

Chowdhury, Shri Y. Gadlingana Gowd, Shri Jaswantraj Mehta, Shri V. Veeraswamy, Shri Bahadur Singh, Shri R. Velayudhan, Shri Anandchand, and Shri Gulzarilal Nanda."

The motion was adopted.

RIVER BOARDS BILL

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the motion in regard to the River Boards Bill. Two hours had been set apart for the previous Bill, and three hours for the present Bill. As the point of order relates to both Bills, I would divide the time taken on the point of order between that Bill and this Bill. I must have closed the debate on the previous Bill by 5 o'clock. We started discussion on that at 3 o'clock. But we have finished it at about 5.35 P.M. That means, we have taken half an hour more on that Bill. That half an hour will be taken away from the time allotted to the present Bill for which three hours have been provided for. The House will sit today up to 7 P.M. So, we shall have 1 hour and 20 minutes today for this Bill. The balance of the time for this Bill will be given tomorrow. This Bill will have 2½ hours in all.

The Minister of Planning and Irrigation and Power (Shri Nanda): I beg to move:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide for the establishment of River Boards for the regulation and development of inter-State rivers and river-valleys made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 15th September, 1955 and communicated to this House on the 19th September, 1955 and resolves that the following members of Lok Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee, namely, Shri Piare Lal Kureel, 'Talib', Shri Sohan Lal Dhusiya, Shri Sunder Lal, Shri Vyankatrao

Pirajirao Pawar, Shri Ramappa Balappa Bidari, Shri Chandrasanker Bhatt, Shri G. R. Damodaran, Shri M. Shankarapandian, Dr. M. V. Gangadhara Siva, Shri M. K. Shivananjappa, Shri Laxman Shrawan Bhatkar, Shri Nand Lal Joshi, Shri P. Ramaswamy, Shri Anirudha Singh, Shri Lalit Narayan Mishra, Shri Nayan Tara Das, Shri Ranbir Singh Chaudhuri, Shri Lakshman Singh Charak, Shri Basant Kumar Das, Shri Sitanath Brohmo-Chaudhuri, Shri B. Ramachandra Reddi, Shri Kadiyala Gopala Rao, Shri Nikunja Behari Chowdhury, Shri Y. Gadlingana Gowd, Shri Jaswantraj Metha, Shri V. Veeraswamy, Shri Bahadur Singh, Shri R. Velayudhan, Shri Anandchand, and Shri Gulzarilal Nanda."

The House, for the purpose of this Bill also, has its time curtailed and I will try to compress the observations that I have to make in putting this motion before the House as much as possible. This Bill is, I may mention, based on, and derives its authority from, entry 56 in the Union List in Seventh Schedule. It reads:

"Regulation and development of inter-State rivers and river valleys to the extent to which such regulation and development under the control of the Union is declared by Parliament by law to be expedient in the public interest".

Thus we have in this Bill clause 2 which reads:

"It is hereby declared that it is expedient in the public interest that the Central Government should take under its control the regulation and development of inter-State rivers and river valleys to the extent hereinafter provided."

The above provision of the Constitution is thus linked up with this clause of the Bill.

In order to carry out this purpose, certain arrangements have been made in this Bill. But what is the purpose?

[Shri Nanda]

Regulation and development of inter-State rivers and river valleys. This has been further explained and clarified in clause 13 where stress is laid on the objective of achieving maximum results. This is the key to the whole idea of integrated, unified development of the water resources of our country. It is possible to have a particular use in a particular way to derive some benefit, but that will be only a partial and fractional utilisation. If, however, we have planned properly, taken a view of the entire possibilities of the region so far as the available water resources in the rivers are concerned, it would be possible to extend and expand the utilisation and to secure much larger benefits through multi-purpose use of these resources. There may be irrigation, there may be power also, there may be navigation, there may be flood control—and several other uses. Therefore, in order that the optimum use is made of these resources, there should be some authority to have a look at the entire picture as a whole and not let partial development come in the way of the fuller utilisation of these resources and not let neglect of these resources be permitted. It is mentioned further in the same clause—there are 8 points—conservation, control and optimum utilisation of water resources of the inter-State rivers, promotion and operation of schemes for the development of hydro-electric power, flood control, navigation and afforestation—I forgot to mention the last—and control of soil erosion, prevention of pollution of waters and all those things. These are intended to be looked after by a method of co-ordinated development of these resources.

Mention was made of a master plan for the country. It is certainly a very acceptable notion and not a notion which is not familiar to us, not an idea which we have already not accepted and to an extent worked out. Regional development alone will not do. The country has to be viewed as a whole and the regional plans also

have to fit into a master plan. For such a master plan, provision is being made through the CWPC, our other resources, States etc. Data are being collected about the potential of the various rivers for purposes of irrigation, power etc. And in order that these may be utilised to the full, various arrangements are visualised here. I shall not go into details. The various clauses are there. The machinery that is intended to be provided consists, in the first place, of a board. A board is to be set up, not as in the case of the other Bill at the instance of a State. Here the Central Government take the initiative to set up a board. The various provisions about its establishment, functions etc. are given in Chapter II—how it is established, either at the instance of the State or otherwise for the purpose of advising and performing other functions. The composition of the board is given in clause 5. It shall consist of a chairman and such other members as the Central Government thinks fit to appoint. Here, it is not one person only, but because of the larger purpose in view, it can be a larger body. Then a member shall be chosen from among persons who, in the opinion of the Central Government, have special knowledge and experience in irrigation, electrical engineering etc.

Then there are clauses 10 and 11 which enable this board to function effectively. In order to strengthen the hands of the board, these provisions have been made, that it may have one or more advisory committee or committees or may associate with itself such persons whose assistance or advice it may desire. This is so much about the board.

The next chapter says how the board shall proceed regarding the various functions. One of the most important is the preparation of schemes, because it is only when there is a properly prepared scheme that the rest of the things can follow. After preparing a scheme, the board shall consult the Governments interested in

respect of the scheme and after considering their suggestions, if any, the Board may confirm or modify or reject a scheme. So that consultation with the States is provided for not at one stage but at various stages. The Central Government may—in the same clause 15—on a request received in this behalf from any Government interested or otherwise, assist the Governments interested in taking such steps as may be necessary for the execution of the scheme. This is another provision which is a very important provision. It takes the arrangements a stage further. It is another integral part of the whole machinery. There are the Boards and then the Central Government takes upon itself certain responsibilities of assisting the Governments interested in taking such steps as may be necessary for the execution of the schemes. These steps may be varied and may arise either because both the States want them or one State wants them and another is neglecting its obligations and, therefore, impeding or retarding the development of the river valleys. Then the Central Government may take such steps as may be necessary to assist the State concerned, of course, in terms of the approved scheme.

