

[Shri S. K. Patil.]

want to come, can come and wholeheartedly and sincerely co-operate with the Government and they would find in Government a very very ready response indeed. One thing, Sir, many many people have really worked hard so that the big, almost gigantic, legislation consisting of 461 clauses could be brought forward and passed. Apart from the complaint made about the time, it was not our desire to restrict the time. As you pointed out rightly, it is the Business Advisory Committee that fixes the time. If it was not merely for the fact that it was the fog end of the session, I would really have liked it myself more time being given and I would have welcomed that. We have passed the Bill, a national Bill, the object of which is to develop national shipping for this country. May it be given to this generation and to you and me, as representatives of this generation to see that India is firmly put on the map of the maritime powers in this world.

4 P.M.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR:
Let India rule the waves once again.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MOTION RE STATEMENT ON THE DAMAGE CAUSED TO KADAM DAM IN ANDHRA PRADESH

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I move:

"That the statement on the damage caused to the Kadam Dam in Andhra Pradesh, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 12th September, 1958, be taken into consideration."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One hour is the time allotted.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Sir, I request that the time be extended. Let us have at least one minute for every lakh worth of dam washed away. This dam is worth two crores of rupees.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are five speakers.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Mr. Deputy Chairman, it is with a sad and a heavy heart that I move this motion. It is the misfortune of Andhra Pradesh that during the last two years, apart from this important Kadam which is to play an important role in the life of Telangana, dams worth two crores of rupees have been washed away. The Mallamadugu and the Kalangi in Chittoor District and Swarnamukhi and Moosi, in last June, were washed away. This was in the Nalgonda District. Sir, it has become the practice of the Government to blame providence, to shift the responsibility to providence who is neither responsible nor accountable here in this House. It is the practice to shift responsibility on that. Varuna, we have all the while been led to believe, was in charge of water and rain-making but now, Sir, according to Government sources, has become a Super-Minister without responsibility but with a lot of power. Anyway, Sir, coming to this Kadam . . .

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): You have started believing in God.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: At least you do believe in God. Let us examine and see, Sir, whether it is really the hand of providence that is responsible for this, whether it is the heavy downpour that is the real cause for the washing away of this Kadam Dam. If we examine all the material that is here before us dispassionately, it will be perfectly clear that *prima facie* it is the Government and the Government agen-

cies that supervised the construction of this Dam that are responsible and not Varuna, as has been alleged.

Now, Sir, coming to the history of this Kadam Dam, Mr. Deputy Chairman, this Kadam is a major tributary of Godavari. Its catchment area is a thousand square miles. This Dam is part of the bigger project called the Godavari Valley Project which was originally prepared by the erstwhile Hyderabad Government to serve the needs of six districts. This particular Dam is built across the Kadam which has a length of 5,495 feet. The estimated cost is Rs. 441 lakhs, of which the Dam part alone comes to Rs. 179.36 lakhs, that is to say, nearly Rs. 180 lakhs.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay): Is it not 101 lakhs of rupees?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I am sorry, it is Rs. 179.36 lakhs or nearly Rs. 180 lakhs. I have got all the documents of the Government before me. I would like to refer to the article written by Mr. H. N. Iengar. Perhaps the hon. Member is mistaking the 1.25 lakh cusecs for the cost of the Dam. The cost comes to nearly Rs. 180 lakhs.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: I want to know whether the information given in the statement is correct or what the hon. Member states is correct. The statement says:

"The project was estimated to cost Rs. 441 lakhs out of which the cost of the Dam was Rs. 101 lakhs. The scheme envisaged annual irrigation of 66,000 acres."

I want to know whether the figure given in the statement circulated by Government is correct or the figure that is being quoted by the hon. Member is correct.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: The unfortunate aspect of the case is that a mass of documents have been circulated by the Andhra Pradesh Government, by the Central Government,

and there are articles written by some Member of the Central Water and Power Commission and so on, which give different facts at different times perhaps to suit the convenience or exigencies of the situation. I do not know what to believe and what not to believe. When I actually come to the Dam, I am going to point out many such discrepancies. This Dam was supposed to irrigate 67,000 acres in Telangana, a backward area in the district of Adilabad from where 50,000 tons more were expected; but, Sir, all of a sudden, overnight, we find that this Dam in the construction of which nine years of toil, of the labour had gone is washed away. What are the causes? If we examine the whole thing, Mr. Deputy Chairman, we will find, as I mentioned earlier that right from its design up to its construction and the washing away, different versions given, different reports given. They are reports of wrong design, reports of bad construction, reports of misappropriation and embezzlement of funds, wrong methods used in the construction. All these things have contributed their own quota to the final washing away of the Dam.

Now, Mr. Deputy Chairman, let me take up the first, the very initial, stages of construction and here I quote no other source excepting that of the Chief Minister himself. He himself said that in the very beginning itself, no detailed data was collected for the construction of this Dam. This is not a concoction of any Communist but this is what the Chief Minister has stated in a Press Conference on the 2nd September, 1958, reported in the "Andhra Patrika" dated the 3rd September, 1958. Mind you, Sir, this is a paper which belongs to one of the erstwhile Members of the Congress Party and who was also a Member of this House:

"Before any project is built, the engineers collect the data about the average rainfall in the area but unfortunately this was not

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.]
 done in the case of the Kadam
 project."

In the very conception of the Dam
 itself, there is mistake and gross
 miscalculation.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL (Andhra
 Pradesh): I do not think the Chief
 Minister of Andhra Pradesh referred
 to any matter that took place before
 the merger of Telangana and Andhra
 Pradesh.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: On
 a point of order, Sir. Why should
 the hon. Member discuss about the
 Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh
 here?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I know.
 The Kadam Dam has been washed
 away and not the Ministers of
 Andhra Pradesh. I am perfectly
 aware of that, but if such things con-
 tinue like this in the life of the
 people, perhaps the day will not be
 far off when the Ministers them-
 selves will be washed away.

SHRI S. CHANNA REDDY (Andhra
 Pradesh): Wherever they happen
 to be.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Yes,
 wherever they happen to be. Where-
 ever such things happen in a callous
 way, they will be washed away.

