

(ख) यदि हां, तो उसका ब्यौरा क्या है; और

(ग) इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार की क्या प्रतिक्रिया है ?

रेलवे मन्त्री (श्री जे. ए. पुनाचा) :

(क) सरकार को इस एसोसियेशन से हाल में कोई ज्ञापन नहीं मिला है ।

(ख) और (ग). सवाल नहीं उठते ।

Train Clerks of Samastipur District

7489. SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state ;

(a) whether it is a fact that the North Eastern Railway Administration has jeopardised the seniority of more than seventy five Train Clerks of Samastipur Railway District alone by transferring two Office Clerks as Trains Clerks on administrative ground favouring them with their original seniority ;

(b) whether it is also a fact that some Trains Clerks who have served as such for the last four years, have been transferred as Office Clerks ;

(c) if so, whether there is any channel of promotion of Office Clerks to that of Trains Clerks ; and

(d) if not, the reasons therefor and under what circumstances this sort of favouritism has been shown to them ?

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI C. M. POONACHA) : (a) to (d). The matter is under consideration and a statement will be laid on the Table of the Sabha in due course.

12.00 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Reported Breakdown of Talks between Central Government and M. P. Government on Narmada Project

SHRI P. K. DEO (Kalahandi) : I call the attention of the Minister of Irrigation

and Power to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon :

"The reported breakdown of talks between the Central Government and the Madhya Pradesh Government over the Narmada Project."

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (DR. K. L. RAO) : In the meeting held on 18.12.1967 by the Union Minister of Irrigation and Power at which the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat and Maharashtra and Irrigation Minister of Rajasthan were present, Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh stated that water requirements of Madhya Pradesh had increased on account of introduction of hybrid and high yielding varieties of crops. It was felt that this might be discussed by experts in agriculture and irrigation. It was agreed that this should be done within a month and the Chief Minister should meet again on or about the 20th January, 1968.

The Madhya Pradesh officers had been requested that whatever information the State Government would like to be considered by the officers should be sent in advance of the meeting but no information or data was received. Nevertheless, four senior officers of the Central Government went to Bhopal and met the Madhya Pradesh Officers on the 18th and 19th January 1968. After some discussion the points on which further studies or information was to be collected were listed and it was agreed that this should be completed within a month thereafter. Unfortunately even after a month the State Government did not send any information. When pressed for this data, the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh wrote as follows in his letter to the Union Minister of Irrigation and Power dated March 5, 1968 :

"During the last four years, an enormous mass of information and data in respect of the developments on the Narmada has already been furnished to various Committees appointed by the Centre and no purpose would be served by adding on to this mass. There is not much new basic data to be furnished. All that is now required is to use and interpret these data in the light of the new agricultural policy and the

recently introduced agricultural techniques. This is best done by mutual discussion across the table and I suggest that your experts should visit Bhopal for the purpose as early as possible."

The Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh further suggested that the experts should pay a visit to the Narmada Basin and observe the trend of recent development. Accordingly the Central Government officers visited Madhya Pradesh on March 20 and 21 and inspected the irrigation developments in some areas selected by the State Government Officers which were served by tubewells. Thereafter discussions were held between the Central Government officials and the Madhya Pradesh officers at Bhopal but no minutes of these discussions were drawn up. Madhya Pradesh officers handed over some notes regarding crop pattern and water requirements.

A further meeting of the officers of Madhya Pradesh and the Centre was held on 10th and 11th April, 1968. During the discussions on the 11th morning, the Madhya Pradesh officers insisted that a record of what Madhya Pradesh officers stated should be made then the Central officers' view should be recorded and the Madhya Pradesh officers should then be allowed to record their rejoinder. They also insisted that the Central Government Officers should affix their signatures to these records. Before the present round of discussions started, the Secretary, P.W.D., Madhya Pradesh Government had written to the Secretary of the Union Ministry of Irrigation and Power as follows :—

"In this connection I am desired to point out that on the same subject discussions were held under the Chairmanship of Shri M. R. Chopra, Chairman CW and PC and it would be desirable to have discussions on similar pattern."

