

## LOK SABHA

Monday, March 25, 1968/Chaitra 5,  
1890 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of  
the Clock

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]  
ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

## NARMADA RIVER WATER DISPUTE

+

\*808. SHRI D. R. PARMAR :  
SHRI P. N. SOLANKI :  
SHRI RAMACHANDRA J.  
AMIN :

Will the Minister of IRRIGATION AND POWER be pleased to state whether action is being taken to resolve the dispute on Narmada River Scheme between Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat States in accordance with the spirit of the A.I.C.C. Resolution of the 27th July, 1965 ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI SIDDHESHWAR PRASAD) : Efforts are continuing to settle the dispute through mutual discussions and negotiations.

SHRI D. R. PARMAR : When there be a dispute between two States in regard to water and power or in regard to the boundary between them is it a fact that the AICC has passed a resolution on the 27th July, 1965 that such disputes should be finalised by being referred to arbitration, and if so, may I know the reasons why the dispute on the Narmada river is not being referred to arbitration ?

श्री रवि राय : मैं एक व्यवस्था का प्रश्न चाहता हूँ। राष्ट्रीय हित के सम्बन्ध में ए० आई० सी० सी० की क्या बात आती है ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : This is the Question Hour. There can be no point of order now.

श्री रवि राय : मैं स्पष्टीकरण तो मांग सकता हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : There should be no point of order during the Question Hour. If I make a departure in the hon. Member's case, then some other Member also will start with a point of order.

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (DR. K. L. RAO) : The resolution of the AICC was that these disputes must be settled by mutual negotiations backed by a sincere desire to find fair and equitable solutions, and it is only when these efforts fail, they have said, that the dispute should be referred for arbitration.

SHRI D. R. PARMAR : When we the Members of Parliament from Gujarat had a discussion on this matter with the hon. Prime Minister on the 22nd June, 1967, we had requested her to fix some time-limit by which this question was to be finalised. At that time, the hon. Prime Minister had informed us that the Chief Ministers of Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh were going to meet within two or three days, that is, on the 24th June, 1967. Thereafter, two or three meetings were held but with no results. May I know from the hon. Minister whether he is in a position to fix some time-limit by which he expects to finalise this question and if not, the reasons therefor ?

DR. K. L. RAO : We had a meeting of the Chief Ministers in December, 1967. At that time, the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh had said that due to the introduction of hybrid varieties of seeds and new agricultural practices, more waters would be required by the Madhya Pradesh Government; he wanted that a team of engineers and agricultural experts should be sent from the Centre to discuss with their officers. Accordingly, a team of those officers was sent in January, and in the course of

[Dr. K. L. Rao]  
the discussions with these experts and technical people, the Madhya Pradesh officers said that they wanted another month's time and accordingly another meeting was held after a month. The officers again met about four days back at Bhopal. A note on the studies by the Madhya Pradesh Government was handed over to the Central officers.

After studying this, I propose to call for a meeting of the Chief Ministers to finalise one way or the other the decisions on this dispute.

**SHRI RAMCHANDRA J. AMIN :** May I know why the Khosla Committee's report has not been implemented?

**DR. K. L. RAO :** The Khosla Committee was appointed to suggest the best way of utilising the Narmada waters and to recommend the distribution of waters, in 1964. They took one year and submitted a very useful report but unfortunately, at the time of the setting up of the Khosla Committee it had been stated that it was only an advisory body and its decisions or recommendations were not binding. As such, we cannot straightway implement or act on those recommendations. That is why further negotiations are to be held between the States.

**SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL :** In view of the fact that the Kutch Award is already out and the border of Kutch is already fixed and Government have declared their policy to develop the Kutch area with the Narmada waters, may I know what progress has been made in this direction and to apply the master plan to the Kutch area so as to develop it? If some progress has been made, may I know the height required to make the waters of the Narmada reach Kutch? If that has also been decided, may I know whether the Ministry will ask the Gujarat Government to start the foundation work on the dam for the required height in future but with the height agreed to between the Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat Government's at present?