Mr. Deputy Chairman, in the very
 beginning itself, proper data was
 not collected and regarding the
 design, different people say different
 things. Here is a document that is
 circulated to us which says that the
 Dam was designed originally to take
 a discharge of 1.25 lakh cusecs "but,
 in view of a bigger flood volume of
 about 2 lakh cusecs having encoun-
 tered some years ago, the operation
 rules of the reservoir above the
 Dam were modified to enable a flood
 discharge of 2.5 lakh cusecs, etc.
 etc." They say that originally it was
 designed for 1.25 lakh cusecs. If

that is so, I do not know how on
 earth, after the Dam is completed
 and without making alterations, it
 was possible to make the Dam with-
 stand 2.5 lakh cusecs of flood dis-
 charge. Sir, here is another state-
 ment by no less a person than one
 of the Members of the Central Water
 and Power Commission, Shri K. L.
 Rao, published in the Andhra Pra-
 desh Souvenir, page 88. It says:

"The spillway is 220 feet long
 and it is fitted with nine lift gates
 60'x15" capable of discharging 2
 lakh cusect."

Here is another statement, Mr.
 Deputy Chairman, by Shri H. N.
 Iengar, Deputy Chief Engineer, Irri-
 gation, Government of Andhra Pra-
 desh published in the journal, Official
 Information Bulletin of Andhra Pra-
 desh. He states here:

"The maximum flood discharge
 is estimated to be 2½ lakh cusecs.
 This is negotiated by the nine spill-
 way gates 60'x15" provided over
 the . . ."

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Sixty or six-
 teen?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Sixty—six
 zero. Here, the same type of gate
 is said to pass a flood discharge of
 two lakh cusecs; the Deputy Chief
 Engineer says that it can pass 2,50,000
 cusecs. In the original statement
 circulated to us, perhaps to cover up
 and to give an excuse for the Dam
 having been washed away, it is
 stated that it was originally designed
 to withstand 1.25 lakh cusecs.
 Where is the truth? Are we to be-
 lieve the Irrigation and Power Min-
 istry of the Central Government
 which gives figures in one way, or are
 we to believe one of the Members of
 the Central Water and Power Commis-
 sion who says that it was originally
 designed only for two lakh cusecs or
 are we to believe the Andhra Pradesh

Deputy Chief Engineer? We are entitled to know and this House is entitled to know which is the right figure and which is the real thing. We should know exactly for how much this Dam was originally designed.

SHRI JASPAT ROY KAPOOR (Uttar Pradesh): Believe all. Do not be an unbeliever.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Yes, Sir, believing all, we have come to this stage where 65,000 acres of land have become non-cultivable, a non-believable phenomenon for at least some years to come. We have had enough of this believing.

Now, Sir, this is what happened in the case of the design itself. Let us see, Sir, how this Dam was constructed. Here I am quoting from no less a source than the Estimates Committee Report of the Andhra Pradesh Legislature. Its Chairman is none else than one of the erstwhile Ministers, ex-Ministers of the erstwhile State of Hyderabad. It is a unanimous Report. Sir, here is a sad story of bungling, of embezzlement, of wrong construction and all that is there in society. Sir, the funniest part of it is this. For everything, a tender is called for but here a great Dam worth Rs. 1,80,00,000 is constructed but no tender is called for. Very funny. This calls for our attention and is certainly a thing which must be enquired into. Here the Report reads as follows:

"The Committee was surprised to find in this particular project that this normal procedure of calling for tenders and accepting the most favourable one was deviated from. The Committee was told that the Department has a discretion to deviate from this normal procedure under normal special circumstances".

Very suspicious thing, and the Committee itself recommends:

"The Committee feels that the Department has definitely gone

wrong in granting the contract to an individual"

Mark, Sir, the word "individual".

" . . . for the construction of the Dam which involves a huge amount without calling for tenders and arbitrarily fixing not only the lump sum project rates but also giving 170 per cent. extra over the district schedule rates".

Not only are tenders not called for but at the whim and fancy of the Irrigation and Power Minister of the Andhra Pradesh Government, this contract is given, not at the normal rates but at 170 per cent. extra rates.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Who is he?

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Bombay): Who is the contractor?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I do not know. It is for the Government to enquire and find out what connection existed between the Irrigation Minister and this particular contractor. It is for the Government to enquire into.

SHRI V. C. KESAVA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): On a point of information, Sir. This was done by the old Hyderabad Government, not by the Andhra Pradesh Government.

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO (Andhra Pradesh): But that was also a Congress Government.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: The hon. Member must realise that. Is he going to disown the erstwhile Hyderabad Ministry? Is he going to say that the Ministry that was there previously was not a Congress Ministry?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with all that. Let us confine to the facts of the case.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Then, Sir, it is admitted that normally 5 to 7 per cent. of the total amount of the estimate of the project is spent on the purchase of tools and plants but we

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.]

find peculiarly, Mr. Deputy Chairman, the following remarks in the Report of the Estimates Committee in regard to this project:

"The Committee was not provided with sufficient reasons as to why in this particular respect more than 20 per cent. of the project amount was spent for the purchase of tools and plants."

It is really mysterious.

Then, Sir, again I quote from the Report of the Estimates Committee:

"The Committee was surprised to find that there is neither stock book, nor log book nor any other record to show the total number of machineries or tools and plant purchased for this project."

Sir, out of a total amount of Rs. 440 crores for this project, on machinery alone . . .

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Rs. 440 lakhs

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I am sorry, it should be in lakhs; it is Rs. 441 lakhs. Out of this sum of Rs. 441 lakhs Rs. 62 lakhs have been spent only for purchasing machinery. It is unusual. The Estimates Committee itself gives out that normally in any project not more than 5 to 7 per cent. is spent on the purchase of tools and plant.

Then, Sir, the story does not end there itself; there are irregularities in purchases and irregular payments also. The same report says: "It appears that in 1952 and 1953, payments amounting to over Rs. 33,000 and Rs. 50,829 were made for excavation below spring level to the contractors." After hearing these things the Committee says: "The Committee, therefore, feels that the Government should take suitable steps to recover this amount from the contractor and hold the person responsible, who deliberately made the payment under 'other items'."

Actually Government was thinking in terms of writing off for these people—I do not know why. Then does the story end here? No, Sir. There are also cases of embezzlement, embezzlement of G.I. sheets. The embezzlement of these zinc sheets amounts to Rs. 35,233. Again about this the Committee says: "The Committee strongly feels that instead of considering the proposal of writing off the embezzled amount it would be better to go into this question in detail and fix the liability and try to recover this amount from those who are found responsible for this embezzlement."