The next part of the machinery is arbitration. This is clause 22, where any difference or dispute arises between two or more Governments interested with respect to any advice tendered or any measures undertaken by the Government interested in pursuance of such advice or, clause (c) is very important, there is any refusal or neglect of any Government interested to undertake any measures in pursuance of any advice, to share benefits or financial liabilities. Supposing any State may not have to derive any benefit immediately or otherwise from a project, but in that State a dam is to be built and if it refuses to go ahead with the various steps it has to take, like the acquisition of land and other things, or if there is any dispute about the share of the cost etc., then this arbitration provision comes in. The arbitrator shall be a person to be appointed in this

behalf by the Chief Justice of India from among persons who are or have been Judges of the Supreme Court or are Judges of a High Court. There is provision also for the appointment of assessors. A very important provision, which is the corner-stone of the effectiveness of this legislation, is sub-clause (4) of clause 22. It says that the decision of the arbitrator shall be final and binding on the parties and shall be given effect to by the Governments interested.

There are certain other very useful provisions. There are he powers to make rules for the Central Government assisting the Governments interested in any scheme prepared. This is only just for the implementation of the intentions of the advice or the decision of the arbitrator, that is, in order that an effective scheme may be drawn up. The provision has been made so that necessary information could be collected by the Board. Of course, the Board will consist of the Chairman and a few persons. Then, how is the Board going to do all these things? It is a big task of drawing up a scheme for a whole region. It won't have the technical personnel necessary. The answer is that the entire organisation of the State, the CWPC and other resources will be at the disposal of this body and, therefore, it will be in a position, with the help of the engineering knowledge available to us, to frame as quickly as possible a scheme and give advice to the States to carry out those schemes. If something comes in the way of quick execution, arbitration is there and the award is there. How is it to be carried out? There, the Central Government can come in and do the job which is required by the Board or the Arbitrator. This is the main scheme of this legislation and it is clear enough. It is covered by a few provisions but it has very far-reaching consequences for the good of the country. I hope that it will have quick passage.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

“That this House concurs in the recommendation of Rajya Sabha

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

that the House do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide for the establishment of River Boards for the regulation and development of inter-State rivers and river valleys made in the motion adopted by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 15th September, 1955 and communicated to this House on the 19th September, 1955 and resolves that the following Members of Lok Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee, namely, Shri Piare Lal Kureel 'Talib', Shri Sohan Lal Dhushiya, Shri Sunder Lall, Shri Vyankatrao Pirajirao Pawar, Shri Ramappa Balappa Bidari, Shri Chandrasanker Bhatt, Shri G. R. Damodaran, Shri M. Sankarapandian, Dr. M. V. Gangadhara Siva, Shri M. K. Shivananjappa, Shri Laxman Shrawan Bhatkar, Shri Nand Lal Joshi, Shri P. Ramaswamy, Shri Anirudha Sinha, Shri Lalit Narayan Mishra, Shri Nayan Tara Das, Shri Ranbir Singh Chaudhuri, Shri Lakshman Singh Charak, Shri Basanta Kumar Das, Shri Sitanath Brohmo-Choudhury, Shri B. Ramachandra Reddi, Shri Kadiyala Gopala Rao, Shri Nikunja Behari Chowdhury, Shri Y. Gadilingana Gowd, Shri Jaswantraj Mehta, Shri V. Veeraswamy, Shri Bahadur Singh, Shri R. Velayudhan, Shri Anandchand, and Shri Gulzarilal Nanda."

The hon. Members may now take part in the discussion. I think Shri S. L. Saksena spoke yesterday. I will give opportunities to all persons. The two bills are inter-related and as there is a single Joint Committee, I am leaving it to the good sense of the hon. Members themselves to find opportunities for other Members who want to participate and who have not participated. No doubt, the one subject is not on all fours with the other subject.

Shri N. M. Langam (Coimbatore): I give my whole-hearted support to this measure.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I wish hon. Members are brief so that many hon. Members can participate.

Shri N. M. Lingam: I shall take note of it, Sir.

Before going into the clauses of the Bill, I want to give some idea to the House of the manner in which our water resources are utilised at present.

[**PANDIT THAKUR DAS BHARGAVA in the Chair**]

In this country, the total annual flow of water is estimated at 1356 million acre feet of which only 76 million acre feet or 5.6 per cent. is used for irrigation and the rest flows into the sea. That is the picture for the whole country.

Taking some South Indian States the position is as follows. I refer to the region comprising to Andhra, Madras, Hyderabad, Mysore, Travancore-Cochin and Coorg. Here the total water that flows into the region is estimated at 200 million acre feet. Most of the rivers flow through more than one State. The water that is actually used comes to only very little. I have not got the figures separately. I have got the figures for the three big rivers, namely, Krishna, Cauvery and the Godavari. In respect of the Krishna, the water used is only 18 per cent., in respect of Cauvery it is 60 per cent. and in respect of Godavari it is only 14 per cent. This is the position. We have large areas to be irrigated in this country but only about 1/5th of the area that is under agriculture is irrigated, although we have very large water resources flowing into the sea. We have the consequential result that we are not making use of our water resources for the development of power also. It is amazing that we did not bestow thought on this vital question affecting the country much earlier.

Then again, take the southern region. The Krishna river flows

through Mysore, Hyderabad, Andhra and Bombay. The Cauvery flows through Mysore, Madras, Coorg and Travancore-Cochin. The Godavari flows through Mysore, Hyderabad, Andhra and the Madhya Pradesh and there are other smaller rivers. There is the Pennar which flows through Mysore and Andhra, the Palar which flows through Mysore, Andhra and Madras, there is the Ponnaiyar river which flows through Mysore and Madras, the Vamasagar river which flows through Orissa and Andhra. So, we see that the majority of these rivers go through more than one State and all these rivers have not been exploited to the full because of this.

