

SHRI M. B. JOSHI: A report that sixteen workshops for manufacturing sleepers for the Bhavnagar-Tarapur line have been started was published in a Gujarati paper. May I know whether this report is correct?

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: Who was manufacturing sleepers?

SHRI M. B. JOSHI: It is said that sixteen firms or workshops are manufacturing sleepers for the Bhavnagar-Tarapur line and the work has started in Tarapur. I want to know whether this is correct.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Some Gujarati paper has published that sixteen workshops are manufacturing sleepers for that particular line. Is it a fact?

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: It cannot be a fact. As I have said, this line is not included in the Second Five Year Plan, and, therefore, it is beyond all comprehension that sleepers are being manufactured for that purpose.

SHRI M. B. JOSHI: Is it a fact, whether the Government have received any proposal for constructing Jhund-Malia-Kandla broad gauge line during the Second Plan period and, if so what action has been taken?

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: I cannot give any reply beyond these two special lines which have been mentioned in this question.

SHRI LAVJI LAKHAMSHI: With regard to his reply to part (c), may I know whether the construction proposal is with regard to Jhund and Jamnagar or Jhund and Kandla?

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: The question is between Jhund and Jamnagar and my reply relates to that.

SHRI LAVJI LAKHAMSHI: The reply of the hon. Minister was that it is not contemplated to construct under the Second Five Year Plan.

That means there is already a proposal. Is there a proposal for a broad gauge railway line between Jhund and Jamnagar or between Jhund and Kandla?

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: For that I will require notice.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Question hour is over. Short Notice Questions.

### SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

#### STATEMENT MADE BY THE FINANCE MINISTER OF PAKISTAN IN CONNECTION WITH THE ANAL WATER DISPUTE

10. SHRI MAHESWAR NAIK: Will the Minister of IRRIGATION AND POWER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the attention of the Government of India has been drawn to a statement made by the Finance Minister of Pakistan in the Pakistan National Assembly to the effect that India's attitude in respect of the canal water dispute was against the very spirit of the co-operative effort under the good offices of the World Bank and that India was going back on her own commitments; and

(b) if so, what action Government propose to take in the matter?

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI S. K. PATIL): (a) and (b). Yes, Sir. The Pakistan Finance Minister's statement in the National Assembly on the 31st August 1957, as reported in the Pakistan Press is misleading. The correct position is:

The Bank Proposal of February 1954 stipulated a transition period of about 5 years during which Pakistan was expected to complete the necessary link canals for replacing supplies from India. It may be recalled that in the statement made by me to the House on the 21st August, 1957, it was indicated that although the transition period according to the Bank

Proposal would have terminated in 1959, we would be prepared to extend it up to 1962, but could go no further without jeopardising the vital interests of millions of our people. Curiously, our readiness to extend the period of transition up to 1962, has been interpreted as a threat of unilateral stoppage of canal waters.

We have not gone back upon any of our commitments. In February 1954, the World Bank put forward a proposal to the Governments of India and Pakistan for acceptance as the basis of agreement. India accepted the principles of the Bank Proposal but Pakistan did not.

In May 1956, the Bank, in its *aide memoire* to both Governments, stated that it might be necessary to provide some storage in addition to the link canals on which the 1954 proposal was based and that the Bank would "proceed to use its good offices to bring about acceptance of an appropriate adjustment of the Bank Proposal of February 1954", when the co-operative work was resumed. Government of India informed the World Bank that our point of view would be explained in the course of further discussions and that we would be prepared to consider at an appropriate stage, any adjustment which on examination might appear necessary.

During the further discussions, under the aegis of the World Bank, till March 31, 1957, this matter was not considered, as the stage for it was not reached. The Government of India have, therefore, had no opportunity so far to consider what, if any, adjustments to the Bank Proposal of 1954 are necessary.

The latest position is that Mr. Biff made suggestions regarding certain heads of agreement to both Pakistan and India in his letter of June 24, 1957, and we have replied to this letter. The replies sent by Pakistan to Mr. Biff, copy of which has been been

supplied to us by the World Bank, is being studied for sending our comments to the World Bank.

