

12.35 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED FAILURE OF THE GOVERNMENT TO COMPLETE FARAKKA BARRAGE AS SCHEDULED

MR. SPEAKER : We now take up the call-attention. Mr. Samar Guha.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : Before I call the attention of the Minister, I want to tell you, Sir, that I am in agreement with the members of Opposition to leave the House. But since the Farakka issue is a very vital and important one, affecting a large section of our nation, while associating myself wholly with the Opposition's decision to leave the House, I have to remain in the House to call the attention of the Minister and the House.

I call the attention of the hon. Minister of Irrigation and Power to the following matter of urgent public importance and request that he may make a statement thereon :—

"Reported failure of the Government to complete Farakka Barrage project as scheduled and assuring discharge of adequate quantum of Ganga water through the feeder canal into the river Hooghly."

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (SHRI B N KUREEL) : The main objective of the Farakka Barrage Project is to provide regulated upland discharges into the Bhagirathi-Hooghly system in order to bring about improvement in the navigability of the Hooghly for the preservation of the Port of Calcutta. For this a barrage across Ganga and a Feeder Canal to carry the waters to Bhagirathi and other ancillary works were sanctioned in 1960. Expenditure sanction was given in 1962. The barrage work was started early in 1963. Barrage and Canal works were originally scheduled to be completed by June, 1971. The present position is that Farakka Barrage and most of the ancillary works were completed by July, 1971. The rail-cum-road bridge over it has also been completed and this has provided rail and road links to North Bengal . . .

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : We have already got a copy of the statement. Why should he read out the whole statement, Sir ?

MR. SPEAKER : The statement has already been sent to the members. It may be

taken as read. The hon. Member may ask the question.

SHRI B. N. KUREEL : I beg to lay the Statement on the Table of the House.

Statement

The main objective of the Farakka Barrage Project is to provide regulated upland discharges into the Bhagirathi-Hooghly system in order to bring about improvement in the navigability of the Hooghly for the preservation of the Port of Calcutta. For this a barrage across Ganga and a Feeder Canal to carry the waters to Bhagirathi and other ancillary works were sanctioned in 1960. Expenditure sanction was given in 1962. The barrage work was started early in 1963. Barrage and Canal works were originally scheduled to be completed by June, 1971. The present position is that Farakka Barrage and most of the ancillary works were completed by July, 1971. The rail-cum-road bridge over it has also been completed and this has provided rail and road links to North Bengal.

The Feeder Canal is one of the largest and difficult constructions in the world having a bed width greater than even the International Suez Canal in Egypt. The work on the canal was started in 1965 and has spread over a number of working seasons some of which were short owing to early rains and sustained prolonged floods. There was a great labour unrest since 1969, both in contractors' organisations as well as in departmental work, affecting the pace of work. Notwithstanding the above, more than 80% of the work of the Feeder Canal has been done and the balance is expected to be completed by December, 1973, we hope to let down the Ganga water through the canal early in 1974.

Regarding the discharge of adequate quantum of Ganga water through the Feeder Canal into river Hooghly, a statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement re. Farakka Project and Port of Calcutta

NECESSITY FOR HEADWATERS FLOW

1. The Port of Calcutta is situated on the Lower Hooghly at a distance of 126 miles from the sea. The navigation conditions of the Lower Hooghly are progressively deteriorating and many famous engineers have been thinking of how best to check this tendency. Sir Arthur Cotton suggested, a century and a half back, the construction of a barrage on Ganga at Rajmahal. Twenty years back,

[Shri B. N. Kureel]

Government of India constituted a Committee under the Chairmanship of Shri Man Singh to examine matters relating to the improvement of headwater supply of the river Hooghly. Later on the subject was further studied by a number of engineers including Dr. Hensep of Germany and is even now being vigorously pursued. Hydraulic model studies have also been employed.

2. It has been agreed that the main reason of deterioration is the absence of adequate and continuous flow in Bhagirathi due to siltation of the river at the off-take point from the Ganga. It is stated that Ganga was originally flowing till four centuries back along Bhagirathi-Hooghly and due to being silted up at the mouth of Bhagirathi, Ganga is now flowing through Padma, which used to be a minor branch of the Ganga. The flow in Bhagirathi is, therefore, confined to a small discharge and this too for a maximum of 60 days in a year at the time of highest floods in Ganga.

3. The necessity for a barrage across Ganga to ensure augmentation of headwaters has been thus accepted and even during the Partition of India, this fact played a large part in fixing the boundaries between India and the then Pakistan in this region.

4. The only question that remained was with regard to the quantum of water that should be let down and its duration. Shri Man Singh's Expert Committee Report on the river Hooghly and the improvement of its headwater supply submitted in October 1952, fixed the discharge of the feeder canal from Ganga at 20,000 cusecs (page 56 of the Report). They observed further :—

"Different opinions have been expressed regarding the quantity of water which should be introduced into the Hooghly. That there is an optimum quantity cannot be gainsaid. Larger quantities will tend to erode the banks, bring down a heavy charge of silt which would tend to create difficulties in the tidal reaches, while too little would not reinforce the ebb current in the tidal reaches to the extent which would enable it to carry back the silt brought up by the tidal inflow. Smallness of the scale of the models made it difficult for the Research Station at Khadakvaala to determine the minimum dry weather discharge required to maintain the river in regime."

5. Further studies were carried out and finally the Ganga Barrage Project Report was prepared in 1959. The cost was estimated at Rs. 56.40 crores. When the Project came up for approval, Planning Commission observed as under :—

"The Planning Commission had accepted the Project as being necessary for the preservation of the Port of Calcutta besides its other benefits, on the basis of general consensus of technical opinion that the scheme was technically sound, even in spite of the full suspension of the withdrawals in periods during March-May."

The Ganga Barrage Project, which was sanctioned by Government of India in April 1960, took note of the various view points with regard to duration of head discharge and made provision for the operation cycle of moderated discharges at Kalna as follows :—

Period	Proposed flow at Kalna (Cusecs)
January to 15th March	— 40,000 to 20,000
15th March to 15th May	— Upto 20,000 (as available)
15th May to 20th June	— 20,000 to 40,000
20th June to 30th June	— 40,000 to 60,000
July to September	— Steady rise from 60,000 upto say, 140,000 and to 80,000 towards the end of September.
October	} — 80,000 to 40,000
November	
December	

It was also further observed that "The suggested Operational Programme, based on the available hydrological data, will have to be further examined and improved with the help of more data that will be subsequently collected and will be tested at the Central Water and Power Research Station, Poona, for the optimum effects on the bars and crossings in the Lower Hooghly."

