

considerable heat slowed the process of examination and after the same had been carried out to a certain extent arrangements were made to allow traffic by the Down line at 10-30 hrs. on 5-12-56, with a stop dead and 5 MPH restriction and to fill the hole with wet sand.

5. After filling the hole with sand and water, the track was put back and the Up line was declared open for traffic. The double line working was thus resumed at 3-15 hrs. on 6-12-56 with a restriction of stop dead and 5 MPH speed on both the lines.

6. The Mails and Expresses on the night of 4th/5th December, 56 were diverted *via* Main Line and South Bihar Branch.

7. The names of those who gave the warning are:—

1. Shrimati Basana Mahatani—widow—D/o Rupchand Mahato, Village Shampur, P.O. Nirsachatti, Distt. Dhanbad.
2. Shri Jogindra Singh, Watchman, General Electric Co., Ltd., Karanpura, P.O. Nirsachatti, Distt. Dhanbad.
3. Shri Radha Singh, Address as (2) above.
4. Shri Gurbachan Singh, Pump Driver of the same factory.

8. A reward of Rs. 300 to the woman who first spotted the subsidence and of Rs. 200 each to the 3 persons who helped to stop 67 Up has been sanctioned and announced in the press. Arrangement to publish their photographs has also been made. The photograph of Shrimati Basana Mahatani has already appeared in the Press.]

श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान : जैसा कि बयान से पता चलता है, जिस जगह पर यह रेलगाड़ी रुकी, वहाँ पटरी के नीचे एक सूराख में से धूल और धुआँ निकल रहा था और उसको पानी और बालू डाल कर के पाट दिया गया है, तो यह इंतजाम मुस्तकिल तौर पर किया गया है या आरज़ी तौर पर किया गया है ?

श्री शाहनवाज़ खाँ : यह तो मुस्तकिल तौर पर ही है ।

श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान : आगे जैसा कि बयान में बतलाया गया है, जिन लोगों ने इसकी सूचना दी और रेलगाड़ी को रोका, जिससे कि यह एक्सीडेंट होने से बच गया, उन चार आदमियों को आपने सिर्फ ३०० रु० और २०० रु० तक के इनाम दिये हैं और बयान में यह भी कहा गया है कि अपने उस स्त्री का फोटो अखबारों में निकाल दिया, वह कोई राजनीतिज्ञ नहीं है कि फोटो के निकलने से खुश होती । तो क्या सरकार की निगाह में ३०० रु० या २०० रु० का इनाम देना हजारों की जान बचाने के लिये काफी है ?

श्री शाहनवाज़ खाँ : हम तो इसको काफी समझते हैं ।

SUPPLY OF IRRIGATION WATER BY MYSORE TO MADRAS THROUGH PALAR RIVER

*397. SHRI V. M. OBAIDULLAH: Will the Minister for IRRIGATION AND POWER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that negotiations have been going on at the instance of the Government of India between the Governments of Mysore and Madras with regard to the supply of irrigation water by Mysore to Madras through Palar river; and

(b) if so, what is the result of these negotiations?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI J. S. L. HATHI): (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT

Negotiations for the Supply of Irrigation water by Mysore to Madras through Palar river

The Government of India offered their good offices to resolve the differences between Mysore and Madras regarding the Palar River waters. It was suggested to the States that their Chief Engineers should meet to discuss the issue and a Technical Officer from the Central Water and Power

Commission would be associated with them to assist in bringing about a settlement. Accordingly, a meeting was held at Bangalore on the 29th June and 1st and 2nd July 1956, in the office of the Chief Engineer, Mysore, to discuss this point. The meeting was attended by the Chief Engineers of the two States and two Officers of the Central Water and Power Commission. It was felt that to meet the keen demand for water in Madras State, the Government of Madras should look to other resources than Palar River. This was communicated to both the State Governments.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : The statement laid on the Table says that the Madras Government should look to other sources. May I know what is the basis on which this agreement was arrived at?

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI : Actually, there was a complaint from the Madras Government that the Mysore Government was infringing the agreement of 1892 and that they were drawing more water and therefore Madras was not in a position to have sufficient water. The complaint was that the Mysore Government was infringing the agreement and drawing more water than it was entitled to. The Government of India asked them to have a joint meeting and an officer of the Central Water and Power Commission was deputed to attend it. It was found that there was no question of Mysore drawing more water. It was not proved. It was also found that there was not sufficient water which could be utilised from this river, and it was under these circumstances that both the Governments have come to an agreed solution that it will not be possible for Madras to get water from the Palar River.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : What was the reaction of the Madras Government to this report?

