

[Shri T. N. Singh]

realise fully the need for improving the quality, and I hope that they will continue to make their efforts to improve the quality. I shall try my best to impress this on them, and I am quite sure that they will also agree with me in this, and they are agreeing with me, I take it, because when I put across these ideas to them, I found that they also seemed to be conscious of the need to improve quality, and they should do something about it. Let us hope for the best of results in the circumstances.

As I was saying, I have learnt a lot from the speeches of my hon. friends on this very important question. After having looked into all the views, I feel that there is not much of a difference of opinion in regard to our approach and the approach of the Members. I have tried to explain the various points. The only thing that I want to say is that if it comes to that, I am going to give a higher priority to scooters, motor-cycles and the like. In all humility, I may suggest to the House that they may kindly permit me to give higher priority to this kind of transport as against even the small car. In regard to that also, I may take the House into confidence, and I am seriously making efforts or rather Government are seriously making efforts to step up the supply and production of these things, and it is quite likely that in the very near future, in about a year's time, there will be an appreciable improvement in the supplies of this mode of transport namely scooters, motor-cycles, mopeds and the like.

In regard to the Fiat car also, I am glad to inform the House that the Fiat supply is also going to be increased, and I feel that that should give some relief, though not much of relief.

In regard to the other points, I have already stated what I wanted to say. I have nothing more to say except to request for the co-operation of the House in the consideration of this problem from time to time and even

formally, I am quite willing to have talks with a small number of friends here and discuss all these questions in greater detail.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Shri Sham Lal Saraf (Jammu and Kashmir): I want to ask one question. He has not covered many points.

Mr. Chairman: There will be other opportunities for that purpose. If I permit the hon. Member, I shall have to give chance to others also.

Shri Sham Lal Saraf: Till the Government is in a position to get the small car, as desired by all of us here, may I know what effort would be made to reduce the present high cost of the car? I think the position has not improved at all.

Shri T. N. Singh: I have already explained the efforts and the methods that I am pursuing in regard to reduction of cost. There must be economy of scale by standardisation and interchangeability of parts. Then there are the problems for the ancillary units. I have already indicated some lines on which I am thinking. (Interruptions)

Mr. Chairman: Order, order. No more questions. We take up half-an-hour discussion.

17.11 hrs.

RE. WATER FOR PROJECTS IN KARNATAK*

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy (Koppal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, let me start my discussion with the Vedic prayer which will express the importance of my purpose:

"O' Waters! As you are the source of happiness, infuse strength into us, so that we have, great and beautiful vision. That essence of yours which is most auspicious, make us share it here. O you who are like loving Mothers.

*Half-an-Hour Discussion.

Let us resort to you fully for that removal of evil, whereby you gratify us. Waters! you have verily created us."

Sir, this is a Vedic prayer.

I have been compelled to raise this discussion. The inter-State disputes about water is going on for the last, I think, 14 years or perhaps even earlier. The two State Governments of Mysore and Bombay have requested the Central Government to take the water dispute to some judicial award all the time. I charge the Central Ministry of avoiding this issue and not taking it up to a tribunal or setting up some body under the River Boards Act of 1956. I have got every respect for the present Irrigation Minister who is a well read engineer and also an expert in irrigation. But may I point out that his expert knowledge or his energy is not being utilised for the just cause of the nation as a whole; his energy is being utilised since 1951 to exploit the upper reaches of Krishna and Godavari, taking water from the scarcity area with an average rainfall of 24" a year to an area with 45" rain and 75" rain per year. So many projects have been recommended without the sanction of the technical experts, or the technical clearance from the Planning Commission, the Central Irrigation Board or the Ministry. This Minister has encouraged them and misused the power from the Central Government and connived with selfish ends. He has diverted waters from the scarcity areas of Bellary district which were once part of the Rayalaseema; it is just on the border of Andhra and Mysore. I do not want to raise a controversial point here. Let us share the water equally, justifiably and judiciously among all these States. I will not plead for a single pot of excess water to this area, in excess of the fundamental and just share. That is why I wanted one day to be fixed for discussing the Gulhati Commission report. That report has not emerged from the Karnatak or Maharashtra engineers; it is an intelligent report. 14 questions had been put in this House

and in Rajya Sabha but no action has been taken. The Maharashtra Government says:

"Whatever that may be, it is evident on the basis of the statements made by the Governments of Maharashtra and Mysore, that there exists today a serious inter-State dispute regarding water of certain inter-State rivers. The Constitution of India specifically provides for the adjudication of such disputes by Parliament. In view of the grave importance of the matter and the grave issue relating to the future prosperity and well being of the peoples of the States that it involves we hope that now that it is a matter of public dispute, it will not be settled by any patchwork compromise formula which will leave room for dissatisfaction in any quarter. Experience during the last twelve years has repeatedly shown that it is dangerous, in relation to important problems of wide interest, to arrive at decisions in an *ad hoc* manner. Such *ad hoc* decisions inevitably reflect the temporary balance of political power and cannot be expected to yield stable solutions. As the Association has always insisted in its various memoranda, it is of the utmost importance that in all such matters uniform standards and methods based on clearly defined and well recognised principles are used in arriving at settlements and that such problems are resolved by publicly constituted authorities or tribunals acting openly and with established procedure."

Shrimati LakshmiKanthamma: On a point of order. When wild allegations are made against others, at least they must be asked to give some of the details of what has been done to Andhra?
... (Interruptions).

Mr. Chairman: He will give. He will conclude within 3 minutes. It started at 5.10.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: No, no. Sir I will need at least five minutes more because the discussion started only at 5-10 I stated the request of the Maharashtra Government. Now here is with my Mysore request also. I cannot read the whole letter. I can only give a reference to letter No. PWD 24/PRA/59 dated 29-1-1962 from the Secretary to Mysore Government requesting the reference of water dispute to a tribunal for adjudication under section 3 of the inter-State Water disputes Act, 1956. The parties are given here: Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Madhya Pradesh and Orissa. About the estimated direct annual yield from sub-basin and the review of estimated yield and project requirements as proposed by State Governments the Gulhati Commission says:

"The Commission regards these estimates as no better than informed guesses; while giving a general idea of the likely average yield from each sub-basin, these estimates are not enough to form the basis of big projects involving large sums of public money. Considerable caution must be exercised in sanctioning new projects."

Here is our Minister who goes on sanctioning, without taking into consideration these things... (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Chairman: The Minister will reply: the others may keep quiet.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: The following is the analysis of the demands and the fair share of each State in Krishna waters. The States concerned are Maharashtra, Mysore and Andhra Pradesh. Taking the total quantity to 2220 TMC, what is the position? A total of 1173 TMC had already been booked for works that existed before 1961, while the allotment for future works comes to 2785 TMC. The commitments have already been gone through. All the State Governments are already ahead with the projects. I have got the total amount of the water balance-sheet. I have placed this book also in the Library. Any hon. Member can go through it. It is

a very interesting one. Before Independence, the water balance in Karnataka was 91 TMC. After Independence, and before 1951, it was 279 TMC. In the third Five Year Plan, the commitments on the projects which have already been referred to by the Planning Commission and also to the CWPC come to 754 TMC. The total of all this comes to 1125 TMC, whereas Karnataka has been allowed only 600 TMC according to the Minister's statement in 1963 during the budget session. He has sanctioned the Upper Krishna project; that is true. But then where are the waters? That is the question now. He has sanctioned so many projects. It is not a political question. It is a scientific question. Being an engineer of high scientific calibre, I want him to tell me how he has sanctioned, without water, the Nagarjunasagar scheme; without water, the Srisailem project; without water, the Pochkonda scheme and the Upper Krishna project. The famine area is the most affected area where the irrigation is 0.9 per cent. While the irrigation percentage in Maharashtra is only eight or nine, in Karnataka or it is just 0.19 within the basin area, which is a scarcity area. The Gulhati Commission has strongly recommended the measures. If this water will not come forth, how can we expect to build up the future projects? If we have no projects, that means the Central Government and the Minister of Irrigation want to perpetuate the famine conditions in Karnataka and completely deprive those people of their rightful share within the basin area. The authorities must take that aspect into consideration. The commitments within in the basin area of the river must be fulfilled. Here is our Minister who has sanctioned the supply of water beyond the basin area. The Gulhati Commission has submitted its report. I congratulate the Minister for the big schemes that he has initiated in Andhra Pradesh. He has worked from 1951 up to now practically in the Central Water and Power Commission. That Power Commission.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should confine himself to a short statement. The Minister has to reply and other Members must have some time to put their questions. Please conclude so that there will be some time for the reply.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: Yes, Sir. He has worked in the Central Water and Power Commission. That Commission was representative of all the States. There should be 75 per cent quota for all the States therein. Formerly, it was cent per cent. Now, there are practically no representatives from the States after he himself was representing Andhra Pradesh in that Commission. Now, there is hardly 10 per cent, as representing the States. He is going on appointing but there is no practical work done by the Central Water and Power Commission under the able hands of the administrative authorities of this Ministry. There is no work turned out, and they have not prepared any plan. They are not giving any plan. Our people are dying and all the labourers have left Karnataka; they have gone away to Bombay and Sholapur and to other States. This is the justice that he has done to us. He wants to see that the whole of Karnataka should remain as barren land and should have no irrigation for Bijapur; no irrigation for Karnataka area. If this goes on, what will happen?