6. Ganga Barrage was taken up for construction and the Barrage was completed by July 1971 and has been providing rail and road links to North Bengal since then. Most of the work on the Feeder Canal has been done and it is expected to be completed by December 1973 and it is programmed to let the Ganga water through Feeder Canal into Bhagirathi early in 1974. It may be noted from the Operational Programme that it was proposed to run the Feeder Canal at 40,000 cusecs practically for ten months and for two months—mid-March to mid-May—with lesser discharges, upto 20,000 cusecs.

7. In the last few years, controversy regarding the quantum of water to be let down into the Feeder Canal during the lean months of mid-March to mid-May started. There are two distinct schools of thought. One group of engineers feel that even for the two lean months, full discharge of 40,000 cusecs should be allowed to flow as otherwise the deterioration of the Port cannot be checked. Another group feel that in the two months the discharge in the Canal can be reduced without affecting the health of the Port. They argue that in view of drainage congestion, the need to flush Bhagirathi head by reversing the flow at Jangipur and possibility of excess bed sediment movement going down to Port area, the flow in the lean months should be reduced as envisaged at the time of the sanction.

The best way of settling the controversy would be to make observations on the prototype, that is, field observations.

8. Ganga carries a flow of 50,000 to 60,000 cusecs during lean months of mid-March to mid-May, the quantity varying from year to year. This water is contributed mostly by Ghagra, Gandak and Kosi, as other rivers have little discharge during the lean months. Even main Ganga and Yamuna do not contribute as irrigation projects on those rivers as at Hardwar, Narora and Tajewala and Okhla (Delhi) developed several decades ago utilize the waters of these tribu-

aries. Ghagra has two tributaries, Sarda and Karnali. Extensive irrigation has been developed on Sarda since 1927. It was found later that the Sarda system did not have sufficient water to supply water to fields. Most of the canals were running empty and many foreign and Indian engineers and economists observed that the Sarda system required reinforcement. Therefore, a scheme was sanctioned in 1968 which supplies water from the other tributary of the same river, and the project was named as Sarda 'Assist'. No new canal system is to be constructed but only a feeder canal to supply water to the various canals constructed several decades ago.

On Gandak, as a result of several representations and investigations, an irrigation project 'Gandak Project' was approved in principle in 1958 to provide irrigation in Bihar, Nepal and U. P. and is under construction.

Similarly on Kosi, an irrigation project was sanctioned in 1956 to irrigate 15 lakh of acres on Eastern Canal. This is besides Western Kosi Canal, which was under discussion with Nepal all along and undertaken only recently.

As other tributaries of Ganga do not contribute much to Ganga flow in lean months of mid-March to mid-May, development of irrigation projects on these will not have any impact on the flow in Ganga during the two months. These projects essentially supply water during *Kharif* season and during *rabi* season where stored waters are available.

Thus, it is to be noted that prior to sanction of Farakka Barrage Project, some projects were approved to supply irrigation waters during the lean months. As these projects have not yet come into full use, the flow in lean months in Ganga is not yet affected.

9. Having regard to the doubts expressed by some people, Government of India wish to reiterate that Calcutta Port will not be allowed to deteriorate and all the modern techniques of adequate supply of headwater discharge, and optimum dredging of tidal prism, where necessary, river training measures etc., will be fully utilised to ensure the health of the great Port of Calcutta.

10. A start on the extensive collection of prototype data has to be made from the commencement of next year (1973) and this will

[Shri B. N. Kureel]

continue for a further period of ten years. These pertain to the river Bhagirathi, tidal reach above Calcutta, and reach from Calcutta to Mayapur and the river beyond. These observations will include, taking cross sections at frequent intervals, discharge measurements, hydrographic survey of the river throughout the year, analysis of bed load samples, collection of tidal data, velocity and silt charge observations, salinity observations, daily depths on bars and crossings, shifting of navigation tracks, dredging data and investigations with sand trap across the river near Calcutta for the assessment of sediment transport. These will be organised by a study team under the auspices of the Ministry of Shipping and Transport, who will co-ordinate the works of various agencies like the Calcutta Port Commissioners, Central Water and Power Research Station at Khadakvasla, etc. State of West Bengal will also participate in this.

11. Results of model tests in Central Water and Power Research Station at Poona show that the discharges given in the original report of 1959 are found to be satisfactory but the model tests by the Calcutta Port Commissioners indicated the requirements of higher discharges at 40,000 cusecs during lean months. Due to difficulties of simulation, model tests, specially for large rivers, have serious limitations in giving any precise quantitative answers to problems and can, at best, be indicative. It is difficult to quantify precisely at this stage as to what is the discharge required to meet the needs of Calcutta Port. The exact requirements of water are best determined by observations on the prototype itself. It is, therefore, decided to adopt the following procedure for operation of the Farakka Project :

(a) For five years after water is let down into the Feeder Canal, the Feeder Canal will carry the full discharge of 40,000 cusecs throughout the year including lean months.

(b) The necessary discharge for efficient functioning of Calcutta Port by continuing the improvement as a consequence of (a) will be determined by the team mentioned in para 10 by observing the effects during the first five years and subsequent two years when the discharges will be varied.

(c) Simultaneously with the above, trench dredging will be carried out above Howrah bridge in varying degrees, so that the afore-

said Study Team can observe its effect on tidal prism and check any heavy movement of bed sediment on to the port area. The dredged material may be used for reclamation work for which schemes would be submitted by West Bengal Government later on.

(d) After the period of seven years, the entire position will be reviewed in the light of reports and observations of the aforesaid Study Team.

12. In conclusion, it may be stated that the Government of India fully recognise the importance of maintaining the navigability of the Hooghly for the preservation of the Calcutta Port as one of the topmost Indian Ports and will take all necessary steps to ensure the same.

It is to be noted that the interest of upstream irrigation projects will also be fully safeguarded.