A dam which has got such a large number of embezzlement cases, has its own quota of scandals, certainly when it has to face a slightly higher rainfall, no doubt it crumbles.

Then, Sir, coming to the very construction of the dam itself, there are so many mysterious things which call for specific explanation and going into. Here in the statement that is given to us it is said: "The Dam was designed originally to pass a discharge of 1.25 lakh cusecs, but in view of a bigger flood volume of about 2 lakh cusecs having been encountered some years ago, the operation rules of the reservoir above the Dam were modified to enable a flood discharge of 2.5 lakh cusecs." I do not know why the hon. Minister did fight shy to quote the whole facts. If I go a bit into this thing, Sir, the plain fact is that the original plan was to enable a flood discharge of 2.5 lakh cusecs but—I don't know why—it was curtailed in 1949, and it was decided that it should be only for 1.25 lakh cusecs. By 1955 this dam was completed. Unfortunately that very year rainfall was to the extent of 9 inches. Then the engineers from the place suddenly had to run up to the Central Water and Power Commission and they asked in panic: "What could be done?" The gentlemen here of the Central Water and Power Commission of course could not say anything but could only give palliatives. They suggested that the level of the reservoir should be kept low and during the flood season all

the sluices must be kept open. And only by slightly strengthening the abutment perhaps it was thought by the Central Water and Power Commission that it could be staved off. But the trick would not work; it is perfectly obvious that these palliative measures would not go.

Now coming to the very causes why this particular dam burst, different stories are coming out. Of course the ultimate responsibility is thrown on providence.

Let me make out my point.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There are still five or six speakers. They cannot get even five minutes.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: But I am covering the whole thing, Mr. Deputy Chairman. It is agreed on all accounts that there should be an enquiry.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken 20 minutes already. Please wind up.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Here is the very statement of Shri J. V. Narasingha Rao, Minister for Irrigation of Andhra Pradesh and he has stated this:

"After a careful study of the rainfall at the stations in the Basin"....See how it varies from the statement of the Chief Minister"the surplusing capacity was designed in consultation with the Central Water and Power Commission for a discharge of about 1.76 lakhs of cusecs. This was based on a rainfall of 9 inches which obtained in 1955 and making due allowance for the absorption in the reservoir. The rainfall at the stations in the reservoir basin was heavy and on 30th the rainfall recorded was 12 inches and this occurred in a period of 12 hours."

Sir, I shall leave those discrepancies or those contradictions between the Chief Minister of the State and the Irrigation Minister of the State to be discussed in the Andhra Pradesh Cabinet, but here there is one cardinal point. The Minister for Irrigation of

Andhra Pradesh herein asserts that after consultation with the Central Water and Power Commission it was designed and modelled and constructed to withstand a flood discharge of 9 inches of rain in 12 hours, which was so in 1955. According to this statement he says that there was 12 inches of rain in 12 hours, that is, 33 1/3 per cent. of extra rain. Are we to understand that by this extra 33 1/3 per cent. of rain alone the Dam is being burst? Are we to understand that the Dam is so constructed that it could not have a potential capacity to accommodate 33 1/3 per cent. of extra rain? Are we to understand that the engineers did not take this into consideration and put in at least a minimum of 50 per cent. extra strength in this? How else are we to understand this phenomenon? It should be either faulty planning or faulty construction or total bungling in its construction. None else could be responsible for this washing away. Normally every dam is given a 50 per cent. extra potential. Simply because there is 3 inches of extra rain it is preposterous to say that the whole Dam has burst, because of this alone.

Then there are so many other phenomena, which are absolutely inexplicable, absolutely contradictory, which must thoroughly be gone into. Since there is no time I am not going into all those things. But here is a demand from all quarters of Andhra Pradesh that this things, must be thoroughly enquired into. I don't quote many of the things, but there are some newspapers which are not run by communists but which are run under the editorship of some of the hon. Members here. Take for instance the 'Golconda Patrika'; the editor of this paper is the hon. Member sitting there, Shri Narotham Reddy. It states that we must take every precaution.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You need not read all of them. If you mention the names of the papers that will be enough.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: There is a very important thing. It looks as

[Shri V. Prasad Rao.]

though something is not correct in the construction of this very Dam. So we demand that a thorough enquiry must be instituted into the whole affair, and, besides, the Pochampad Project must also be taken up.

Here is another cutting, Mr. Deputy Chairman, from a paper the editor of which is the hon. Shri Venkateswara Rao, who is our colleague. Here it says that immediately after the report of the Chief Engineer had come . . .

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: It was edited by one of the Members of the Congress; that only goes to show that we are fully aware of it. Then why create more trouble?

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: You are aware of it, but you never remedy it; that is the whole trouble.

The paper itself says that even if it is extra expense the Dam must be so built that there is no room for further havoc, and that the whole thing must be enquired into. Sir, the president of the Provincial Congress Committee, the secretary of the Communist Party, the secretary of the Socialist Party, in fact every newspaper in Andhra Pradesh wants a thorough enquiry. We do not want in the name of enquiry whitewashing to be done. We do not want the answer from the Ministry of Irrigation and Power that this is a State subject, we could not go into it. I can give him a precedent. It is only two days back the hon. Minister for Irrigation and Power replied to my question, that a Chief Engineer from here was being sent to enquire into those complaints that were brought out by the Estimates Committee of Andhra Pradesh. It is not a question of the cracking up of a particular canal; it is a question of a dam being burst. We cannot simply close our eyes and say that it is providence that is responsible. I think, Mr. Deputy Chairman, it will be accepted by all sides of the House that a thorough-going enquiry should be instituted and the real causes for this bursting should

be ascertained so that no such thing will happen in future.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Statement on the damage caused to the Kadam Dam in Andhra Pradesh, laid on the Table of the Rajya Sabha on the 12th September, 1958, be taken into consideration."

There are names of five speakers here already. The hon. Minister will be called on to reply at 4.45. So, five minutes each.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: It is not the Minister who has got to reply. It is I who has got the right to reply.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: All right. If there is time, you can reply. Mr. Channa Reddy. Five minutes each.

