

[Shri Morarji Desai]

even if a demonstration is led by my hon. friend. He must understand that. I now see that he is on a war path. That does not matter. I don't want to meet him on that path. This is not the way to do it.

In this particular incident, I do not suspect anybody's hand. I do not want to make any allegations about which I am not convinced. If I am not convinced, I will not believe in it. But I do not want to rush to any conclusions about it.

But, these people did turn violent and therefore they had to be dealt with in this manner. Otherwise they would have done far greater damage; they would have burnt even some houses.

How could this be allowed by this Government, or by any sensible or civilised Government? What is the meaning of meeting barbarism with barbarism? If a wolf is on the rampage, it has to be shot down. It cannot be pampered.

If people attack this country from outside with force, they have to be met with force not by non-violence. It cannot be done by non-violence. There is a difference between these two things. That must be understood.

In this matter, we have declared that nobody is going to object to peaceful demonstrations and they were allowed there. But when they turned violent, and violent in no uncertain terms, and they injured policemen, with grievous hurt to two of them, how can this be allowed? And, even then, no firing was resorted to. They managed with a lathi charge and they were driven away and several people are being prosecuted. That also will bring facts to light in the Court.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH:
Do you think that it is a dress rehearsal by Chaudhuri Charan Singh?

SHRI MORARJI DESAI: No. I don't think so. I don't believe that. Some people had started a rumour, they told me that Charan Singh ji at that time had passed by in his car. I immediately rejected it at that time. I don't believe that he can do that. Until I get proof of anything I am never going to believe that about him or about anybody. I will say this about my friend Shri Raj Narain also, that if he says something like that, then, one begins to suspect. Therefore, one has to be very careful about it even when one speaks. Merely loud speeches and great courage do not do in these matters. They have got to have some discrimination at the same time. That is why it is no use creating such scenes in this House. That is all that I can say.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Calling Attention is over. Now, Mr. Barnala.

12.40 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. NARMADA WATERS

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION (SHRI SURJIT SINGH BARNALA): The Narmada Water Disputes Tribunal has today forwarded to the Central Government a report setting out the facts as found by it and giving its decision on the matters referred to it.

It may be recalled that as the disputes amongst the States of Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra and Rajasthan regarding the Narmada waters could not be settled by negotiations, the Government of India constituted the Narmada Water Disputes Tribunal on 6th October, 1969 for adjudication under the Inter-State Water Disputes Act, 1956.

Shri Justice V. Ramaswami, the then Judge of the Supreme Court was appointed as Chairman, along with two serving Judges of Kerala and Allahabad High Courts as the other

two members. The Tribunal has thereafter in February, 1972 given its decision on certain preliminary issues of law. Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan, however, filed appeals in the Supreme Court against this decision and obtained a stay order; the Supreme Court had, however, permitted the Tribunal to proceed with the inspection and discovery of documents. Later, in July, 1972 the Chief Ministers of the four States held discussions with the Union Minister of Irrigation and Power when it was agreed that the settlement of the dispute be carried out by mutual agreement with the assistance of the then Prime Minister. They agreed that 28 million acre ft. of water is available in the Narmada for three-fourths of the years. Of this, the requirements of Maharashtra and Rajasthan for use in their territories were agreed to be 0.25 and 0.5 million acre ft. respectively. The then Prime Minister was requested to allocate the balance quantity of waters between Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat and fix a suitable height for the Navagam Dam. It was further agreed that the Chief Ministers of the four States would finalise the arrangement for power generation and its apportionment.

Since these issues could not be decided according to that agreement, the Chief Ministers of Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Rajasthan and the Adviser to the Governor of Gujarat met again in July, 1974 and agreed that the Tribunal should decide the height of the Navagam Dam as well as the level of the Canal and the other issues such as sharing of power benefits, etc. They also agreed that Rajasthan and Madhya Pradesh should withdraw the proceedings before the Supreme Court. The Tribunal thereupon resumed its work and has since investigated the matter referred to it.

The more important features of the Award of the Narmada Water Disputes Tribunal are as follows:—

- (1) The annual utilisable quantum of Narmada waters which can be depended up in 75 years

out of 100 is assessed to be 28 million acre ft. (MAF).

- (2) Out of the utilisable quantum of 28 MAF or 75 per cent dependability, Madhya Pradesh is allotted 18.25 MAF, Gujarat 9 MAF, Rajasthan 0.5 MAF and Maharashtra 0.25 MAF. The party States would get the same proportionate share in years of excess or scarcity.
- (3) The Full Supply Level of Navagam Canal offtaking from Sardar Sarovar is fixed at +300' at its head. With the prescribed slopes, the canal would reach Rajasthan border at a level of about 131'.
- (4) The full reservoir level at Sardar Sarovar dam in Gujarat at Navagam is fixed at +455' and the maximum water level at +460'.
- (5) Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra are allotted 57 per cent and 27 per cent respectively of the electric power, produced at Sardar Sarovar. The balance of 16 per cent is allotted to Gujarat. Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra are also directed to share the proportionate cost of the power portion of Sardar Sarovar complex.
- (6) Specific directions are given to Madhya Pradesh for releases in a regulated manner of due share of water for Gujarat and Rajasthan. For these regulated releases, Sardar Sarovar Project is required to credit to Narmada Sagar Project 17.63 per cent of the actual cost of Narmadasagar Dam Unit I. Detailed guidelines for framing rules of regulation and water accounting are set down to ensure that party States get their due shares.
- (7) Detailed directions are given for acquisition of land by

[Shri Surjit Singh Barnala]

Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra for Sardar Sarovar and for rehabilitation of outleets by Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh and Maharashtra.

