

and not as President. Is it not contrary to the policy of conciliation, negotiation and arbitration?

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: It is such a lot of jumble of words that I do not know what reply I should give. I can only say 'No'. (*Interruptions*)

Mr. Speaker: 'No' is the reply.

Shri B. K. Galkwad: May I know whether it is a fact that the labour leader, Shri Khedgikar had been to Delhi and tried his best to see the Labour Minister and the Finance Minister and settle the dispute?

Mr. Speaker: The same question is being put. Shri Nath Pai put the same question.

Shri Nath Pai: But the Minister concerned refused to give the answer.

Shri B. K. Galkwad: May I know whether the Minister concerned refused to see the labour leader?

The Deputy Minister of Labour (Shri Abd All): I may submit that I met him in the Central Hall and one hon. Member opposite suggested that he should meet us and discuss this matter in detail. I gave him an appointment with the consent of the hon. Member opposite at 5-30 in the evening. But he did not come to meet me.... (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Mr. Pillai.

Shri Anthony Pillai: What is the difficulty experienced by the Government in the matter of referring the dispute to arbitration to a Tribunal? It may be that the Government considers the demands unjust....

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. No arguments in this matter. The hon. Member put a question: what are the difficulties in the way of this matter being referred to arbitration? (*Interruptions.*) Order, order. Let there be some decorum and order here.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: When these demands were sent up to the Government by the Manager, it was indicated to him how they could be

dealt with, what were the demands in which the Government would be able to meet the workers and what were the demands which the Government would be able to consider. There are certain matters in the Security Press which it is no use referring to arbitration. We are not in a position to accept the question of placing a watch and ward, the seniority or the question of superseding the Works Committee in the manner that was suggested. Some of the demands made are such as could not be decided by arbitration considering the particular nature of the Press. So far as I was concerned, I asked the Manager to indicate that any reasonable demand, made, would be considered. For instance, a demand like furnishing houses forthwith to all these people is a thing which obviously cannot be met even by arbitration. The nature of the demands are such that quite a number of them could not be dealt with even by arbitration. (*Interruptions.*)

Mr. Speaker: We go to the next item. There are two short notice questions.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Indo-Pak Canal Waters dispute

+

S. N. Q. { Dr. Ram Sabbag Singh:
No. 7. { Shri N. R. Munisamy:

Will the Minister of Irrigation and Power be pleased to state:

(a) whether talks were recently held in Delhi between World Bank representatives and representatives of India and Pakistan on agreement relating to *ad hoc* transitional arrangements for a further period; and

(b) if so, the outcome of those talks?

The Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri S. K. Patil): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) As a result of prolonged discussions with the parties, the Bank representatives have informed themselves fully of the views and requirements of both sides in connection with

the proposed agreement for *ad hoc* transitional arrangements for a further period. No agreement has yet been reached. It is believed that the Bank would continue its efforts to secure an agreement.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: Is it true that the World Bank representatives have told the Indian representatives that storage of water in Bhakra canal would be a hostile act against Pakistan?

Shri S. K. Patil: They gave the Indian representatives to understand that any storing of water in 1958 as it is going to be would be very much objected to by Pakistan.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether the World Bank representatives also told the Indian representatives that India must pay the construction cost of the link canals to Pakistan?

Shri S. K. Patil: There has been such a demand made, since 1955, twice and the World Bank itself had rejected it. This time also such a demand has come from Pakistan that India should pay for the link canals—not only for the construction but even for their operation.

Dr. Ram Subhag Singh: May I know whether in view of such demands by Pakistan, it will be useful for India to carry on this negotiation with World Bank representatives and Pakistan representatives?

Shri S. K. Patil: We should not come to any hasty decision in a matter like this since the World Bank has been using its good offices and the co-operative work both by India and Pakistan is still in progress.

Shri N. E. Munkhramy: May I enquire whether the hon. Minister will throw better light for further understanding of where exactly the difference lies between the standpoint of Pakistan and the standpoint of India keeping in view of course the Bank's 1954 proposals and also whether the discussion has been held separately or jointly?

Shri S. K. Patil: This question, Sir, is confined at present, to *ad hoc* transitional agreements and not the whole question of the dispute, and here the difference is, as I have stated, that for those link canals that have been constructed by Pakistan in order to replace the historic withdrawals (that are known to the House), India should pay. India is not prepared to pay for them except as a part of the overall settlement of the entire dispute.

Shri Goray: Has the Government told Pakistan as well as the World Bank the limits to which India is ready to go and beyond which it would not go under any circumstances?

Shri S. K. Patil: I do not know what those limits are, whether in regard to payment or whether in regard to the time factor. So far as the time factor is concerned I have made it clear in this House that 1962 is the dead line so far as India can wait for the replacement of these withdrawals.

Shri A. C. Gaha: The hon. Minister stated that Pakistan Government has made certain demands. But what is the opinion of the World Bank on them?

Shri S. K. Patil: The World Bank is simply using its good offices, it does not give any opinion. It conveys the desires of demands, whatever they are, of the Pakistan Government to us and our replies to them; that is exactly what is meant by 'good offices'.

Shri N. E. Munkhramy: Sometime back the hon. Minister stated in this House that no supply of water will be made to Pakistan if no dues are paid. May I know what is the present position as regards that?

Shri S. K. Patil: I never made a statement of that description. I merely said in 1962—I will rather put it the other way—not that we shall not give any water to Pakistan, but we shall require water ourselves and if we do not get it that will deteriorate the condition of millions of farmers in India.