SHRI S. CHANNA REDDY: Mr. Deputy Chairman, at the very outset I am of the opinion that if this discussion were to be raised in the State Assembly it would have been more proper.

[THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU) in the Chair.]

And much of the vehemence and eloquence of my hon. friend opposite would have been more appropriate in the State Assembly, because as it is stated in the Statement provided by the Ministry that the C.W.P.C. had no occasion even to examine the scheme. The whole scheme was drawn up by the erstwhile Government of Hyderabad, that is, before 1949 and the work was taken up in 1949.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: During the Congress regime.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Please do not interrupt. You go on.

SHRI S. CHANNA REDDY: Of course. I think it is a question to be more appropriately discussed in the State Assembly. There is a short history of the Kadam project. It is not a single project. It is part of a comprehensive and integrated scheme of the Godavari river valley project that has been designed by the late Shri Ali Nawaz Jung, an eminent engineer of all India repute. He has been quite familiar with the topography of the erstwhile Hyderabad and he perfectly knew the rainfall and other geographical conditions of each and every district. It is said that he has designed this project to a flood discharge of 2.5 lakhs cusecs of water. But something happened in between and ultimately when it was ready it was designed only for 1.5 lakh cusecs discharge. This is a thing which has created suspicion in the minds of so many. Recently I had been to Hyderabad, soon after this unfortunate incident happened. Of course, among all the people this was a subject of common talk and naturally it attracted the attention of all the newspapers and all important people also. There were so many stories related, with regard to the construction of the Dam.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You have finished your time.

SHRI S. CHANNA REDDY: Over and above this, there is the report of the Estimates Committee in which they have adversely remarked about the discrepancies in the execution of the Dam construction.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): There are four other speakers wanting to speak.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: He has not spoken for five minutes yet. It is only two minutes.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You can go on for two minutes more.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: We shall sit 15 minutes more.

SHRI S. CHANNA REDDY: The Estimates Committee has made some adverse remarks regarding the construction of the Dam. It is not a question of this single Dam. It has happened in the case of Kadam Dam now. It may happen in the case of Nandikonda and other big projects also.

Therefore, doubts and suspicions have arisen in the minds of the intelligentsia regarding the ability of our engineers and the efficacy of their execution. Therefore, it is quite proper, as the Pradesh Chief, the Congress President of Andhra Pradesh has already stated publicly, that an enquiry must be instituted. I think it is quite reasonable. If that enquiry is instituted and if the wrong is located, where it actually lies, then it will be in the interests of the country.

I have to make one more request before I resume my seat. The damage caused to the Dam is estimated to the tune of Rs. 30 lakhs. But the devastation which this calamity has caused to the cultivators is more than Rs. 30 lakhs. Nearly 10,000 acres of land were under paddy cultivation. In this Abi crop season water was promised to be given to these 10,000 acres of land. But now that is not possible.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): It is now more than five minutes.

SHRI S. CHANNA REDDY: Water will not be supplied. Therefore, all the *kisans* who have cultivated under this project will be put to a great loss. Now, I request the Central Minister to give help. Of course, he has promised to give all sorts of technical help. But merely giving technical help will not do. He must go to the rescue of the State Government with financial assistance also. By that financial help alone the damage caused to this Dam will be recovered and some benefit will be done to district Adilabad which is supposed to be the most backward in Telengana. Thank you.

SHRI V. VENKATARAMANA (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, it is with great pain, I have to fall in line with the mover of this Motion, because it is not the only project which met this unfortunate situation. Incidentally this has come to light. But there are some more projects in our unfortunate State which were washed away or made completely useless or not at all useful for irrigation purposes. I am not worried so much about this Kadam project itself. What I feel is that in order to have a proper check and supervision over all such projects, for which the Centre is giving either aid or loan or some other grant, we should have a 'Project Evaluation Committee' consisting of technical people and Members of Parliament to find out whether the projects are properly executed or worked out, or whether the waters of the project are properly utilised or fully utilised or not. Unless the Central Government takes up that issue, there is no use of giving money as and when required by the Government of Andhra Pradesh. It will be a sheer waste of money. It will be something like throwing the entire amount into the Bay of Bengal. I know of so many cases, not only in Andhra Pradesh, but in U.P., Bihar and in Bombay. There are instances where some of the projects were washed out. In the case of Andhra especially I may tell you I have brought the cases to the notice of the Central Irrigation and Power Ministry. I am glad the Ministry also has accepted what the Estimates Committee of the Andhra Pradesh Assembly has suggested on various important projects. Unfortunately, so far no definite action has been taken either by the Central Government or by the State Governments. There is an argument in this House or elsewhere that the Centre has nothing to do because it is a medium size project. I strongly object and oppose such an argument here. We are all equally interested, as much as the Assembly Members of Andhra Pradesh or any other Assembly, to see that these

projects should be properly executed and worked out and this water should be properly and expeditiously used for the betterment of the country. So, I strongly support the idea of conducting an enquiry immediately on the Kadam project and also constitute Project Evaluation Committees to go into such projects which were either completed already or are under construction and see how far embazzelement is there, wrong design is there, bad work is there and all that. This was, in fact, recommended by the Estimates Committee to which Mr. Prasad Rao referred. So, in all sincerity, let us not think about party politics and 'party-ism'. Let us sincerely request the Andhra Government through this House to appoint an enquiry committee, to look into the matter to find out the real culprit, the real person who is responsible for its wrong design and execution. I request the Irrigation and Power Ministry here to appoint Project Evaluation Committees to inspect all projects which are under construction or constructed already. Thank you.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Sir, my friend in the opposition got up and said with a very sad heart, and I get up with a sadder one for two reasons. Firstly I am very sad because of the damages that have been caused, but I feel more for the Members who have misinterpreted and misrepresented things. Sometimes even the truth is misquoted and misrepresented by them.

Sir, before I try to comment on his remarks, I would like to say that on the question of the constitutional propriety of admitting this Motion, I cannot question the Chair. But the Motion having been admitted, I would like to say a few words.

Sir, this is an entirely State problem. I do not know how this matter got into a discussion here.

I am not questioning the propriety as to why it was admitted, and the Motion having been admitted I have to keep quiet. But the only thing I suggest is that it would have been much better if this had been discussed at the State level. The Central Government has nothing to do with it. I do not think that all the criticism and the theatrical way in which my hon. friend made his speech had produced any effect. It would have been better had he placed his facts before the local Assembly.