Taking this region alone, the hydro-electric power potential is about 5 million kwts. We see the leeway that has to be made for the full utilisation of the waters that flows in this region. It is gratifying to note that it is not merely to use the waters for irrigation and power that this Board is being set up but also to have schemes for the development of navigation, for flood control, for afforestation and conservation of soil, and prevention of pollution of waters in inter-State rivers. But imposing as the list of objectives of the Board is, I have a fear that the machinery provided is unequal to the tasks that we envisage for this body. In clause 13, the Board is to tender advice only to the State Governments in respect of these matters. These matters, as the House knows, are very vital for the economy of the country. For instance, the problem of soil erosion is our problem number one today. It has its effects not only on the fertility of the soil, but also on floods and many other aspects of soil. The question of afforestation, which is linked with soil erosion, has vital bearings on the economy of the country. There is the all-important question of navigation. This question is not solved merely by the Board tendering advice on these matters that may be referred to by

any State Government. I am analysing clause 13. Here the Board's function is only to tender advice. Sub-clause (b) of clause 13 says:

"preparing schemes, including multi-purpose schemes, for the purpose of regulating or developing the inter-State river or river valley and advising the Governments interested to undertake measures for executing the scheme prepared by the Board."

It is true under sub-clause (c), it is stated:

"allocating among the Governments interested the costs of executing any scheme prepared by the Board and of maintaining any works undertaken in the execution of the Scheme."

But my own feeling is that these schemes, unless they come entirely within the purview of the individual States, cannot be executed by the Board proposed. If any particular scheme is within the ambit of the State Government, the mere advice of the Board is sufficient, but if the scheme extends over more than one State as it often happens, for which the Board is specially constituted, then the machinery provided is ineffective. It is a stupendous task to take one problem alone. Taking for instance, soil conservation in a river basin which flows through more than one State, it requires the resources of the States concerned and possibly of the Centre also to a considerable extent, not to speak of the technical personnel and other facilities necessary to execute the scheme. A machinery will be necessary to implement schemes with regard to soil conservation alone in a particular region covering more than one State affected by the course of a river. Similar will be the position with regard to the development of afforestation. There is then the question of navigation also. Inter-State navigation cannot be tackled by a Board like this. It involves the opening of new canals and many other ques-

[Shri N. M. Lingam]

tions connected with navigation. I feel, therefore, that the machinery of the River Board will not be effective in solving these problems that will affect more than one State. It has to be really effective if it has to carry out the functions envisaged for it in the Bill and it has to be a very high-powered body with ample resources, with more powers than provided for in this measure.

The development of navigation has not been very satisfactory—I mean inland navigation and it is necessary that we should make a beginning in this regard through the machinery of this Bill. The poet Bharathi of the south dreamed of a time when the waters of the Ganges would mix with the waters of the Cauvery in a system of countrywide inland navigation. This navigation will not only help us in our transport problem but also create a feeling of oneness in the country like our railways and postal systems. The connecting of all parts of the country by a sound system of inland navigation will create this feeling of oneness. So, having regard to the terms and functions proposed for this board, we cannot escape the conclusion that the powers allowed to it are the minimum.

Mr. Chairman: Your time is up.

Shri N. M. Lingam: With regard to the audit of the accounts of the board it is said that the accounts shall be audited at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed. But it would be better in my opinion if the Bill itself explicitly stated that the accounts should be audited by the Auditor-General. Even in the case of boards like the Coffee Board or the Tea Board, we have stated that the accounts shall be audited by the Auditor-General. So, instead of leaving it here to be provided for in the rules, it is better that express provision is made in the Bill itself.

Again, no clear idea of the funds that the board will have at its command is given in the Bill. It is necessary that the Bill makes provision

for defining the sources of income for the board so that it would carry out its functions according to the schedules and the programme before it and which will have to be incorporated, I believe, in the Five Year Plan of the Government. I take it that the proposals of this body will be incorporated in the Five Year Plan for the development of the country. In that case, the schedule of development has to be prepared by the board and the regular source of revenue has to be assigned to it. The board will not have full time work if occasionally it takes up a scheme at the instance of the State Governments and sits idle for the rest of the time.

These are the principal remarks that I have to make with regard to this. The Select Committee, I hope, will go into all those questions and make the Board really powerful so that it will be a very important machinery for the economic development of the country through the development of our water resources.

Shri Tek Chand (Ambala-Simla): When I turn to the Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill I consider it to be a most laudable measure but when I examine some of the provisions I am assailed with doubts as to the effectiveness of the measure. While framing the various clauses there is such an interlocking which will create considerable impediments and inconsistencies in the path of its enforcement. Nobody is afraid as much as I am as to the dangers of parochial patriotism; that is, that the State may want to do something not perhaps for its own advantage so much as perhaps out of spite for the other State. The tendency to be parochially patriotic and nationally un-patriotic is a tendency which has to be eschewed and that is likely to be there.

But, what I notice about this Bill is that the objective is that there should be a central authority, as my learned colleague who just preceded me said, conducive to the oneness of the

country. This is no doubt a laudable object, but, is it an objective we are likely to achieve through the agency of this legislative measure?

The difficulty that I notice is that it is a provision ostensibly, seemingly advisory, actually directive or even mandatory. For instance a Board cannot be established unless its establishment is sought by a State Government.

Shri Nanda: Or otherwise.

Shri Tek Chand: I am coming to that. Then we have the words "or otherwise by notification etc. by the Central Government". When we come to the proviso, the notification cannot be issued unless the State Governments have been consulted. Therefore, there will be certain obstacles or impediments which should not be lost sight of. A State seeking advice may be bargaining for a lot that was never intended. The dictionary meaning of 'advice' or the Lexicographer's meaning of 'advice' is that certain opinion is requested. It is for the person or individual or the corporation seeking opinion to act or not to act upon the opinion. Where the difficulties will arise is that when a State seeks a certain advice with respect to a certain relevant matter the advice is offered. The advice may have very important and heavy financial commitments and the advice must be followed. This is the curious result, not of the intention but of the wording. For instance, we have clause 13. "Matters in respect of which a Board may be authorised to tender advice" is the marginal heading. (a) relates to advising Government, (b) relates to preparing schemes and (c), (d) and (e) relate to other incidental matters.