I urge upon this House to go into this question. I appeal to my Karnataka friends and Maharashtra friends that they should gather together and bring force upon the Minister. Lastly, I demand that this Minister, Dr. K. L. Rao, should have a change from this post of Minister of Irrigation. I am saying this with pangs in my heart. We have lost faith in his. There is not faith and we cannot get any justice from him. There must be a Minister of Cabinet rank for this subject. I have represented to the late Nehruji also. I am representing to Shastriji also. The present Minister's decision alone should not be final. There must be a

Cabinet decision. Otherwise, there will be gross injustice done.

There is one more point which I want to make. National integration or national unity will all break down if water unity is not maintained. This is my last prayer to the House on this occasion.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Chairman: I will give opportunity to those who have already intimated to me. Only one question for each. They should be brief.

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): Other Members who want to put questions may also be given chance.

श्री तुलशीदास जादव (नांदेड़): अभी माननीय सदस्य ने इंटिग्रेशन का जिक्र किया है। वह बहुत जरूरी है। देश को एक रहना है। उसकी आज बहुत गर्ज है। लेकिन आप देखें कि महाराष्ट्र का क्या हाल है। महाराष्ट्र में दौ सौ से अढ़ाई सौ इंच तक वर्षा साल में होती है वहां पर इरिगेशन के लिए पानी की तंगी है। छः परसेंट के लिए ही पानी उपलब्ध है।

महाराष्ट्र ने मांग की है कि एक ट्रिब्यूनल एप्वाइंट किया जाए इस डिसप्यूट का कोई हल निकालने के लिए। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि हमारे राव साहब इस प्रश्न का लिकाल इस तरह से क्यों नहीं ढूंढने की कोशिश करते हैं?

आंध्र में जितने भी काम होते हैं, उनके लिए पानी दे दिया जाता है। इस तरह से चलता रहा और पानी खत्म हो गया तो महाराष्ट्र को पानी कहां से मिलेगा? महाराष्ट्र गवर्नमेंट की प्रॉपोजिज्ज उनके पास आती है, लेकिन उनको मजूरी नहीं मिलती है, इसका क्या कारण है?

हिन्दुस्तान की एकता कायम रहे, इसके लिए यह बहुत जरूरी है कि सभी के साथ न्याय हो, किसी के साथ भी अन्याय न हो। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि क्यों नहीं इसकी इस तरह से

[श्री तुलशी दास जाधव]

व्यवस्था कर दी जाती है कि ट्रिब्यूनल सारे सवाल का हल निकाल दे ? वह सब से उत्तम निकाल होगा ।

Shri M. L. Jadhav (Malegaon): What is the percentage of irrigation in Mysore, Maharashtra and Andhra Pradesh and why may I also know whether there is any progress with regard to the solution of the inter-water disputes between these three States?

Shri S. B. Patil (Bijapur South): How much of the Krishna water is already being used out of 800 TMC allotted to Andhra Pradesh, 600 TMC to Mysore State and 400 TMC to Maharashtra and may I know whether the Government of Mysore and the public as a whole protested against the diversion of Krishna waters towards the Arabian sea?

Shri Koujalgi (Belgaum): According to the present allocation of water, there is no provision for Ghataprabha and Malaprabha, Stage II, and therefore, may I know how the second stage is to be provided with water?