SHRI J. V. K. VALLABHARAO: Would you convey it?—

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: You and I need not convey it . . .

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR (Kerala): Sir, on a point of order. It was ruled by the Chair that this subject should be taken up for discussion in this House. Here she is questioning the propriety of that ruling; is it proper, Sir?

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I am not questioning the discretion of the Chair.

(Interruptions.)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SARFU): You please go on.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: Sir, I would like to place before you one or two points. This calamity no doubt has caused great damage, but it has been the result of nature's fury. We may have brought in God, but I am surprised if they bring in God and other elements.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: It is not your monopoly.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I am glad that you are looking up to God now.

SHRI N. C. SEKHAR: We cannot follow you.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: My friend has quoted so many facts and figures about the construction of the Dam. I am not disputing them. Then he said so much about mismanagement, maladjustment and other things. He wants an enquiry. Well, nobody is saying that there should be no enquiry. I am sure that even the Government in the local region are very anxious for an enquiry, they are as anxious as my friends are. It is not a question of the Congress Party or the Communist Party, it is a question of national property, it is a question of the money of the people. Many people have lost their properties and few their lives and we are as much sorry for that as they are. Even before the Communists could think about it, every member of the Congress Party, all those who are connected with the Congress, brought to the notice of the Government the grimness of the situation. If and when we bring a question about the law and order situation in Kerala, which is entirely man made, these people raise a hue and cry.

(Interruptions.)

Here, Sir, this was a thing which was not man made. It was a *Vis-major*. But these people say that it was not properly looked into. This only goes to show how very fair-minded we are and how well prepared we are to undertake responsibility. These people come and say that the Government has not been doing anything, that the Government is not prepared to hold an enquiry. Have the Government said that they are not, going to hold an enquiry? No. I am sure they are anxious for an enquiry. If you are not satisfied with the enquiry, then you bring this question up later, I have no objection. But this is not the time or place.

My friend used the word 'unfortunate' about the Andhra Pradesh Government. I am extremely sorry why he used that word. I am proud of that Government. And I am proud to belong to that State. I am

[Shrimati Yashoda Reddy:] extremely sorry why he used the word 'unfortunate'. It was unfortunate usage of the word 'unfortunate'. That is all I can say. I earnestly appeal to my friend opposite, let them not bring politics into this national problem. It is not as though the Communists are more interested and the Congressmen are not, or the other way about. It is a national problem, it is a State problem, it is a problem which has got to be looked at without any prejudiced or narrow point of view. I want to express our sympathy to the people who have suffered, and we are equally sorry for the damage that has been caused. I can assure the House on behalf of the State Government that the State Government is going to do everything possible.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: How can you assure on behalf of the State Government.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I mean, I am so sure about it as they are not, and if my friends are not satisfied with that, then we will think about it later.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Mr. Samuel,

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Sir, you will please permit me to enquire one thing before you allow the Minister to speak.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Sir, so much has been said that I do not know where to begin. However, this Kadam Dam was started in 1949 by the then Hyderabad Government. The scheme was drawn up and executed entirely by the State Government. At no time did it ask the Centre for any technical assistance, nor was the project at any time technically examined by the Central Water and Power Commission. The Centre is being brought in and criticised, I do not know for what fault. The Centre may have given some grants, but it

is giving grants for such projects all over the country. That does not necessarily make it a Central project, nor does it involve any Central responsibility. Therefore, the proper place for a discussion of this question, because the Centre's part in it is nil and because the State has entirely and fully and completely done it, is the State Assembly.

Now, Sir, coming to the floods in the Kadam River and the damage to the Dam, I want this House to remember one central fact. The average rainfall in this area has for several years been known to be 40 inches, and the Dam was designed and constructed on that basis, that is, to provide for a take-off of 1,50,000 cusecs of water. Mark these words: 40 inches of rainfall and 1,50,000 cusecs of water. In 1955 the flood discharge in the river happened to be more than normal, and it was about 2,50,000 cusecs of water. Then, the engineers reconsidered the matter and reconstructed the spillways and made them capable of discharging 2,50,000 cusecs of water. I do not know what damage took place at that time in 1955. After 1955 and until 1958 there has not been that amount of flood discharge. Now I want to remind the House again about the rainfall—40 inches. But on August 30, last within 24 hours—I am not saying 12 hours but 24 hours—there was a rainfall of 17 inches . . .

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: In three days.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: Well, even that has got the same effect of an excessive flood discharge. So, this heavy rainfall over a catchment area of 1000 square miles speeded up river, gushing it furiously with a force which had never been experienced in the Kadam River. When this high flood of water, as against the earlier estimate of 2,50,000 cusecs of water, lashed and broke against the composite Dam, the earth covering disappeared and later the wall also collapsed. Even then, the spillways,

the sluices, the gate and even the masonry works still remained intact.

DR. NIHAR RANJAN RAY (West Bengal): Is it a fact that this Dam has not been affected, but it is only the masonry works?

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: It was damaged but not destroyed. It was only hurt, but not effaced. Therefore, I need not go into the losses suffered, and so on. Now, an issue arises, was the Government wise or unwise in having provided for a take-off of 2,50,000 cusecs of water or it should have provided for 5,70,000 cusecs if that is the flood record? Or again, was the State Government wise or unwise in having depended upon the figure of 40 inches rainfall and having provided for more than the nine spillways that it has provided? Or again, I ask this House, can the engineers construct or build four times the number of spillways than is warranted by the normal flow of water? If the engineers can do that, all of us would say that it is a waste of money. I concede that the rivers in the South, particularly in Andhra Pradesh, are very unpredictable. The Kadam river is a tributary of the Godavari. The Godavari is a great river, a noble river, a river sacred to many; it is a river which has a capacity of two hundred million cusecs of water at times and three hundred million cusecs at other times. The Kadam river belongs to the same family. But can we calculate the unpredictable and provide for it? I dare anyone to calculate the unpredictable. It is impossible. You cannot do it. If you can do it, it does not remain unpredictable.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): So is your Government of Andhra unpredictable.

