

[Sh. Sobhanadreeswara Rao Vadde]

speaking on the very important demands for grants of the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Rural Development.

Sir, you are aware that this Government and their predecessor Governments did not think the necessity to have a National Agricultural Policy Resolution. As you are aware, there was an Industrial Policy Resolution adopted as far back as 1948 which was reviewed in 1956, 1977, 1980, 1984 and 1991. While nearly 75 per cent of the people live in villages and depend on agriculture especially in the beginning more than 50 per cent of the people were depending on the gross domestic products coming from the agricultural sector—the successive Governments never felt the necessity to have an Agricultural Policy Resolution. Though some programmes like the Grow More Food, Minimum Support Price the Agricultural Products and the Land Reforms Laws were taken up but they were mainly intended to make over the crisis. They were not introduced with the real intention of improving the standard of living of the rural people. And because of this neglect in providing adequate funds to villages, even after four decades they are still in a very very backward stage. Most of them are not in a position to provide even the basic amenities to the people.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Rao, it is already 5.30. We have to take up Half-an-Hour Discussion. You will be on your legs tomorrow. So, you can proceed with your speech tomorrow.

SHRI SYED MASUDAL HOSSAIN (Murshidabad): After the Half-an-Hour Discussion is over if the discussion on Demands for Grants for the Ministry of Agriculture continues for two hours, it would be better.

MR. CHAIRMAN: But it has not been agreed to earlier.

SHRI SYED MASUDAL HOSSAIN: It has already been agreed to.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let the Half-an-Discussion

start, I will check up whether somebody has agreed to this earlier or not. Anyway, I will have to discuss and then I will let you know.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM): If the House agrees to this, we are with the House. If you want to have the extension up to 8 o'clock, we have no objection.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Meanwhile, you have some discussion amongst yourselves.

SHRI SYED MASUDAL HOSSAIN: All right.

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM: Sir, from our side, we make it clear that we will leave it to the House. If the House wants to extend it up to 8 o'clock, let them do it. Let them decide it before 6 o'clock because my Ministers have already gone.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will see what is to be done when it is 5 minutes to 6 o'clock.

17.32 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION
CLEARANCE OF TEHRI DAM PROJECT

[English]

MR. CHAIRMAN: Since, there is no unanimity, let us proceed with the Half-an-Hour Discussion. Shri Khanduri.

SHRI BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI (Garhwal): Sir, I rise to initiate a Half-an-Hour Discussion on Tehri Dam arising out of answer given by the Minister of State in the Ministry of Environment and Forests on August 5, 1991 to Starred Question No. 287 regarding clearance of Tehri Dam Project.

The Minister had state that the construction of Dam would be cleared, subject to design consideration of 8.5 on the Richter Scale. Today, I would like to speak basically on two issues-(1) Design aspect and (2) Impact of a breach in the Dam, whether it takes place due to faulty designs or due to any other reason, what would be its impact?

Before I come to the design aspect of it, I would like to give you a little background. The Dam was conceived in 1961 for a capacity of 600 M.W. at the cost of about Rs. 197 crore. Since then, over a period of time, the installed capacity has been increased to 2000 M.W. and the cost to around Rs. 5000 crore.

Ever since, the Dam was conceived of, it attracted a lot of controversy. Shrimati Indira Gandhi, in August, 1980 felt that the cost-benefit analysis was not favourable to this Dam and therefore, she ordered a review. An Expert Group was composed. This was ordered in March, 1980. In August, 1986, the Expert Committee said that this Project should be abandoned, although a considerable amount of money, around Rs. 236 crore, had been spent on it. But a very interesting thin happened thereafter.

In November, a Russian Delegation, headed by Mr. Gorbachev came and an aid of Rs. 2000 crore was managed for this Tehri Dam. However, the Russians said that they wanted a technical clearance which did not exist. Therefore, a Technical Committee was ordered. It consisted of people who were not seismologists. It is very interesting to know that this Technical Committee which sat after earlier Technical Committee had recommended abandonment of the project, me just for one day i.e. on 16th October, 1986 and gave a recommendation that the construction of a Dam was safe. Based on this, the Russians gave the aid of Rs. 2000 crore and the work re-started.