Finally, it may be stated that legitimate interests of Bangla Desh will be kept in view and no arrangement made by us will adversely affect these interests.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : The hon. Minister for irrigation and power is reputed to be very vocal and makes longish statements—he makes a longish reply to a small question. I am extremely astonished as to what has happened to him today. He is not reading out the statement himself and is taking shelter under the younger one. I do not want him to do it.

This statement of the Minister is a narration of history. Narration of history, in a way that is also a distortion of facts, suppression of facts, evasion of facts. He has conveniently chosen certain reports of certain experts but he has conveniently excluded the reports of certain international experts and those experts who were directly connected with it and whose services were commissioned by the Government of India. I want to know why the Minister has chosen to quote extensively from Man Singh's reports, and not from Dr. Hansen's report. But there are reports of Dr. Hansen, Dr. Dronkard and also by Dr. Joglekar and also there is the report of Mr. A. C. Mitra, Chairman of the Technical Committee of Farakka. What about that? I wanted to use a strong word but I want to desist from doing that.

In a way he has given an impression in

this House as if there are two opinions, two schools of thought about determining the quantum of the discharge of Ganga water into the proposed feeder canal for the river Hooghly. He has said that the Poona Institute had conducted experiments. Also the Hydrological Institute of the Port Commissioners of Calcutta has also conducted another set of experiments. I have no time to go into them. I do not know what is the contradiction. The Poona Institute has conducted experiments but they have not come to any conclusion. It is wrong to say that there are two schools of thought in determining the quantum of Ganga water that will be discharged into the proposed feeder canal.

The international experts whose services were commissioned for this purpose have also submitted their report. Instead of making such a long statement, it would have been better if the Minister would have come straightaway to the last page and tell us what actually he wanted to do.

One more submission I want to make. Before coming to that I want to draw your attention to one thing. An impression is being surreptitiously tried to be created as if the problem of the Calcutta port is the problem of the State of West Bengal. No, Sir, it is not a problem of the State. If you recollect, Sir, the statement of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on the floor of this House, also said that the task of the preservation of the port of Calcutta is a great national task. It is not a State matter. But if you still say so, I would not call it 'anti-national', but I will call it an a-national or non-national poser. The Calcutta port is almost facing the death pangs and it is a national issue. Why is it a national issue? Calcutta port was the first port among the major ports of India when India became free. Now, in handling traffic, the position of Calcutta port is relegated to the fourth position. Sir, out of 365 days, ships of 26ft. draft cannot enter for more than 68 days. For the last 10 years, every year Rs. 30 crores is spent for dredging purpose, for filling up the gaps of the deficit budget of the Calcutta Port and for paying the capital invested for Farakka Barrage Project. Problem facing Calcutta Port is a national problem. It is still a national port. It still handles 45% of our exports and 31% of our imports. It earns one-third of our foreign exchange. It handles the maritime traffic of whole of Eastern India, namely of Tripura, Nagaland, Assam, Arunachal

Pradesh, Bihar, Orissa, Eastern UP, and West Bengal. It also handles the maritime traffic of Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim. Therefore, Sir, can it be called a State problem? Calcutta port is some kind of an 'Economic Grid' for sustaining the economy of the eastern region of our country.

We should look at it from a national perspective. 85 per cent of the workers in the Calcutta port are geographically speaking, coming from the other States. On both sides of the Hooghly, we find that the industries are owned by men who are geographically from the other States, not belonging to West Bengal only. Therefore, it is a national problem. It is not a State problem.

Sir, it is a seven-page statement that the hon. Minister has given. It will take some time for me to elaborate my points. I now come to the question. For five years, what will be done? 40,000 cusecs of water will be discharged to the feeder canal during all the months. Then for 2 years variable quantum of water will be given. Then, after that, there will be a prototype study regarding the nature of the vagaries sand bars and sand prism in the bed of the Hooghly. There is to be a prototype study like this. In the first instance, you say; 40,000 cusecs of water will be given. Then you say, variable quantum of water will be given for 2 years. May I know under what reasoning you have come to this conclusion? How do you come to the conclusion that it will be variable? It is stated that a prototype study of the movement of sand in the bed of the Hooghly estuary will be made on the basis of the finding of the hydraulic study. Now, how can you determine as to what will be the necessary quantum of Ganga water? How would you know what its effect would be? What is the basis on which you can determine all these things? How can you say, this 40,000 cusecs will be for five years and then variable quantum for two years? How can you make the quantity variable? What is the basis for these things? What is the data? What is the statistics?

It is stated that it will take 10 years for a prototype study of the movement of the sands of the bed and the vagaries of the Hooghly river. Without having some data or some statistics how can you come to any such conclusion?

We know so many schemes about the use of the surface water in the Upper Gan-

[Shri Samar Guha]

getic Region. Is it not a fact that the G. S. I. has made some elaborate hydrological study of this region? Have they not pointed out certain things regarding the use of the under-ground water in the northern region? Did they not say that the over-use of the surface water may lead to the massive alkali infestation as in the Thar region of Pakistan, as also already manifest in Etawah and in the Upper Gangetic region? Will not overuse of this surface water make alkali infestation possible and make large areas of cultivable land in the upper regions unusable? Why do you not make use of the hydrological data? Why do you use the surface water, when under-ground water can be used by means of tube-wells, and open wells system? If this is done, there will be two things which will happen. Firstly, it can protect the area from the possible massive alkali infestation of cultivable land. Secondly, it will help to conserve the Ganga water for keeping the flow between Allahabad and Patna and also for discharge of Ganga water for the Farakka feeder canal.

Now, I shall conclude by putting a few pointed questions. I want to know from the hon. Minister (a) whether 40,000 cusecs of water will be ensured for ten years by which time the prototype studies on the effect of such water discharge will be completed and the findings assessed and the statistics assessed for fresh determination of quantum of water (b) whether a high-powered agency will be formed to ensure discharge of 40,000 cusecs of water throughout the year as indicated by the hon. Minister, (c) whether a scientific study will be made about the possibility of using underground water or ground waters since a study was made by the Geological Survey of India to find out alternative sources of water for irrigation purposes and also to save the Upper Gangetic region from alkali infestation and thus conserve the water ultimately for flushing out the lower region of the Hooghly, and whether a task cell will be set up to tackle all the problems like the deficiency in the earth excavation equipment of the barrage and also the dilatory tactics of the feeder canal contractor as also the labour trouble there? The time-schedule for the completion was 1970, but I fear that it may not be completed even by 1973, because it will be humanly impossible to excavate 35 crores c.ft. of earth at the rate of 18 crores c.ft. per year; because of the deficiency in equipment, the contractor shall not be able to

do more than 12 crores c.ft. per year. Therefore, canal work may not be completed before 1975, unless Government take it up seriously and form a separate cell and tackle the whole problem on an emergency basis.

