

PAPER LAID ON THE TABLE—Contd,

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY) : I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. 359/85 (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 19th December 1985 together with an explanatory memorandum making certain amendment to Notification No. 153/85-Customs dated the 24th May 1985 so as to exempt newsprint from the whole of the auxiliary duty of customs leviable thereon, under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962.

[Placed in Library See No. LT 1759/85]

RE : BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD) : Sir, I would like to submit that after we finish this Half-an-Hour discussion, there will be further discussion on the Seventh Plan. We have arranged dinner also for the hon. Members.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Shall we extend the time by two hours now ?

SHRI GHULAM NABI AZAD : Yes, initially let us extend it for two hours.

DR. A. KALANIDHI : Sir, as there is no other member present from our side, you please allow me ... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You please sit down, I will call you.

SHRI G. S. BASAVARAJU : You please allow from each State..... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please sit down. You can put questions and not speeches. I will call you.

SHRI M. V. CHANDRASHEKARA MURTHY : Sir, last week it was admitted in my name. The hon. Speaker called me. It was postponed... (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I will allow two persons from that State. In the notice if one person's name is there, one more person will be allowed. Suppose Shri Krishna Iyer's name is there in the list, one more person from Karnataka will be allowed. We now take up Half-An-Hour-discussion; Shri Ayyapu Reddy.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION
TELUGU - GANGA PROJECT

[English]

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY (Kurnool) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir 25th May 1983 was characterised by the Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu as a historic date. On that date, our late Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi inaugurated the project called the 'Telugu Ganga Project' at the Nehru Stadium in Madras City. She was surrounded by four Chief Ministers—Chief Minister from Tamil Nadu, Shri M.G. Ramachandran; Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, Shri N.T. Rama Rao; Chief Minister of Karnataka, Shri Ramakrishna Hegde; and Chief Minister of Maharashtra, Shri Vasant Rao Dada Patil.

Sir, at that function, she inaugurated a project called the Telugu Ganga Project by switching a button which unveiled a tablet and illuminated the geographical model of the Telugu Ganga Project. She also handed over to the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, Shri N.T. Rama Rao a cheque for Rs.30 crores, representing the first instalment of Tamil Nadu's share of the cost of the project.

Sir, I have got The Hindu of the 26th May wherein in the photos of all the Chief Ministers alongwith the Prime Minister on

the dais is published prominently on the first page as demanded by the hon. Member, I am laying it on the Table of the House. I have even authenticated it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No, no. Not necessary.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : Now I will come to that point.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Already the paper is available. It need not be done.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : This was called a historic event and as a matter of fact the Prime Minister stated this. "Inaugurating the work on the Krishna Water supplies scheme in the project, Mrs. Gandhi appealed to the people not to regard this as belonging to one State or another, but citizens of India united by a common bond of making the country self-reliant."

The Prime Minister as also the Chief Ministers who participated in the function hailed the project as a symbol of mutual understanding and cooperation between two States and hoped that this spirit would help solve the State problems—including the Cauvery Water issue also. The Government of Tamil Nadu published a souvenir, which was freely distributed and supplied to all the Chief Ministers and all the representatives of the various States. This project detailed the plan in the map of the Telugu-Ganga project. It also showed in broad colours the areas which are going to be irrigated under the Telugu-Ganga project in the State of Andhra Pradesh. As I submitted, the switching on the ceremony...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Already the paper is there.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : This I am placing on the Table of the House. This souvenir also I am placing on the table of the House...

*(Interruptions)**

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No,

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : This is a very important document. It has to be placed on the table of House...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You can quote, I am allowing you to quote.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : I am quoting from this. I have already given notice that I am placing this document on the table of the House, Sir this project...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please take your seat.

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO : Will heavens fall if it is placed on the table of the House ?...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have allowed him to quote it. It is not necessary to place it on the table of the house, because already there is no time...

(Interruptions)

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I have already given notice so that, I am allowed to quote I have quoted only favourable portions. The plan itself will show that switch which Smt. Indira Gandhi pressed also clearly disclose that the areas which were going to be irrigated. The project was envisaged to carry 29 TMC water in the State of Andhra Pradesh for the purpose of irrigating chronically drought prone areas of Rayal-seema besides carrying 15 TMC of water for supplying drinking water to the people of the city of Madras, this has been clarified and clearly stated and kept beyond reasonable doubt, beyond the shadow of doubt. Because, the irrigation part of the scheme was an integral part of the scheme and it was a condition precedent to the agreement between the two Chief Ministers of Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh. Not only that. The sharing of costs between Tamil Nadu Government and the Andhra Pradesh Government was apportioned on the basis of the irrigation which Andhra State is going to derive or going to have under the project. The cost component

[Shri E. Ayyapu Reddy]

itself shows that the State of Andhra Pradesh was going to have irrigation of 29 TMC of water. The souvenir published by the Government of Andhra Pradesh also displayed prominently the letter written by the then Minister for Irrigation Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha. And he has clearly stated as follows :

“Besides providing water for Madras city and irrigation to drought prone areas in the districts of Rayalaseema and the Nellore district.....
Heartiest good wishes on this occasion.”

This is what the Minister for Irrigation, Shri Raw Niwas Mirdha had stated in his letter. And this letter has also been published in the Souvenir published by the Government of Andhra Pradesh on that occasion. I may be permitted to lay this also on the Table of the House. *(Interruptions)*

SOME HON. MEMBERS : There is no need to lay it on the Table.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : Why are you afraid of the documents which have been published ? *(Interruptions)* Don't forget history.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Order please; take your seats. *(Interruptions)* I request the hon. Member to cooperate in the conduct of the proceedings. Why are you shouting, all of you ?

AN HON. MEMBER : Why are these Members objecting to the laying of it on the Table of the House ? *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I am the presiding officer. I can control the House; why are you controlling it ?

AN HON. MEMBER : They can state their viewpoints later.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : All of you keep quiet. I will answer Mr. Reddy, if there is any need. I do not want others

to interfere. Take your seats. *(Interruptions)* Please...order.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : Suffice it for me to say that Shri Ramakrishna Hegde who was present on that occasion, hailed it as a shining example of inter-State cooperation. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I do not want anybody to interrupt.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY ; Every body knew that it was for the benefit of both the States. The irrigation component of the scheme was published. It was published very much in the Press; and on the 25th May 1983, "The Hindu" prominently published the scheme, its plant and also the portions which are going to be irrigated under this scheme. So, this has been done.

By November 1985, what is the position ? Rs. 80.2 crores have already been spent on this project, out of which Rs. 47 crores have been advanced by the Tamil Nadu Government; Rs 33 crores have been spent by the Government of Andhra Pradesh. A labour force, 40,000 strong is working on this project. At this stage, some unseemly controversy has been raised unfortunately. We never expected that there will be any scope for a controversy with regard to a matter which was settled by a judicial tribunal, by the Bachawat Tribunal where all the issues relating to the sharing of the waters between the three States have been very clearly and categorically laid down, without giving any scope for any doubt whatsoever. We expected the Union Government to take a clear and firm stand, so that these matters which were settled by a judicial tribunal are not allowed to be raked up and recycled, and a finality which was reached, is not undone. But unfortunately, the answer given to this question under discussion gave scope for doubting matters which were settled by the tribunal already.

I will only quote the Tribunal from which the hon. Minister quoted, i.e. sub-clause (5) of Clause 5 of the Tribunal.

