

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
WATER RESOURCES
LOK SABHA**

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO:1916

ANSWERED ON:11.08.2011

RAVI-BEAS WATER SHARING

Bairwa Shri Khiladi Lal;Meghwal Shri Bharat Ram;Rao Shri Inderjit Singh

Will the Minister of WATER RESOURCES be pleased to state:

- (a) whether the issue relating to sharing of Ravi and Beas water between Haryana, Punjab, Rajasthan and Delhi is pending for many decades;
- (b) if so, the details thereof and the reasons therefor;
- (c) whether the Government is also aware that the areas where this water was to be supplied for drinking as well as for agriculture in those States including Haryana are facing acute drought as a result of the same;
- (d) if so, the details thereof;
- (e) whether the matter is pending in the Supreme Court;
- (f) if so, the details thereof; and
- (g) the action taken/proposed to be taken by the Government to resolve the issue?

Answer

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES & MINORITY AFFAIRS (SHRI VINCENT H. PALA)

(a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The agreement signed by the Chief Ministers of Punjab, Haryana and Rajasthan on 31.12.1981 re-allocating the surplus Ravi Beas waters provided the following allocations:

Share of Punjab	4.22 Million Acre Feet (MAF)
Share of Haryana	3.50 MAF
Share of Rajasthan	8.60 MAF
Quantity earmarked for Delhi water supply	0.20 MAF
Share of J&K	0.65 MAF

The agreement also provided as follows:

"Until such time as Rajasthan is in a position to utilise its full share, Punjab, shall be free to utilise the waters surplus to Rajasthan's requirements. As Rajasthan will soon be able to utilise its share, Punjab shall make adequate alternative arrangements expeditiously for irrigation of its own lands by the time Rajasthan is in a position to utilise full share. As a result, it is expected that during this transitional period when Rajasthan's requirements would not exceed 8.0 MAF, 4.82 MAF of water should be available to Punjab in a mean year when the availability is 17.17 MAF."

Distribution of Ravi-Beas waters is being done by the Bhakra Beas Management Board (BBMB). A formulation for the distribution of surplus Ravi Beas waters in the light of the 1981 agreement, for transitional period, was put up to BBMB in its 99th, 100th and 101st meetings but no decision could be taken regarding distribution of surplus Ravi Beas waters. The matter was then put up before BBMB in its 105th meeting held on 03.12.1982. Since the detailed discussions did not lead to any agreement amongst the members, the Chairman BBMB proposed an ad hoc interim arrangement for the distribution according to which Rajasthan's share worked out to 49% i.e. 8 MAF. Although subsequently, Rajasthan has been requesting for the restoration of its remaining share of 0.6 MAF, Punjab has so far not agreed to it. Punjab has questioned the estimated quantity of average flow of surplus Ravi-Beas waters adopted in the 1981 agreement. On 12.07.2004, Punjab has also enacted the Punjab Termination of Agreement Act, 2004 terminating the 1981 agreement and all other agreements relating to Ravi-Beas. As per the provisions of the Act, all existing and actual utilizations through the existing systems shall remain protected and unaffected and Rajasthan is continuing to get only 8 MAF out of its share.

The above agreement also provided that the Sutlej Yamuna Link Canal shall be implemented in a time bound manner. The completion of this canal would enable Haryana to draw 3.45 MAF out of its share of 3.5 MAF. As Punjab did not complete the canal, Haryana approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court for its early completion. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in its orders of 15.01.2002 and 04.06.2004 directed the completion of the canal. But on 12.07.2004, the State of Punjab terminated the 1981 agreement and all other

agreements relating to Ravi-Beas waters as stated before, discharging itself of any obligation arising from the agreements. A Presidential Reference on the validity of the Act is now before the Hon'ble Supreme Court. Haryana is drawing only 1.62 MAF through Bhakra Main Line (BML) as decided in the meetings of the BBMB earlier instead of drawing 3.45 MAF out of its full Ravi-Beas share through the Sutlej Yamuna Link (SYL) canal.

In a decision taken by the then Secretary, Ministry of Irrigation on 15.01.1982 in pursuance of the provisions of 1981 agreement, Rajasthan was entitled to draw 0.17 MAF through BML via Haryana on the restoration of its capacity. Under the circumstances, Haryana has so far not agreed to release this 0.17 MAF to Rajasthan.

Delhi is being supplied its share of 0.2 MAF through BML and Narwana Branch. Jammu and Kashmir depends on the construction of Shahpurkandi dam for drawing its full share of 0.65 MAF. As Shahpurkandi dam is yet to come up, Jammu & Kashmir is at present drawing only a part of its share from pumping stations located at Basantpur and Lakhanpur.

(c) Yes, Sir.

(d) The full supplies of Ravi-Beas waters would help extension of irrigation in southern region and drought prone areas of Haryana as well as Sidhmukh Nohar command of Rajasthan.

(e) to (g) The issue of construction of a BML-Hansi Branch – Butana Branch Multipurpose Link Channel by Haryana envisaging equitable distribution of Ravi Beas waters available to it at present, is before the Hon'ble Supreme Court in suits filed by Punjab and Rajasthan against its construction. Hon'ble President of India in exercise of powers under Article 143(1) of the Constitution of India has made reference to the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India on 22.07.2004, questioning the validity of the Punjab Termination of Agreement Act, 2004. Haryana has also filed a suit against construction of the Shahpurkandi dam by Punjab and has prayed for its construction and operation by BBMB. In view of its difficulties in getting timely supplies of Ravi Beas waters, Rajasthan has also filed a suit praying for the transfer of control of head works at Ropar, Harike and Ferozepur from Punjab to BBMB in compliance of BBMB's functions stipulated in the Punjab Re-organisation Act, 1966. In view of these matters before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, no action by the Government is possible at this juncture.