Shri Basappa (Tiptur): May I know whether there is a clever move on the part of the Government to see that the water of the Tungabhadra, a share of which belong to the Mysore Government, is diverted to Andhra Pradesh on the ground that they may grow two crops or three crops, while the Mysore people are suffering under famine-stricken conditions, and while water is being taken from one river basin to another river basin only with the object of helping every part of the country, my part of the country, namely, Mysore, which has only about five to six per cent of irrigation potential, is left backward?

Dr. Sarojini Mahishi (Dharwar North): Taking into consideration the geographical area, the net sown area, the scarcity area, the cultivable

area and the population, may I know whether the Government would consider the allocation of water to the States of Maharashtra and Mysore purely on the basis of intra-basin demands and not divert the waters on the extra-basin demands?

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Chairman: Under the rules, notice is required for putting questions. I do not want to depart from the rules.

The Minister of Irrigation and Power (Dr. K. L. Rao): Sir, I have heard with rapt attention the brilliant speech made by Shri Sivamurthi Swamy. I would like first of all to give a resume of what has happened so far, because my hon. friend seems to have been under a complete misunderstanding of the whole situation. For the first time, all the States concerned came together and entered into an agreement about the Krishna and Godavari waters in 1951. Till September 1960 there was no protest whatsoever. Only in September, 1960 there was a representation from two States—Maharashtra and Mysore—saying that that allocation has got to be altered. The then Minister of Irrigation and Power appointed a committee and that committee—the K. G. Commission, otherwise known as the Gulhati Commission—gave its report in 1962. Afterwards, my distinguished predecessor went into this very carefully and gave some suggestions to be adopted, the idea being that the development of this vital area which covers nearly one-fourth of India's entire cultivated land should not be retarded. While Mysore to a large extent and Andhra Pradesh to some extent have accepted it and are working on those lines, Maharashtra Government felt that the allocation was not sufficient and should be revised.

An hon. Member: Mysore also.

Dr. K. L. Rao: Not Mysore. On the advice of the Prime Minister we,

thought it best to discuss it in a meeting of the Chief Ministers at a high level. So, the first meeting was held on the 19th August and we have had a very interesting and useful discussion. The second meeting was scheduled to be held on the 29th October. Unfortunately that day our late lamented Shri Dasappa died and the Mysore Chief Minister, Shri Nijalingappa, had to go to Bangalore. I must express my great appreciation of the sense of duty which the Chief Minister of Mysore showed. He asked me whether he should stay on for the discussion. He attached so much importance to this subject. I told him that in view of the grave situation, he could go and we shall discuss it later. Finally the meeting has been scheduled for 15th January between the Chief Ministers to discuss this subject.

Normally but for the very unfortunate and completely wrong statements made by the hon. mover, I would have gone into a very detailed discussion of the whole subject. But I am refraining from doing so, because I feel that the procedure I am following is in the best interests of the nation. I do not want to say anything which will even remotely endanger the great attempt that is being made to arrive at an amicable solution.

I shall just give two or three facts to show how there was a complete misrepresentation of the whole situation. I was only an ordinary member of the Commission and I had nothing to do with the subject till I became Minister in 1963. Since then or since 1961, projects amounting to 130 TMC were sanctioned for Karnataka in the Krishna basin, whereas for Andhra, it was only 2 TMC, for small and medium projects. (Interruptions). I am not yielding Sir.

Regarding the other allegation that was made about the Srisaillam project, I want to submit that the project does not consume water. It is only a question of evaporation loss. Evaporation

loss is the characteristic of any storage reservoir. Even in Upper Krishna and other projects sanctioned in Karnataka, there is evaporation loss. It is not that in Mysore, there is no evaporation loss. It is a characteristic of every storage reservoir. Hon. Members are anxious that the Krishna river must be utilised to the fullest extent. For that, we have got to construct as many storages as possible on this river. That is what Egypt is doing now where the construction of the High Aswan Dam is going on to store water of a total quantity of 127 million acre feet, 1-1/2 times the total flow of the water in the Nile river, whereas in Krishna taking into consideration all the projects in Maharashtra the storage reservoirs in Mysore and Andhra, it comes only to 20 million acre feet. Suitable storage sites are difficult to be found on Krishna. Storage site like the Srisaillam should not be lost sight of, from the point of view of utilising the water as completely as possible.