**DR. K. L. RAO :** It is true that a large amount of area in the great and small Rann of Kutch has got to be developed. The question about the waters of which rivers should be utilised for this purpose has not yet been settled. It may be the Mahi waters or the Narmada waters or the waters of some other river. I am afraid that it is too premature to answer the various questions which the hon. Member has put.

**SHRI MANUBHAI PATEL :** The last part of my question has not been answered. Wherever might be the future height, may I know whether the Ministry will ask the Gujarat Government to start the work with the agreed height?

**DR. K. L. RAO :** I do not know what the hon. Member is referring to. Probably he is referring to the project which was sanctioned already. If that be the case, there is no objection to proceeding with the work which is already sanctioned. If the hon. Member wants any further amplification of the answer, I am afraid I would not be able to answer now.

**श्री रवि राय :** प्रश्न पूछने से पहले मैं स्पष्टीकरण चाहता हूँ। जो प्रश्न पूछा गया है उसमें अखिल भारतीय कांग्रेस कमेटी ने जो प्रस्ताव पास किया है उसका जिक्र किया गया। क्या आगे चल कर ऐसा प्रश्न पूछा जा सकता है कि एक राजनीतिक दल का क्या प्रस्ताव हुआ है? (व्यवधान)

**MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :** That was just a reference. Now he may ask the question.

**श्री रवि राय :** क्या मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान इस तरफ गया है कि नदियों के पानी को लेकर के भिन्न भिन्न राज्यों में आपस में आज काफी झगड़ा है? उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आप जानते हैं, कि मैसूर की सरकार ने कृष्णा नदी के पानी को ले कर मामला करने तक इस चीज को ऐडवोकेट जनरल को सौंप दिया है। इसी तरह से पानी का झगड़ा गुजरात

और मध्यप्रदेश के बीच में चल रहा है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय क्या स्थाई मशीनरी अपनाना चाहते हैं जिस के जरिये यह सब झगड़े मिट सकें? नर्मदा के पानी के बारे में उन का क्या प्रस्ताव है, या वहां पर भी मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार को समाधान कराने के लिये कोर्ट में जाना पड़ेगा?

DR. K. L. RAO: Fortunately, there are only two cases of river disputes in our country, one in regard to the Krishna-Godavari waters and the other in regard to the Narmada waters. We have been trying our best in these two cases to settle the dispute by negotiation if possible. If these negotiations fail, then the law is very clear, and we have got to resort to the Inter-State River Disputes Act and action will be taken accordingly, if we find in the course of the next few months that we are unable to make any headway with reference to these negotiations.

श्री बलराज मधोक: जो नर्मदा के पानी का झगड़ा है उस में मध्य प्रदेश वाले कहते हैं कि कैचमेंट एरिया अधिकतर उन के यहाँ पड़ता है, और राजस्थान के पास साधन हैं डैम बनाने के लिये। एक देश होने के नाते इस बात की आवश्यकता है कि जो चीज देश के हित में हो और जो शीघ्र से शीघ्र हो सकती है उस को किया जाये। परन्तु इस में प्रदेशों की सरकारों बीच में अडंगा लगा रही हैं। इसको देखते हुए और इस देश की एकता का विचार करते हुए और इस देश के सम्यक विकास का विचार करते हुए क्या भारत सरकार इन दोनों राज्यों की परवाह न करते हुए अपने कुछ एक्सपर्ट्स तय करके और जो उसे उचित लगता है उसको तुरन्त करने के लिये कदम उठायेगी? अगर यह नहीं किया जाता तो इसका क्या मतलब यह है कि स्टेट्स जो हैं वे बीटो करती रहेंगी उन बातों को भी जो सारे देश के हित में भी हैं।

DR. K. L. RAO: I am glad the hon. Member has struck the correct note

when he said that the resolution of these disputes should be in the best national interests. I entirely agree with him.

