

डा० राम मनोहर लोहिया : अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रायः खुद सोंबें कि सवाल का जवाब आ गया है। हमको तो दिलचस्पी है और अगर वह जानना चाहें, तो सबसे ज्यादा दिलचस्पी उस लक्ष्मी गुडन में है, जिसकी छूट इस दफा श्री मोरारजी देमाई ने दे दी है और जो उनकी तरफ प्राजकल बहुत ज्यादा इस्तेमाल होता है। यह मैंने सुना है, और वह छोड़िये। (अध्यक्ष) यह हूँ की कोबान नहीं है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि सदन को मालूम हो। यह बहुत गम्भीरता का मवाल है। हमारा उत्पादन का मारा इन्चा खत्म हुआ है। और जो हमारे ऊपर 80 अरब रुपये का विदेशी कर्जा है उसमें से मेरा अनुमान है— 80 अरब में मैं वह 20 अरब स्टालिंग बीनेम गिन लेता हूँ पहले का—और मेरा अनुमान है उसमें 40 अरब रुपया इन तरह की फिजूल की चीजों से है। मंत्री महोदय सवाल के रुख को मसज नहीं रहे हैं।

श्री विमेश सिंह : मैं पूरी कोशिश कर रहा हूँ अध्यक्ष महोदय लेकिन मवाल के साथ इतनी चीजें हैं कि मैं किसको किसको समझूँ ? जहाँ तक आयात का मवाल है मैं माननीय सदस्य से बहुत विनम्र निवेदन करूँगा कि जो हमारी लाल कितान आयात के सम्बन्ध में निकली है एक मन्वे उम पर अपनी नजर दौड़ाये। फिर देखें कि कितना उसमें जरूरी काम के लिए है और कितना और जिसको कि वह फिजूल समझते हैं और उसमें कोई बात हो तो मुझे बनाये, हम जरूर विचार करेंगे।

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त : क्या मंत्री महोदय बतायेंगे कि जैसा कि उन्होंने कहा है कि 1826 करोड़ रुपये का आयात है उस में से कितने ऐसे हैं जिनको आपने 50 करोड़ या उससे अधिक आयात का लाइसेंस दिया है ? अगर अभी यह फिगर्स आपके पास न हों

तो क्या सदन में बाद में रहेंगे और (बी) क्या यह सही है कि जो लोग इम्पोर्ट लाइसेंस लेकर अपना बेच देते हैं उनको कोर्ट में कैस चलाना हो तो सरकार की परमीशन लेनी पड़ती है ? अगर ऐसा है तो क्यों ऐसा है और क्या इस कंटीशन को हटायेंगे ?

श्री विमेश सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, पहले श्री श्री बनर्जी ने यह सवाल पूछा था। कोई हमारा इरादा इसको छिपाने का नहीं है कि किसको कितना लाइसेंस दिया गया। दिक्कत यह है जो हमारी प्रणाली इस बक्त प्रचलित है उसके हिमाब से कनोडिटीबाइज कितने लाइसेंस मांगे गए उसका हिसाब रहता है, फर्म-बाइज नहीं रहता है। माननीय सदस्य किसी फर्म का जिक्र करें या जैमा 50 करोड़ से ऊपर उन्होंने पूछा है मैं पूरी कोशिश करूँगा पता लगाने की और मदन के मापने इसको रखूँगा।

Mr. Speaker: The Question Hour is over.

Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta: I asked a question . . .

Mr. Speaker: The Question Hour is over.

12 hrs.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTION

Narmada Project

S.N.Q. 19. Shri P. N. Solanki: Will the Minister of Irrigation and Power be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Chief Ministers of Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh met on the 23rd May, 1967 at Pachmarhi to discuss and finalise the details about the Narmada Project; and

(b) if so, the result of their talks?

The Minister of Irrigation and Power (Dr. K. L. Rao): (a) and (b). The Chief Ministers of Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh met at Pachmarhi on Tuesday, the 23rd May, 1967 and had

discussions on the subject. These are to be continued during this month.

