

सकते हैं ? कहां तक यह सच है ? पहले अनुमान था कि 50 करोड़ रु० का सोना चोरी-छिपे आता है जब कि अब यह मात्रा बढ़कर 400 करोड़ तक हो गई है ।

श्री बी० आर० भगत : 400 करोड़ ?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : 400 करोड़ रु० का सोना चोरी छिपे जा रहा है ।

श्री बी० आर० भगत : आज ?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हां, आज । भारत में यह अनुमान लगाया गया है । मैं जानना चाहता हूं क्या सरकार ने इस बारे में भी विचार किया है कि यह चोरी-छिपे सोने का आना रोकने के लिये सरकार स्वयं अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय दर के भाव से सोना खरीदे और उसे भारत में लाकर भारत में जो बाजार भाव है उस पर बेचे ?

श्री बी० आर० भगत : यह सुझाव है । 400 करोड़ रु० की जो बात कही गई, माननीय सदस्य को ज्यादा मालूम होगा इन बातों के बारे में । मेरे पास ऐसी सूचना नहीं है कि 400 करोड़ रु० की सोने की स्मगलिंग अब हो गई है । यह भी कहना कि गोल्ड कंट्रोल के बाद स्मगलिंग ज्यादा हो गई है, अधिकृत रूप से तो यह नहीं कहा जा सकता है । कुछ लोगों का ऐसा ख्याल है कि स्मगलिंग पिछले महीने में

कम ही हुआ है, ज्यादा नहीं हुआ है । मगर इन बातों के बारे में यकीनी तौर पर कहना जरा मुश्किल है । जहाँ तक उन्होंने सुझाव दिया है कि सोने को बाहर से मंगवा कर यहां लाना है तो अगर विदेशी मुद्रा हमारे पास इतनी हो कि अनाज की बजाय सोना मंगाये तो यह संभव है पर हम अभी इस स्थिति में नहीं हैं ।

#### RIVER WATER DISPUTES BETWEEN STATES

\*619. SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR : Will the Minister of IRRIGATION AND POWER be pleased to state :

(a) what efforts have been made by the Centre to settle the outstanding river water disputes between the various State Governments;

(b) what is the latest position of these disputes; and

(c) how far these disputes have affected the programme for irrigation and power generation for the Fourth Plan ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (DR. K. L. RAO) :

(a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

(c) The programme for irrigation and power generation for the fourth plan is yet to be finalised.

#### STATEMENT

##### Regarding River Water Disputes between States

Name of dispute	State concerned	Position
1. Krishna-Godavari . . .	Andhra Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Mysore and Orissa.	Discussion have been held individually with the Chief Ministers of Maharashtra, Mysore and Andhra Pradesh. A joint meeting with the Chief Ministers of the States concerned is proposed to be held soon.
2. Cauvery waters . . .	Madras and Mysore	A Committee of Chief Ministers of the three States with the Union Minister of Irrigation and Power as convener has been set up by the Southern Zonal Council to resolve this dispute. In the absence of a Council of Ministers in Kerala, discussions are held over.
3. East and West flowing rivers in Kerala.	Madras, Kerala and Mysore.	

Name of dispute	State concerned	Position
4 Narmada waters Dispute	Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Rajasthan	After separate discussions with the Chief Ministers of Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Rajasthan at their State capitals during May-June 1966, further discussions were held in a joint meeting between the concerned Chief Ministers, and Minister of Irrigation & Power at Delhi on 22nd August, 1966. In the interval, Chief Engineers and other officers of all the States and the Chairman and concerned officers of C W & P C and Ministry discussed the technical aspects on different dates between 19th July and 14th August, 1966. At the joint meeting of the Chief Ministers, frank and helpful discussions took place and there was appreciation and understanding of each others' viewpoints. In the course of the discussion, some suggestions emerged and it was decided that these should be discussed later among the Chief Ministers themselves to arrive at an amicable settlement of the problem. The final decision, it is hoped, would be made after the next joint meeting of the Chief Ministers with the Union Minister of Irrigation and Power to be fixed after the matter has been discussed among the Chief Ministers.
5 Keolari Nadi	Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh	The clearance of Keolari Project in Uttar Pradesh for irrigating 3,668 acres has been held up as the Madhya Pradesh Government have not concurred in the utilisation of the part catchment of the project lying in that State. The matter was discussed by the representatives of these two State Governments on the 13th April 1966. The Govt of Madhya Pradesh have informed the Ministry of Irrigation and Power that the decisions reached at this meeting are still under their consideration.
6. Tungabhadra Project	Andhra Pradesh and Mysore.	The Governments of Mysore and Andhra Pradesh have not so far been able to reach agreement on certain issues relating to Tungabhadra. The matter is proposed to be discussed at a joint meeting with the two Chief Ministers.

**SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR :** In the statement that has been placed you have mentioned six disputes but how old these disputes are has not been mentioned. Then, may I know, Sir, when did the Centre intervene, and why is it that during all these years the Centre was not able to settle these disputes? What is the real difficulty in coming to a solution about these disputes?

**DR. K. L. RAO :** There are many inter-connected, inter-State rivers in this country and as long as waters flow in these rivers there are bound to be some sort of disputes as projects are being built up. I am glad to say that in India inter-State disputes are far less than in other countries.

With regard to the number of years, Sir, the first one, Krishna-Godavari dispute, is five years old. The hon'ble Ibrahim Sahib after dealing with this dispute for three years had made a statement in the Rajya Sabha in 1963. As I said, this is not final. Again some points of dispute have arisen between the States. They are being looked into.

With regard to rivers Achankoil and Cauvery between Kerala and Madras, the dispute has been going on for the last three or four years. Here again we are not going into details because the Madras Government and Kerala want to settle between themselves before seeking intervention of the Government of India.

With regard to the Narmada waters, Sir, for the last three years we have been trying to find out some sort of a settlement. I am glad that the hon. Minister has been able to make them discuss between the Chief Ministers.

As far as the Tungabhadra waters are concerned, most of the points have been settled. There are a few points which are to be settled between Andhra and Mysore. These things are to be discussed with the Chief Ministers. Therefore, we see that in India these river disputes do not offer much of a trouble.

**SHRI M. N. GOVINDAN NAIR :** May I know, Sir, whether it is a fact that the Madras Government, in the State Plans they have submitted, have included the diversion waters from the Kerala rivers without any consultation with the Government of Kerala especially at a time when there is no popular Government there?

**DR. K. L. RAO :** There are some inter-State rivers which start in Madras like Achankoil, Kallada and Annamalaiyar which start from Madras and go to the Kerala State. Likewise there are rivers which are tributaries like Kabini of Cauvery which start in Kerala and go to Madras. There have been demands from both the States to use the other water. Kerala wants to use the waters of the tributary of Cauveri and likewise Madras wants to use the waters of the tributaries which are coming from the other area. It is not a fact that Madras wanted it when the popular Government in Kerala was not there. The fact was that this point arose when the popular Government in Kerala was there in 1964 itself but the matter could not be pursued further.

**DR. D. R. GADGIL :** May I ask the Minister whether it would not have been better in all these disputes to take advantage of the very specific provisions in the Constitution for arbitration rather than trying to solve them entirely on the political plane?

**SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED :** I have already explained to this House before that as far as possible it is not desirable to take recourse to the provisions under the constitution with regard to arbitration because, the moment reference is made to arbitration it is likely that many of the activities of development of water resources in these areas will be brought to stand still by resorting to stay orders. Therefore it is our effort to have these matters settled amicably among the States themselves and only allow an extreme step, if no possible arrangements can be made, to take recourse to the provisions under the Constitution.

**DR. D. R. GADGIL :** Is it not a fact that numbers of these disputes have not been settled for a number of years and that if arbitration proceedings had been taken, it would have been more expeditious and satisfactory ?

**SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED :** That is not a fact. In fact we have during the past few years, been able to bring about settlement with regard to a large number of disputes. So far as these four or five disputes mentioned here are concerned, they are also nearing settlement and it is only through negotiations and exercise of patience, I hope, that these also can be settled.

**SHRI A. D. MANI :** In regard to the Narmada water dispute the statement says that on 22nd August there was a conference of the Chief Ministers of the States concerned and there was a frank and helpful exchange of views. It has been decided after the conference that this matter should be allowed to be settled between the Chief Ministers themselves in an amicable way. Am I to understand that the Chief Ministers concerned are not willing to accept any direction or advice of the Central Government on this subject and they insist that the matter should be settled by mutual negotiation among themselves ?

**SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED :** That will not be the correct interpretation of the decision taken at the joint meeting of the Chief Ministers with me on the 22nd of this month. As I pointed out in the statement, we discussed these matters for three hours. We had the viewpoints from all the States and in the course of the discussion certain suggestions emerged which I thought would be desirable for the Chief Ministers to further discuss among themselves first before I met them again in a joint meeting. I hope these discussions will be fruitful after verifications and ascertaining certain facts. So we thought that so far as these verification of matters was concerned, they may be given opportunity before discussions. After they have informed me of the discussions, then I shall fix a date for the final talk.