With regard to these rivers, the catchment area and other factors are there, and when a river passes through more than one State, that is, in the case of inter-State rivers, the river has to be developed in the best national interest as well as in the interests of the States concerned.

With regard to the question of the Centre overruling the States, there is no such question. We try to carry them along with us as much as possible. If that is not successful, we have got the Inter-State River Disputes Act which lays down very clearly the provision for settlement by a tribunal.

SHRI BAL RAJ MADHOK: Any time-limit fixed?

DR. K. L. RAO: So far as Narmada is concerned, it is very tragic even though at first we had reached agreement in 1963—the Ministers of Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh and myself signed the agreement in regard to the project—later on this was repudiated or rather not agreed to by the Madhya Pradesh Government. Since then, we have been trying to find a way out to come to an agreement between the concerned States and I think we have come fairly close to the close of these discussions. We shall have one more meeting and then take a decision on this subject.

SHRI M. B. RANA: Are Government aware that the Khosla Committee which reported on this question was appointed by the Government of India? Therefore, would it not be proper for Government to stop negotiations and implement the Report?

DR. K. L. RAO: As I submitted already, the Report of the Khosla Committee was only advisory in character. However valuable it may be, so far as this matter is concerned one has to get the consent of the

[Dr. K. L. Rao]  
States, discuss the matter and try to persuade them to come to an agreement.

श्री झारखंडे राय : इस बात को ध्यान में रखते हुए कि भारत में एक संघीय व्यवस्था है और अलग अलग राज्यों को पर्याप्त मात्रा में आटोनीमी प्राप्त है, क्या भारत सरकार इस तरह का आयोग या कमिशन बनाने की कृपा करेगी जो दो राज्यों के बीच में चाहे पानी का विवाद हो, चाहे विद्युत का हो, चाहे सीमाओं का हो या अन्य प्रकार के विवाद हों, सब विवादों को राष्ट्रीय हित को ध्यान में रखकर अन्तिम रूप से तय कर दें और उसका वह निर्णय सब राज्यों पर लागू हो ?

DR. K. L. RAO : With regard to settlement of water disputes, there is the Inter-State River Disputes Act under which we can act. There is no necessity for a separate Commission to be appointed. According to the Act, the Chief Justice of India will nominate a Judge and then the assessors will be there. Their decision will be binding on the parties. We have not so far resorted to this; we have been still feeling that we could settle this by negotiation.

SHRI P. M. MEHTA : Apropos the reply given by the Minister, what time do the Government of India want to finalise the issue ?

DR. K. L. RAO : As I have already said, we are going to have another meeting of the Chief Ministers concerned with regard to the Narmada dispute. I hope that will be the final meeting in this connection.

I will not be able to say when it will take place. It has to suit the convenience of the Chief Ministers. I hope it will be in the next two months.

SHRI D. N. PATODIA : The hon. Minister just now referred to the recommendations of the Khosla Committee. One of their important recommendations was that 8,50,000 acres in Jalore and Barmer districts in Rajasthan will have to be put

under irrigation from which the yield in food production will be 100 crores of rupees. What consideration has been given particularly to this recommendation, is it being implemented, and have the other States also agreed to it ?

DR. K. L. RAO : What the hon. Member has said is correct. The irrigation of 8 lakh acres in Rajasthan is a desirable project. The only point is that in order to irrigate that area we have to get water from Mahi which flows into Gujarat, and to replace the water we take off from Mahi we have to depend on water from Narmada. That is how it happens. Otherwise, Narmada itself will irrigate only about one lakh acres in Rajasthan. By taking water from Mahi, we will be able to have the advantage of another 7 lakh acres being put under irrigation.

It is very necessary in the case of Rajasthan where there are no water facilities that we should assist in the development of that area by borrowing as far as possible from neighbouring sources, as we have done in the case of the Rajasthan Canal.

