by the Supreme Court yet it is enacted in the subsequent Act that the matter will be judged by a single Judge. In view of these difficulties which the hon. Minister may realise does he contemplate any change in the legislation? The hon. Minister according to what he has said does not consider that these disputes are very suitable for legal consideration and decision. So, should these not be considered legislative functions rather than legal functions? In view of all this, does he contemplate any change in the existing legislation?

DR. K. L. RAO: It is quite true that this Act of ours is not very good and it is not consistent with similar Acts in use elsewhere in other countries of the world. Therefore I have been thinking for some time now of referring this matter to the Research Section of the Supreme Court and the Indian Law Institution to seek their advice as to what amendment should be made to bring it in line with the latest trends in the world.

श्री निरंजन वर्मा (मध्य प्रदेश) : आदरणीय , अभी मदन में जो इस विषय पर विवाद हुआ उससे यह पता चलता है कि मध्य प्रदेश और गुजरात की सरकारों में कोई मतभिन्नता नहीं है और इसी प्रकार से प्रतिनिधियों में भी किसी प्रकार की मतभिन्नता नहीं है, लेकिन यह बात जरूर है कि श्री राव से मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार खुश नहीं है और उसका कारण है। क्या मिस्टर राव यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे—उन्होंने इसका उत्तर जरूर दिया लेकिन हम क्लियर यह पछता चाहते हैं—कि जब दोनों सरकारों के प्रतिनिधि आपस में मिलते हैं और नोट लिए जाते हैं तो जब मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार के नुमाइन्दे ने उनसे नोट लेने के लिए कहा तो नोट लेने की कार्यवाही क्यों बन्द कर दी गई ? एक बात ।

दूसरी बात यह कि जो तीसरा बाध बांधेगा, जो गुजरात का सबसे आधुनिक बाध होगा उसकी ऊंचाई इस कदर बढ़ा दी जायगी जिससे नर्मदा के ऊपर कंदो बांधों से भी उसकी ऊंचाई ज्यादा हो जायगी और इस कारण उन दोनों बाधों के द्वारा जो बिजली और सिंचाई की योजनाएँ है वे सारी की सारी खटाई में पड़ जायंगी और उनका कोई लाभ नहीं मिलेगा ।

तीसरी बात यह कि उन्होंने बताया कि हमने बीच में जब कोई विवाद आया तो उन विवादों का समाधान करने के लिए जैसे हमने चम्बल के गांधी सागर डेम की साइट बदल कर दूसरी जगह पर रख दी । क्या उससे मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार को 93 लाख रुपयों का नुकसान नहीं हुआ और इसी प्रकार क्या वे यह सोचते हैं कि यह योजना मध्य प्रदेश की सद्भावना न लेकर उसके ऊपर थोपना क्या उसके लिए और आपके लिए उचित है ?

DR. K. L. RAO: With regard to the question of the hon. Member about verbatim record, I wish to submit that when discussing between officers we never maintain such records. It is not a question of ver-

batim notes. The main contention between the Central Government officers and the Madhya Pradesh Government officers was that the Madhya Pradesh officers wanted the opinion of the Central officers to be recorded and then they would record theirs and then the whole thing would be signed. This is a particularly unusual procedure and it has never been done. We have discussed and solved so many disputes and this has never been done. A lot of problems have been solved and they keep on coming in the Irrigation and Power Ministry. We have 17 States and you can imagine if we take 2 States at a time or 2 or 3 States at a time, by permutation been done. A lot of problems have a very large number of disputes. We have them, as I said, and we deal with them everyday and we discuss and solve them and in one or two cases we get stuck up like this. Therefore it is not a question of any verbatim record or anything of that sort. Merely it is a question of pertaining to procedure that the Madhya Pradesh Officers wanted.

Secondly with regard to the dam and the construction of the Jalasindhi and Harinphal dams the Khosla Committee very clearly stated about them and had taken into account that these two proposed dams will not be there and therefore every benefit that will accrue to Madhya Pradesh on account of these dams will be supplied by the State or the Central Government. That is the whole essence of the proposal. One thing I must submit. The Harinphal project is not an irrigation project. I am not justifying anything and I have not made or expressed myself outside anywhere. But since this has been stated in the Khosla Committee I am saying it that the Jalasindhi and the Harinphal projects are not irrigation projects. They are purely power projects and whatever power could be obtained from these two would be more than compensated.

With regard to the third point I am sorry the hon. Member has not under-

stood the position correctly. At the planning stage we are bound to take into account every factor and the height of the Gandhi Sagar Dam was not altered on account of any dispute. In fact there was no dispute. On the other hand the Gandhi Sagar Dam is one of the projects of which we should feel proud that Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan have worked together wonderfully in building that dam. I should like to congratulate Madhya Pradesh on this wonderful coordination in the scheme of the development of the Chambal project. I do not think I have got any reason to feel that the Madhya Pradesh Government have got anything against me. On the other hand I have paid more visits to Madhya Pradesh in recent months than to any other State and I have always received great courtesy at the hands of the Madhya Pradesh Government. Therefore there is no question of any dispute and if we find any undesirable feature and if we find that in the interest of the country a particular site has to be changed or a dam's height has to be increased or changed, it has to be done in the best interests of the country.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I think that will do. We have taken too much time on this.

SHRI S. D. MISRA (Uttar Pradesh): During the last 10 to 15 years the country has been facing acute shortage of food and now there is growing dispute about inter-State river projects. Today we are talking about the dispute about Narmada waters. There have been disputes about Gandak waters, about Krishna, about Godavari and many others. There was a scheme in the Ministry to have these inter-State river projects brought under the Central sector for Central execution. Why is not the Ministry taking up that matter and why are they not being brought in the Central sector so that there can be no disputes and there will be a growing feeling of oneness?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has already explained that.