**SHRI BABUBHAI M. CHINAI :** May I know whether it is a fact that during the course of the last two days the representatives of Maharashtra, Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh have been discussing under the patronage of the hon. Minister for Irrigation the Narmada Valley Project and whether the differences between the States have been narrowed and if so, whether there is any solution which we can expect in the near future ?

**SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED :** As I pointed out, these discussions took place on the 22nd of this month and my impression is that there is a very good chance of settlement and that is why I said that this procedure of allowing the Chief Ministers to have free talks with regard to this has been adopted.

**SHRI T. V. ANANDAN :** Is it not the Centre's experience that there are States which are prepared to let the water flow into the sea than share it for drinking purposes with other States ? Is this the way we are going to succeed in the national integration of the country.

**DR. K. L. RAO :** For drinking water we always give the highest priority and I am not aware of any case where anybody has been refused drinking water.

**SHRI T. V. ANANDAN :** Between Madras and Andhra it is there.

**DR. K. L. RAO :** It is very unfortunate that the hon. Member has got wrong information regarding the offer of Andhra Pradesh to Madras for water supplies. On the other hand, Andhra Pradesh has agreed to give water to Madras for water supply. It is only Madras that wanted to have an alternative scheme to get water from Cauvery. That is why the matter has been held back.

**SHRI M. M. DHARIA :** While appreciating the efforts of the Minister to have an amicable settlement, is the Minister aware that in States like Maharashtra and Mysore where the irrigation

is less than 10 per cent, while the average for the country is 23 per cent, the minds are greatly agitated and it is necessary that a settlement should be reached as early as possible? If it is not possible through negotiations, may we know whether the Minister will put some time-limit for the negotiations and if it is not possible, as has been suggested by Dr. Gadgil to-day, will he refer the matter to arbitration if they are not settled within a prescribed time-limit?

**DR. K. L. RAO :** I am glad to state that between Maharashtra and Mysore States for the last two years a large number of irrigation schemes have been sanctioned which will require at least 15 years to execute. With regard to the question of limitation or arbitration, my senior colleague has mentioned already that it is always better to settle these by negotiations and not by going to the court. In fact this has been the experience in even advanced countries like America. In America there is a river, Colorado, regarding which there were disputes for 30 years between seven States and it had to be settled finally by negotiations.

**SHRI K. SUNDARAM :** May I know from the Minister whether there is a dispute pending between the Kerala Government and the Madras Government over the supply of drinking water to the Coimbatore city? Is he aware of it? For the last three years it has not been settled. May I know when this is referring to.

**DR. K. L. RAO :** This is not brought to our notice. I do not know what he is referring to.

**SHRI NIREN GHOSH :** May I know whether there is any dispute between Bihar and West Bengal over the waters of Damodar and whether there is any proposal to trifurcate the Damodar Valley Corporation between West Bengal, Bihar and the Centre or whether the D.V.C. would be kept as it is?

**SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED :** There is no such dispute. The only question which was discussed at the recent meeting was whether under

the changed circumstances it was desirable to have a reorganisation of the D.V.C. and for the present we have decided that the reorganisation may be postponed.

**SHRI B. K. P. SINHA :** The Minister said in reply probably to justify the delay that in Colorado the dispute had been going on for 30 years. Is he aware that the American Constitution is entirely different from the Indian Constitution in this respect and in America the Centre has only those powers which are specifically conferred on the Federation and all the residuary powers are with the States. In India the position is entirely different and the Constitution contemplates that when a river flows through more than one State, it shall be for the Centre or the Union to regulate the use of those waters and to equitably distribute those waters. In the circumstances, I do not see where the justification is for bringing in Colorado in defence of the delay that has occurred. Will he explain this?

**SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED :** I appreciate the anxiety of the hon. Member. There is no such decision, so far as we are concerned, to follow the precedent of the United States. What my colleague pointed out was that if the matter was referred to arbitration it was likely to take a longer period, and not to say that any precedent in the United States is to be followed here.

**SHRI D. THENGARI :** Does the Government propose to fix any time limit for the final settlement of this dispute so that, after that time limit is over, the matter may be referred to arbitration because, in the absence of any such time limit, it would be impossible for us to finalise the Fourth Plan?

**SHRI FAKHRUDDIN ALI AHMED :** I would appeal to the hon. Members to have patience because, so far as these matters are concerned, I myself am anxious that they are settled as early as possible.