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (DR. K. L. RAO): I would like to submit that most of the points that the hon. Member has mentioned were all considered very carefully. I would like to submit that the statement contains a very clear indication of the water that will be let down and the period for which it will be let down. I am very pretty certain that the experiment that we are going to do will leave us very valuable lessons. Government have assured the House in the last para of the statement that the preservation of the port of Calcutta is the major objective of the Government of India, and they will do all in their power to save this port which is a very valuable one and which is one of the topmost ports of our country. I did not follow the other points that the hon. Member made. But in regard to ground water, I would like to submit that we know that the Ganga basin has got the best underground water in the whole world, and we are exploiting it fully. Already, there are 15,000 tube-wells and we shall have to exploit more and more this ground water. This is one of the alternatives that we are thinking. For, after all, the whole trouble is in the lean months when the discharge of water is very little and it is not very much compared with the water that the river carries, which would be 400 million acre-feet; so, all this trouble is due to about 2 million acre-feet. Therefore, we are already thinking of various alternatives. One of the alternatives being thought of is the exploitation of ground water in the Gangetic basin.

Then, the hon. Member has said that it cannot be completed by 1973 but it will be completed only by 1975. I do not know on what basis he has said it. Contractors and department together are doing about 18 crores c.ft. every year. The balance of work is about 26 crores c.ft. What actually happened in the past was this. The statement contains very clearly the reasons for the delay that has been there. One reason is that in 1971 we could not do much because the Ganga had sustained floods, and, therefore, the working season was very small and that was why only half the work could be done. We expect that during this year it will be possible for us to

have the full working season and we expect over 20 crores c.ft. to be cleared in the working season, and after the working season is over, another 6 crores c.ft. so that the whole canal will be completed. We hope that unless something adverse occurs, it will be possible to complete it. We have gone over this matter very carefully, namely the question of trying to complete it, and we hope that it will be possible to complete it by December, 1973 and we could let down in the feeder canal early in 1974.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : My other questions have not been answered. Hon'ble Minister has not indicated how 40,000 cusecs of water will be ensured for ten years, because he has said that it would take ten years to make the prototype studies and then the position would be re-examined.

DR. K. L. RAO : I have already explained very clearly in the statement that the period is not ten years, but seven years. In the first five years we will let down about 40,000 cusecs.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Ten years is for making a study and fresh determination of the quantum of water that will be discharged.

DR. K. L. RAO : We thought seven years would be sufficient. In five years, we will be able to know the effect of it. There are both adverse effects and also favourable effects. It is not as if we are letting down 40,000 cusecs in the entire seven year period. We have a lot of training work to do. We are going to do the experiment in seven years. By that time we will have a sufficient indication as to what should be done.

I have submitted already that the preservation of the Calcutta port is a most important objective of Government. They will ensure that this will be achieved.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY (Cooch-Bihar) : In the course of his long statement in reply to the call attention, the hon. Minister has, I must say at the outset, in paragraph 11 given us to a certain extent temporary relief, which will give partial relief to the people of Bengal, will help in the preservation of the Calcutta Port and will also help to preserve the whole national interest. For this, thanks are due to the timely intervention of our respected leader, the Prime Minister, and also the able leadership of the Chief Minister of West Bengal who in future years may be called the Bhagirathi of modern

Bengal. Unfortunately, the hon. Minister has failed to mention in his statement the discussions he has had with the Chief Minister of West Bengal along with his Cabinet colleague, the Minister of Irrigation of West Bengal, and also with the Prime Minister. The impression has been created that he seems to be so much sympathetic to the cause of Bengal and eastern India and also the Calcutta Port. But in giving out this impression, the hon. Minister has drafted the statement in such a way that it is nothing but an attempt to hoodwink the people. If I were to go into details, it would take a long time and I would not be in a position to conclude within the short span of time available to me.

The hon. Minister has referred to the Man Singh Committee Report of 1952. He has also quoted from it. May I ask simultaneously this question. Even after the 1952 recommendations of the Man Singh Committee, was not the project for the preservation of Calcutta Port discussed and financial sanction accorded to it? That being so, is this reference not a device to hoodwink the whole country, particularly the people of Bengal and eastern India?

13. hrs.

Secondly, the hon. Minister has failed in his duty by presenting a twisted version of what the Planning Commission has remarked that even in spite of the full suspension of withdrawals during the lean period, the project is very sound and is accepted as necessary. To put the matter straight, is it not a fact that even after this clarification by the Planning Commission or whatever it is, this Parliament gave sanction in 1962 for the total project with the idea that there must be a discharge to the extent of 40,000 cusecs throughout the year? To put it shortly, I would simply refer to the Estimates Committee's report presented in April 1970 where it is stated in para 1. 2 :

"The project after completion will enable the diversion of 40,000 cubic feet per second of water from the Ganga to the Bhagirathi. This, with the normal discharges going down the Bhagirathi when the level of Ganga is high, will set right the hydraulic balance of the bores in the Hooghly and check the threat posed to the ports...."

In the action-taken report submitted by the ministry laid on the Table of the House in

[Shri B. K. Daschowdhury]

July 1971, nothing has been challenged, I mean the observations referred to by the hon. Members of the Estimates Committee, nothing has been challenged. Here we find the hon. Minister has been quoting certain conditions here and there which give the impression that 20,000 cusecs will be enough or may be so. In his statement he also said in para 10 of the statement: a technical committee will go through the model study and on the basis of the report only it is to be found out what is the required quantum of the discharge of water to rejuvenate and resuscitate the Calcutta port. I also ask my third question. There have been a number of Committees and commissions? and some were invited even by Dr. K. L. Rao and they said that it had been decided that nothing less than 40,000 cusecs of water would be required to rejuvenate and resuscitate Calcutta port, to make it alive. It was contained in the expert committee report of Dr. Hensen who put his signature and seal in May 1957. My fourth question: will the Minister be good enough to put down in the Lok Sabha the entire report of Dr. Hensen which he submitted to the ministry concerned along with the experts Dr. Dronkard and Dr. Joglekar, expert on river research scheme in Poona and chairman of the special cell in the Farakka project. A. C. Mitter? If all these things are laid on the Table, the whole situation would have been cleared.