Then again, if you will turn to arbitration clause 22 (c) it says that, "Where any dispute or difference arises between two or more Governments with respect to the refusal or neglect of any government interested to undertake any measures in pursuance of any advice tendered by the Board". Well, the matter goes to arbitration. The result, therefore, is,

when an advice is sought by a State, the advice given under certain set of circumstances may not be considered to be to its own behoof or to the betterment of that particular State to the fullest extent. The advice given may result in involving that State which seeks advice in heavy financial commitments. The moment the advice sought is not considered feasible by that State, then the result will be that refusal to receive advice becomes justiciable by an arbitrator and an arbitrator can mulct, can enforce and can involve it in heavy financial commitments simply because an advice sought was not accepted or could not, under the circumstances, be followed. Therefore, my feelings are, eliminate the question of advice: Let this be the function of the Centre—where it considers necessary in the interests of one State, two States, or more States, that river board should function in a certain manner, it should not be within the jurisdiction of the States to ignore the decisions of the river boards. The difficulty will be that in these circumstances, the particular States will be very chary of seeking advice. When we are seeking advice and receiving opinion, the opinion may have to be rammed down our throats. Therefore, some sort of intelligible nexus ought to be established between the request for an advice and liability to obey the advice perforce. Otherwise, facing the decision of an arbitrator must be final. To my mind, there is an inherent inconsistency between advice sought, advice given and the advice assuming the shape of a command and which must be followed.

Mr. Chairman: I think it is a sugar-coated pill!

Shri Tek Chand: Not that I do not want the Boards to function; not that. I do not want them to exercise the powers that they have, but the difficulty is, they will not function, because for the purposes of their functioning, some State must set the machinery into motion. They may inadvertently seek an advice, and

[Shri Tek Chand]

when once an advice is sought, then of course the river boards can do what they like. But my difficulty is, out of fear that the river boards may involve them into onerous duties, they may feel shy of seeking advice.

Then, clause 25 contains an inconsistency which may be noticed. The marginal note gives protection to members, officers and servants of the board to be public servants. But when you read the actual clause, the status of being public servants or the immunity that they get under the provisions of the Indian Penal Code is confined to members and officers of the board only. There is a distinction in law between an officer of the Government let us say, and a servant of the Government. An officer is only a functionary or employee of the Government, who is called upon to discharge what is called an *officium*. Every servant is not called upon to discharge an *officium*. Therefore, a distinction is deliberately made by law between a Government officer and a Government servant. No doubt, in a broad sense, every Government officer is also a Government servant. Therefore, in the clause, you are giving immunity to members and officers of the Board, but in your marginal note you are giving that immunity to members, officers and servants of Government.

So far as arbitrator is concerned, according to sub-clause (2) of clause 22,

"the arbitrator shall be a person to be appointed in this behalf by the Chief Justice of India from among persons who are, or have been, Judges of the Supreme Court or are Judges of a High Court."

To say that the arbitrator shall be appointed "from among persons who are, or have been, Judges of the Supreme Court" is understandable. It means that the present Judges of the Supreme Court as well as the ex-Judges or the retired Judges of the Supreme Court are persons qualified

to be an arbitrator. But when we come to Judges of the High Court, existing Judges of a High Court alone are qualified to be arbitrators, but not ex-Judges of the High Court. The distinction does not admit of any logical reasoning behind it. The age of retirement in the case of Supreme Court Judge is greater than in the case of a High Court Judge. Therefore, if you are going to recruit an arbitrator from among ex-High Court Judges, you may be recruiting a comparatively younger person who may be in a position to discharge his duties which may be of a very complex character with greater diligence. Therefore, it will be desirable that if you are going to have arbitrators from among Judges of a High Court, you may as well include an ex-Judge of a High Court, because thereby you will be preventing a great pressure on the High Court's work. Already in every High Court there is a preponderance of arrears and most of the High Courts are asking the Government for more Judges. If you are going to put this work on existing High Court Judges, the difficulty will be one of greater pressure. Therefore, it will be just as well if you include an ex-Judge of the High Court, who, in matters of ability and efficiency will be no less than a present High Court Judge. These are incidental matters. I think that the Central Government should be able to get over the difficulties created by the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution by having greater powers and not merely advisory powers.

Shri Viswanatha Reddy (Chittoor): I need not dwell at very great length on this Bill, because, just as the previous Bill, this Bill also has been welcomed by the House wholeheartedly. The hon. Minister while making his motion said that the authority behind this Bill is entry No. 56 in the Union List. I am sure he would agree with me that the immediate provocation for the introduction of his measure is to be found in the experience that has been gained by

the working of the Tungabhadra Board. The work connected with the Tungabhadra project was confronted with a great deal of difficulties, but after the Board was actually formed, those difficulties were to a considerable extent solved by the State Governments themselves by mutual consultation. The very fact that they came round the table and discussed their difficulties face to face solved many great difficulties. I am sure the origin of this Bill should have been suggested to the hon. Minister by the excellent working of the Tungabhadra Board. Of course, there are still some difficulties with regard to the Board, but generally speaking, the Board has functioned very well and it has helped a great deal in solving certain very difficult problems that were confronted by that project.

I would like to make very briefly some observations with regard to certain provisions of this Bill. I am happy to know that the Board contemplated under this Bill is a purely advisory Board. I am sure it is better that all of us recognise that we are functioning under a federal constitution, where the States have a great deal of autonomy. The State Governments are very much responsible to the people and therefore, it must be assumed and conceded that those Governments will always behave in a very responsible manner. Therefore, from this end, that is from the Central Government it should not be necessary to force anything on them unless it is so absolutely imperative. That fact is recognised and the Board has been made a purely advisory body. That is a very welcome measure.

Under clause 5, with regard to the composition of the Board, I find that the Central Government has got the power to nominate the members. I should think that usually the Central Government would nominate some members who have got the confidence of the respective State Governments which are interested. But, with regard to the termination of the Services of

these nominees, I think it would be better to provide that the State Governments should have the authority to withdraw any of their nominees from the Board and in their place, place some other nominee in whom they have confidence. That matter has not been made abundantly clear here. It looks as though once the State Government nominates a nominee in the Board, until the period of the member expires or until the Central Government terminates their services, that member will continue. That would lead to a very anomalous position. I think that it should be provided in this Bill that the State nominees should be capable of being withdrawn by the respective State Governments.