“(C) The State of Andhra Pradesh will be at liberty to use in any water year the remaining water that may be flowing in the river Krishna but thereby it shall not require any right whatsoever to use in any water year not be deemed to have been allocated in any water year water of the river Krishna in excess of the quantity specified hereunder.”

Under clause (a) and (b) the water which the Maharashtra Government was entitled to use and the Karnataka Government was entitled to use was specified by the tribunal. Under clause (c), they said :

“The remaining water the state of Andhra Pradesh is entitled to use subject to clause (a) and (b) and also subject to its own allocated water 800 TMC of water.”

The reason given by the tribunal is to be found on page 167 of the Award. It reads as follows :

“We restrain the States of Maharashtra and Mysore from using more water than that which is allocated to each of them. We permit the State of Andhra Pradesh to use the remaining water but we lay down that by such the State of Andhra Pradesh shall not acquire any right to use the waters of the river Krishna except to the extent allocated to it. In making allocations to the three States in this manner under Scheme A we do not expressly provide for the sharing of deficiency. But we may mention that we have taken notice of the fact that out of 100 years, there may occur deficiencies in 25 years and in these 25 years the State of Andhra Pradesh is likely to suffer more than the States of Maharashtra and Mysore. In this connection we have discussed the carryover capacities of the Nagarjunasagar Dam and the Srisailem Dam and have permitted the State of

Andhra Pradesh to utilise the carryover capacities available in these two Dams.”

The reason for allowing the State of Andhra Pradesh to use the remaining excess of water while expressly restraining the States of Karnataka and Maharashtra not to use any water other than allocated has been clearly stated by the tribunal because out of 100,25 years are considered to be drought years and the sufferer would be the State of Andhra Pradesh and not the States of Maharashtra and Karnataka. That is the reason why they have given this clause. Now, the Government of Karnataka did raise an objection to clause (c) of allocating of excess water for the use of the State of Andhra Pradesh. They raised their objection under 5b of the Inter-State Water Dispute Act. This came up of final hearing before the tribunal and the tribunal has unequivocally stated as follows :

“Karnataka prays that this Tribunal may be pleased to clarify and/or explain —

(i) that the liberty given to Andhra Pradesh to use the remaining water in excess of allocations made to it under Clause (V) (C) is limited to the existing carry-over capacity as found by this Tribunal to meet the deficiency in deficit years,

(ii) that the liberty given to Andhra Pradesh to utilise surplus waters be restricted to utilisation within the basin, and

(iii) that the liberty given to Andhra Pradesh for the utilisation of surplus waters does not confer rights on Andhra Pradesh either to divert waters outside the basin in excess of its allocations or to construct new works for utilisation outside the basin, except with prior consent of the upper States.

There is no ground for limiting the use of the remaining

[Shri E. Ayyapu Reddy]

water by Andhra Pradesh to its existing carryover capacity. If the remaining water is not used by Andhra Pradesh, it will be wasted to the sea.

At Pages 409-411 of Vol. II of the Report, we have given full reasons for not imposing restrictions on Andhra Pradesh regarding diversion of water outside the Krishna basin. We see no ground for further clarifying this matter."

Therefore, after the Tribunal gave this decision, after it did not accept the objections of the Government of Karnataka, and overruled these objections and gave full freedom to the State of Andhra Pradesh to utilise the excess water not only in the Krishna basin, but in any other basin, not only in any existing project, but any other project, the matter became finally decided by a judicial tribunal. And now, the Government of Maharashtra did not even raise this objection! It is only the Government of Karnataka that raised the objection. The objections were overruled and were not accepted by the Tribunal.

The matter is once again sought to be re-cycled and the matter which had become final by an award of a tribunal is sought to be raked up once again. Now, this sort of re-cycling a dispute in the nation,—for whose benefit is it being done? Now, is it consistent with the policy statement made by the Prime Minister at the Conference of the newly formed Water Resources Council? I shall only quote the Prime Minister, what he state on the 30th of October, 1985.

"Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi today called for the best productive use of the country's water resources without worrying too much about how much water belonged to which State. 'With better utilization', he told the Council, 'there will be very few States actually short of water. The key is in not wasting water.' He further stated—Mr. Gandhi—

that he was not suggesting that the minimum requirements of Certain States should be reduced "but it is ridiculous to have water flowing into the sea going waste in certain areas while other States and other areas are dry".

Now, about 300 TMC of water is going waste into the sea.

DR. V. VENKATESH : This is with reference to the North India.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : About 300 TMC of water in the Krishna River is going as a waste today. This is a fact. Nobody can deny it. Neither the Central water and Power Commission, nor the Union Government, nor the State Governments of Karnataka and Maharashtra can deny it. Can they deny the fact that 300 TMC of water is going waste into the sea? They cannot! They do not have any objection if this water goes to the sea!

AN HON. MEMBER : It is not so.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : You do not have any objection if this water goes to the sea, you have got objection if 29 TMC—which is only 10 per cent of the water which is going waste—is diverted to give irrigation facilities to a chronically drought-brone area!

DR. V. VENKATESH : Karnataka is also suffering from drought.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : Now, unfortunately, one of the objections which we are not able to understand is that if we construct dams add prevent water going to the sea, how is it going to affect Karnataka and Maharashtra? Water flows from Karnataka to Andhra. Water flows from Maharashtra to Karnataka. Water does not flow from Andhra to Karnataka and vice-versa. Everybody knows that the lower riparian owner and the lower riparian State cannot adversely affect the rights of the upper riparian States.

In this case I am reminded of one of Aesop's fables. A wolf was drinking water

over upstream and a lamp was taking water down stream. The wolf said, "You are muddying the water." The lamp replied, "No, Sir. You are muddying the water. The muddy water is coming down." We are down-stream, we are down below. Even if we construct ten or fifteen or twenty dams we can only prevent water from going into the sea. We cannot prevent water which automatically—naturally—flows into the Karnataka State. The Karnataka Government can prevent water flowing to Andhra and it is physically not possible for Andhra State to prevent water from flowing into Karnataka! In a drought-stricken year, if there is deficiency of water, Karnataka and Maharashtra will take their water. It is only Andhra that will be put to the necessity of making good of what is remaining, for its water needs.

The basic fact is, nobody is concentrating on this basic, physical fact. I have also quoted history, history which was made by Shrimati Gandhi on the 25th May 1983. But the basic physical fact that we are a lower riparian State, Andhra is a lower riparian State, and that we cannot adversely affect the rights of Karnataka in any manner, has not been recognised.

Kindly let them say, how by constructing a dam here it is going to affect them. This is a misconception.

*(Interruptions)**

By calling a lamp a dog, a lamb will not become a dog. The basic physical facts are there.

Then, coming to the...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You put the question, Mr. Ayyapu Reddy.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : Then, having stated this much, with regard to the physical features and the facts, that we will not be able to affect the rights of Karnataka and Maharashtra, and having also stated the findings of the Tribunal, I wonder why the answer to this question said, "The techno-economic aspects of the project would be considered".

And again, the inter-state aspects have to be resolved. The inter-State aspects

were resolved by the Tribunal. The Tribunal itself envisaged that there was no necessity for an implementing authority. The Tribunal has purposefully stated that it is not necessary to have an implementing authority for the simple reason that everything has been clarified and there is no scope for dispute. That is why the Tribunal has very happily and very prudently did not envisage any implementing machinery. Now, everything was going on smoothly and every person was actually thinking that the dispute has been settled and the rights of the parties have also been settled, and they are free to go along with the agreement.