He brought forth argument to give the impression that 20,000 cusecs of water would be enough because certain projects taken up in the upper reaches of the Ganga ought to be implemented and the programme, as it has been, sanctioned. Mention has been made of Gandak, Kosi and Sarda projects. Will the hon. Minister clarify whether the Kosi project, Gandak project that were sanctioned prior to 1960? Was it not sanctioned later on? Will the hon. Minister lay down a white paper giving all these projects, major and minor, 34 major and 170 minor; these have been sanctioned even against the vehement opposition of the State Government of West Bengal, whether it is a fact or not? Not only this I have every regard for the hon. Minister. I have heard; I would wish the hon. Minister to clarify this point. Even when Dr. Hensen submitted a report that nothing less than 40,000 cusecs would be required for the preservation of the Calcutta port, I am told that Dr. Hensen, a hydraulic expert, a German expert who was invited to go through all the model studies,

was asked: could you not bring it down to 20,000 cusecs? As a result Dr. Hensen was so much agitated, he felt very much insulted. What followed? Dr. Hensen refused to accept a lunch arranged in his honour. He replied: in a country where scientist's views are being dishonoured in such a way for political manoeuvres action it is better not to have lunch. There is an impression. I do not know whether it is true or not. It is better to clarify. I know the details which sort of lunch was arranged. It is true that dredging has been going on increasing from 75 lakhs a year to 7.5 crores. Ten times. It is true that the sanctioned amount for Farakka Barrage has gone up by 180 per cent, as referred to by the Estimates Committee, from Rs. 56 crores to Rs. 156 crores. As a result, what happened? The high tidal bore which was normally before 1947 to the extent of 2 to 3 feet, has got so strengthened and so voluminous that it rises up to 6 or 7 feet and it carries with it inflow of water, but it cannot outflow because the pressure in Hooghly is not very much. As days go by, silt formation is going up and up. It is feared that even after this model test, after 1979 or 1989, the cusecs of Ganga water that would be required to be discharged would be much more than 40,000.

In conclusion, I want to know along with these six questions—they are short questions—will he make a prohibition order restricting hence forward that there should be no project with any pseudonym—people do not even understand the names of the projects; there are such a large number of them, more than 200, big and small projects—no such schemes will be approved by the Central Water and Power Commission unless it has been considered by this technical committee, under section 10 of this report. Will he also consider, as pointed out by this Commission, the upper reaches of Ganga river where the ground waters are available in sufficient quantities, because of which certain lands are not being fit for cultivation because of their marshy nature and will he consider taking these resources from the ground water? All these things will end the matter. He should look into the fact that Calcutta Port is not for West Bengal alone but it is in the national interest. With that end in view, he should not misguide the whole nation.

DR. K. L. RAO: Most of the points raised have been covered by the statement I have made and I request the hon. member to read the statement more carefully. It do

not want to enter into any controversy because I am very happy that we have had a very useful discussion with the Chief Minister of West Bengal and Irrigation Minister over the week-end. We spent a considerable number of hours over this difficult problem. I am sorry the hon. member has attributed motives that I claim originality for this. I do not add their names because I have not taken their signatures. It is also not fair to take their signatures. In fact, he did not authorise me nor did I ask for it. In the absence of the signature, I could not refer to it.

The hon. member seems to know more about the lunch engagement of Dr. Hensen. It was a private lunch in my house, not a public lunch. Dr. Hensen not only came to the lunch but brought a beautiful set of flowers. This is all due to some cock and bull story given by some engineers who have been dismissed.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY : *Prima facie* it seems there are certain stories about it.

DR. K. L. RAO : There are always lots of stories in Calcutta.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I strongly protest against this objectionable remark. The question is whether the points raised by these engineers merit attention or not. They are not in this House to defend themselves and I strongly protest against this remark that they have been given by dismissed engineers.

DR. K. L. RAO : I said it because it was a wrong statement made by the hon. member. It was a private lunch, not at Ashoka Hotel or anywhere else ; it was in my own house. I invited Dr. Hensen because he was known to me for years. I knew him long before he came for the Calcutta port. I had been to Hanover many years before. When he came here, I naturally invited him for a lunch. He came, as I said, with a lot of beautiful flowers. In fact I even said "Why do you bring so many flowers".

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY : Is it a fact that Dr. Hensen did not take even a cup of water ? (interruptions)

DR. K. L. RAO : The hon. Member seems to have been at that time (interruptions). It is very unfortunate these things should have been brought out.

But the most important thing is this,

Neither Dr. Hensen, nor Dronker was invited for the second time by us. Dr. Hensen came at the invitation of the Port Commissioners, as also Dr. Dronker was not called for this project. He was asked for the outer harbour, for the Haldia project. The Port Commissioners seem to have asked him this question. They have given some information that we have got. We have got two pages, not signed pages, wherein they say that his opinion was asked for and "we agree with that". Dr. Hensen's first report very categorically states of 20,000 cusecs . . . (interruptions)

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : It is not correct

MR. SPEAKER : He is speaking with out my permission. If he continues like that, nothing will go on record. I do not know how to deal with this gentlemen. He must maintain certain discipline. He cannot get up any time he wants.

DR. K. L. RAO : I want to avoid any controversy. I do not want to say anything further except to say on the irrigation projects in the upper basin area that the area that is irrigated in the Ganga Basin consisting of several States is hardly 24 per cent in spite of the fact they have got the best water resources. That is why we said the up-stream irrigation projects will be safeguarded. That is what the statement says.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY : Is it a fact that there are 34 major irrigation . . .

MR. SPEAKER : All of you are beating each other in one thing, in making these interruptions. Already we are very late and behind the schedule.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY : The West Bengal Government protested because these projects will hamper the progress of the Farakka barrage project and the improvement of the Calcutta port. Is it a fact that 34 major and 170 minor irrigation projects were sanctioned even in the teeth of the opposition of the West Bengal Government without consulting the Ganga Brahmaputra Flood Control Commission ?