With regard to the functions of the Board, a fairly detailed list has been given in this Bill. But, I fail to notice in the enumeration, the rehabilitation of displaced persons. By rehabilitation, I mean, by the submergence on account of the construction of any dam, problems of rehabilitation may arise just as in the Damodar Valley. That is a very important function of the Board which has not been remunerated. I think it would be fair that this function of the Board should clearly be indicated in clause 13 of the Bill.

Then, I would like to refer to what in my opinion is a very important matter, with regard to which sufficient attention has not been bestowed in this measure. After all, this Board is set up in order to help the State Governments to arrive at certain agreed conclusions and to execute the work expeditiously. Where the State Governments differ in their views, provision is made for arbitration. But, where the Central Government differs from the views of the Board, it looks as though the opinion of the Central Government prevails even over the opinion of the State Governments. Therefore I should like specific provision to be made under clause 14 that where unanimity of opinion has been expressed by the concerned State Governments, the Central Gov-

[Shri Viswanatha Reddy]

ernment is bound to accept. I might illustrate my point by citing an example, the example of Nandikonda project. I know in this House the word Nandikonda has been heard quite often, and I am sure the hon. Minister must have got wearied of this agitation for Nandikonda. With regard to this project, there has been consistent agitation both in Hyderabad and Andhra which are the concerned States. In spite of their opinion that this project ought to be taken up immediately and executed as expeditiously as possible, the Central Government, and possibly the Planning Commission also, was very much against it, and it was only after a great deal of struggle that it was possible to sanction this scheme and put it in the Five Year Plan. I feel that the same situation should not arise with regard to other inter-State rivers. If the concerned State Governments insist that a particular project should be taken up, they ought to be allowed to judge which is best for them, and normally the Central Government must with great alacrity accept that unanimous suggestion of the State Governments. Therefore, such a provision ought to be made in this Bill. I do not know where exactly it can be inserted. I think the Joint Committee would do well to go into this question and see how far the wishes of the State Governments can be adequately respected.

Shri Tek Chand just now raised a very important matter, that is, suppose any State Government sought merely an advice from the Board, it should not be taken as a demand from the State Government, and the Board after going through the matter that is brought before it should not force it over the State Governments concerned. After all, a State Government might have innocently asked for some advice without deeply going into the consequences that are going to arise over it. Suppose they want some technical advice. The Board is a very

easy place where they can go for technical advice.

Shri Nanda: For technical advice, they do not have to go to this Board. The CWPC is there for technical advice.

Shri Viswanatha Reddy: The CWPC is there normally but the Board is functioning actually in those areas where.....

Shri Nanda: No.

Shri Viswanatha Reddy: Well, that should be made clear at least when the hon. Minister makes his reply.

Mr. Chairman: The Board can be constituted even if there is no request from the State Government. The Central Government, if it so chooses, can constitute a Board. There is no question of seeking advice.

Suppose any State Government wants only a clarification or advice, why should it be taken as a demand and then forced on it later on?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): No, it won't be.

Shri Viswanatha Reddy: I think it should be made clear at least by the hon. Minister.

Now, I would like to refer to one final point, and that is the sharing of waters of these inter-State rivers. A certain percentage of the waters of all major rivers has been allotted to various States already, and these allotments have been accepted and on the basis of that the resources of the States have been calculated. Many schemes have been investigated and several other actions have been contemplated. But, if this percentage sharing of water is to be a subject which can be raised in the Board or in the Tribunal that is provided in the other Bill, that would, I think,

lead to a hornet's nest. Certain very confirmed notions have been agreed to by various State Governments, and they should not be a topic which should be raised again afresh now. Therefore, it should be made adequately clear that question of sharing of water on percentage basis that has already been fixed for various major rivers should not be a subject that should be opened again.

With these remarks I commend this motion for the acceptance of the House.

श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी (कुप्टगी) : यह जो बिल इस हाउस के सामने पेश किया गया है और जिस के जरिये से कि जो दरिया दो तीन स्टेट्स में बह कर जाते हैं, उन के पानी को रेग्युलेट करने के लिये और झगड़ों को किसी बोर्ड को सौंपने के लिये जिन बोर्डों को कायम करने की व्यवस्था की गई है, मैं उस का स्वागत करता हूँ। मैं मंत्री महोदय को इस बिल के लाने के लिये बधाई भी देना चाहता हूँ। जो झगड़े स्टेट्स के दरमियान होते हैं उन के बारे में मैं कुछ मिसालें जोकि मुझे पता है, अगर पेश करूँ तो, मैं समझता हूँ, यह मुनासिब ही होगा।

जनाबसदर, मैं तुंगभद्रा प्रोजेक्ट के एरिया से आता हूँ और तुंगभद्रा प्रोजेक्ट में पहले तो दो स्टेट्स हिस्सा ले रही थीं, हैदराबाद और मैसूर, अब उस में एक और स्टेट आंध्र भी शामिल हो गई है और वह भी उस में हिस्सा ले रही है। जो बातें श्री विश्वनाथ रेड्डी ने बताई हैं उन को मान लेने से झगड़ों को हल करने में कुछ आसानी होगी और अगर जो बोर्ड कायम किये जायेंगे उन के साथ स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स सहयोग करेंगी तो काम आसानी से हो सकेगा। अब जो झगड़ा तुंगभद्रा के बारे में है उस के बारे में जो राधवाचारी जी ने यह कहा कि मैसूर गवर्नमेंट का कसूर है और उस पर जो