SHRI M. H. SAMUEL: So, it is one of those things that we must endure, endure with the strength that we have, endure with the hope that not every day is August 30 and not every

year is 1958. Therefore, I hope that we shall take some lessons by this discussion and also by a Committee that may be appointed—I hope the State Government will appoint a Committee and will associate one of the Government of India representatives on it. Let us await the findings of that Committee.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I have very little to add to what has been said. The only thing that I want to say is that, while listening to the debate, I was wondering whether I was sitting in a House of Parliament or in the Andhra Pradesh Assembly.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Or in the West Bengal Assembly.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: These useless comments do not at all add either humour or dignity.

Sir, the question is, are we in this House to drag in the affairs of the States in utter violation and defiance of the provisions of the Constitution?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Mr. Basu, the motion was permitted by the Chairman as papers had been laid by Government on the Table of the House.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: I am coming to that. I am not unmindful of that. The motion was admitted by the Chairman and he had certain reasons to do so.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): A statement was laid on the Table and therefore the House could discuss that statement.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: I am going to discuss that aspect, certainly. A statement was laid on the Table in response to a demand from some Members from Andhra Pradesh and as a result of that, a discussion is now being raised which has been allowed by the Chairman.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Now you want to waylay this?

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: I am really raising a question of principle as to whether the hon. Member who is in charge of this Motion should not state the facts which would bring in the Union Government directly within the ambit of this Motion. The Chairman has certainly done it in anticipation that all the requirements and conditions which enable an hon. Member to bring it before Parliament have been or will be satisfied in this case. I have, therefore, listened very attentively and with great care to the hon. the mover of this Motion to his eloquent speech. He has done his duty very well, if I may say so with great respect, as an engineer Member of this House. The technical aspect of the matter has been ably dealt with by him for which I must pay my tribute to him. It was really a treat to hear him discuss these technical aspects of the matter. But at the same time, I fail to understand how he can bring it up before this House without laying the foundation for such a discussion in a House of Parliament, namely, to point out directly, conclusively, the part that the Government of India has played in this unfortunate event or disaster.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Does not the Planning Commission or the Central Water and Power Commission come into the picture?

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: Nothing has been said up till now. If Dr. Gour had been here, he would have supported me in this. Nothing has been said about the Government of India in the opening speech on his Motion.

DR. R. B. GOUR: That is common knowledge.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: It is common knowledge to Dr. Gour who comes from Andhra Pradesh. It is not so for me who comes from elsewhere. I am here to be told why the time of this House is to be wasted

by matters which directly concern—and exclusively concern—the State Government and the State Assembly. I have got the Constitution before me. Sir, I need not go very deeply . . .

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Mr. Vice-Chairman, I am raising a point of order whether this is relevant to this matter.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: List II says (item 17):

“Water, that is to say, water supplies, irrigation and canals, drainage and embankments . . .”

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You have made your point. It is over five minutes.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: I have taken five minutes because it is a constitutional question. If you think that I should finish, I shall do so. I do protest against my friend taking advantage of the Chairman's consent to bring this matter up without either mentioning anything which would bring in the Government even into the picture.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You better leave Mr. Chairman's name. You can say that the speaker has not brought out any facts.

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR BASU: That is what I am saying. The Chairman's name was not mentioned by me. You brought in the Chairman's name. That is why I have got to mention this. Therefore, I would humbly request you to consider this. (*Interruptions.*) I would say, if this kind of thing is allowed without the Member making any effort to make it relevant, to make it constitutional, for a matter to be brought up here and discussed, this House would be flooded with matters of administrative details taking place in the various States of this country so that our legitimate work will suffer and those

things will loom large in the deliberations of this House. I think that ought not to be allowed.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: May I, Sir, before Mr. Hathi speaks, intervene for one minute? I am very sorry that this mishap has taken place and I support the demand that there should be a thorough enquiry into the matter, not only in regard to the destruction of the Dam, but also from the very start of the Dam, that is, since 1949, and also in matters pertaining to the financial affairs as were pointed out by the Estimates Committee. What I want to ask the hon. Minister is this. It is stated in the statement which has been placed on the Table of the House.

"Kadam Irrigation Project in Andhra Pradesh was started in 1949 in the old Hyderabad State and was subsequently included in the First Five Year Plan."

In the concluding paragraph, it is stated:

"As the project was started before the First Five Year Plan it was technically examined by the Central Water and Power Commission or considered by the Technical Advisory Committee."

When it has been included in the First Five Year Plan, why is it that it should not have been examined by the Central Water and Power Commission? What was the reason that the Central Water and Power Commission did not think it necessary to examine it when they were advancing money and it was included in the First Five Year Plan? Central funds were involved in the construction of this Dam. Therefore, it was the duty of the Central Water and Power Commission to have gone and examined as to whether what was being done was technically correct or not before funds were advanced to this project.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): We have only five minutes

more, Mr. Hathi. We can extend the time for a few minutes if the House agrees.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, yes.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: No, no.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I think we should be reasonable.

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN (Madras): Sir, though we may now sit after five o'clock, normally we should not sit. The other day the Communists raised this point and said that they would not sit after five o'clock. Though we can do the same thing to them today, we will not do it. Today, we will allow them. But as a right, we have to go at five o'clock even if a single Member objects. Today we will permit them to go on.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Thank you very much for your kind offer.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI J. S. L. HATHI): Sir, how much time do I have—five or ten minutes?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): I would like you to be as short as possible. Be brief. The House is very tired.

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI: Sir, I will not take much time. I am really sorry that this unfortunate incident has happened in Andhra Pradesh and that there has been a breach in the Dam. I would not like to raise the technical questions, the constitutional questions as such but I would only make the position clear and that is by way of replying to the hon. Member's query, the Member who spoke last, about the responsibility of the Central Water and Power Commission. Generally as the House is aware, these are State subjects. The execution rests with the States, the formulation of the Plan rests with the States but in the Planning Commission when we include the projects in the Plan, naturally they are being

[Shri J. S. L. Hathi.]