MR. SPEAKER : I think he has made it very clear.

DR. K. L. RAO : The irrigation potential so far developed in the up-stream area is very little. But the sanction of a large number of projects there does not even in the least

[Dr. K. L. Rao]

effect Farakka. I have made this very clear in the statement.

If the Ramganga project is taken up, it does not contribute at all in any way for the two lean months. The only concerned rivers are Gagra, Gandak and Kosi. Everything is contained in that statement.

DR. RANEN SEN (Barasat) : On the 31st of March this year Dr. Rao placed a statement on the Table of both Houses, the contents of which we find on page 3 of the statement. Here he has stated in short that it is neither desirable, nor possible, to give more than 20,000 cusecs of water for the river Bhagirathi. Today he makes the statement we saw also in the newspapers his agreement with Shri Siddhartha Shankar Ray—that 40,000 cusecs will be available throughout the year for the river Bhagirathi. I do not know whether he is a magician or not. When he made the statement that 20,000 cusecs will be needed and will be supplied, and not more than that, he knew the opinions of Dr. Hensen Dr. Dronkhurst, Dr. Joglekar of Khadakvasla Institute and Shri A. C. Mitra of Uttar Pradesh. Still he made that statement. By making that statement, one purpose was served. I do not know whether he deliberately did it or not. Bengal was pitted against Bihar; U. P. was pitted against Bengal. There was no trouble between Bengal and Bihar, no trouble between Bengal and U. P. We are peaceful citizens living as good neighbours. Only when he made that statement, all these questions cropped up in Bengal, Bihar and U. P. He is responsible for that. He made a very serious statement.

Not only that. Even before that, on the 26th June, he made a statement in the Calcutta Raj Bhavan he found no other place to make a statement—which will be offending to the feelings of the people of Calcutta. It is the same statement that not more than 20,000 cusecs of water will be available.

Now, in this statement, he says it will be available for seven years. Before stating that in the statement, he also dug up, as pointed out by many hon. Members, the Man Singh Committee Report of 1952. After all these things, a very well-known Engineer, well-known to Dr. Rao, Mr. Devesh Mukerjee, made a statement in the press that nowhere, when he was the General Manager of the Farakka Barrage, there was any mention of any difference of opinion. He is the person who was ex-

posed by Dr. Rao himself as one of the foremost river Engineers that India has produced. He said that nobody knew about this thing, there was no serious difference of opinion. Today, in this statement, the hon. Minister mentions about the Man Singh Committee Report. I do not know who was Mr. Man Singh. I do not want to make a long statement.

I simply say that this whole thing, his statement, is shrouded in mystery. In May and June, he made a statement that no more than 20,000 cusecs of water will be available. Now, in the middle of August, he makes a statement that it is available for seven years and then certain studies will be made.

I want to know which statement is correct, today's statement or the statement that he made in this House on the 31st May this year. Therefore, as I said, the whole thing is shrouded in mystery. I am afraid, this will lead Bengalis-Biharis fighting for water as has been the case with Narmada water and Cauvery water. I want to know specifically categorically from the hon. Minister whether the formula that he had given earlier in this House which is embodied in the statement on p. 3, has been given up at least for the coming seven years.

Secondly, I want to know the reason why the construction of this feeder canal has been delayed. In January, 1968, Dr. Rao will recollect that there was a Consultative Committee meeting where he invited many of us. I was also there. The feeder canal was being dug in those days. Now he speaks of the labour trouble. The labour trouble was much more in Farakka Barrage than in the case of the feeder canal. Why was it not completed by 1971? According to him, it is to be completed by 1973. Where is the guarantee? This delay in the construction of feeder canal, according to the Farakka Barrage authorities, is causing a loss of Rs. 6 crores every year as interest charges. Who is going to pay? It is the public Exchequer. Why should the public pay? So, I want a guarantee from him. It is not simply saying, "I do not find any reason why it should not be completed." Can he give us a guarantee in this House today that by the end of 1973, the feeder canal will be constructed and that, if for that purpose any other agency is to be set up or brought in, that will be done?

Thirdly, I want to know about this investigation in the whole Farakka Barrage scheme that

Mr. Samar Guha raised to which Dr. Rao has not answered. By whom was the investigation done and how the investigation will be done after seven years or after five years? All this is in the statement. How will the other elements who are interested in the development of the Calcutta Port be taken into confidence? What will be the machinery to do that? These are the three questions.

DR. K. L. RAO : I did not want to make any statement in the last session. What happened was that the hon. Speaker told me that the hon. members from West Bengal insisted that I should make a statement. That is why I had to make a statement.

Farakka project is a sanctioned project approved in 1960 by the Ministry of Shipping and Transport to which this project belongs. This project does not belong to the Ministry of Irrigation and Power; that has nothing to do with it, neither with the power aspect nor with the irrigation aspect. This is the project of the Ministry of Transport and Shipping. They asked us to do the works. The figure that I have given has been quoted from page 56 of the sanctioned project report. The hon. Member may see that. I have no authority to change it. What I gave was exactly the amount laid down for different months in the sanctioned project.

A lot of emotion was created. The Chief Minister of West Bengal wanted to discuss this. We had a lot of discussions. We find that, in the next five years, it will be possible for us to allow 40,000 cusecs of water. Everything has been covered in the statement. We want to settle this controversy by field experiments. The controversy about 40,000 cusecs of water being required relates to those two lean months; it is not a question of ten months. Some feel that 20,000 cusecs of water will do for those two months. We have yet to take observation. We have got to make observations on the prototype and not on the models. That is why we have said that it is a very useful and scientific investigation. The hon. Member asked who will do the investigation. That has also been given in the statement. The investigation will be done by the Ministry of Shipping and Transport who is responsible for that. They will have a study team. The study team will consist of the Port Commissioners of Calcutta Central Water and Power Research Station, Khadakhyala, West Bengal Government, and

any others that the Ministry of Transport and Shipping may consider necessary. That is why they have said, 'etc.'. The investigation will be done by them.

