

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the balance of payment position in the country is very bad—admitted even by the Economic Survey—it is necessary that we should have some counter-trade agreement by which we should be able to augment the export so that whatever we lose by way of imports in terms of foreign exchange we will be able to make up the loss. Therefore, this is a welcome move to having this. But I would like to know from the hon. Minister after this counter-trade provision has been arrived at, what is the total quantum value-wise as well as volume-wise because if you give it only value-wise in view of the adjustment of the currencies we are likely to get a wrong picture. Therefore, will you tell us quantum-wise also and value-wise also what is the total export we have *been able to achieve? Has that export been able to upset in a substantial measure the great expenditure that we had to incur as a result of the imports?*

Lastly taking our past experience into account, I hope, all the State arrangements will be directly done with the companies concerned and there will be no middle man utilised who is likely to create trouble.

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI DINESH SINGH): So far as this question relates to the question that we are discussing, may I say that we had targeted an export on this account of Rs. 95.6 crores which is cumulative for the last three years. Out of this by December 31, 1988 goods worth Rs 66.1 crores had been exported and accounted for. Goods worth Rs 30 crores more had been exported before December 31, 1988 but their papers had not come and, therefore, it had not been accounted for. That has since been reconciled and the total export that has taken place is Rs. 96.15 crores as against the target of, Rs. 96.62 crores. So the target has been fulfilled by the active interest that STC has taken in this regard.

As my colleague explained this would be an additionality. This will not eat into our normal trade with the countries which had

been designated. I have checked up and there is an increase in the trade with all those countries which had been targeted. Therefore, one could assume that there has been additionality.

So far as the volume is concerned, that would be a long list and I do not think that would help the hon. Member. But what would help is that this is taken into account in terms of the present parity between the Swedish kroner and the rupee and not the earlier parity. So, this would reflect the real value now.

Hon. Member knows that there is no such word as 'strait trade'. There is trade in the normal commercial sense and this is the *normal commercial transaction*.

Cauvery Water Dispute

*277. SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: Will the Minister of WATER RESOURCES be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government of Tamil Nadu has sent a memorandum to Union Government for solving the problem of Cauvery water dispute in February, 1989;

(b) if so, the steps taken in this regard; and

(c) whether Government are considering to form a tribunal for solving the dispute?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI KRISHNA SAHI): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise

(c) The matter is under consideration.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: Sir, the answer is always routine and a usual one from the Ministry of Water Resources. This matter has been raised in this House seven times. I have already drawn the attention of the Minister by means of mention under Rule 377 three times and by means of special

submission one time and three times this question has come. What actually the Ministry of Water Resources is doing with regard to solving this problem of inter-State rivers? Actually this is the answer which was given in 1986-87 and now in 1989. It is the same answer.

Sir, the hon. Minister knows about this matter well. Actually, we were pressing upon this matter with the Water Resources Ministry and also with the Prime Minister for a number of years. This matter is pending for the last 20 years, i.e., two decades, since 1977 onwards. My question is regarding this Cauvery water dispute. Already negotiations have taken place between the Central Ministry and also the State Ministries of Karnataka and Tamil Nadu but the matter has not been solved. Even the Janata Government could not solve this. Mr. Barnala also took interest in this and also many other States. I want to know whether any specific time-bound programme is there in order to solve the inter-State water problem. It has been published in the papers, when the DMK Ministry of Tamil Nadu assumed office, that Mr. Karunanidhi announced in the papers that they have sent a Memorandum to the Water Resources Ministry but they say that they have not received any Memorandum actually from the Tamil Nadu Government. Moreover, he has already stated to the Press...(Interruptions)... Sir, I want half-an-hour discussion on this.

MR. SPEAKER: I can only say one thing I can give you a certificate on both sides. It is the same consistency, the same question, the same answer and the same long speeches. I want you to put a specific question.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: Even if I ask a specific question, they are going to reiterate the very same answer.

MR. SPEAKER: That is why I said that I can give you a certificate on both sides—the same question, the same answer.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: I want to

know whether there is a specific time-bound programme in order to solve the Cauvery water dispute and other disputes by the Central Government.