The present status of the controversy is that all the Seismologists in the world including Prof. Brune and Dr. Borock of Russia have objected or have not cleared the design

aspect. Initially, the design scale was 7M peak Ground Acceleration (PGA) of and 0.153g. Then over a period of time, the second Technical Expert Committee has increased it to 7.2M and .25g. On what basis these changes are made in the design is not known. However, this design 7.2M and .25g was not accepted by the Seismologists and controversy started again.

The matter was referred to various people. I would like to quote Prof. Brune, who is supposed to be well-known expert on Seismology. He said as follows:

"There is no question in my mind that Tehri dam should be subjected to the most rigorous state-of-the art dynamic design analysis, and should be designed for peak ground acceleration of about 1g."

Subsequently, Dr. Brock of Russia, who is supposed to be a well-known and highly respected Seismologist, also concurred with this opinion.

The other interesting aspect of this design is that the Tehri Dam Authorities have been accepting the increases as they go on from 7M to 7.2M and then 7.4. And now, as the Minister has told us, the requirement is 8.5 M. Now, we do not know what is exactly happening on the ground. As per my information, the initial foundation was of 1100 metres width; and if it is to cater for 8.5, the minimum width required is 1500 metres. That space does not exist. How is the design capability on the ground increasing? It is all on paper; it is something which needs to be looked into.

Now I will come on to the second aspect. If a breach takes place, what will happen? (1) It is because of the design inadequacy; (2) the thing which probably has not been considered so far is the defence aspect. Some of you may be aware that during the Second World War, the Royal Airforce raised a few squadrons which were called 'dam burst squadrons', to burst dams which were under the occupation of Germans.

[Sh. Bhuwan Chandra Khanduri]

There were five such dams. An attempt was made to destroy them. In one cold night, they destroyed two dams causing immense damage to the German's war potential, and crippling its offensive capability. Gentlemen, those were the days of premature technology and small dams. Today, we have Super High Technology. We are aware what happened in Iraq. The Americans were able to guide their weapons to a pin-point accuracy. Now, if that sort of capability is available, who can say with guarantee that our enemy cannot have that technology? And the Tehri Dam is going to be an ideal target. You will realise when I tell you in a moment what is the likely impact.

An expert Dr. Narasimham says "flood water reach Rishikesh in an hour after the dam burst and Hardwar in another 20 minutes and wipe out Deoprayag, Rishikesh, Hardwar and their environs by more than 200 feet high battering ram of water. While Meerut and its environs will be destroyed by a 30 feet flood water within 6 hours, Bulandshahr and its environs will be ruined by a 25 feet flood water within 12 hours of the failure of the dam."

Some details are also giving an Article in Hindustan Times dated 19th March, 1990. The most alarming which will happen is the "short-circuiting" at Narora Atomic Power Plant. Since the Plant cannot be shut off in a few hours, it will short-circuit, heat up and explode. A 'chernobyl' would have been re-enacted and a hundred 'Bhopals' would be enacted. Radio activity will kill 90% of population within a radius of 100 Kms-which includes Delhi, Agra, Meerut. In addition, the flood waters rushing down towards Calcutta will be highly radio-active, causing immense damage.

All Defence installations en-route would be destroyed. Such scenario during war is chilling.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You should now at least restrict your questions to the issues

which you have given in your explanation, because otherwise you will not get sufficient replies. Within three or four minutes you should summarise and the Hon. Minister will reply.

SHRI BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI: I am now coming to the specific points which need to be looked into before the clearance of Tehri Dam Project is given. I have got five points which need to be resolved. I will read for the information of the Hon. Minister: One, if the initial design catered for 7 M and 0-15 g and had a foundation width of 1100 metres, has this width been increased on the ground? If so, how much? I am told width required is 1500 metres. If no, then what is proposed to be done. Two, what exact changes have been executed on ground to upgrade the design requirements. The Minister himself has said that the increase in effect from 7 M to 8.5 M is 300 times.

Three, the latest "Expert Report" (Jai Krishna report dated 17th Oct. 86) based on which work is being carried, be made public and be laid on the table of the House. Why has been kept a Secret?

Four, What damage management plans has been prepared? These were to be prepared by the 31st March, 1991. Nothing has been done so far. Why have they not been prepared? I have just given you an idea of the damage that is likely to occur.

A White Paper giving all the aspects of the design should be placed on the Table of the House so that there is no doubt about it and the tear in the minds of the people is removed.