The other question was about the delay. I am surprised the hon. Member is asking this question. It is one of the most difficult projects in the world. The canal's width is far greater than the width of the Suez Canal; its width is 490 ft. as against the width of the Suez Canal of 200 ft. It has got so many engineering difficulties. Moreover, this project was started in 1965. The canal was constructed quite remarkably. We are going to do it in eight years. The hon. members may recall that the Rajasthan Canal has been going on for the last 15 years and yet, we are no where near completion. This project involves a large amount of work. (Interruption) The reasons for the delay have been given. In 1971 there were heavy floods. The whole area was flooded. The working season was little. One of the most important reasons is labour unrest in 1969. The hon. Member referred to Mr. Debeash Mukherjee who was my friend though he differs from me now. The General Manager told me—he complained very bitterly about this unrest—, 'Dr. Rao, my driver drives the car at a speed of five kilometres per hour; I want to get down and walk, but he does not allow me to walk; what is this trouble. He was the General Manager in 1969. I did not want to quote all these things. The hon. members must know that I have the privilege of being associated with this project for long; perhaps nobody else, no other engineer, has been so long associated with this as I have been. I have been associated right from the beginning, right from the first step—when it was investigated and what has to be done and so on, as early as 1955. It will be one of my privileges to see that this project functions and objectively works in the way we wanted it. No engineer in this world would say that once the project is designed and constructed, he will not see the fruits thereof. Therefore, the hon. Members are unnecessarily attributing motives.

The situation is difficult. There are three possibilities. It is all given in the report. Also I want to tell the hon. Members that the interests of the country do not lie in putting one State against the other or one project against the other. We are not interested in one particular project. We want to develop the whole country. I want to submit very clearly that we want to take irrigation potential

[Dr. K. L. Rao]

of this region from 24% as early as possible, in the next ten years. After all, the problem is not hopeless. It is of an intricate nature, we will be able to find a solution. We will be able to achieve all the three objectives that have been mentioned in the last page of this statement.

SHRI B. K. DASCHOWDHURY : I want to make one thing clear.

Nobody desires that there should not be any development projections. All the development projections should be there.

श्री भारद्वाज राव (बौसी) : मान्यवर, यह सर्वविदित है कि कलकत्ता बन्दरगाह हमारे देश का एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण स्थान है। इसके विकास के ऊपर ही हमारे देश के पूर्वाञ्चल का विकास भी निर्भर करता है। खास कर के कलकत्ता में उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार के लाखों आदमी काम करते हैं, उनकी जीविका का भी सम्बन्ध कलकत्ता के विकास पर निर्भर है। और कलकत्ता का विकास रुक जायगा, अवरोध हो जायगा अगर उसके बन्दरगाह पर उचित मात्रा में पानी नहीं दिया गया। ऐसी स्थिति में मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ, दो तीन सवाल के रूप में कि :

1. क्या इस जेट स्टेज पर भी पूर्वी पाकिस्तान जो पहले था, जो अब बांग्ला देश बन गया है उसकी सरकार की ओर से भी इस मसले में कोई अड़चन है, किसी प्रकार का मतभेद है पानी की मात्रा और परिमाण में, या किसी प्रकार की कोई अड़चन है? यदि है, तो वह क्या है, और उसके दूर करने के लिये सरकार ने क्या उपाय अब तक सोचा है या क्या वह करने जा रही है?

2. दूसरा सवाल यह है कि इस वक्तव्य में यह स्पष्ट रूप से स्वीकार किया गया है कि खरीफ की फसल के लिये उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार में किसी प्रकार की पानी की कमी नहीं पड़ेगी, अगर यह फीडर कैनल बना दी गयी तब भी। जब यह स्थिति स्वीकार कर ली गई तब भी इतनी देर इस चैनल के बनाने में क्यों की गयी? केवल लेबर ट्रबल की जो बात

कही गयी है वही है या और कोई कारण है, या रहा है? और अगर कोई अन्य कारण रहा है तो वह क्या है?

3. अन्त में मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ तीसरे सवाल के रूप में कि जो अब तक की गति है, या जो अब तक का अनुभव है, और बावजूद इसके कि माननीय मन्त्री जी ने बहुत बलपूर्वक शब्दों में इस बात को मना है कि यह उन के लिये एक प्राउड की चीज है, वह बनेगी, जिस गति से अब तक रफ्तार चली है क्या 1973 के अन्त तक यह चैनल ज़रूर बन जायेगी इस बात का विश्वास स्पष्ट शब्दों में इस सदन को देना चाहते हैं?

ये तीन सवाल हैं इनका मैं जवाब चाहूंगा।

DR. K. L. RAO : With regard to Bangla Dosh, it has been made clear in the statement that the legitimate interests of Bangla Dosh will be taken into account and I am pretty certain that the great neighbouring country of Bangla Dosh and ourselves will be able to sort out the various problems connected with this.

With regard to the other question, about delay, I have already made it clear. I am not expecting any more delay in this project. There may be delays in the completion, by one or two months, but that is nothing. In a big and magnificent project like this, the like of which has not been done anywhere else in the world, nature plays a large part. Nature could have easily obstructed us more but we are prepared for many more difficulties. We saved Rs. 10 crores because of nature's gift. We have been able to do the work in about 8 years. This took us from 1963 to 1971, that is, 8 years. We have done this magnificent work. The canal was a bit late when we started because we were engaged in the difficult job of the barrage and so the work of the canal was started late in 1965. We are hoping to complete it by 1973. I don't want to say anything else, so that hon. Members may not get angry with me later on. I wish the same speed and the same quickness is given in respect of the other projects in the States themselves.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I will be the first to congratulate you, if you can complete it by 1973.

DR. K. L. RAO : I can assure the hon. Member this. If there is no labour problem, it will be completed by 1973.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Lakhs of workers of U. P. and Bihar are there..

MR. SPEAKER : You have one leg in Bengal and another leg in U.P.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : I am proud of U. P. They have elected a Bengalee. They are not parochial. I know that lakhs of people from U. P. and Bihar have gone to Bengal in search of jobs. We want that all the industries in Bengal, especially Calcutta port, must be restored to their normal condition. Every lady used to sing : *सैय्या गए बंगला देश, मेजो इको न सन्देश*। It was sung by every girl. Because, people used to go to Bengal Desh.