Shri P. N. Solanki: It is more than two years since the Khosla Commission was appointed by the Central Government. Every time discussions are held and talks are held, but there is no result. Is the Central Government going to interfere in this national project? When we have food problem and other things, is the Central Government going to do anything about this project?

Dr. K. L. Rao: The Khosla Committee's report was received in September, 1965 and was laid on the Table of the House. Then the Ministry of Irrigation and Power went into discussions with States and, finally, some suggestions were made at a meeting held in August 1966. In that meeting it was decided that these two Chief Ministers would discuss and try to settle the problem amicably, which the Chief Ministers undertook. We are awaiting the results of their discussions. As soon as the results of their meeting are known, the Central Government will take further steps.

Shri P. N. Solanki: When all these discussions are held, is there any representative of the Central Government present there to iron out the differences between the Chief Ministers?

Dr. K. L. Rao: That is what I submitted. At a meeting of the Central Government and the two Chief Ministers and other concerned Ministers, held in August 1966, certain suggestions were made and then it was decided, and the Chief Ministers of Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat accepted, that they should first discuss between themselves and try to settle the problem amicably. That is why a meeting was held between them. As soon as the results of their discussions are known, the Central Government will take further steps.

Shri Manubhai Patel: In view of the fact that the Narmada project is considered to be a national project and the foundation-stone for it was laid by the late Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru some six or seven years before, may I know whether the hon. Minister of Irrigation and Power will fix a deadline before which the Chief Ministers of the two States should come to an agreement and report back to the Ministry and if they do not come to an agreement by that date, then the Central Ministry will intervene and take some decision or action?

Dr. K. L. Rao: It is true that the Narmada river is one of our most precious rivers, the development of which is very anxiously awaited by all of us. It is our earnest desire that some settlement should be arrived at, and I expect that during 1967 we shall be able to arrive at some solution.

Shri Virendrakumar Shah: Considerable anxiety is expressed not only by this House but also by Gujarat in particular about this Narmada Valley project. Will the hon. Minister enlighten us what the anticipated cost of the Narmada project is on the basis of the report of the Khosla Commission, and what benefits will come to the country by way of irrigation, foodgrains production and power generation?

Dr. K. L. Rao: It is rather premature to give those figures because that will depend upon the type of agreement that will be reached between these two States. But as a general statement, I can say that we are expecting about 10 million acre to be irrigated in both Madhya Pradesh and Gujarat on account of these projects.

श्री वल्लभजी शिंदे कृपावार्ता: अध्यक्ष महोदय, क्या मंत्री जी यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि अगले मध्य प्रदेश और गुजरात के मुख्य मंत्री परस्पर बर्बाद द्वारा किसी नदीके

पर पहुंच पाये तो फिर केन्द्र द्वारा इसके बारे में क्या कदम उठाया जायगा ?

Dr. K. L. Rao: It has been reported that there have been cordial and frank discussions so far between the two Chief Ministers. As soon as we hear from them, the Central Government will step in.

Shri Yajnik: In view of the fact that the Central Government took the responsibility, in view of the fact that this river Narmada goes through many States, in view of the fact that the harnessing of the Narmada waters to a considerable extent was considered a national question, and also in view of the fact that the Government of India appointed the Khosla Commission to frame a comprehensive scheme after consulting the representatives of the two States, may I know why the Government of India have not taken a final decision on the utilisation of the waters of the Narmada according to the recommendations of the Khosla Commission and why they have been waiting all this time for an agreement between the two Chief Ministers who have not been able to come to any agreement for all these years? Secondly, may I know whether the Soviet engineers have been drawn into this matter by the Madhya Pradesh Government in order to elicit their co-operation in building the Punasa Project and whether the Government of India are also asking the Soviet engineers to frame or help in framing a concrete scheme for implementing the comprehensive Narmada project which may cover more than one State?

Dr. K. L. Rao: As I have submitted already, the Centre is not taking the initiative at the moment, because there were discussions between the various Chief Ministers and the Centre at which it was decided that the two Chief Ministers would settle this between themselves and will first make attempts in that direction and then report to the Central Government after which only the Central Government would take further

action. We are awaiting the results of those meetings very anxiously.