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI : The representative of the Madras Government was there in this meeting.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : It is true that an engineer representative of the Madras Government was

there, but what was the reaction of the Madras Government to this report?

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI : They will look to some other source and not the Palar River.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : May I know whether this question was considered by the Committee on the theory of riparian ownership?

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI : The whole question was looked into by this Committee from the point of view of the agreement of 1892. The complaint was that at various places more water was being utilised. Those also were enquired into and ultimately it was found that these complaints were not well-founded and that there was not sufficient water and that therefore the Madras Government should look to other sources. This has been agreed to by the Madras Government.

SHRI H. C. DASAPPA : Who were the representatives at the time when the last settlement was negotiated?

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI : The last negotiation was on the 1st and 2nd July 1956 when the Chief Engineers of Mysore and Madras were there together with a representative of the Central Water and Power Commission.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU : Apart from the agreement entered into in 1892, was the question considered on the theory of riparian ownership?

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI : The question was not considered on the basis of riparian rights as between one State and another. The complaint before this Committee was that an infringement of the agreement of 1892 was made by the Mysore Government. The question was whether Mysore was drawing more water than it was entitled to. The Madras Government had said that at various places they had raised tanks and that in some places they were utilising more water than they were entitled to. All these complaints were enquired into and ultimately it was found that there was no infringement of the agreement of 1892. It was on that point only that the question was considered.

SHRI P. S. RAJAGOPAL NAIDU: Can the question be considered on the present basis of riparian ownership?

SHRI J. S. L. HATHI: If any of the States wants to consider this question whether, if there is sufficient water, another State could utilise the surplus water, naturally under the new Act that has been passed, that can be brought within the purview of a dispute, and the machinery set up for this could naturally go into this and find out what the actual position is.

BENEFITS OF FREE RAILWAY PASSES AND P.T.Os. GIVEN TO RAILWAY OFFICERS ON DEPUTATION TO OTHER MINISTRIES AND DEPARTMENTS

***398. SHRI R. P. TAMTA:** Will the Minister for RAILWAYS be pleased to state whether it is a fact that Railway officers while on deputation to other Ministries and Departments of the Government of India, enjoy the benefits of free railway passes and privilege ticket orders, and if so, what is the number of such passes and privilege ticket orders admissible to them per year?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS AND TRANSPORT (SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN): Yes. A statement is placed on the Table of the Sabha.

STATEMENT

The number of Privilege Passes and Privilege Ticket Orders admissible to Railway Gazetted Officers on deputation to other Ministries and Departments of the Government of India.

	No. of privilege passes	No. of privilege ticket orders
(i) Railway Gazetted Officers on deputation to other Ministries and Departments of the Government of India who, during the period of deputation, continue to draw the same pay and allowances as would be admissible to them on the Railway.	6 sets	12 sets*

	No. of privilege passes	No. of privilege ticket orders
--	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------

(ii) Railway Gazetted Officers on deputation to other Ministries and Departments of the Government of India who draw deputation allowances or are fixed in a scale of pay higher than what would be admissible to them on the Railway—

(a) Officers with less than 25 years of service.	2 sets	Nif
--	--------	-----

(b) Officers with 25 years of service or more.	3 sets	Ni.
--	--------	-----

*The grant of privilege ticket orders has been withdrawn temporarily from October, 1949.

Note 1.—The word 'set' ordinarily means one outward and one return journey pass.

Note 2.—(a) For Officers in category (i) above, the passes may include dependent relatives also. School passes to the extent of 3 sets per child per year are also admissible for their school or college going children.

(b) For Officers in category (ii) passes do not include dependent relatives. School passes are also not admissible. Passes are admissible in the case of such officers only for a period not exceeding 3 years from the date of deputation.

SHRI R. P. TAMTA: May I know whether the amount involved in giving free passes to officers serving on deputation will be realised from the Ministries concerned?

SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN: I shall require notice for that.

SHRI R. P. TAMTA: What is the justification for the Railways continuing the benefits of free passes to officers serving in other Departments, especially when they draw higher scales of pay?

SHRI SHAH NAWAZ KHAN: The reason for continuing this in the case of officers on deputation is that they still continue to be railway officers. Also we feel that sometimes the