Lastly, I would suggest that the entire aspect of the Dam should not be left to experts who are involved in the controversy but should be given to outside experts who are well known seismologists.

[Translation]

SHRI RAJENDRA AGNIHOTRI

(Jhansi): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to ask a question...

MR. CHAIRMAN: According to the procedure the hon. Minister will reply first. Then only that person can ask a question who has given the notice of question first of all. Thereafter we will see if something is left, but, but for the time being nothing will be done.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI KAMAL NATH): This Half-an-Hour discussion is flowing from a question addressed to the Ministry of Environment and Forests on 5th August, 1991.

The project was originally approved by the Planning Commission in 1972 for an installed generation capacity of 600 MW. Subsequently, the Bhumbra Committee of the Ministry of Environment and Forests in 1990 had expressed apprehensions regarding the safety of the dam as it was designed for an earthquake of a magnitude of 7.2 on the Richter Scale whereas an earthquake of a magnitude of 8 or 8.5 on the richer scale was considered imminent during the life of the reservoir at the Tehri site which is located in a "Seismic Gap". Therefore, the Department of Mines was asked to constitute a High Level Committee of Experts for reviewing the safety aspects of the dam.

This Committee, under the Chairmanship of Director General, Geological Survey of India submitted its report in April, 1990. Meanwhile, Dr. Gaur, who was earlier Director of National Geographic Research Institute, Hyderabad, and previously a professor of earthquake engineering in Roorkee University and is presently the Secretary, Ocean Development, was one of the members and, he expressed reservations based on discussion with Professor Brune on the assumptions made by the Committee in using Professor Brune's formula.

Two major issues arise here.

(a) According to the Plate Tectonic Theory, an earth quake of magnitude of 8 and above on Richter Scale is imminent in this seismic gap region, whereas peak ground acceleration has been calculated on the basis of an earth quake of magnitude 7.2 on Richter Scale while designing the dam.

(b) The calculations were based on the equations developed by Prof. Brune of USA who opined that correct application of the formula will give rise to peak ground acceleration of 1 g or above rather than .22g being adopted.

The dissenting note of Dr. Gaur with the observations of Prof. Brune was referred to the High Level Committee which gave a supplementary report in July, 1990 reiterating its earlier opinion. Prof. Gaur refused to sign the supplementary report. The supplementary report of the High Level Committee was considered by the Government in August, 1990 and it was decided to refer the matter to another expert Prof. Jai Krishna who opined in September, 1990 that the proposed dam section for the Tehri Project is safe from the point of view of seismicity.....(Interruptions)

SHRI MUKUL BALKRISHNA WASNIK (Buldana): What is the background of this expert?.....(Interruptions)

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Prof. Jai Krishna was one of the consultants to the Tehri Dam Authority. It was a single man Committee, which was appointed.....(Interruptions)

SHRI BHUWAN CHANDRA KHAN-DURI: He is not a seismologist. He is only an earth quake engineer.....(Interruptions)

SHRI MUKUL BALKRISHNA WASNIK: How a person connected with the Authority has been employed?.....(Interruptions)

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Prof. Jai Krishna, one man Committee, in September 1990 opined that the proposed dam section for the Tehri Project is safe from the point of view of seismicity.

[Sh. Kamal Nath]

The Ministry of Mines had, however, been receiving representations from various quarters expressing doubts and misgivings regarding seismic safety of the dam. Therefore, the Director General, GSI was asked to constitute an Expert Group for a critical reappraisal of the safety aspects of Tehri Dam taking into account the misgivings raised. This Expert Group gave its report in July, 1991 observing that the design of the dam has been subjected subsequently to a peak ground acceleration of 0.5g and found satisfactory. The Department of Mines, this month in August, 1991, observed as follows.

Based on the report of the Director General, Geological Survey of India, the Department of Mines accepts the recommendation of Prof. Jai Krishna that the proposed dam section for the Tehri Project is safe from the point of view of seismicity of the region.

On the basis of these reports the Department of Mines also considers that the following scientific studies need to be undertaken. It means that the Department of Mines while clearing it has made two observations. And whether we call them as observations or as conditions, that is a separate thing. The Department of Mines has made the following observations.