12 NOON

SHRI MAHESWAR NAIK: May I know how far the contention of Pakistan's Finance Minister to the effect that the World Bank had adjusted in 1956 certain proposals of 1954 in some important material aspects has any basis?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: That is a question that should appropriately be addressed to the Finance Minister of Pakistan, Sir. He is free to make any comments. I do not know the basis on which those comments were made.

SHRI MAHESWAR NAIK: Is it not a fact that Pakistan wanted some alterations in the proposals of 1954 so as to nullify the proposals in favour of Pakistan, as against India?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: I do not know that, Sir. So far as the *aide memoire* is concerned, I am not free to divulge its contents without consulting the World Bank.

SHRI MAHESWAR NAHC: Sir, in view of the fact that Pakistan has all along been indulging in intransigence, why does not the India Government propose going ahead of its own plans without waiting for the year 1962?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: So far as intransigence is concerned, we do not want to follow Pakistan. But, so far as the other aspect as to why we do not go ahead is concerned, it is that the World Bank is using its good offices and it is still continuing and it is not proper for India to do so.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: The hon. Minister stated that the original plan of the World Bank in 1954 consisted only of the link canals. Then the hon. Minister said that, in a subsequent proposal, there was mention of storage dams. May I know from the hon. Minister how the Government of India

is considering the question of both canals and storage dams when there was only a mention of canals? Secondly, the cost of the canals would have been much lower in 1954. May I know whether the Government of India is going to insist that the cost of the canals to be paid by India will be on the basis of 1954 prices or on any other basis?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: That question does not arise at this stage. This is an explanation that is of use, if it is not properly appreciated. The proposal was made in 1954. The *aide memoire* is not an additional proposal. That is why it is called *aide memoire*. It was called in 1956 in explanation of it. But the proposal has not been accepted by Pakistan, it is not proper for us to say what we do next. Therefore, that question, as I have indicated, has not arisen. It will only arise after the basic principle has been accepted by Pakistan.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: No agreement is reached at all. What is the attitude of the Government of India going to be and what action they are going to take?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Wait and see.

SHRI S. K. PATIL: I have said, Sir, in my speech in the other House and I think, on a number of occasions, that we have given 1962 as the year when all our other things would be ready and by that time, Pakistan must be ready to have their plans of body ...

(Interruptions.)

AN Hon. MEMBER: Can we have it otherwise?

SHRI MAHESWAR NAIK: Is there any truth in the report in certain sections of the Press that the World Bank is holding up its good offices because of the intransigence of Pakistan?

SHRI S. K. PATIL: I do not know that. 56 RSD—3.

**CANCELLATION OF DELUXE JANATA  
TRAIN FROM NEW DELHI ON 31<sup>ST</sup>  
AUGUST 1957**

11. SHRI MAHABIR PRASAD: Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Deluxe Janata train scheduled to leave New Delhi for Madras on the 31st August, 1957 did not leave on that day although the train was on the platform till after the scheduled departure time; and

(b) if so, what were the reasons for cancelling the departure of the train?

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM): (a) Yes.

(b) The Generator Car (Power-Van) which supplies electricity for the air-conditioning equipment of the entire train was not considered fit to run and it could not be rectified in time before the due departure of the train. No replacement was also possible.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: An announcement. . .

SHRI MAHABIR PRASAD: What was the number of passengers in the train?

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: Thirteen air-conditioned and 79 third class passengers were booked by this train.

SHRI MAHABIR PRASAD: May I know if any alternative arrangements were made for their travel?

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: Yes. They were provided accommodation in the G. T. Express.

SHRI MAHABIR PRASAD: All of them were accommodated in the G.T. Express?

SHRI JAGJIVAN RAM: AU those who wanted. And those who did not go were given a refund.

SHRI T. S. PATTABIRAMAN: I heard at the Central Station that the train had to be cancelled due to engine