In his statement the hon. Minister has assured the people of U. P. and Bihar that there will be no shortage of water in U. P. and Bihar for the kharif season. We are told that the sub-soil water can be tapped for irrigation in the Gangetic valley. Previously, Dr. Rao used to say that attempts will be made to have Ganga-Brahmaputra project. Now he says attempts will be made for Ganga-Cauvery project I don't know why this diversion has come about. He is an engineer, I am not. In case the Ganga-Brahmaputra canal has come about, it would have benefited practically most of these States, especially those States which were suffering because of the power shortage and water shortage. About Gandak project it has been stated that this will benefit Bihar, Nepal, U.P. etc. This is under construction since 1958. In view of the controversy over Gangetic water from Farrakka, I wish to submit that all these controversies must stop. 40,000 cusecs of water to be supplied to Farrakka, for revival of the Calcutta port is in our interest and for the people of U.P. and no further dispute should arise. But, Dr. Rao's statement has created some controversies, some imaginary and some real, among the people of U.P., Bihar and Bengal. Mr. Daschowdhury congratulated Chief Minister of Bengal and said, he will be known as Bhagirath. Sir, no further dispute should arise between the three States. They must live like neighbours. I wish to ask him one important question : Will the hon. Minister agree to set up a Control Board ? I know, this was envisaged previously. May I know whether a control board will be set up consisting of the representatives of Bengal, U. P.

and Bihar so that all disputes might be settled by mutual consultations then and there and the people of Bengal would not have to issue a statement against U. P. We could include all the three chief Ministers in the control board ? And also Members of Parliament and experts from all the three States to resolve any dispute which may arise in future. I would like to know whether such a central board or control board is likely to be established.

I would also like to know why the Ganga-Brahmaputra canal has been given up in favour of the Ganga-Cauvery link. What is good in the Cauvery which is not there in the Brahmaputra ? I have seen all the rivers, but I do not know their virtues and vices. So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister why the Ganga-Brahmaputra canal has been given up.

DR. K. L. RAO : The Ganga-Brahmaputra canal is very much in our mind. Actually, it is one of the projects which we think is all very vital, but so far we have not come out with execution, because we have to clear the problems of the Bangla Desh region through which the canal passes.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE : Now, that is possible.

DR. K. L. RAO : For obvious reasons we cannot make any statement about it like that. I am sure hon. Members will find that in all our statements, we have only used the phrase diversions from the neighbouring basins. The Ganga basin has got to be and may be assisted in some respects by diversion from neighbouring basins. That is the statement that hon. Members will find all along. The neighbouring basin is the Brahmaputra basin. I would submit once again that the Ganga-Cauvery will be greatly assisted and would become greatly valuable by the diversion from the Brahmaputra. In fact, it is in the interests of the Ganga-Cauvery link that the Brahmaputra link must come. I do not want to expatiate on it and go too much into this subject, because I do not want to go into further details at this stage, since we have not yet cleared it with the great country, Bangla Desh, many other details and so on; we have not even discussed it. So, I would leave it at that.

I want to assure the hon. Member that we want to connect not only these two rivers, but our object is, and in fact, that

[Dr. K. L. Rao]

is the modern technique throughout the whole world, and in fact, the best technique for India or the next decade or the next century will be to link up the waters so that the rivers with surplus water could be linked up with rivers with less water which supply deficit areas and thus there could be exchange of water from one river to the other. This is the main thing. The Brahmaputra is one river whose waters are not used at all. Practically no water from that river is used. So, it will be a great source of water for us. It will be, therefore, our endeavour to use its waters. Almost all the modern techniques will be used and will be pressed into service to see that we are able to use the waters of the Brahmaputra to the maximum extent for the service of India.

The hon. Member had suggested the setting up of a control board. There are already the zonal councils at which these are discussed. Any way, the hon. Member's suggestion is a very good suggestion, since West Bengal belongs to one zonal council and U.P. belongs to another. So, we can create a body where the whole Ganga basin could be represented. We shall consider this suggestion.

13.39 hrs.

RE. PRESENTATION OF TAMRA-PATRAS TO FREEDOM-FIGHTERS

MR. SPEAKER : Now we shall take up the next item of business.

SHRI N. SREEKANTAN NAIR (Quilon) : I seek your permission to raise an important matter, and I have already written to you also seeking your permission to raise the question about the Tamra-patras which have been presented to the freedom-fighters. Tamra-patras have been presented to those people who have never seen the inside of a prison. I want to raise this question, because as you would agree, it is a question of national importance. It is an insult to the freedom-fighters on the one side that these Tamra-patras should have been given to persons who have never been inside a prison, and secondly it is an insult to the other regional languages which have been listed in the Constitution, to have the inscription only in Hindi and then give it.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN (Madras North) : Please permit me to say a few

words on this matter ? I shall conclude within a minute, after saying something regarding the issue raised by my hon. friend Shri N. Sreekantan Nair.

MR. SPEAKER : I am sorry.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : On behalf of my Party, we offer our felicitations to the freedom fighters. That is one thing. The second is that they have come from all over the country, from all the States. But the *tamra patra* given to them is inscribed only in Hindi, which is against the Constitution. The Constitution has recognised two languages as official languages, one Hindi and the other English. Unfortunately, the freedom fighters from Tamil Nadu, from Orisa and from Bengal cannot read anything inscribed on it. I think this is an indirect way of encroaching upon the domain of the non-Hindi-speaking areas. The freedom fighters from these areas are insulted... (*Interruptions*), absolutely insulted.

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down. There should be no controversy over this. I had no intimation from him about this.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : I say, this is a calculated and cunning move to infiltrate into the non-Hindi-speaking domain. I warn the Hindi-speaking people that if they systematically adopt this attitude, history will later call them as people who are disintegrating this great country. This matter should not be taken very lightly. You in your wisdom have already given directions to the House so many times that both Hindi and English should be used.

MR. SPEAKER : I should have had some intimation that he wanted to raise this matter.

SHRI K. MANOHARAN : I would request you at least to convey our feelings that if this is allowed to continue in future, I do not know what will happen. This is my warning.

13.42 hrs.

RE. BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER : The call attention motion has already taken one hour. I am very sorry that the Ministers who have to lay papers on the Table, a formal business, have to keep sitting for such a long time.