SHRI NIRANJAN SINGH (Madhya Pradesh): First of all I want to ask the Minister one thing. He says he is impartial. He also says that the Gujarat Government has not criticised. It means when one party criticises and the other party does not, the other party has got favour from the arbitrator.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN: Not necessarily.

SHRI NIRANJAN SINGH: It is always so.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anyway, come to your clarification.

SHRI NIRANJAN SINGH: We have been talking about the Narmada project since 1947, and as Dahyabhai said it was the Madhya Pradesh Chief Engineer who has given these things.

SHRI DAHYABHAI V. PATEL: Mr. Wacha.

SHRI NIRANJAN SINGH: The Bargi and Punasa projects were investigated by the Government but all of them have been given up. Why have they been given up? Was it because of the size or condition of the valley or was it due to the financial position of the Madhya Pradesh Government? Due to poverty the Madhya Pradesh Government are not getting a proper share in the development of the State which has been ignored by the Central Government with the result that the schemes have been given up. I want to know why, when seven all-India projects have been taken up by Government, the Madhya Pradesh projects have been ignored up to this time. Why has the Bargi project, why has the Bain Ganga project been given up? The Minister said that he has toured the whole of Madhya Pradesh in recent years. Can he tell me why he

has given up all these schemes? The Riva project and the Sone project, are also given up. If the Navagaon dam has been constructed, I want to know whether the easement will be acquired by this dam and the other dam will be ignored or rejected? When Bargi and Punasa schemes have been finalised, why have they been dropped?

DR. K. L. RAO: I want to submit to the hon. Member that the Jal Sindhi scheme was not thought of in 1947. It was thought of only in 1965. Apart from that, he is quite correct when he says that the CWPC has investigated a number of projects. Bargi and Punasa are two of such projects. In fact I have been to the Bargi and Punasa sites a couple of times and I know them thoroughly. They are very good projects and I have always said that these should be taken up as early as possible. I have been strongly advocating this and I would like to submit to hon. Members that I am one of those who believe that Madhya Pradesh State has been very badly neglected in the matter of irrigation facilities. I have the statistics for the whole of India and Madhya Pradesh has got the least amount of irrigation developed so far. Not only so far; in the case of States like Mysore and Maharashtra a large number of projects have been sanctioned. Though their percentage of irrigation is small now, when the sanctioned schemes are completed the irrigation percentage will be much higher than in the case of Madhya Pradesh because in Madhya Pradesh no project has been sanctioned and that is all the more regrettable. That is why Madhya Pradesh requires very special treatment and I shall be one with hon. Members in requesting that finances are adequately given in the Fourth Plan. I can assure hon. Members that I will do my utmost, subject of course to the availability of finance, to see that projects like Bargi and others are taken up. There are quite a number of good projects like Satiara and others and it will be my

pleasure and privilege to be of service in the fulfilment and completion of these projects. I also want to assure hon. Members that the Navagaon is not going to drown the whole of Madhya Pradesh. That will submerge some portion of Madhya Pradesh but that is already to be drowned by their own dams.

SHRI NIRANJAN SINGH: But the storage of water will be there.

DR. K. L. RAO: If the Bargi dam is there, there will be storage of water. If the Punasa dam is there, there will be storage of water. All these have been taken into account.

SHRI A. D. MANI: How much water goes into the sea after these proposals?

SHRI NIRANJAN SINGH: Can the Government assure us that full utilisation of water will be given to Madhya Pradesh and only then the surplus water will be allowed to go out?

DR. K. L. RAO: It will be bad of me to say anything on this question but I can assure the House that we have taken everything into account. I am saying on the basis of the Khosla Committee because I do not want to go beyond and say anything as my personal opinion because again I will be subjected to criticism. But very careful calculations have been made. You must realise that Narmada is a very big river. It is equivalent to the whole of the Indus system the Sutlej, Beas and Ravi. It is a very big river and its water will be more than sufficient for the development of irrigation both in Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh. Of course Maharashtra does not have any benefit because it is all hilly area and there nobody lives except in a very few areas.

Then there was the question of a proper share for Madhya Pradesh. The finances are always fixed by the Planning Commission based on certain criteria but as I have submitted in so

far as Madhya Pradesh has got the least percentage of developed irrigation in the country while at the same time having very high possibilities for development of irrigation, I would very definitely be one with hon. Members that special attention must be paid to irrigation in Madhya Pradesh.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

I. APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS (POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS), 1966-67

II. AUDIT REPORT (POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS), 1968

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI K. C. PANT): Madam, on behalf of Shri Morarji Desai, I beg to lay on the Table, under clause (1) of article 151 of the Constitution, a copy each of the following papers:—

(i) Appropriation Accounts (Posts and Telegraphs), 1966-67.

(ii) Audit Report (Posts and Telegraphs), 1968.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-1085/68 for I and II].

MAIN CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOSPITAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (1968)

सिचाई तथा विद्युत मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (प्रोफेसर सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद) : माननीया, मैं श्री सत्य नारायण सिंह की ओर से अस्पताल समीक्षा समिति (1968) के मुख्य मुख्य निष्कर्षों और सिफारिशों के सारांश की एक प्रति सभा पटल पर रखता हूँ ।
[Placed in Library, See No. LT-1066/68.]

REPORT (1ST MARCH, 1966 TO 31ST MARCH, 1967) BY GOVERNMENT ON THE WORKING OF THE HINDUSTAN LATEX LIMITED, NEW DELHI

प्रोफेसर सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद : मैं डा० एस० चन्द्रशेखर की ओर से समवाय अधिनियम,