इल्जाम लगाया है उस को मैं बिल्कुल बे-बुनियाद समझता हूँ और यही बात जो चीफ इंजीनियर गोखले हैं वह भी कह चुके हैं। यह बात जरूर है कि जहां पर दरिया बहते हैं उन के पास को जो जमीनें होती हैं उन को पानी दिया जाना जरूरी होता है। साहबे सदर, आप भी हरियाणा प्रान्त से आते हैं और आप को भी मालूम होगा कि कि पहले तो उन इलाकों को पानी दिया जाना जरूरी है जिनके पास से दरिया या नहर बहती है और उसके बाद ही दूसरे जिलों को पानी देना वाजिब है। लेकिन झगड़ा उस वक्त खड़ा हो जाता है जब कि नदी के पास एक जमीन को पानी मिल जाता है और उसके पास ही दूसरी जमीन किसी दूसरे की है उसको पानी नहीं दिया जाता और जब वह आदमी जिस की जमीन को पानी नहीं दिया जाता किसी तरह से उस नहर में से पानी ले लेता है तो फिर उस पर जूमनि लगाय जाते हैं। इस तरह से पानी के बटवारे में कुछ तकलीफ होती है और कुछ झगड़े भी पैदा हो जाते हैं। इस लिय जितना एक स्टेट को पानी देना है उसकी मिकदार को फिक्स कर देना जरूरी होगा। तुंगभद्रा प्रोजेक्ट के बारे में हकीकत यह है कि जो भी झगड़े हैं वह इमेजिनरी हैं क्योंकि हलांकि यह प्रोजेक्ट तकरीबन खत्म होने को आ गई है और उस पर जो करोड़ों रुपया खर्च किया जा चुका है उसका पानी न तो आंध्र स्टेट इस्तेमाल कर रही है, न हैदराबाद स्टेट इस्तेमाल कर रही है और न ही मैसूर स्टेट कर रही है। इसके पानी से रैचर जिले में चार लाख एकड़ जमीन में सिंचाई की व्यवस्था होनी थी लेकिन अभी तक केवल पांच छः हजार एकड़ में ही सिंचाई की व्यवस्था हो पाई है। अगर किसी से इस प्रोजेक्ट के बारे में और पानी इत्यादि के बारे में पूछा जाता है तो वह कहता है कि दूसरे के पास जाओ। अगर स्टेट गवर्नमेंट

[श्री शिवमूर्ति स्वामी]

को कहा जाता है तो वह कहती है कि सेंट्रल बोर्ड के पास जाओ और अगर इस बोर्ड के पास जाते हैं तो वह किसी और के पास जान को कहता है। इसके बारे में मैंने मिनिस्टर साहब को दो तीन मर्तबा लिखा है। आप जो यह बात सोच रहे थे कि नौ लाख एकड़ जमीन को पानी दिया जाय उसके बारे में मैं कुछ भी नहीं हो रहा है। यह ताज्जुब होता है कि तुंगभद्रा कम्पलीट होने को आ गया है लेकिन अभी तक जो डिवेलपमेंट का काम है वह पूरा ही नहीं हुआ। बोर्ड के काम को यहां पर हम देखते हैं तो हम समझते हैं कि यही सही ही होगा कि जो भी बोर्ड कायम हो, वह एक एडवाइजरी नेचर का ही हो। इसके साथ ही मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि एक बलाज इसमें बढ़ाकर स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स के अफसरों को यह हिदायत दी जाय कि वे इस बोर्ड के तहत में और सुपरवीजन का काम करेंगे।

इसके बाद मैं एक तकलीफ के बारे में आपको कहना चाहता हूँ जो कि तुंगभद्रा बांध के सिलसिले में मेरे यहां के लोगों को उठानी पड़ी है। पहले इस बांध के लिये १६३५ फुट के लेवल तक के लिये जमीन एक्वायर करने की बात थी लेकिन हैदराबाद और दूसरी स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स ने १६२८ लेवल तक की ही जमीन एक्वायर की। और जो गांव मर्ज हो सकते थे उनको खाली कराया गया और वहां के लोगों को रिहैबिलिटेड किया गया। बोर्ड कायम होने के बाद जब वैरीफिकेशन हुआ तो उस लेवल को १६३५ फुट तक बढ़ाने का फैसला किया गया। अब फिर उन ७० गांवों के लोगों को रिहैबिलिटेड किया जायगा। इसमें लोगों को बहुत तकलीफ होगी। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि हमको रायलासीमा एरिया को पानी देने के लिये सेक्रीफाइस

करना होगा लेकिन मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस लेवल को दोबारा बढ़ाने से फिर रिहैबिलिटेशन का प्राबलम पैदा हो गया है। इसलिये मेरी इस्तदुआ है कि विलेजर्स की तकलीफ को दूर करने के लिये और इस बारे में स्टेट गवर्नमेंट को एडवाइज करके लिये बोर्ड को पूरी पावर्स दी जायें। ऐसा न हो कि विलेजर्स बोर्ड के पास जायें तो उनसे कहा जाय कि तुम स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के पास जाओ, और जब वे स्टेट गवर्नमेंट के पास जायें तो उनसे कहा जाय कि तुम बोर्ड के पास जाओ, हम तो उसके कहने के मुताबिक जमीन एक्वायर कर रहे हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह से उन लोगों को तकलीफ न हो। मैं यहां जब सवाल करता हूँ तो बहुत से सवालों को स्टेट सवजैक्ट बतलाकर छोड़ दिया जाता है। तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि गांव वालों को इस मामले में परेशान न होना पड़े। आप इस बिल में डिकलेअर करते हैं :

"It is hereby declared that it is expedient in the public interest that the Central Government should take under its control the regulation and development of inter-State rivers and river valleys to the extent hereinafter provided."

जब आप यह डिकलेरेशन करके आघारिटी लेते हैं तो इंटर स्टेट प्रोजेक्ट्स के सिलसिले में जो मसले पैदा हों उनको भी हल करने की आपको पूरी पावर्स लेनी चाहियें।

दूसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जो हमारे झगड़े होते हैं उनको जजिज को फंसले करने के लिये दिया जाता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि इस बात पर ज्यादा जोर दिया जाय कि जहां तक हो सके इन मसलों

को सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट या बोर्ड आपसी बात-चीत से तै कर दे ।

यह कहा गया कि एक स्टेट गवर्नमेंट दूसरे स्टेट गवर्नमेंट को सहकार नहीं देती । यह बात गलत है । सब एक दूसरे को सहकार देते हैं । लेकिन नजदीक की जमीन को पानी देना जरूरी होगा । यह नैतिक दृष्टि से उचित नहीं होगा कि दूर की जगह को तो पानी दिया जाय और पास की जगह को छोड़ दिया जाय । अगर आप सब को इंटेसिव कल्टीवेशन के लिये पानी नहीं दे सकते हैं तो मामूली कल्टीवेशन के लिये ही पानी दें । रायचूर, बलारी, अनन्तपुर और रायलासीमा ये ऐसे इलाके हैं जो कहल से भरपूर रहते हैं । इन इलाकों को तुंगभद्रा का पानी अच्छी तरह से दिया जाय । साथ ही नन्दीकोडा और दूसरे प्राजेक्ट्स को हाथ में ले कर ज्यादा पानी का इन्तिजाम किया जाय । अगर ऐसा किया गया तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे देश की तरक्की होगी ।

मैं इस बिल को ताईद करता हूँ ।

Shri N. Rachiah (Mysore—Reserved—Sch. Castes): I whole-heartedly support this important measure. I hope the Ministry could have introduced the Bill much earlier in the best interests of the country. While supporting this Bill, I want to refer to the powers and functions of the Board. This Bill seeks to provide for the establishment of River Board for the regulation and development of the inter-State rivers and river valleys. The Government contemplates to regulate the functions and powers of the Boards. They are very important. The purposes of the Board are:

(i) conservation, control and optimum utilisation of water resources of the inter-State river;

(ii) the promotion and operation of schemes for irrigation, water supply or drainage;

(iii) promotion and operation of schemes for irrigating the development of hydro-electric power;

(iv) promotion and operation of schemes for flood control;

(v) promotion and control of navigation;

(vi) promotion of afforestation and control of soil erosion; and

(vii) prevention of pollution of the waters of the Inter-State river.