In the discussions conducted by Shri Chopra the representatives of State Governments concerned with the dispute stated their point of view. But at no stage was the Chairman of Central Water and Power Commission called upon to give his views on the various issues before the group. Also no signatures were insisted upon. After the present round of discussions was completed, the Central Government would have naturally issued a summary record of

discussions. To insist on recording proceedings in the manner suggested by the State Government officers is not correct or appropriate and is not in consonance with the practice adopted by the Centre. In spite of the repeated requests of the Central Government officers to continue the discussions, the Madhya Pradesh officers refused to proceed further and left the meeting.

The demand of the Madhya Pradesh officers that the Central Government officers should record their views and also affix their signatures to the record was most unusual and inappropriate, particularly as the Central Government is not a party to the dispute.

SHRI P. K. DEO : This reported breakdown of the talks and the strained States-Centre relationship is a matter of distress. We are sometimes inclined to feel whether this is not the time when the boundaries of the States should be realigned according to the basis of rivers rather than on the basis of language. At the moment, the feeling has been gaining ground that those States which have a stronger pull in the Centre get a lion's share in such disputes compared to other States. Taking into consideration all these factors, may I suggest that instead of arrogating to itself the power of a judge, the Central Government should appoint an impartial tribunal to go into the question so that there may be a national approach to this problem and a proper solution may be found ?

DR. K. L. RAO : The Central Government has been making every effort to support a settlement between the States themselves on this river issue. So far I am afraid it has not succeeded. If further efforts also fail, very soon Government will consider the question of taking action under the Inter-State Water Disputes Act.

SHRI CHANDRA JEET YADAV (Azamgarh) : In view of the fact that there is a deadlock in the talks over the Narmada waters, that our Minister himself addressed a press conference and the M.P. Chief Minister has issued a long statement using very harsh words, in this critical situation, may I know what the Central

[Shri Chandra Jeet Yadav]

Government proposes to do to solve this dispute between the M. P. and Gujarat Governments, because it is an important matter and ultimately the farmers of both States will suffer ?

DR. K. L. RAO : The M. P. Government officers have given some notes. They have re-modified them on the 10th. These notes are being studied. When they are finalised, an effort will be made again to call for a Chief Ministers' meeting. If this fails, naturally, as I said earlier, action will be taken under the Inter-State Water Disputes Act.

SHRI A. S. SAIGAL (Bilaspur): May I know what steps have been taken to refer this matter to a tribunal, for which the Constitution has specially provided under article 262 ?

DR. K. L. RAO : As I said, the general principle is, it is always best to settle these disputes by negotiations and by accommodation between the regions concerned. But when it fails, as it tends to do in this case, the matter has to be referred under the Inter-State Water Disputes Act.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI (Mandsaur) : Narmada is essentially a river of M. P. The entire catchment area lies within M. P. 700 out of 800 miles pass through M. P. When Vindhya Pradesh was merged with Madhya Pradesh, the idea was the deficit area of V. P. should be fed with the surplus waters of M. P. Only 100 miles pass through Gujarat. The main point is the Centre should adopt an entirely impartial attitude. It should not only do justice but should appear to do justice. Why should Dr. Rao give an image in the papers that he is partial to some States ?

SHRI C. M. KEDARIA (Mandvi) : It is a wrong statement. It is the Chief Minister who has charged the Central Minister.

SHRI AMRIT NAHATA (Barmer) : It is a baseless insinuation.

SHRI S. S. KOTHARI : If the Central Government does not take an impartial

attitude it would be setting a very dangerous precedent. Another important point is, it is surprising that the Central Government officials cannot work in unison or co-ordination with the State Government officials. Where are we heading to? Reasonable record of meetings are kept and that should be kept. Why should there be any dispute about that? Therefore, I would like to know what steps Dr. Rao is taking in this matter and whether he proposes to act in an absolutely impartial manner.