SHRI RANGA : He only gave us the theory about it. But has the Gujarat Government agreed to this proposal ?

DR. K. L. RAO : The Gujarat Government has agreed.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA : What about the Madhya Pradesh Government ?

DR. K. L. RAO : I do not know to what acceptance the hon. Member refers. This will be effective only if the waters we use from Mahi get replaced by Narmada waters. To what extent the water will be available depends on further discussions.

श्री नाथूराम झहिरवार : क्या यह सही नहीं है कि दोनों राज्यों के बीच में केन्द्रीय सरकार के साथ बैठ कर यह समझौता हुआ था कि बांध की ऊंचाई इतनी होनी चाहिये और क्या यह भी सही नहीं है कि उस पर मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार तैयार हो गई थी ? क्या

यह भी सही नहीं है कि गुजरात की सरकार ने कहा कि इसको ज्यादा ऊंचा किया जाए और इसका नतीजा यह होता कि हाइड्रल प्राजेक्ट जो मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार बनाने जा रही है वह सबमर्ज हो जाती और इस कारण से मध्य प्रदेश की सरकार ने एतराज किया है ?

DR. K. L. RAO : It is not quite so. The agreement was signed by the Ministers but it was not signed by the Chief Ministers. When it went to the Chief Minister, Madhya Pradesh, for his concurrence, he raised many other points and therefore, it did not come into effect.

SHRI R. K. AMIN : In view of the fact that at one time Madhya Pradesh was ready to construct a dam at a height of 465 ft. above sea level at Haranpal, may I know what prevents the Government of India agreeing to the construction of a dam at the same height at Navagam ?

DR. K. L. RAO : This is one of the ways one can argue about it, the relative height and other things. But one has to get the acceptance, if possible, of the State concerned. As regards the construction of a dam at Haranpal, Madhya Pradesh proposed to the height of 465 ft.; they do not agree however to the construction of Navagam dam at 465 ft.

श्री शिव नारायण :

रहिमन पानी राखिये, बिनु पानी सब सून ।  
पानी गया न उभरे, मोती मानुष चून ।

मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह पानी का जो प्रश्न है इसको लेकर ए० आई० सी० का जो रेजोल्यूशन था उसका क्या भाव था और उस पर इन दोनों राज्यों ने क्या अमल किया है ? यदि नहीं किया है तो उनके खिलाफ आपने क्या एकशन लिया है या ए० आई० सी० सी० के प्रेजिडेंट ने क्या एकशन लिया है ?

DR. K. L. RAO : I have studied the resolution as also the speeches made

on that occasion. The main point made out there in both was that national interests must prevail and should take precedence over the interests of any particular State.

#### PRICES OF SULPHUR

\*809. SHRI HIMATSINGKA : Will the Minister of PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that while the price of sulphur in the U.S.A. has increased from \$ 16.00 in 1956 to \$ 38.50 per ton it has increased from Rs. 150/- to Rs. 800/- per ton in India; and

(b) if so, the reasons contributing to this disproportionate rise in the cost of sulphur in India ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS AND OF SOCIAL WELFARE (SHRI RAGHU RAMAIAH) : (a) The price of sulphur in USA at the beginning of the decade was \$ 20 per long ton F.O.B. which has increased to about \$48 per long ton F.O.B., for the supplies made by the traditional suppliers of USA. During this period, the CIF price of sulphur in India increased from Rs. 150 to between Rs. 525 and Rs. 600 per long ton, depending on the source of supply.

(b) The reasons for the rise are :—

- (i) Steep increase in prices in the world market consequent on world-wide shortage of the commodity ;
- (ii) devaluation of the Indian Rupee by 57.5% ;
- (iii) increase in freight costs due to the closure of the Suez canal ;
- (iv) reduction of normal supplies from traditional sources; and
- (v) import of sulphur from non-traditional sources at higher prices to make up the shortage.