Now, the only point is, I am making it unequivocally, that extra use of water or whatever projects, come up, the matter can be reviewed after the 31st May 2000 AD. The matter would be reviewed only after the 31st May 2000 AD. Now the capacity of various States—Karnataka apprehends and Maharashtra apprehends—may change. If the Andhra State develops its capacity to utilise the water that may—that may—adversely affect their rights for a review. They want, though they are not able to develop their capacity now, they do not want Andhra State to develop its capacity at any time, so that they can stand on an equal footing. This policy of preventing others from progressing, others from developing, other States from raising their standards is certainly not in the national interest.

Above all, my submission is this : As the Prime Minister has stated, the best use of water has to be kept in view.

I may assure the hon. Members from Karnataka as well as from Maharashtra that if the irrigation potentialities of Andhra Pradesh are fully exploited and developed, it will not only help the State of Andhra Pradesh but it is going to help the entire country. Instead of water flowing to Karnataka and Maharashtra, grain will flow from Andhra Pradesh to Karnataka and Maharashtra. Today Punjab grain is flowing to every part of the country. You do not want Andhra Pradesh grain to flow to other parts of the country if it is possible, cheaper and quicker. If Andhra Pradesh develops its

[Shri E. Ayyapu Reddy]

potentialities, the nation will prosper. After all, the Prime Minister has said the other day that only 40 per cent of the water is being used. Andhra Pradesh is capable of making use of this water immediately and developing its irrigation potentialities as envisaged in the Seventh Plan. Allow the grain to flow from Andhra Pradesh to other States. It will be an asset of the nation. Unfortunately, this aspect has not been taken into consideration by the hon. Minister in giving his reply.

My last point is that they are trying to rely upon clause 4 of the 1977 agreement which was entered into between the States. Clause 4 says that from the point of offtake to be agreed upon between the Governments of Tamil Nadu & Andhra Pradesh, there shall not be irrigation from the canal which is taking water to the city of Madras. That is sought for the purpose of saying that there should be no irrigation whatsoever... *(Interruptions)*

AN HON. MEMBER : So, you agree to 1977 agreement. You stand by it.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : Please permit me to say. We are standing by everything but you are not standing by anything. That is an agreement between the Tamil Nadu Government and the Andhra Pradesh Government and it says that from the point of offtake to be agreed upon between these two governments, the canal shall not be used for irrigation, that is, the 50 TMC of water which is going to be diverted to the city of Madras should not be tapped for irrigation. That was the purpose of that clause 4. But unfortunately, a perverse interpretation is sought to be given to that clause overlooking the entire award given by the Bachawat Tribunal. Therefore, my submission is that the State of Andhra Pradesh has done everything which is within the possibility, to satisfy every doubt raised by everyone of these States and also by the Central Water Commission as well as the planning Commission. Number of representations have been made and already the work was inaugurated on 25th May 1983 by the late Prime Minister. Two years and six

months have elapsed. Rs. 637 crores have been apportioned. Do you mean to say that the Government of Andhra Pradesh agreed to give land only for the purpose of supplying water to the city of Madras? You cannot convince even an ordinary illiterate that the Government of Andhra Pradesh has agreed to spare Rs. 637 crores and also to give land to it only for the purpose of giving water. Don't try to exercise what is called ingenuity to the extent of exploring credibility of every person. So, my submission is that this scheme ought to have been cleared by the CWC.

I am pained to say only one thing in the end and conclude. Mr. Shankaranand hails from Karnataka. It is not his fault. I have got absolute faith in his objectivity and reasonableness... *(Interruptions)*. Justice should not only be done...

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : It is a very bad thing, Sir. On a point of order.....

(Interruptions)

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : Justice must not only be done..... *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please conclude now.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : I am concluding..... *(Interruptions)*. Please sit down. I have not said anything against him..... *(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You are not allowing further discussion...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Minister is there. It is for the Minister to ask. Why are you worrying about this?.....

(Interruptions)

(Interruptions)

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : What is that I have said and what is it that they are objecting?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please all of you take your seats.
(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Mr. Reddy, you also take your seat. Please all of you sit down.

SHRI VIJAYA KUMAR RAJU : It should be withdrawn by the HON. MEMBER. It is an allegation.

SHRI M.V. CHANDRASHEKARA MURTHY : It is an allegation on the Government and on the *bona-fide* of the Minister. It should be withdrawn.
(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Who are you all shouting? Please take your seats.

(Interruptions)

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : What is it that I have to withdraw? What is it that I have said? Please sit down. Don't try to bamboozle us.

SHRI M.V. CHANDRASHEKARA MURTHY : He is making allegations, Sir.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : I am not making allegations.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I will request all the Members to be very cordial. We are discussing it in a very smooth manner. There may be some sensitivities, because their interests.....

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Listen to me first. Then you speak.
(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : If anything objectionable has been said by anybody, it will not go in the records. Definitely it would not go in the records. I will expunge if there is anything wrong. Therefore, you all to cooperate. Only then the Minister can reply and the Members can express their views. When a Member is speaking do not try to interrupt him and stop him to speak. This is not the way. I request all of you to cooperate.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : The

basic principle is that justice must not only be done, but should appear to have been done. I, as a person, as Ayyapu Reddy, have got absolute faith in Shri Shankaranand's objectivity, but all the six crores people of Andhra Pradesh do not have the same impression. They always consider that Shri Shankaranand is not discharging his duties. (Interruptions)

So, it is in his own interest that he should deal with the Telugu-Ganga Project. It is in his interest. It is absolutely necessary so far as the Telugu-Ganga project is concerned that any objection from any one of these States must straight be dealt with by the Prime Minister or by some other Minister who does not hail from any one of these controversial States.

(Interruptions)

That itself exposes you.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Do not go on shouting. If Members cooperate, this discussion will go on, otherwise I will have to wind it up.

(Interruptions)

SHRI M.V. CHANDRASHEKARA MURTHY : He is doubting the integrity of the Minister.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I request the hon. Members on this side not to interrupt the Member's reply. Let him finish. If you go on interrupting and making noise, then others definitely cannot express their views. I am telling this to everyone. If anybody goes on like that I will not allow any further discussion. This is very clear.

SHRI C. MADHAV REDDI : There should be no discussion at all. Only questions should be but.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS. We have objection to that.
(Interruptions)

SHRI V. KRISHNA RAO : Then we will walk out or stage a Dharna.
(Interruptions)

SHRI S.M. GURADDI : I am on a point of order. When you have given an opportunity to a Member from another State, why have you not given an opportunity to a Member from Karnataka to speak?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Why have you come to that conclusion. There is no point of order. Please sit down. I have not given any of my ruling like that.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Please take your seats. The Minister is on his legs.

THE MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND): The House is aware that the Telugu-Ganga Project is under very hot discussion both inside and outside the House.

Specially, the concerned States are very much agitated over their rights and fears whether ill-founded or well-founded. And we as a nation are sitting here to solve the problems, specially to find solutions to the vexatious problems, and I can very well appreciate the agitation of the hon. Member from Telugu Party.

SHRI C. JANGA REDDY : Not Telugu Party, but Andhra Pradesh M.P.s.