The Gulhati Commission is not a recommendatory body. If you read the terms of reference, it was purely to gather data in the various places.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: On the basis of data, what is the difficulty of appointing a tribunal?

Dr. K. L. Rao: I am coming to that. It is a counsel of despair. River disputes create difficulties all over the world; it is not only in India.

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister may conclude in two or three minutes.

Dr. K. L. Rao: I will conclude in five minutes.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) : इन के 5 मिनट के 10 मिनट हो जायेंगे और फिर 10 के 15 मिनट हो जायेंगे। जल्दी में वे पूरी बात भी अपनी नहीं कह पायेंगे। इसलिये कल का उन से अपनी पूरी बात कहलवा दीजिये। इस के अनिश्चित हाउम में इस समय कांरम भी नहीं है।

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Minister may resume his seat. The bell is being rung. If there is no quorum then I will adjourn the House.

There is quorum now. The hon. Minister may continue.

Dr. K. L. Rao: Mr. Chairman, I would like to deal with this subject of reference to the tribunal a bit more carefully and at length because a number of hon. Members have raised it and I think it is better I deal with that point clearly. What happens in the case of a river valley project is that passions are roused and a sense of regional identity is there with the result that solutions become very difficult. It looks almost impossible. In a case like this the tribunal is no solution. I will give you a few examples. In Karnataka itself, at the time of the construction of Krishnarajasagar there was dispute between Madras and Mysore. The dispute which started in 1910 got referred to a court of arbitration in 1913, and finally settled through negotiations in 1924, after 14 years. Similarly, take the example of foreign countries. There is the river Colorado in the United States. Over that the dispute went on between the States for a number of years and finally it was settled at the governmental level and not by a tribunal. It is very interesting. I would only quote one very interesting case. There was a case between Wyoming and Colorado and Wyoming pressed that the dispute should be taken to the court. A curious result of the decree was that although it reported to recognise Wyoming's prior appropriations, actually, in a year of low flow, it was Wyoming that suffered. This actually happened in 1922 itself so that Wyoming's legal victory proved in practice to be an empty one. A Governor of Wyoming was of opinion that the State would have done better to seek an agreement with Colorado instead of engaging in legal combat. A solution by agreement is best in the end for all concerned.

Our very distinguished jurist Shri B.N. Rao who worked as the Chairman of the Indus Commission in 1941-42, observed that "the most satisfactory settlement of disputes of this kind is by agreement, the parties adopting the same technical solution of each problem, as if they were a single community undivided by political or administrative frontiers".

So, it has been all the time the experience of the world that the best thing is to resolve this problem by a spirit of friendliness, and by negotiations. No problem was solved by tribunal anywhere in the world in the case of river disputes. About the Krishna river there are quite complicated factors. Even the amount of water that is there in the river is uncertain. There are so many other things. I do not want to go into the various aspects of it. As I said in the beginning itself, I do not want to be drawn into any detailed discussion on the subject. I only want to submit before this hon. House that I am trying to do my best in this matter. Shri Sivamurthi Swamy has expressed want of confidence in me. But I am pretty certain that my friends from Karnataka will express confidence in me. I am sure about it. If my Karnataka friends say that it is not so, then I am prepared to quite (*Interruption*) There is absolutely no question about it. Shri Sivamurthi Swamy levelled so many charges against me which are entirely not borne by the facts. The fact is, no project has been sanctioned, as I told you, to Andhra Pradesh besides that mentioned earlier.

I would once again appeal that if the House builds up an atmosphere of friendliness and an atmosphere of patience this problem can be solved very well. If we go to a tribunal, it would be a bad precedent for India. No river dispute has gone to a tribunal. The Act under which this is sought is also a very defective Act.

It has got to be amended, it has got to be modernised and it has got to have incorporated in it a provision for a conciliatory apparatus.

Therefore, what we want in this country is the building up of integration and that is not served by resorting to a tribunal. I would say, while I am grateful to Shri Sivamurthi Swamy for getting out all that was in his heart—I never knew that—I would appeal to my hon. friend to view things dispassionately and if he has got any particular thing on which

he has got a grievance against me he can come to me and I will try to satisfy him and his other friends.

Mr. Chairman: The House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 11.00 A.M.

17.47.

[The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Thursday, December, 24, 1964/Pausa 3, 1886 (Saka)].