With regard to the Soviet engineers and their participation, to which the hon. Member has referred, the facts are as follows:

The Soviet Government supplies machinery to various projects. Therefore, the Madhya Pradesh Government sought their assistance in supplying machinery for the Punasa project which is otherwise called the Narmada Sagar project. But the Government of India told the Madhya Pradesh Government that first of all we have got to settle this dispute between the parties before we can take up this project on the Narmada river. Therefore, the question of Soviet participation or assistance does not arise at this stage.

श्रीमती जयशंकर शर्मा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, जब जब स्टेट्स के बीच में नदियों या दूसरे विषयों को लेकर कोई सवाल पैदा हो जाता है, तो उसमें देर लग जाती है और एक ऐसी हवा पैदा हो जाती है कि कोई स्टेट उन सबालों के बारे में पंछि लग जाते हैं और कोई नहीं लगते हैं। मैं यह चाहती हूँ कि जब ऐसे मामले उठें, तो उनके बारे में आर्यजेनिटिव ब्यू लेकर उनके फाइनलाइजेशन के लिये कोई ऐसी मशीनरी बनाने की कोशिश करना चाहिये कि जिन में उन में देर न हो और जल्दी मामले तय हो सके। अब जैसी यही नर्मदा वाली बात को ही ले लांजिये, इससे मध्य प्रदेश को तकलीफ होने वाली है, लेकिन उससे गुजरात में ऐसी हवा पैदा होती है कि वे लोग कुछ नहीं कर पाते हैं। यह गुजरात की ही बात नहीं है, अब जब ऐसे मीके आते हैं, काम आगे नहीं बढ़ पाता है। इसलिये कोई ऐसी मशीनरी बनाई जाय जो ऐसे मामलों पर सोच कर उन के बारे में जल्दी निर्णय लेकर काम को जल्दी से जल्दी आगे बढ़ाये।

Dr. K. L. Rao: It is important that wherever there is a dispute concerning projects on rivers, we should proceed very expeditiously and see that these disputes are settled amicably. In the case of the Narmada, I agree that it will be possible to arrive at a solution in the near future.

Shri E. K. Amin: The Khosla Commission was appointed in order to iron out the differences between the two Governments. When a time-limit of 15 days was given in order to get a reply from the Governments concerned, how is it that the Central Government allowed it to continue so long despite the fact that none of the Governments concerned was ready to answer within the 15-day limit? In this connection, what action has been taken by the Government of India to expedite matters?

Dr. K. L. Rao: It was made clear when the Khosla Commission was appointed that it would be purely an advisory committee and not one whose recommendations would be binding. Therefore, when the Commission's recommendations were received, it was necessary for both Governments to go into them very carefully and see to what extent each can accommodate the other. Therefore, it is that we cannot act upon the Khosla Commission's recommendations all at once.

Shri Narendra Singh Mahida: Even if the two Chief Ministers agree and the scheme is commenced immediately, may I know whether it will take 15 years to complete it? Also, may I know whether the amount allotted for it in the Budget will be utilised in the current year on this project?

Dr. K. L. Rao: In harnessing the Narmada, there are no engineering difficulties such as we have in harnessing all the Himalayan rivers because there is good rock and there are not many difficulties to be got over. For the progress of the project, it depends on the hon. Deputy Prime Minister and Finance Minister to whom a question may be addressed on the subject.

Shri Ranga: In view of the fact that this is not only of purely economic importance but also of political significance and by reason of the obvious inability of the Ministry concerned to persuade the two Governments to reach any agreement, why is it that Government do not wish to appoint a tribunal to decide this matter as per powers given to them by special legislation passed by this Parliament 10 years ago? Why do they go on allowing this kind of delay to take place by simply appointing one commission saying it is an advisory body and then asking the Ministers afterwards also to complicate matters through the introduction of politics?