AN HON. MEMBER : Tamil Nadu also.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Everybody is concerned, even Karnataka also is concerned. Please take your seats. Let him speak.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Sir, now I remember, if I can get two minutes to illustrate what the hon. Member said, a case was being argued in a court of law and the lawyer of one side presented his case in a calm, quiet manner very convincingly. Then the other lawyer got up and started shouting, beating the bench, shouting at the Chair and the opposition side, and all noise and no arguments. That was over. So, the other lawyer was

called upon to reply. Then the other lawyer got up and just without opening his mouth and talking anything, was thumping his table and making his hands pushing in the air. The Judge asked : 'What are you doing'. Then he replied, 'I am replying to the first part of the argument of the other lawyer'. That, of course, I am not going to do.

The hon. Member said so many things, but he forgot to say the main thing. May I tell for the benefit of the Member? You should have said that the Telugu Ganga project should be cleared early, You did not say that.

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO : We have told that a number of times on the floor of the House.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : I am here not to uphold the right of any particular State against any particular State. I belong to a Party which is an all-India party, I belong to a party which has the history of 100 years.

(Interruptions)

SHRI BASUDEB ACHARIA : Your Party has the history of only 17 years, the Congress (I).

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I do not want such kind of discussion. Please sit down.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : I am saying this because a personal reference was made to me that I belong to Karnataka.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Can I request the Members to be calm? Please hear what the Minister says. Even when the Minister is speaking all are interrupting. What is this?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : I am just explaining certain remarks which were

made against me individually saying that I belong to Karnataka. The hon. Member has said it, others may not have the same feeling, but should I say to the House that I am proud that I belong to Karnataka, I am proud that I am a Kannadiga, I have a culture which the Prime Minister has praised the other day.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I do not want any controversy. Mr. Ayyapu Reddy he is not mentioning like that.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : To that State I belong, but I also belong to the Party whose leader was Mrs. Gandhi and whom you have praised. I also belong to the Party which held the young leader Rajiv Gandhi as the Prime Minister of this country. He is the Prime Minister of this country and the country has chosen him to be the Prime Minister to shape the destiny of the country and the policy of this country. On behalf of that Party and that Government, I am speaking and not on behalf of any State.

(Interruptions)

SHRI ANAND GAJAPATHI RAJU (Bebbili) : Sir, let him come to brass tacks. Why does he beat about the bush ?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : As a Member of Parliament and Minister belonging to that Party, it is our national commitment. I cannot forget the national interests. I will always keep the national interests above the regional interests. That is my policy.

SHRI ANAND GAJAPATHI RAJU : Sir, we are not asking for regional interest. Let the issue be settled. Don't denigrate us that we are standing for regional interest.

SHRI A. CHARLES (Trivandrum) : Why can't you listen ?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : Before going into the rigmarole of the arguments on the three sides, may I just point out a simple thing ? Before entering into the

disputable aspects of the case, i.e. inter-State aspects, may I bring to the notice of the House that the Andhra Pradesh Government has yet to reply to many of the comments of the Central water Commission before the project is asked for clearance ? May I just for the benefit of the House and also for the benefit of the Members from Andhra Pradesh, bring it on record what are the points which need clarification from the Andhra Pradesh Government ? This is for the information of the House including the hon. Members from Andhra Pradesh. The replies from Andhra Pradesh Government are awaited on the following points :

- (i) further comments on National Water Planning perspective sent to State in June, 1985.
- (ii) simulation studies in the light of suggestions of Central Water Commission.
- (iii) details of designs and drawing of Spillways of 3 dams—Velugodu reservoir, Sir Pothuluri Veerabrahmendra Swamy Vari Matham Reservoir, Kandaleru Reservoir—the balancing reservoirs.
- (iv) compliance to further comments on Irrigation aspect sent in December, 1985.

Now the important aspects which are still required to be sorted out are :—

- (a) Water availability from Krishna and Pennar for en-route irrigation envisaged (Simulation studies awaited).
- (b) Irrigation planning including finalisation of crop water requirement.
- (c) Designs of dams spillways of the three balancing reservoirs.
- (d) Firming up of cost estimates and working out realistic Benefit Cost ratio.
- (e) Clearance of the project from the

[Shri B. Shankaranand]

environmental angle/Forest conservation Act of 1980.

(f) Resolving of Inter-State aspects.

May I request hon. Members from Andhra Pradesh...

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : You can ask 100 more questions and pray for eternity.

DR. A. KALANIDHI : If that is the case, then how Mrs. Gandhi came to Madras and made an announcement that Krishna water would be given to Madras.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Sir, No, please. No interruptions.

DR. A. KALANIDHI : She come to make a spontaneous announcement. How she came and announced like that ?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : Mrs. Gandhi came to Madras to give you water.

DR. A. KALANIDHI : If the Central water Commission has raised so many queries, then how she said so ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Dr. Kalanidhi, please take your seat. Let his finish. Then you can ask question. I am allowing you afterwards. When I will give you a chance, you can express. I cannot allow like this. If everybody is speaking, then, you cannot hear anything.

(Interruptions)

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : May I say, we are equally, if not much more, concerned for the water supply to Madras city than the hon. Member himself because we are here to deliver goods. He is there to raise objection.

DR. A. KALANIDHI : I do not raise any objection. I need water.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : You send the information on how many ladies are there and how many water points are there.

DR. A. KALANIDHI : Our ladies get up at 2 O'Clock to get water.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : I am happy that all the Members are referring to the participation of Mrs. Gandhi, the then Prime Minister who had identified herself with the hopes and aspirations of this country, specially the down-trodden, the weaker section of the people who are suppressed and oppressed and who are in need and that is the reason why she was present in the inaugural function. *(Interruptions)* We are for the people who are really suffering for want of water, whether drinking or irrigation. Let it is very clear to the hon. Members that we have to create irrigation potential to those areas which are specially drought areas of this country, whether Andhra Pradesh, Tamilnadu or any part of the country. We have to see that their grievances are redressed by supply of water to them for irrigation and drinking water. May I for the information of the House say that on 30th October, 1985 we had the first National water Resources Council meeting of which the Chairman is the Prime Minister himself and he did make reference to the drought-prone areas of this country, the drought-affected areas of this country. Of course, Rayalaseema and other parts really do deserve immediate attention of the Government. *(Interruptions)* Bijapur, Gulberga and Kolar are chronically affected areas. All these deserve our attention but we are in the process of drafting the National Water Policy. This National water Resources Council consists of all the Chief Ministers including Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Tamilnadu. We have appointed a Sub-Group for preparing a draft paper of the policy and may I inform the House that the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh Mr. N.T. Rama Rao, the Chief Minister of Tamilnadu, Mr. M. G. Ramachandran and the Chief Minister of Karnataka, Mr. Hegde are the Members of this Group who are burdened with the responsibility of drafting the National Water Policy and who have unanimously accepted the principle of giving the highest priority to drinking waters Madras stands at the highest and that is the reason why Mrs. Gandhi went to participate in the inauguration of the water supply scheme.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : We take serious note of this because the entire scheme was a component.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : I am coming to your help. Please do not spoil a good case by bad argument.

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : We know how to plead our own case.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : I am telling for your own benefit. Andhra Pradesh, I know, my heart goes to the people who are suffering for want of water. It is a drought-prone area, Rayalaseema, I know that.