examined. But as he House is aware, when we took up the First Plan that is in 1951, there were certain projects which were already under construction. As you know very well, the First Plan was not a Plan of that nature where we had selected certain projects. For example, Bhakra Nangal was being executed. Hirakud was being executed. the Kadam Dam was being executed. Similarly so many other schemes were already being executed and were under execution. It was not possible to leave out those projects out of the Plan. That means they had to be included in the Plan, that is all the tit-bits had to be collected and the Plan was formulated as such. So there was no question of examining those schemes, whether the designs were made properly, whether estimates were made properly or not. There was no scope or chance and it was not done and it could not be done because they had already started. In 1946, 1948 and 1949, so many things were started and therefore those schemes which had already started were taken up together and included in the Plan as if they were Plan projects. But actually neither the Planning Commission nor the Technical Advisory Committee nor the Central Water and Power Commission ever examined any of those schemes but then subsequently we thought, when the Second Plan was being formulated, that although this is a State subject, we have to see that the money that even the States invest should be remunerative, that the scheme should be productive, that they should be economical and that the estimate and project report were being properly made. For that purpose the Planning Commission appointed a Technical Advisory Committee. The Central Water and Power Commission further examines them, then it goes to the Technical Advisory Committee on which engineers, not only of the Government of India but from outside, that is those who are not officials, those who are not even officers of the State Governments—such engineers

also are on that Committee. The Chairman of the Central Board of Irrigation and Power which is a non-official body and not the Central Water and Power Commission, is also on the Committee and these projects which are being included in the Second Plan are examined by this Technical Committee. The Central Water and Power Commission examines first the plans and sees that they are technically sound, they are economical and that they will be remunerative and there is a need for those projects. Therefore I submit that this was the reason why the Central Water and Power Commission had not examined it or was not associated in this and many other schemes of this nature.

DR. W. S. BURLINGAY: It is 5 o'clock, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): You should be more considerate.

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI: In view of what has been said, I will take about 10 minutes.

5 P.M.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Your problem is, you are a Congress-man.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN: (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The Chair has no party affiliation but I am here on the Congress ticket and I do not apologise for it, I am proud of it.

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI: Then this is purely the responsibility of the State Government for execution. It could not be possible and it would not be possible . . .

SHRI V. VENKATARAMANA: Would the Irrigation and Power Ministry take the responsibility for those schemes technically sanctioned by this Commission?

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI: So far as these projects are concerned, the technical examination is there. The Central Water and Power Commission will take responsibility that it was properly

designed and that they have been properly designed and the projects prepared. That they will take, because it has been scrutinised by them. So far as execution is concerned, again the question comes in. It is not possible for the Central water and Power Commission to send an engineer to every particular project and to watch and see that execution is being carried on properly. It is not possible. There are about 300 medium-sized projects. 146 are now to be included in the Second Plan and it is a continuing process. It would not be possible for the Central Water and Power Commission to send one officer for each of the project to examine it. That is not possible. Secondly if we want to send such officers, they should be of a higher qualification than the Chief Engineers of the State Governments concerned. Supposing we want to send an engineer to U.P., unless you have an engineer of a higher calibre, or technically more qualified, than the Chief Engineer of U.P., Bombay or Madras or Bengal or Andhra or any other State, that man would not carry that weight. To get such 200 people to go round is rather an impossibility and then we have to see that the State Government is carrying on the Government. They have the responsibility, they are responsible people and we should rely that they will do it as expeditiously, as economically and as ably as possible. We cannot transgress the limit of Constitution and put our man at every project to carry on the execution of the project. That is not possible. All that has to be done could only be done by a co-operative attitude of the States because they are equally interested in seeing that the monies that are spent are properly spent or utilized. The suggestion which Mr. Ramana put forward that there should be a Committee to go round the projects is again an impossibility. You cannot have a Committee going round all projects but as the House is aware perhaps, the National Development Council has set up teams—a team for irrigation and power, a team for agricultural projects, a team for public buildings and constructions,

a team for community projects works—such a team is set up and that team goes round one or two specified projects. They have, for example, examined the working of the Chambal Project. They have examined the programme of the Lakkavali Projects. They are now taking up the Koyna and Nagarjunasagar Projects; and that is a body where the Chief Ministers of States are also interested. The National Development Council took this decision and set up the Committee to evaluate the construction of various projects and how these projects are being carried on. It is not only some people—some administrators or public-men. There is also a Consultative Committee on which eminent engineers are members. For example Mr. Khosla is a member, Mr. N. N. Ayyangar is a Member (Electrical), Mr. Thirumalai Ayyangar is a Member. So eminent engineers are in the Consultative Committee which advise this team and they go round and see and the function of that team is the same which Mr. Ramana or anybody here would like to have. They are:

1. To study all aspects of the Project having a bearing on economy and efficiency with special reference to:

- (a) Utilisation of trained personnel and materials
- (b) Utilisation of machinery and equipment
- (c) Construction Plant lay-out
- (d) Adequacy of original estimates and designs as evidenced from actual construction of the Project
- (e) Phasing of construction with a view to studying whether—
 - (i) timely utilisation of benefits accruing from the project has been ensured etc.

Therefore we have evolved a machinery to safeguard all these but it is only in a co-operative attitude with the State concerned. We cannot ride rough-shod over the States and the Constitution. The whole body where

[Shri J. S. L. Hathi.]

the Chief Ministers were present, took the decision. These teams, in respect of projects where they have been assisted by eminent engineers of the country, where they have looked into the projects, have given their report also.

Therefore, what we can do is to select certain projects. It will not be possible for the Government to send one team for each project. It is not possible. It is not feasible either and I do not think the House also will wish that they should be sent. Government have taken sufficient steps and they do take them.

With regard to the various points which the hon. the mover raised, I do not think I am in a position to reply to all those points which he raised. After all, these are matters of every day or day-to-day execution for the State Government, whether tenders were invited, whether the contracts were given on tenders, whether there was embezzlement, whether the materials used were of the right specifications and so on.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: But there is the statement of the Irrigation Minister which says definitely that the Central Water and Power Commission examined it and it was only after his consultation and advice that it was done.

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI: I will explain that position also. I will come to that presently. So far as the other points are concerned, the giving of tenders, question of embezzlement, or the quality of the materials used, the conduct of the Minister or the Chief Minister, I do not think it is even fair for us to bring up these things here. I was rather sorry that on an occasion which creates a feeling of regret, sorrow and anxiety, we should bring in heat and say that the Minister should be washed away. I was rather sorry that a very sober Member like Shri Prasad Rao for whom I have respect—and even now I think that he is sober—should have done so. But then in the heat

and passion of the moment, sometimes words come out. But it pained me really to hear that he should have uttered these words that the Minister should be washed away. What is the reason and why should we utter such words here. What is their . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA (Uttar Pradesh): . . . significance, if any?