- (i) Time bound micro-seismic investigation (with the help of digital seismometers) in the Tehri area within about a year's time in order to have better estimates of the critical seismic parameters including determination of the depth of the plan of the detachments under-thrusting and estimation of Q. Value.

So, Q. value determines Prof. Brune's formula. It is a very important ingredient of Prof. Brune's formula.

If the Q. value is wrong, the whole of Brune's formula goes astray. The Depart-

ment of Mines has asked for a proper determination of Q. value.

- (ii) The design of the Dam to be tested for actual accelerogram. That means the peak ground acceleration which has been estimated at 0.5 g.

For the purpose of its clearance, certain presumptions were made. Those presumptions have to be checked out by these two conditions of the Department of Mines.

- (iii) The design of the Dam to be tested for actual accelerogram of the Gazli-the Gazli earth quake aspect is the worst case scenario aspect, it is the worst scenario for peak ground acceleration higher than 0.5 g just to test the stability of the design.

The studies should be designed and carried out in coordination between Geological Survey of India, National Geo-Physical Research Institute (NGRI) and Tehri Hydro Development Corporation. If the results of the above studies necessitate any modification of the design, the same could be taken care of by the concerned authorities.

The Department of Power has agreed to fund these studies.

For the time being the Project authorities propose to continue with the present design on the plea that it would be able to withstand the seismic forces.

As far rehabilitation is concerned, an observation was made and I would like to say something on that. I will say some points for the benefit of the House. The total submergence is 112 villages plus Tehri town. The hon. Members who hail from Tehri. I suppose, will have to look for another abode.

The Power Generation is 2000 MW at Tehri and 400 MW at Koteshwar. This will be the installed capacity, but the firm power will be 487 MW. this is a Hydel Project. So, it will

be used for peaking. The Irrigation potential as envisaged by the Project authorities is 2.7 lakh ha of additional land and Stabilisation of irrigation where irrigation is not adequate or to sustain it. 6.04 lakh ha. 3000 cusec of drinking water has to come to Delhi. The Project cost on 1990 cost is Rs. 3500 crores. This is on the prices prevailing in 1990. There is an environmental cost which, for the time being, has not been taken into consideration. As far as life of the Dam is concerned, there is a presumption being taken on Siltation and Assumed sediment rate by the Project authorities is 14.5 ha m per 100 km² per year. The CAG has observed that cost-benefit ratio has reduced from 1:11.7 to 1:1.349 in 1986. I do not know if any cost benefit ratio has been done after 1986. Uptill now, an expenditure of about Rs. 600 crores has been incurred, Rs. 450 crores has been incurred on the power components and Rs. 150 crores roughly has been incurred on the irrigation component. There is a provision in the current plan. This Project has not yet got the P.I.B. clearance. It is not correct to say that my Department is sitting back and not monitoring it.

I will just read out the last para of the conditions of the clearance which was given by my Ministry while approving this project. The hon. Member has said that we have not given clearance, that is not correct. We have given a conditional clearance. Our condition was very categorical and it says:

"The completion of studies, formulation of action plans and their implementation will be scheduled in such a way that their execution is *paripassu*, that means at the same time, with the engineering works failing which the engineering works would be brought to a halt without any extraneous considerations. These conditions will be enforced, among others, under the provisions of the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986."
Now

Now, the status of these conditions is as follows:-

MR. CHAIRMAN: Will you take more time?

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Sir, I was just trying to be as elaborate as possible for the benefit of Members. It is up to you. If you allow me more time, I will take, if you do not, I will not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the House agrees, we will extend the time by few minutes so that we can have a complete reply.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes, Sir.

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla): Sir, let this be completed. This is a very important matter

[*English*]

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Sir, the items which were a part of the conditional clearance, I will very briefly dwell on those as to what happened and what is their current status. Those are: the safety aspects and the design of the dam. The design of the dam had to be approved by the Ministry of Mines. The Ministry of Mines has given clearance on the design of the dam, subject to those conditions. The question is when those conditions are fulfilled, whether they will require modifications in the design or not. The Tehri Dam authorities have stated that any modifications required in the design of the Dam arising out of those two studies to be carried out will be made. So after the High Level Committee gave its Report in April, 1991 with a dissent note of Prof. Gaur, subsequently the Department of Mines have conveyed that the design is acceptable with these two conditions. Where rehabilitation is concerned, a study had to be carried out. We have yet to receive comprehensive proposals on rehabilitation. The question was what will be a family unit whether the head of the family will be the unit or the head of the family plus the major sons will be treated as a unit. This is still being debated. The comprehen-

[Sh. Kamal Nath]

sive proposal for rehabilitation on the basis of a study by an outside agency has not yet been received by my Ministry.