For the survival of man, for the sustenance of life, drinking water is a must. I beseech every Member of this hon. House to help in finding a solution so that Madras gets water first; in the process, the problems of Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Maharashtra are also going to be solved. I am not pessimistic about this. I myself went to Hyderabad—I think, the hon. Members from Andhra Pradesh will agree with me—and I myself went to the Chief Minister's house in the honest hope of finding a solution by having discussion with him on the various issues. I had discussion with the Irrigation Minister also, along with the officers, very recently. We have had discussion with Maharashtra. I am going to talk to Karnataka Government also; I have told the Karnataka Chief Minister that I am going to talk to him about their problems. I am doing all this only to find out a to find out a solution so that every one in consensus; I am making an honest approach to find out an unanimity, this country stands benefited. Whether grain flows from one State to another; we do want all that; nobody can deny. But, this we can do if we all put our heads together, if we come face to face and honestly try to find a solution. We should understand the problems; without knowing the problems, solutions cannot be found. That is the reason why I made an appeal last time also in this House. Let all the Chief Ministers come together and help me. After all, we are Indians first. I do not think that any Chief Minister is interested only in his own State at the cost of the other States. I do not think that Shri N.T. Rama Rao or Shri M.G. Ramachandran or Shri Hegde is interested in their

own State only. They are all leaders of their own Parties and I do not think that they will think only about their own State and nothing else. I believe in their magnanimity, I believe in their large-heartedness, I believe in their broad vision, I believe that their interest is not limited only to the boundaries of their respective States. The poor people are beyond the boundaries of their respective States. The drought-prone areas are beyond the boundaries of their respective States. Water is needed for farmers not only in these three States but in the other States also. May I say that the difficulties are not insurmountable, the difficulties are surmountable. We can find solutions. But let us come with a clear heart. Let us not depend on the various Agreements. I do not want to go into the merits of the Agreements because, may I tell the House, these Agreements are not going to help, strictly speaking, in the legal sense of the term, any side. Being a lawyer myself, I know what legal aspects are involved. But that is not the case now. I do not want to find out the faults or mistakes in any Agreement. Here I am, with the help of this House, with the help of the hon. Members, trying to find out solution to the problems. Let the Chief Ministers come together and help the Government of India to find a solution. The Government of India is here, the Prime Minister is here, I am here; let us find an early solution to all these problems.

SHRI V.S. KRISHNA IYER (Bangalore South) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have just listened to the arguments of the very able lawyer, Shri Ayyappu Reddy...

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You have only to put a question to the Minister. The Minister has replied to the hon. Member. If you want to seek any clarification, you may just ask a question.

SHRI V. S. KRISHNA IYER : Shri Reddy referred to the inaugural function of the water scheme for Madras city. That was meant only to provide water to Madras city and nothing else. Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra and Karnataka Governments readily agreed on humanitarian ground that 5 TMC of water should

[Shri V. S. Krishna Iyer]

be given by each State. There is no dispute about that. That function also was meant only for that.

If it was for irrigation purpose, the function would have been held somewhere in Andhra Pradesh. I am sure about it. I remember the invitation; I forget to bring it because I thought that it was not proper to put it on the table of the House.

Mr. Ayyapu Reddy also referred to the message given by the then Irrigation Minister. It can never be a Government order. It is not a clearance by the Centre. Mr. Reddy said one thing which I agree, i.e., that the concerned states must abide by the award of the tribunal. That is what the Karnataka Government is also asking. We want all the concerned states to abide by the award of the tribunal and nothing beyond that. That is our demand. If they accept that, I need not even speak here.

What does the tribunal award say? The Bachawat Tribunal gave an award. According to the tribunal—I have been forced to give the figures because Mr. Reddy did not give figures—depending upon the percentage, the tribunal determined that the available quota of water would be 2060 TMC and the allotted quantum among the three basin states are as follows :

Maharashtra—560 TMC, Karnataka—700 TMC Andhra Pradesh—800 TMC. It is a fact. The Andhra Pradesh Government has been given liberty to use the remaining water that may be flowing in the river Krishna over and above 2060 TMC. But it shall have no right...

(Interruption)

Mr. Reddy had already read it. That is one portion of the Tribunal's award. Mr. Reddy did not refer to the other portion i.e. Scheme 'B'. It further indicated that when the Krishna Valley Authority is constituted, either by agreement among the three states or by law to be made by the Parliament, it shares the surplus water if it is upto 2060. Between 2060 TMC, upto

2130 TMC it is going to be allocated as follows :

Maharashtra—35%, Karnataka—50%, Andhra Pradesh—15%. If it is above 2130 TMC,

Maharashtra—25%, Karnataka—50%, Andhra Pradesh—25%.

This is the award. What we are asking is that it is the duty of the Central Government to implement it. I also accuse the Central Government that why they have delayed it so long. They should have implemented this also already. Mr. Reddy also asked for it. We are also asking for it. All the three basin states are asking for it. All the three basin states are asking for it. Whenever there is a tribunal appointed with the consent of the States or even according to the 1950 Act on Water Dispute, it is the bounden duty of all Maharashtra, Karnataka and Andhra Pradesh to abide by the award.

Karnataka is very generous. It is a very-very generous State. We are very kind. Karnataka has absolutely no objection. We never wanted water to be wasted. Every drop of water should be harnessed and used in the interest of the country. We always look at the national interest.

AN. HON. MEMBER : As though other states are not,

SHRI V.S. KRISHNA IYER : Why I mentioned it is because Mr. Reddy, in his speech said the Karnataka is unnecessarily objecting. That is not correct.

Now, I will come to the facts. In respect of 700 TMC to which we are legally entitled we have got the projects. The Upper Krishna project alone requires 400 TMC. The Upper Bhadra and Upper Tunga projects require the remaining allocated water. The Upper Krishna project will irrigate 300 million areas and it may not be an exaggeration to say that 60 per cent of the basin area is in Karnataka and 40 per cent is in Andhra.

(Interruption)

Sir, thought Karnataka is generous yet we cannot afford to lose even a drop of water because we are committed to that. Let me assure the hon. Members that in Karnataka we do not want even a drop more than what has been allocated.

SHRI B. AYYAPU REDDY : We will not take even half a drop of water more than what has been allocated.

(Interruptions)

SHRI V.S. KRISHNA IYER : Now, I come to the apprehensions of Karnataka. The salient feature of 1976 and 1977 agreements is that 5 TMC water be given to Madras for drinking water purposes by each State. Further, it has been specifically stated that water that is coming to Andhra Pradesh shall not be used for irrigation. It is there in the award. Andhra has got 800 TMC water. They have already committed works for 740 TMC and also 33 TMC for Sri Salem project and 18 TMC for Julara Project. So, their allocated quota is over. Now, Andhra Pradesh is saying that they are going to use only the surplus water. But there is no extra water. Where is the water? They are digging such a big canal that it can take 300 TMC water but the point is where is the water? If water is there why should we object? They are our brethren. If there is surplus water Karnataka will never object. Now, I would like to ask the hon. Minister whether the proposed Telugu Ganga project is in accordance with the Bachawat award? Is it in accordance with the 1976 and 1977 agreement arrived at among the three basin States? If it is not in consonance with the award or the agreement, why should the hon. Minister ask the Andhra Pradesh Government to send all the details in in this regard? You have asked them so many clarifications. What is the necessity for that when there is no surplus water? Why do you give them trouble when there is no surplus water at all? The question of clearance does not arise at all because there is no surplus water. Sir, they are spending a thousand crores of rupees for this project. When there is no water, what is the necessity of spending this huge amount?