DR. K. L. RAO : Actually, in the meeting held in August, 1966 between the various Chief Ministers of the various States I suggested a solution and the Chief Ministers of Madhya Pradesh felt it was a good approach. Then they said that they would discuss it between the Chief Ministers of Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat. This went on. Unfortunately, there was a change in the Chief Ministership of Madhya Pradesh State. Then we held another meeting. This meeting also was quite cordial. The question that I was acting partially to one State came as a surprise to me I know it only from the Press reports. As I said, I do not myself know how that accusation could have been made because nowhere as I said anything except in the confidential Chief Ministers' Conference and that too by way of a compromise between the two parties. Nothing more beyond that I have done. The Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh can say anything he likes. He is a free citizen of India. Our intention, as I submitted in the very beginning, is to support every effort to bring an agreement between these two States. The centre is not interested to come in between the two. If the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh can go to Gujarat, discuss with him and come to a settlement, the Central Government will only be too glad to accept the solution agreed to between them. But when that is not possible we have to, in the larger interest of the nation, take up an attitude which is in the best interest of the nation.

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA (Mandya) : Sir, there are two sets of facts, one placed by the hon. Minister for Irrigation and Power and the other placed by the Chief

Minister and the team that came from Madhya Pradesh to represent that State. The hon. Minister when he was Chairman of the Central Water and Power Commission had made certain proposals to put up a large dam in Gujarat on the Narmada river. To that proposal the Government of Madhya Pradesh had registered its protest. Now the whole controversy is that Dr. Rao still clings to that theory of putting up a large dam in Gujarat and that is the reason why Madhya Pradesh is opposing.

Secondly, Dr. Rao unnecessarily dragged in the change of leadership in Madhya Pradesh to the picture. It is that which has created a great controversy, which has injected a new element into this inter-State water dispute. So far, in Maharashtra, Mysore and Andhra Pradesh, in all these three States, unfortunately, there are Congress governments, whereas here, in the Narmada dispute, the controversy is between a Congress Government in one State and a non-Congress Government in other Estate. Over and above that, there is Dr. Rao who represents the Central Government which is also a Congress Government.

Now, Sir, Maharashtra has served notice on the Government of Andhra Pradesh. Mysore is in the process of serving a notice on the Central Government. Now the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh has expressed in no uncertain terms that he does not have any confidence in Dr. Rao. In view of these facts, I would like to pose a question to Dr. Rao himself. Would he be any effective in bringing about a certain rapprochement between the parties as long as he continues to be the Minister in charge of Irrigation and Power ?

DR. K. L. RAO : The various statements made by the hon. Member are entirely incorrect. I never suggested a high dam when I was connected with the CWPC. I know the proposal for a high dam came after 1963 when I was Minister. If the hon. Member had cared to know the facts he could have avoided wasting the time of the House. In 1963 the agreement arrived at between Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat was for a dam of 425. There was no question of 465. The rest of the thing has been completely his imagination. Of course, the hon. Member has been dreaming a good lot of things. So the question of a high dam has not arisen and the proposals are

going on changing from time to time. The question of a high dam has come up only recently.

With regard to the question of one statement being given by the officials of the Central Government and another statement being given by the officials of the State Government, naturally I have to depend on what the officials of the Central Government say. I was not present here in Delhi on the 11th of this month, on the day the talks broke down. The Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh has said that I was here and I was directing the engineers to break up and all that. I do not know what exactly it is, whether I can call it a lie or a fad. The officers of the Central Government are experienced people. They deal with international discussions, discussions with various countries like Nepal, Pakistan and others. They are very highly experienced people. They have a large amount of patience. Naturally I must believe what they say and I have given the facts in the statement. What the Chief Minister of Madhya Pradesh has stated is entirely his own. I cannot say anything on that. If he wants to indulge in something of the kind of language that he has done; let him do that. I cannot deny him that privilege.

12.19 hrs

Re. MOTIONS FOR ADJOURNMENT AND CALLING ATTENTION NOTICES

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (बलरामपुर) :
अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपसे मिला था और मैंने आपसे इस बात की अनुमति चाही थी कि आप उत्तर प्रदेश के बारे में हमारे स्थगन प्रस्ताव पर विचार करने का अवसर दें। उत्तर प्रदेश में जो कुछ हुआ है, उस से लोकतन्त्र को आघात लगा है—(व्यवधान)...अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह ऐसा खेल है जो हम भी खेल सकते हैं... (व्यवधान)...

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. Hon. Members are only helping to create disorder. They are not helping me at all. Allow him one or two minutes. He came to me and sought my permission. It is not