SHRI BHUWAN CHANDRAKHANDURI: Let us first clear the design aspect. Other things can be incidental.

DR. ASIM BALA: This is a very technical matter, Sir.....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I am trying to translate in comprehensible language.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Ram Naik kindly give him an opportunity to simplify. Let him complete.

[*Translation*]

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR (Bareilly): Sir, the hon. Minister is replying to all question except rehabilitation. He should also reply to rehabilitation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is coming to that.

[*English*]

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Sir, I am very happy that the hon. Member from the BJP is joining me on this...(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: No disturbance please. Let him complete. You have every right to ask questions afterwards.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Sir, I will get to the design aspect straightaway.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please tell briefly.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I would be very brief if it suffices them. Sir, as far as the design aspect is concerned, the hon. Member has brought out the Defence dimension to this, about current Defence capabilities and how this dam could be destroyed. One of our conditions was the Disaster Management Plan, that is, what happens if there is a

breach. The Disaster Management Plan which was to be submitted, which was one of the conditions, has yet not been submitted. I do not know at what stage it is.

The other aspect is what are the seismic forces; whether it will be 7.2 or 8.5M2. Technically this has been gone into by the Ministry of Mines and after having considered this aspect, Prof. Jaikrishna has given a report. After Jaikrishna's report, the GSI has considered it. The Ministry of Mines has taken all these aspects into consideration. So, my Ministry is not concerned with the designing of the dam, let us be very clear about this.

SHRI BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI: Why only Mr. Jaikrishna all the time has been asked from first one to the last one? Why not from anybody else?

SHRI MUKUL BALKRISHNA WASNIK: They are interested only in 'Jai Ram', don't say Jaikrishna. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: No cross talk please. Let him complete. Please do not disturb the Minister.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: All these points were examined by the Ministry of Mines and they, in their wisdom, thought that the G.S.I. Report-with Professor Jaikrishna agreeing to it is good and have accepted it. They have asked for two studies to be carried out. This has happened just this month. Where the design aspect is concerned, there is no doubt that this is a seismic region. It is because of this being a highly seismic region that the Ministry of Environment and Forest had laid down these conditions. These conditions were laid out at the time of giving the approval. We are looking forward to the fulfilling of these conditions and I can only assure the House that we will not overlook any of the safety factors on this.

SHRI BHUWAN CHANDRA KHANDURI: You have given it as 8.5. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just a minute. Shri Khanduri, please resume your seat. I have received notices from three hon. Members to ask questions on this. Let them ask the questions on this and then you will ask the question and then we shall see what is to be done. I have received notices from hon. Shri Rabi Ray.....

(Interruptions)

SHRI MUKUL BALKRISHNA WASNIK: Sir, please add my name also. *(Interruptions)*

MR. CHAIRMAN: According to the rules, one is required to give notice in writing, to the Secretary General that he wants to ask the question and only then those Members who have given advance intimation can ask the question. Now Shri Rabi Ray, Shri Santosh Kumar Gangwar and Shri Manabendra Shah.....

SHRI MUKUL BALKRISHNA WASNIK: Sir, with you in the Chair, there can be some relaxation.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us see what is to be done. Let us go according to the rules. We have already decided that till this discussion is over, the time of the House is to be extended. That, we have already decided. We have received notices from three hon. Members—Shri Rabi Ray, Shri Santosh Kumar Gangwar and Shri Manabendra Shah—who will ask the questions first; the Minister will reply, and then if Shri Khanduri has any questions he will ask.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Not at this stage. Let us go by rules.

DR. R. MALLU (Nagar Kurnool): It will not have any relevance.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Probably the question which you want to ask, will be asked by somebody who has already given the notice.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let those Members who have given notices ask the questions first. Now Shri Rabi Ray.