Dr. K. L. Rao: I am told there is no politics in this particular problem. It is only a question of convenience, of the advantages gained and the disadvantages suffered by each of the States in taking up the project. With regard to the question of arbitration, it is a very important fact that in connection with river disputes the last thing to be resorted to is the tribunal. We should never allow it to go to a tribunal, we should always try to adjust and settle the problem amicably. That is what they do all over the world. In the case of Narmada I am afraid we have taken the least time. In the settlement of the problem of Narmada which is a very mighty river, one or two years is not very much, and I think we have made very good progress. In 1966 we discussed with the various Chief Ministers, and we got nearer the solution. It is on account of the elections and the emotions developed by that that there has been some delay; otherwise it should have been settled by this time.

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: It is between Gujarat and Madhya Pradesh.

Shri Shoo Narain: It is a national project, there is no question of U.P. or Madhya Pradesh.

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : अभी तक गुजरात का ही दृष्टिकोण सामने आया है, मैं अब मध्य प्रदेश का दृष्टिकोण सामने रखने के लिये खड़ा हुआ हूँ

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्वेश्चन पूछिये ।

An hon. Member: Is Gujarat out of India?

श्री जगन्नाथ राव जोशी : मैं आचार्य रंगा की बात से सहमत हूँ कि राष्ट्रीय योजना के रूप में इस सवाल को हल करना चाहिये । किन्तु नर्मदा का प्राज तीन-चौथाई भाग मध्य प्रदेश से होकर बहता है । बांध की ऊंचाई से जो जमीन पानी के नीचे आने वाली है वह भी मध्य प्रदेश की है, लेकिन उसका लाभ गुजरात को मिलने वाला है—दिन इत्र दी ककस झाफ़ दी प्राबलम । इसलिये इस प्राबलम से जो कठिनाई खड़ी होने वाली है उस के लिये जब तक केन्द्र कोई व्यवस्था न करे, कोई सिद्धान्त सामने रख कर उस का हल न ढूँढा जाय, यह कैसे हल होगी ? यह सिर्फ गुजरात का झगड़ा नहीं है, इसी तरह का झगड़ा कृष्णा-गोदावरी का आन्ध्र, मैसूर और महाराष्ट्र में है, इन लिये किसी सिद्धान्त को लेकर इसको हल करना चाहिये ।

Mr. Speaker: It is a good suggestion made. I do not know if he has any answer for this.

Dr. K. L. Rao: I have submitted already that the Central Government took the initiative, made some suggestions, and that has been the basis of agreement between these two States, and it is expected that it will be finalised on those lines.

WRITTEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Loss of Foodgrains during Rail Transit

*392. Shri K. N. Pandey: Will the Minister of Railways be pleased to state:

(a) the figures of loss of foodgrains either due to lack of proper storage

or negligence during transit on all Railways during the last two years (year-wise); and

(b) whether any action has been taken by the Ministry to see that such loss does not recur in future?

The Minister for Railways (Shri C. M. Poonacha): (a) and (b). The information is being collected and will be placed on the Table of the Sabha.

सूती कपड़ा मिलों में नाल का जमा हो जाना

*398. श्री सिद्धेश्वर प्रसाद : क्या वाणिज्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(a) क्या यह सच है कि सूती कपड़ा मिलों में इतना नाल जमा हो गया है जितना पहले कभी भी जमा नहीं हुआ था ; और

(ख) यदि हाँ, तो इसके क्या कारण हैं ?

वाणिज्य मंत्री (श्री विनेश सिंह) :

(a) जी, नहीं ।

(ख) प्रश्न नहीं उठता ।

Price Control on Cotton Textiles

*399. Shri D. C. Sharma: Will the Minister of Commerce be pleased to state:

(a) whether the United Chambers Trade Association of Delhi has urged the Government to lift the production and price control on cotton textiles, as its objective to bring down prices had not been attained and ample stocks of cloth were lying with the mills and wholesalers;

(b) if so, the reaction of Government thereto; and

(c) the decision taken in the matter?

The Minister of Commerce (Shri Dinesh Singh): (a) The United Chamber of Trad Association, Delhi had represented for the lifting of the