A two-tier machinery is directed to be set up to ensure the implementation of the decisions of the Tribunal. The machinery comprises:

- (a) The Narmada Control Authority consisting of three full time Engineer Members appointed by the Centre and four part-time Engineer Members appointed one each by the party States.
- (b) A high powered Review Committee consisting of the Chief Ministers of Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Maharashtra and Rajasthan with the Union Minister of Irrigation as Chairman. The Review Committee will review any decision of the Narmada Control Authority referred to it and its decision shall be final and binding.
- (9) The Award is subject to review at any time after a period of 45 years from the date of the Award.

The Report of the Tribunal is being forwarded by the Government of India to the concerned State Governments.

The Inter-State Water Disputes Act provides that if the Central Government or any State Government is of the opinion that anything contained in the Tribunal's decision requires explanation, or that guidance is needed upon any point not originally referred to the Tribunal, the matter may be again referred to the Tribunal, within a period of three months from the decision, for further consideration. The Tribunal may forward a further

report giving such explanation or guidance as it deems fit and in such a case, the decision of the Tribunal shall be deemed to be modified accordingly.

The Act further provides that the Central Government shall publish the decision of the Tribunal in the official gazette and the decision shall be final and binding on the parties to the dispute and shall be given effect to by them.

Now that the Tribunal has given its report and decision, the way is clear for the speedy implementation of the various projects on this river which would provide irrigation in an area of about 5 million hectares which is nearly 10 per cent of the area at present under irrigation in the country. The Narmada is the largest west flowing river and is the fifth largest river in the country. It is estimated that the irrigated area will produce on full development nearly 5 to 6 million tonnes additional foodgrains besides increase in production of cotton, sugarcane, vegetables, fruits etc. and provide gainful employment opportunities due to intensive farming system. The value of the gross additional production on full development of irrigation in the Narmada command area is estimated to be of the order of about Rs. 800 crores per annum at the current price level. In addition, there will be generation of hydro-electric power of about 450 MW at 100 per cent load factor in the final stage and a lot more during the interim period. That would bring a great deal of prosperity to the people of the region and the country as a whole. . . . (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There cannot be a discussion on this. . . . (Interruptions) **

Nothing will go on record if all of you stand up. . . . This is not the way. I know that several hon. Members are agitated and they want to say some-

thing on this... (Interruptions). Nothing will go on record. Why are you unnecessary prolonging? There is no use talking like that. Nothing is going on record. Why do you waste the time of the House. If you are really agitated, give notice and we could have a short-duration discussion or something like that on this.

13.48 hrs.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Tea Board

बाण्ड्य तथा नागरिक पति और सहकारिता मन्त्रालय में राज्य मंत्री (श्री वृंज कुमार गोयल) :
उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ :

“कि चाय नियम, 1954 के नियम 4 (1) (ब) के साथ पठित, चाय अधिनियम, 1953 की धारा 4 की उपधारा (3) (ब) के अनुसरण में इस सभा के सदस्य, ऐसी रीति से जैसा कि अध्यक्ष निर्देश दें, उक्त अधिनियम के अन्य उपबन्धों तथा उस के अन्तर्गत बनाये गये नियमों के अध्येक्षीन चाय बोर्ड के सदस्यों के रूप में कार्य करने के लिए अपने में से दो सदस्य निर्वाचित करें ।”

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

“That in pursuance of sub-section (3)(f) of Section 4 of the Tea Act, 1953, read with rule 4(1) (b) of the Tea Rules, 1954, the members of this House do proceed to elect, in such manner as the Speaker may direct, two members from among themselves to serve as Members of the Tea Board, subject to the other provisions of the said Act and the Rules, made thereunder.”

The motion was adopted.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR (Gandhinagar): I am not making a statement. I am accepting your suggestion. I am not making a speech at

all. My point of order is that you have suggested, very rightly, that the matter can be discussed at some length by giving notice. My point of order is on a different thing. In view of the fact that such an important statement has come *suo motu* from the Government, you have rightly denied us even rising for a clarification. Would it then be within our rights, apart from raising it through a discussion, to raise certain matters by getting the consent of the Speaker? You know, Sir the session is going to be there only for some days more.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We are sitting till the 30th.

PROF. P. G. MAVALANKAR: Can we bring it under rule 377 or in any other manner? But Government may not find time. They may say there is no time for a discussion. Sir, you kindly direct Government that they should find time to discuss the matter here.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Mavalankar, please give notice. You are an ingenious Member. You can raise it in some form or the other.

SHRI HITENDRA DESAI (Godhra): People of Gujarat will not be satisfied with this award.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Don't go into the merits of it, and discuss this now. Now item under rule 377. Shri Raghavji. (Interruptions)** Nothing will go on record. What is the purpose of your getting up like this? (Interruptions)**

श्री राघव जी (विदिशा) मैं नियम 377 की चर्चा...

श्री प्रकम चन्द कछवाय (उज्जैन) : प्राप पक्षपात क्यों कर रहे हैं।... (व्यवधान)

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : पक्षपात की बात प्राप करेंगे तो कोई स्पीकर ऐसा नहीं मिलेगा, जो प्राप की इन बात को मानेगा । मैं जानता हूँ कि मैं कोई पक्षपात नहीं कर रहा हूँ ।