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI: What is their meaning? We want to discuss the question on merits. Would it be proper to bring in the Ministers of the State who are not here? It would not be proper.

Now I will explain the particular point which Shri Prasad Rao raised—the point about consultation and what Dr. Rao said. There are different ways of expressing the position. One is the capacity, another is the maximum flood discharge. The third is the moderated flow which could be moderated by regulating the floods. These figures may vary. When was the Central Commission consulted? He said that after examining the discharge of 1955 these things were done. That means that the consultation, if any, was not in 1949 or 1944 or 1945, but afterwards, in 1955. That is to say, after the Dam was completed. So this statement is also correct. Let us not try to contradict anything that anybody says. After 1955, these designs were consulted about. When they thought that this was a heavy rainfall in 1955, then it was brought to their notice and they were consulted in 1955. That means it was after the floods of 1955. This does not mean that the Minister said something which is not correct, or what I say, namely, that in 1955 or before, at any time before 1955 the Central Commission was not consulted, is not correct. Both are correct. This is the version and that is what I would like to clarify.

Then what Dr. Rao said is that it was a Dam for 2 lakh cusecs and he certified it for 2.50 lakh cusecs, because 2 lakh flood discharge was already there in 1955 and the Dam remained safe and 2.50 lakhs can be moderated to

1.75 lakh cusecs. The Central Water and Power Commission, whenever it checks, takes great pains to see that the investigations are perfectly made and they are all engineers. And as one hon. Member said and rightly said, they follow the Ali Nawaz Jung formula on the Hyderabad side. He was a renowned engineer. I know as far as the engineers of the South are concerned, they are reputed engineers. In fact, they have been pioneers in this line and they have built so many Dams. He was an eminent engineer and according to that formula it was done. There was one drawback somewhere and that was because the narrower the catchment area, the more difficult it is to measure the intensity of the rain-fall. If it is a big area like the Hirakud catchment—some 33,000 sq. miles—then a could burst, if it is in three or five miles, may not be in the whole area but some 40 miles away, and, therefore, the whole catchment area is not flooded. But if the cloud burst is in a particular area and that area is only 1,000 sq. miles that means all the rain is in that particular area and so the water is more. Otherwise, so far as the Central Government is concerned, we are taking the utmost care to see that the hydrological and other data that we collect are not only sufficient, but we also take absolute precaution. For example, I may state, what we did in the case of Hirakud. After all, we have to learn. As soon as I read the report, I said to myself 'Let us check what we have done about the other rivers to see whether we have taken sufficient precaution'. I wanted to satisfy myself. After all, these incidents are our teachers and I wanted to know what we have done so far as Hirakud is concerned. Very careful studies, I found, were made to evaluate the maximum flood. Envelop curves were drawn for the Indian rivers as well as the rivers of the world by utilising the vast amount of observed data. The data available covered 75 rivers—(2 from New Zealand, 23 from America, 5 from Australia, 42 from India and 2 from Europe and 1 from Africa). They

find out what would be the intensity of a particular rain-fall in particular area under particular conditions like these. So we took all pains. But even then if there is some misfortune, well, after all, it happens. Here in this case, what I want to impress upon this House is that the Central Commission was not in the picture, either in the beginning or during the construction. Therefore, there is no reason for the Centre to say anything on this. But after all, as I said, we have the Planning Commission and the plans are formulated by them. We are looking after the projects and we are financing them and we are doing it all in co-operation with the States and that is the procedure which we have evolved, and I am sure if there is any defect and if there is any wrong execution in this project the Andhra Government will certainly look into it.

One point that the hon. Member referred to was that we should appoint a committee. But as I have said, there is already a committee for Plan projects. I can however, say here and now that I did discuss this question with the Chief Minister of Andhra and he has agreed to appoint a committee to look into this. That is all I have to say.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): Yes, Mr. Prasad Rao, please be brief; only a few minutes are left.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I shall be brief, Mr. Vice-Chairman. The hon. Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power has accepted to appoint a committee . . .

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI: No, no. The Andhra Chief Minister has accepted it.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: I see.

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI: As I said, we are doing it in a spirit of co-operation.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Sir, this is a question of the K. C. Canal and the engineer from the Central Water and Power Commission has seen it. Anyway, I think this will be gone into in detail.

It is not for the first time, Sir, that dams are being damaged. My hon. friend, Mr. Basu, may be right or may not be right. I am not going into that but when dams of this magnitude got burst, when thousands of acres are being laid waste, then let us not bring in the question of the Constitution. Let us see how this situation can be saved.

I am glad about the other hon. Members who had accepted the idea of an enquiry so that in future such things may not occur again but, at the same time, I cannot understand the speech of some. (*Interruption.*) Yes, let it be an enquiry conducted by experts either from the Centre or from somewhere else. I still feel that the enquiry should not be conducted by the engineers who have been entrusted with the construction of this Dam. There are, for instance, many eminent engineers. In our House we have got Mr. Khosla. He may be asked to enquire into the whole thing. I think it would be better even for the Andhra Pradesh Government to ask eminent engineers from the Centre, people who have nothing to do with this thing, to go into the whole thing. The only thing I cannot understand is this. The hon. Lady Member pleaded for a non-party attitude. She did that with a lot of vehemence. I do not know whether non-partisan attitude and vehemence go together.

SHRIMATI YASHODA REDDY: I speak so vehemently, because you people do not understand any other language.

SHRI V. PRASAD RAO: Sir, it is not in a partisan manner or with a spirit of partisanship that we have raised this point. We only want that such things should not recur, that such damages should not be inflicted on the people and that the good money of the tax-payers should not be wasted on such faulty constructions.

Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity. I hope that a full enquiry will be ordered and that proper lessons will be learnt out of this.

MESSAGE FROM THE LOK SABHA

THE SUPREME COURT JUDGES (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) BILL, 1958

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following Message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose here with a copy of the Supreme Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Bill, 1958 as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 25th September 1958."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI P. N. SAPRU): The House stands adjourned till 11 A.M. on Saturday, the 27th September 1958.

The House then adjourned at seventeen minutes past five of the clock till eleven of the clock on Saturday, the 27th September 1958.