Sir, so far as water to Madras city is concerned, it is a commitment. Under no circumstances we are going back from on word. So, Sir, this matter could be sorted out among the Chief Ministers. I would once again urge upon the Minister that under no circumstances clearance should be given and there is no valid reason for giving clearance for this scheme.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I may inform the hon. Members that we have already taken one hour and ten minutes for the discussion of this subject. I would therefore request the hon. Members to put only questions. Now, Mr. Janga Reddy to put questions.

[Translation]

SHRI C. JANGA REDDY (Hanamkonda) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I want to ask four questions from the Government. Why did you not invite the Chief Ministers to sort out the dispute going on between the State Governments for the last six months? What was the objection in inviting the three Chief Ministers? You invite them for lunch someday and settle the dispute sitting together. All the three Chief Ministers are fighting for their rights. The Government of India should as a mother, invite her sons; but the sons do not sit together. It is the duty of Government to invite them. We are prepared to join the talks. At this point, I recall a story of 1983.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I do not want any story.

[Translation]

SHRI C. JANGA REDDY : I cannot help but narrate that story. A person got his daughter married to a money lender. Two children were born to the couple and in the third year he lodged a complaint that his daughter was abducted and forcibly married.

(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : If you have any question, you can put. You put your questions and they will go on record. Other things will not go on record.

[Translation]

SHRI C. JANGA REDDY : Why did this matter remain pending with the Central Government in spite of the fact that Shri Ramkrishna Hegde, Shri N. T. Rama Rao, Shri M. G. Ramachandran and Shrimati Indira Gandhi were associated with it? Why Delhi is hesitant in solving this issue? Why do they not give clearance to it. I want to ask another question who will give forest clearance, who will give clearance on environment—is it not the Centre which gives clearance on these? But the Central Government want to make the non-congress State Governments to fight among themselves like cats and to watch the show like a monkey. This is your policy ... (Interruptions)... I want to say that neither you use yourself nor you let others use it. You do not drink yourself and you do not let others drink. Is it possible?

(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER ; Nothing will go on record.

(Interruptions)**

[Translation]

SHRI C. JANGA REDDY : You are doing injustice to me. Not only to me, you are doing injustice to six crores people of Andhra Pradesh. I know there is famine in Bidar and Gulbarga. This problem has arisen due to the division of the States on the basis of language. I want to know from the Central Government ... (Interruptions)...

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please conclude now. If you persist in speaking, I will have to order that nothing goes on record.

[Translation]

SHRI C. JANGA REDDY : We are trying to supply drinking water to Madras. This injustice is not being done to me alone, it is an injustice to the entire people of the State and at the same time, it is also a big injustice to the people of Tamilnadu... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please put your question. You are not speaking on Telugu Ganga Project, but something else. Please conclude now.

[Translation]

SHRI C. JANGA REDDY : You know, the pipe is being laid through the fields for supplying water to Madras and the farmer also requires water for irrigation. The farmer would not sit quiet if he sees water flowing down in the pipe and when he is in dire need of water for drinking and for irrigation, he will use the water by breaking the pipe. As such, making water available to Madras would become impossible. Therefore, our Government has evolved a scheme to supply drinking water and water for irrigation through open Channel to Madras. Therefore, my suggestion is that the Central Government should invite the Chief Ministers to a lunch, make them sit together and decide the matter. To give forest clearance is the responsibility of the Central Government. Where is the need to consult the States in this regard? The hon. Minister should reply to my questions.

[English]

SHRI V. SOBHANADRAEESWARA RAO (Vijaywada) : Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, our colleague; Shri Ayyapu Reddy has in detail narrated the circumstances in which this project made a beginning, and the several aspects of the Bachawat Award which is binding on the three States and also puts a special responsibility on the Government of India to implement the award in letter and spirit. Unfortunately, the hon. Minister did not say a single word in his reply to the specific points that have been raised and the extracts from the

award that have been quoted by Shri Ayyapu Reddy. Instead, he was simply avoiding the issue.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister how many times, the Central Government would be sending new points of information to be clarified by the State Government. Unfortunately, the Government of India are resorting to this tactic of putting forth some or the other points to be clarified. Why don't they ask for all the clarifications at one time? After the State Government sends the clarifications, the Central Government will send them new points for clarification. This way, this matter is being dragged on. I want to put a straight question to the hon. Minister. Since the Government of Karnataka has raised the objection-of course again it will be a repetition only-when they have clearly objected to that matter, the Bachawat Tribunal has clearly stated in the clarification number 7, which my colleague has already quoted that what our colleague from Karnataka said is not correct because this part is not there. I am not disputing this. I want to seek a straight answer from the hon. Minister on this question. We request the hon. Minister because Karnataka is in the upper reach. Only after they utilised their share of water, the remaining water will come to Andhra Pradesh and if there is no adequate quantity of water it will be put to loss. In fact my colleague was telling, practically there is no drop of water-excess water which is remaining that is left in the Krishna with which one can construct the project. So why do you object when you are sure that there is no water? But we will be investing our money in the fond hope that we will be able to provide drinking water and water for irrigation to the permanently drought prone area of all the districts of Rayalseema. We want the hon. Minister to clarify this point. And I want to get one straight answer from him. Suppose, you are telling that let the Chief Ministers of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka sit together and why not they settle the issue and suggest some solution to me. You only putting the two Chief Ministers together.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He is taking the effort.

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO : He wants to create trouble between the people of these two States. He does not want to fulfil his responsibility. When the two States do not agree, is it not your responsibility to implement Bachawat Tribunal Award. That is my straight question. Let the hon. Minister answer.

SHRI B.N. REDDY : I belong to Andhra, at least one...

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : No. Who is B.N. Reddy?

SHRI B.N. REDDY (Miryalguda) : Sir I am here, I am standing, you are listening to me. It was inaugurated by the Prime Minister. After year, spending almost 80 crores in two years on this project, my thiy trouble is uncalled for, unwanted and unhealthy. So this must be removed and after all Andhra people are entitled to utilise the water-the surplus water and the water which is going into the sea. The trouble must not be created, and people should not sit as judges at the same time. That is what I wanted to tell.

SHRI H.N. NANJE GOWDA (Hassan) : Shri Ayyapu Reddy has raised three-four very relevant points. I am happy, that is development capacity, clearance for the project and then surplus water distribution by 2000 A.D. These are some of the points which are raised by Shri Ayyapu Reddy. He has also quoted 1976 and 1977 agreements.

Sir, about the development of capacity for irrigation, I straightaway tell Shri Ayyapu Reddy, it was their duty to create capacity for us. The whole House may be surprised why I am talking like this. Sir, what is Karnataka today? Today's Karnataka consists of 19 districts. But earlier there were only 9 districts. The rest of the 10 districts were added to Karnataka at the time of States Reorganisation on linguistic basis. Earlier to 1956 where were there districts? They were with erstwhile Hyderabad, erstwhile Madras and erstwhile Bombay

[Shri H. N. Nanje Gowda]

state. They were all with their friends for centuries. They only came to us recently after the reorganisation of states in 1956.

The story of the Kannadigas living in these integrated areas is a pathetic one. They did pay their taxes to the erstwhile Governments. By their money, you constructed and developed your language-speaking areas alone. You never located any project in the Kannada speaking areas. Neither the erstwhile Hyderabad Government, nor the erstwhile Bombay Government, nor the erstwhile Madras Government located any project in the Kannada speaking areas. Ten districts were added on to us, to become part of Karnataka. Was it an offence that they were speaking Kannada. You never located projects in their areas. What was the irrigation in Krishna basin in 1956 in the Kannada speaking areas and how much water put in use. Twenty TMC only. whose fault was that, capacity was not created. You exploited the Kannadigas; you never created the capacity for them there. You left them to suffer in the famine-stricken areas, and you developed yourself, because you were near the seat of power and never allowed them to come nearer to the seat of power.