SHRIMATI KRISHNA SAHI: Efforts are made to solve the inter-State water dispute through negotiations. The adjudication through tribunals is resorted to only when settlement through negotiations is not found possible. We do not have any information from the State Governments but what we have read and learnt from the papers is that the two Chief Ministers of the two State Governments are having many love letters. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: I won't allow romanticising the House here.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: You lay the lovers on the Table of the House.

SHRIMATI KRISHNA SAHI: I am prepared to do it. But I have got to do a lot of pulling which I cannot do. The hon. Member has said that many times this matter has come to the Parliament. I agree with him. It has come to Parliament many times and outside Parliament also. I would like to say that our Union Minister of Irrigation and the Chief Ministers of the three States held about 11 meetings during 1970-75 to discuss the various issues. But what can be done? In April 1983 the matter was raised and a meeting of the Chief Ministers was convened by the Union Minister of Irrigation. But sometimes one Chief Minister does not come and sometimes the other Chief Minister does not come. Then, what can we do? We have been trying to negotiate. We can only become a *Panch*. But it all depends upon the two States to resolve the issue. Now, the Chief Ministers are saying that they have welcomed it. We have seen in the papers on 31.1.89 that Mr. Karunanidhi has welcomed the Cauvery plan. and said that water dispute should be settled through discussions. What can we do?

MR. SPEAKER: Now, the question is put to you.

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: It is a perennial problem to the farmers of Tanjore and Trichy. Unless water is available from Cauvery, they cannot grow any crops like paddy in the lands of Trichy and Tanjore. What has been the result of all these steps? You had about eleven meetings, but what is the result? If you are not able to solve the problem, why should you be in power then? Unless you solve the problem, I have to stage a *dharna* before the Ministry of Water Resources. You take it from me. It is a very serious matter; you have to face its repercussions even in the parliamentary elections. This is a farmers' problem; it is a national problem. That has to be solved.

MR. SPEAKER: No threats in the House. Just put the question.

(Interruptions)

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: There must be a time-bound solution. Unless the Ministry comes forward with a time-bound solution of this problem, I would stage a *dharna* before the Ministry. What do you say to this? (Interruptions). It should be referred to the Tribunal at least

[Translation]

SHRIMATI KRISHNA SAHI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have stated it earlier and I am saying again that the new Government of Tamil Nadu had taken a decision that this matter should be settled through negotiations. It was stated that this was the political will of the Government. If this is the case then what can we do?

[English]

SHRI VEERENDRA PATIL: I would like to know whether it has come to the notice of the Government of India that the newly elected Chief Minister of Tamil Nadu has changed the stand that the previous Governments had taken with regard to the Cauvery dispute. In fact, he had reiterated this stand during the time of election campaigning and after he assumed the office of chief Minister-

ship, he categorically made a statement that so far as Cauvery dispute is concerned, he is not for referring it to the Tribunal, but he is for a negotiated settlement. Has this fact come to the notice of the Government of India? When two parties and the two State Governments are prepared for a negotiated settlement and there is a change in the stand of the Tamil Nadu Government, can the Government of India come into the picture?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE AND MINISTER OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI B. SHANKARANAND): I agree with the hon. Member's views. The situation before the Tamil Nadu elections was entirely different. During the time of MGR, negotiations went on a MGR, took up the stand saying that only a Tribunal can solve this problem. After MGR now we have heard and seen from the press the stand taken by the present Chief Minister that this dispute can be solved by discussions and Shri Bommai has welcomed it and praised it....(Interruptions)

SHRI P. KOLANDAIVELU: What has been result so far?

MR. SPEAKER: If you want to interrupt unnecessarily he cannot reply. The situation cannot be helped.

SHRI B. SHANKARANAND: When two parties agree, the interference of the third person is unwelcome.

[English]

Strategy to Boost Exports

*228. SHRI BALASAHEB VIKHE PATIL†:
SHRI MAHENDRA SINGH:

Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state:

- (a) whether he held recently a meeting of big business export houses of industry;
- (b) if so, the details of the participants at the meeting;