In our country we have got very mighty and vast rivers with very good water resources and power but we have not been able to regulate and control these and fully exploit the big rivers for the benefit of our country. Whereas in other countries even big rivers like the Volga, and Raine have been fully exploited for the benefit and progress of those countries. But, here, unfortunately, though we have already reached the 9th year of independence, we have not been able to exploit our resources fully for the benefit of our country. I am very happy that the Government at least now have thought of making use of these mighty rivers for the benefit of the country.

I am one of those who do not believe in too much of concentration of power in the Central Government. With regard to disputes referred to by my friends from Andhra and also from Madras, particularly, Mr. N. R. M. Swamy, I would like to refute the charges made by them with regard to the Mysore State, and the execution of their powers with regard to the projects in Mysore State and other States pertaining to the rivers Kaveri, Pennar and others. My friends must know that these agreements with regard to the sharing of the waters or power—whatever it might be—of these rivers were executed by the irresponsible Governments before our Congress Government took over, after independence.

[Shri N. Rachiah]

The British Government wanted only disputes and not agreement and they were not very much interested in the solution of these problems, the disputes that were connected with the sharing waters of the rivers, After independence, we have got responsible Governments in the States as well as in the Centre. Ever since 1947, we have not been having so many disputes or differences. The State Governments, especially Mysore and Andhra, with regard to the Tungbhadra project, have been going on very well and as my friend Shri Viswanatha Reddi just now stated, the State Governments are fully co-operating with each other and no Government will be foolish enough to prevent any other Government for taking advantage of any watercourse when that is sufficiently utilised by the State which is having the source of the water.

With regard to the Kaveri river, about 6 years back, I know there was complete failure of rains both in Coorg and Mysore. The whole belt was dry; there was not one foot of water. When there is no water in Coorg where the river takes its birth and there is no water in the dam constructed for the benefit of the State in Mysore, how could the Madras or the Andhra Government get water from a river where there is no water? Even during this year there was complete failure of crops in Mysore District i.e. in my constituency due to failure of rains in Coorg and in the district. No Government could allow any of these waters to be snatched off unless it is fully utilised by that State Government. Suppose a man comes for a gift and he wants a thing from some other person, then that person who has got to make charity must first satisfy his own needs and then give charity to another person. It is something like the story of the camel which wanted shelter only for its head when there was no shelter at all and afterwards due to its greed it wanted shelter for its

whole body and turned the owner out. To attribute motives to the Mysore Government or Mysore officers with regard to the sharing of the waters of Kaveri, Pennar or other rivers is not fair. I refute such charges because the Mysore Government and Mysore officers have been very fair, and no complaints have so far been published even in papers. Without even knowing the difficulty in arriving at an agreement or solving a dispute or difference between two State Governments or more one can't charge Mysore Govt. and it may be due to technical difficulty—Shri Swamy said that "instead of a 9 feet bund, they have raised another 18 feet bund and as such we have not been able to get water". That is utterly false. Unless the dam is protected, unless the project is protected well, by filling of silt and sand and other things, water cannot be allowed to go into the other territory. Also, in the best interests of the Mysore State, we must also keep more and more water so that our crops may not fade; otherwise, it will result in scarcity of food which causes famine. I, therefore, refute the charges levelled against the Mysore Government by Shri N.R. Muniswamy, by Shri Raghavachari and also by Shri Lakshmayya.

Shri Lakshmayya (Anantapur): Even now, they stand in the way of a high-level canal for which we are asking.

Shri N. Rachiah: I repudiate that allegation. Shri Swamy also charged the Mysore Government with violation of the principles of the agreement by using water for agricultural purposes instead of irrigation purposes. That also is really a false charge. Much more than these disputes, I am sure that the Board will give its attention to the complete exploitation of our water resources for the full benefits of our country and also to control the floods which are damaging our property and person more and more every year. Now we have solved the problems of displaced

persons and we have solved many other problems also. Our country has to face this problem of flood havoc, and it is high time that the Government should set up this Board in the best interests of the country to regulate flood damages caused to our country particularly at a time when we are in a period of transition and engaged in nation-building activities.

I very strongly support this Bill and hope that the Government will see that this Bill becomes an Act very soon for the best interests of the country.

सरदार इकबाल सिंह (फ़ाज़िल्का सिरसा) : मैं इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ लेकिन साथ ही मैं यह महसूस करता हूँ कि यह एक बहुत कमजोर क्लिप्स का बिल है और मैं समझता हूँ कि जब तक आप छोटे छोटे हर एक दरिया के लिये कम-से-कम एक इलाक़े के लिये एक ऐसी एयारिटी या संस्था नहीं बनायेंगे जो कि खास तौर पर उस इलाक़े के वास्ते पानी के मुतालिक़ फ़ैसला कर सके कि इन दरियाओं के पानी को किस ढंग से डवलप करना चाहिये तब तक एक सेंट्रल वाटर पावर कमीशन से हम अपने मक़सद में कामयाब होने वाले नहीं हैं। साथ ही मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि अलहिदा अलहिदा स्टेट्स में जो आप बोर्ड्स बना रहे हैं, उनको जब तक आप खास तौर पर ताक़त नहीं देंगे कि वह अपने खास इलाक़ों के मसले हल कर सकें तब तक आपका यह काम ठीक से चलने वाला नहीं है। आप कई एक इस तरह के कमीशन बनाइये, गंगा कमीशन बनाइये, ब्रह्मपुत्र कमीशन बनाइये और साउथ इंडिया के जो दरिया हैं उनके वास्ते एक अलग कमीशन बनाइये जो कि सब आपके इस सेंट्रल वाटर पावर कमीशन के नीचे बर्क करे और एक कोआरडिनेशन के तौर पर काम हो और सारे डेटा इकट्ठे किये जायें और फिर उन पर फ़ायदे से काम किया