This is the pathetic story. The house may otherwise think: why do these Karnataka people neither use water, nor allow others to use it? The question is not so simple. These are the historic reasons why irrigation potential could not be created in these Kannada speaking areas which are in the Krishna basin. They were all with those people only—all these people. (Interruptions)

I say this just to enlighten them. What happened in 1951 for the First five Year Plan while they wanted to allocate water? They took the allocation of projects as the basis and accordingly, they cleared the projects. These projects were allotted in these areas only. In fact, when the Krishna-Pennar project was to be cleared, inside the erstwhile Madras State the Tamil speaking popula-

tion and the Telugu speaking population began a quarrel. Then the Telugu speaking people said: Krishna water should be used only in the Krishna basin, not outside the basin. They never wanted Krishna water to be taken outside the basin, for the Tamil speaking people. When Potti Sriramulu sat for the satyagraha, this was also one of the points. Now they have become Andhraites, and they are not bothered. They can take the Krishna water outside the basin, because it helps only them. It would mean outside the basin, if it was to help the Tamils. Now it is not like that. It is going to help Andhra people only. Therefore, they can get water outside the basin. This is the theory they are propounding

(Interruptions)

About clearance, I want to tell Government of India: we are thoroughly convinced now that since the inception of independence, for some reasons or the other the Kannada speaking people were given a stepmotherly treatment in the matter of irrigation. I will tell you why.

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. JANGA REDDY: By which Government?

SHRI H.N. NANJE GOWDA: Which ever Government might have been there. Dr. K. L. Rao was a Minister. He was also a Congressman. But we know that he helped the Andhra people, and the Andhras must ever be grateful to him. I am happy; let him help them. I do not mind his having helped them. But we must remember that he was also a Congressman but andhraite.

SHRI C. JANGA REDDY: Sir, it was not sponsored by the Central Government. The allocation made to the State under the State Plan was utilized by the State Government.

SHRI H. N. NANJE GOWDA: We are expressing our apprehensions. On 23rd March 1963, what was stated by the then Minister of Irrigation on the floor of this House? He promised this House, and made a declaration. What was that declaration? It was that the Nagarjuna Sagar project's

second stage would be cleared only after the Godavari diversion to Krishna was made. That was the assurance given in this House by the then Minister, i.e. the late Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim. What happen later ?

Later on, Dr. Rao came. He forgot this assurance. He cleared the second stage also. When the Bachawat tribunal was appointed in 1969, it was all *fait accompli*.

Sir, Now I would ask to ask the Minister. Since how many years Upper Krishna Second Stage Project is pending before the Government of India ? Ten years. Since how many years ago Mr. Ayyapu Reddy you have sent your project? Two years ago, I request Shri Ayyapu Reddy to plead on our behalf with the Irrigation Minister to clear our project which is pending since long-10 years For how many years the Upper Bharat Project is pending ? Why have you not cleared it? They have not cleared Upper Krishna Second Stage. Why? Because it is covered under Scheme A of the Bachawat Award. If Mr. Ayyapu Reddy had gone through that, he would understood that. Why should they not clear the Telugu Ganga Project ? Because It is not covered by scheme A or scheme B of the Bachawat Tribunal's Award. Then how can the Government of India, whether he is seeking a clarification or doing this or that, can clear it ? If they clear that project, I ask the Minister if he wants to clear this Telugu Ganga Project which is not covered by scheme A of the Bachawat Tribunal award ? It is the bounden duty, moral duty, responsibility of the Government of India to clear all the Karnataka Projects pending with the Government of India. Do you know what they have done? What is the area irrigated? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : Have we ever objected to the clearance of your projects ?

SHRI H. N. NANJE GOWDA : What is the area irrigated by Upper Krishna Second Stage ? 10 lakh acres where ? In Gulbarga and Raichur districts who will

be benefited, Not we but their brothers. Those who lived with them for centuries. I request my Andhra friends to get this project cleared and help their brothers. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI E. AYYAPU REDDY : Have the Government of Andhra Pradesh objected at any time to the clearance of your Projects ? *(Interruptions)*

SHRI H. N. NANJE GOWDA : I am happy that Mr. Ayyapu Reddy mentioned 1977 October/agreement. Does it not states as follows : I would like to ask the Minister, Sir.

“Tamilnadu shall be permitted to draw not more than 15 TMCft in a year. The period of drawal shall be from 1st July to 31st October of the year. The Channel from Srisailam to Somasila Dam on Panner shall have a discharge of only 1500 cusecs capacity.”

What is now the channel capacity ? It is 11,150 cusecs. We are not opposed to giving Tamilnadu drinking water. It is inhuman. But let them not project to the whole world that Karnataka is opposing giving drinking water, it is not like that. Under the guise of drinking water, they should not trap others. Then it further says as follows :

“This lined channel shall not be utilised for irrigation and other consumptive uses. The Government of India will arrange to inspect and ensure that withdrawals from Srisailam shall not exceed 15 TMCft in a year.”

If they are violating this agreement, if the scheme is not covered under A, which is notified by the Government of India, how on earth can anybody clear that projects ? If you want to clear this project, then clear our projects ; they are pending for ten years.

What is the percentage of the irrigation in Karnataka ? It is 20 per cent. What is in Tamilnadu ? It is 44 to 46 per cent. What is in Andhra Pradesh ? It is

[Shri H. N. Nanje Gowda]

42 per cent. You want that the Government of India should encourage regional imbalances in this country. (Interruptions)

SHRI V. SOBHANADRIBESWARA RAO : Do you want some States to suffer? What is this? (Interruptions)

SHRI H. N. NANJE GOWDA : Not at the cost of Karnataka. (Interruptions)

SHRI V. SOBHANADRIBESWARA RAO : Their crop areas is 90 per cent. (Interruptions)

SHRI H. N. NANJE GOWDA : What is scheme 'B' of the award and why? Because, the Tribunal has clearly understood that Karnataka was meted out with injustice all through decades. Now, because of historical reasons and lack of projects due to manipulations by the men in office at Government of India level, Kannadigas could not create capacity for irrigation. That is why the Tribunal felt the need of Karnataka and allotted 50 per cent of the water to it under scheme 'B'. I would like to know whether the Government of Andhra Pradesh would give an undertaking to the Government of India that they will never claim water for this channel after 2000 A.D. Let us know it. Let them give an undertaking to the Government of India to that effect and let Government of India examine it. Then let them call other Chief Ministers and consult them. The project is neither under scheme 'A' nor under scheme 'B'. For drinking water we are not objecting. Why are Kannadigas objecting? Why should water go waste? What is the method of using the surplus water? Can it not be utilised in the existing channels? Why to draw up a new channel for this? Are Tamil and Andhra people not getting three crops in Cauvery basin. They are using our share because we have not developed the capacity in Cauvery basin again for historic reasons. Under the guise of drinking water, they want to establish their right, which should not be allowed. I urge upon the Government of India not to allow them to use our share of water. This scheme is not covered by

scheme 'A' or Scheme 'B' and they have no authority to utilise this water. I caution you not to clear this project unless you clear Karnataka projects which are not covered under scheme 'A' but covered under scheme 'B'.

SHRI S. G. GHOLAP (THANE) : It is a fact that Telugu Desam cannot utilise this water for irrigation. The canal is meant only for drinking water to Madras. That is why, all the States have agreed to give 5 TMC of water from their share. They are investing crores of rupees on this project. Will the Government issue directions to the Telugu Desam Government not to go ahead with their investment till a final decision is taken in this respect.

[Translation]

***DR. S. JAGATHRAKSHAKAN (CHENGALPATTU)** - Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, so far as this Telugu-Ganga scheme is concerned, this is being bruited about for the past 60 years. In 1983 under the benign presence of the former Prime Minister of India, Shrimati Indira Gandhi, the long-awaited Telugu-Ganga scheme was approved by the Chief Ministers of four States-Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu. All these four Chief Ministers came to the unanimous decision of accepting this scheme and allocated Rs. 633 crores for this scheme which would provide drinking water to 50 lakhs of people in Madras. Our former Prime Minister, Shrimati Indira Gandhi was the inspiration behind this agreement. Our Chief Minister, Dr. M.G. Ramachandran allocated Rs. 100 crores for this scheme. The Planning Commission has provided in the 7th Five Year Plan Rs. 7000 crores for provision of potable water. But no special allocation has been made for solving the drinking water problem of Tamil Nadu. I want that a special allocation of Rs. 100 crores should be made for Telugu-Ganga scheme. It should be taken up as a centrally sponsored scheme so that it can be implemented expeditiously before the close of the 7th Plan. The people of Tamil Nadu, particularly of Madras are grateful to the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh for his whole-hearted cooperation

*The speech was originally delivered in Tamil.

in accepting and implementing this scheme. We are equally grateful to the Chief Minister of Karnataka who has shown keen interest in solving the drinking water problem of Madras city. We are indebted to our Prime Minister also in this matter. The work is going on speedily. The Central Government should intervene to ensure expeditious implementation of Telugu-Ganga project. I demand that all fiscal and physical measures should be initiated for completing Telugu-Ganga project before the end of 7th Plan.

[English]

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: Sir, in my reply, I deliberately did not quote the figures. I also did not enter into a controversial area raised by hon. Members for and against the Telugu-Ganga project. My main intention was, not to hide any facts from the House. But my efforts was mainly not to create any further controversy in the matter of solving the problem. If there were little more time I would have given more details. I thought, after having seen the arguments for and against, both sides try to question and reply each other by giving information and receiving information, by raising controversies. I did not think it fit to give more details.

The whole thing starts when this Project report was received in December, 1983. Immediately—because somebody said from the other side that we committed delay in bringing out the points which should receive clarifications from Andhra Pradesh—immediately after the receipt of the Project Report we did send—in 1984 itself—the Government's queries or clarifications that were needed from Government of Andhra Pradesh and as I said, the replies are still awaited.

To sum up, I do not want to go into the various things the hon. Members have said, and I see that hon. Members are very much agitated, about the injustice done to the respective States, especially Karnataka. May I sum up some of the objections we have received?

Sir, the House knows what are the objections raised by Karnataka and Maharashtra against the clearance of this

Project. Karnataka have sent objections to the clearance of this Project. They are:

- (1) That the carrying capacity of the canal is as per the project report, 11,150 cusecs as against 1,500 cusecs as per the 1977 Agreement.
- (2) That the period of drawal would be for the entire year according to the project though the agreed period is only four months, that is, from July to October.
- (3) That it is specifically stated in October 1977 Agreement—there is a convention—that it is meant only for water supply to the city of Madras.

These are the stipulations made in the Agreement of 1977. It is true that the water is to be used only for drinking purposes and for nothing else. That has been a stipulation in the agreement. I do agree. But what the hon. Member Mr. Nanje Gowda has spoken about this point:

Maharashtra has raised objections, and to sum up, they are:

- (i) That the Project Report is vague about the source of water—to be drawn and utilised.

They are challenging the very concept of the availability of water for the Telugu-Ganga Project!

- (ii) That the project is in gross violation of the decisions of Krishna Water Disputes Tribunal and interstate agreement on Madras city water supply.
- (iii) Since the State of Andhra Pradesh had given conditional ratification to the 1977 agreement, the agreement itself may stand void.

It is a very serious objection that they have raised because it is Andhra Pradesh which has ratified conditionally.

- (iv) That the agreement of 1983 between Andhra Pradesh and Tamil

Nadu is not keeping in line with the 1977 agreement.

To resolve these problems, the Prime Minister has written to Karnataka and Maharashtra Chief Ministers to try to find out and resolve the problems and he has informed the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh. As earlier stated, I myself had gone to Andhra Pradesh, met the Chief Minister of Andhra Pradesh, and Secretary level meetings were held. Various efforts are being made and I am still pursuing the efforts. The House may appreciate that on the one side both the States have said that no, this is absolutely against the Bachawat Award and should be thrown lock, stock and barrel—that is what these two States say—whereas, on the other side, Andhra Pradesh says that look, water is going waste to the sea, there are dry lands and the people are in urgent necessity of having water for agricultural purposes, for irrigation purposes. It is nobody's case that any provision of Bachawat Award is illegal. Nobody challenges any provision of the Bachawat Award. Everybody is pinpointing the Bachawat Award though, in fact, Telugu-Ganga is outside the Bachawat Award. This is a funny situation in which we are all held...

(Interruptions)

SHRI C. JANGA REDDY : The name of Telugu-Ganga might not be there in the Award but the surplus water can be given.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : Sir, I am sorry, I am unable to make the hon. Member know the situation. I cannot make myself more clear than what I have. It is true that Scheme 'B' if implemented—and it is according to the observation made by some Member that the non-implementation of Scheme 'B' is causing injustice to Karnataka—requires the appointment of a River Valley Administrative Authority and that can only be done by an Act of Parliament and nothing else, and that needs a general agreement between the concerned States. We are very much eager to solve these problems.

Reference has been made to the clearance of Upper Krishna Stage-II, Upper Bhadra and other projects of Karnataka. I can say that all these projects do deserve

sympathetic consideration because I know the suffering of the people of that side of the country and of Karnataka. As I have already said, I need not go into these controversies. Rather I am willing to go into these controversies in order to find a solution rather than create further controversy in the masses. All I need is, as I told somebody, that I should call the Chief Ministers for some dinner or lunch. May I, on behalf of the Government of India and on behalf of the House, request the Chief Ministers of three States...

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER : For dinner ?

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : No, to come together and help themselves and help this country to find out the solutions that are most needed urgently for the people who are suffering not only in Tamil Nadu but in all these three States.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We are continuing discussion on the Seventh Five Year Plan...

(Interruptions)

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO : Please protect my right. The Minister has not answered my specific question. Please come to my rescue. We have referred to the Bachawat Tribunal Award, What is the reply of the Minister ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Everybody is agreeing. There is no dispute on it at all.

SHRI V. SOBHANADREESWARA RAO : I want to seek a clarification. Even during the 1977 Agreement, the Government of Andhra Pradesh signed it saying that they do not affect in any way the rights of the State of Andhra Pradesh to utilise the waters of Krishna River for the purpose of irrigation and other uses in any area and in any manner. The Minister has not answered to that.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND : In my reply in this very House last time I gave reply to that question. Please see that.