जाय। अगर आप हर एक दरिया के लिये बोर्ड बनायेंगे और उसके ऊपर एक कमीशन बनायेंगे तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इससे बहुत ज्यादा कन्फ़्यूज़न होगा। यह बहुत जरूरी है कि जो आप तीन चार कमीशन बनायें उन पर जिम्मेदारी डालें ताकि वह ठीक से कोआरडिनेशन के साथ साथ सेंट्रल वाटर पावर कमीशन के नीचे डवलपमेंट का काम कर सकें। मैं मंत्री महोदय से कहना चाहूंगा कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को तीन या चार वाटर पावर कमीशन बनाने चाहियें और उन को जरूरी पावर्स देनी चाहियें ताकि वे अपने अपने इलाक़ों की उन्नति कर सकें और डवलपमेंट का काम अंजाम दे सकें। हर एक स्टेट के अलग अलग मसले हैं, अगर एक स्टेट का मसला यह है कि उसे दरिया से बिजली पैदा करनी है तो दूसरी स्टेट को दरिया से पानी ले कर अपने खेतों में डालना है और बिजली पैदा करने वाली रियासत का नुक्तेनज़र और हो सकता है और उस रियासत का जो अपने खेतों में पानी पहुंचाना चाहती है नुक्तेनज़र कुछ दूसरा हो सकता है, इस वास्ते यह जरूरी हो जाता है कि हम इस देश में तीन या चार वाटर पावर कमीशन और बनायें जोकि सेंट्रल वाटर पावर कमीशन के नीचे रहें और जोकि एक कोआरडिनेटेड डेटा इकट्ठा करें कि फ़लां सूबे को कितने पानी की जरूरत है और फ़लां सूबे को कितनी बिजली की जरूरत है। और इसीलिये मैं ने कहा है कि जब तक आप सारे देश की तीन, चार हिस्सों में तक्रसीम कर के अलग अलग कमीशन नहीं बनायेंगे और उन को पावर्स नहीं देंगे तब तक देश की उन्नति का कार्य पूरा नहीं हो सकता है।

अमरीका में टेनेसी वैली एयारिटी बनाई गई और उस में बड़े बड़े इलाक़े के

[सरदार इकबाल सिंह]

नुमायन्दों को उस में रक्खा गया जिस से डेवलपमेंट का काम कोआरडिनेशन से योजना-पूर्वक हो सके, मैं उस के खिलाफ नहीं हूँ और मैं इस बात को मानता हूँ और चाहता हूँ कि गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया को अस्तित्वात होना चाहिये कि वह सारे देश की बेहतरी के लिये एक कोआरडिनेटेड प्लान के मातहत प्रोसीड कर सके और वह रियासतों सतह पर न जा कर और छोटी छोटी बातों में न जा कर एक ब्रॉड माइंड से अपना काम करे। और मैं मान सकता हूँ कि इस क्रिस्म के ज्यादा बोर्ड्स बना कर हम शायद उस चीज को हासिल न कर सकें जो हासिल करना चाहते हैं। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप पालिसी तो यहां सेन्टर से तय कर दें और जो उस के अमल में लाने का यानी एक्सीक्यूशन का काम है वह स्टेट बोर्ड्स के जिम्मे होना चाहिये कि वह उस को अमल में लायें और हम ने इस तरह के बोर्ड बनाये हैं, जैसे तुंगभद्रा का बोर्ड है और पंजाब में भाखड़ा कंट्रोल बोर्ड है और इस क्रिस्म के शायद और भी कई बोर्ड बने हैं और हो सकता है कि आप ने उन के जरिये एक वक्ती तौर पर अपना काम चला लिया हो लेकिन यह काफ़ी नहीं होगा और इसीलिये मैं ने सुझाव दिया है कि आप स्टेट्स में ताक़तवर कमीशन बनायें जिन को कि आप पूरी ताक़त दें और जिन के जरिये कि कोआरडिनेटेड तरीक़े से उस स्टेट में आप डेवलपमेंट का काम चलवायें। इस बिल में यह भी दिया हुआ है कि अगर कोई स्टेट गवर्नमेंट यह समझती

है कि उस के साथ इन्साफ नहीं हुआ है और वह बोर्ड की सलाह को नहीं मानती है और उस के मुताबिक काम नहीं करती है तो इस मामले में आरबिट्रेशन किया जायगा और चीफ़ जस्टिस आफ इंडिया उस के लिये आरबिट्रेटर मुकर्रर करेंगे और उस का फ़ैसला बोर्ड और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट दोनों मानेंगे और आरबिट्रेटर का फ़ैसला स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स पर बाइंडिंग होगा।

7 P.M.

मैं आखिर में फिर एक बार कहना चाहता हूँ कि तीन, चार इस तरह के वाटर पावर कमीशन बनाये जायें जो सेन्दल वाटर पावर कमीशन के नीचे वर्क करें और एक कोआरडिनेटेड प्लान के मुताबिक डेवलपमेंट का काम करे। एक साउथ का है, उस के बाद एक वेस्टर्न रिवर्स का हो सकता है, एक गंगा रिवर्स का हो सकता है, एक ब्रह्मपुत्र रिवर्स का हो सकता है, एक सेन्दल इंडिया रिवर्स का हो सकता है। यह चार पांच कमीशन जो गवर्नमेंट आफ इंडिया पावर कमीशन के नीचे काम करें, हो सकते हैं। यह कमीशन तमाम डेटा इकट्ठा कर के सारे बेस की बेहतरी के लिये विचार करे। एक बोर्ड बनाना सारे देश के लिये शायद काफ़ी नहीं होगा। इसलिये मैं आशा करता हूँ कि इस तरह के कमीशन जल्द से जल्द बना दिये जायेंगे ताकि ज्यादा रियासतों की और ज्यादा लोगों की बेहतरी हो सके।

The Lok Sabha then adjourned at Eleven of the Clock on Friday, the 30th September, 1955.