SHRI RABI RAY (Kendrapada): Sir, I think this issue is not being considered with due seriousness. I congratulate Shri Kamal Nath for having done his homework well. I also appreciate that he admits the responsibility of Ministry of Environment and Forests. On the day this matter was first raised in this House and due to which this half-an-hour discussion is being held, Shri Kamal Nath had courageously declared that he was

[English]

a Minister who would keep a vigil on the Ministry of Mines and other Ministries which are involved in the construction of this Tehri Dam

[Translation]

I would have been glad had he not brought technical aspects. My first question is whether it is not a fact that the conditionalities under which the permission was granted initially was on the basis of facts collected forcibly. We are grateful to Shrimati Indira Gandhi because she had got a survey done in this connection. This is a very big dam. After the survey, the Ministry of Environment decided to abandon the project. Sir, you may also please listen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am listening. Please ask your question.

SHRI RABI RAY: Earlier, the Government was of the opinion that this dam should not be constructed. Later, when the U.S.S.R. offered Rs. 2000 crores as aid for this project, the opinion changed. We are grateful to the Soviet President for having made this offer but this matter concerns the entire country. Sir, I would like to remind the hon. Minister that he had said that Delhi also lies within the seismic zone. The areas of Haridwar and Rishikesh are also bound to be

[Sh. Rabi Ray]

affected I want to say that had Rs. 2000 crores not been received, the decision taken by Shrimati Indira Gandhi to abandon the construction of this dam would have been adhered to. Is Shri Kamal Nath aware that the Environment Assessment Committee has said that-

[English]

"Taking into consideration the geological and seismic setting, the risks and hazards, ecological and social impacts accompanying the project, the costs and benefits expected, and after a careful examination of the information and data available, the Committee has come to the unanimous conclusion that the Tehri Dam project as proposed should not be taken up as it does not merit environmental clearance."

I would like to encourage Kamal Nath ji to stick to the stand of his Ministry. Why does he deflect from this? I say, he is deflecting from this.

[Translation]

Sir, I am always every punctual. The estimated cost at present is Rs. 2,000 crores but escalation in costs could raise this figure to Rs. 20,000 crores. The so-called conditions attached to the proposal have not been accepted till now and the work on the project is going on so far Rs. 66 crores have been spent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What information do you need from him now?

SHRI RABI RAY: I would like to say that this is purely a political issue, there should be no mention of mines in it because the reply to the complaint by Dr. Gaur was not given by the Ministry of Mines and the mover of the Motion has already said that a well-known seismologist has already warned-

[English]

Don't go forward about this:

[Translation]

This is a question of life and death for the nation. When the hon. Minister also agrees that the Government should have a total view of the overall situation, I would like to say that besides being a Minister he is also a representative of the Government and so he should make a statement on behalf of the Government. When he has already agreed before us, this august House that this should definitely not happen. These conditions have not been fulfilled. Then we should know that these conditions will not be fulfilled in future also. Lastly, my question is

[English]

Does he invoke the Environment Protection Act and abandon the project?

[Translation]

Through you, I would like to warn him today because

[English]

he should keep a vigil as a Minister of Environment and Forests.

[Translation]

The reference given of the Ministry of Mines is misleading. My only request is that-

[English]

let him take up courage in both hands and tell the House today that he is going to invoke the Environment Protection Act so as to abandon the project, as his Ministry has already taken the lead in this respect.

MR. CHAIRMAN: First, let all the questions be asked. Then, you can reply.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Sir, I will be answering the whole gamut of them together.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It will save the time also.

[Translation]

SHRI SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR (Bareilly): Sir, much has been said about this in the House as well as outside. Rs. 450 crores were spent between 1972 and 1990 and in 1990 the Committee said that this project is not viable. Later, the person who was project consultant was appointed expert and his report was taken. I shall not touch upon the technical aspect and even the public is not interested in going into technical details. The people want to know as to what is our achievement. I think U.P. is getting a raw deal. It has been said that the cost of this project has escalated to Rs. 4000 crores between 1972 and 1990. I have the feeling that U.P. will not get anything out of it. This issue will move around politicians like a ball and U.P. will not benefit in any way. The decision in case of this project will have to be taken after careful consideration of all aspects, otherwise there will be a great loss. I feel that besides the hon. Minister the hon. Energy Minister and the hon. Minister of Mines should also have been present here so that a decision could be taken on this matter.

Sir, I have to make just one submission. A lot has been discussed about this between 1972 and 1990. I would like the hon. Minister to clarify matters regarding the future of this project and the final decision proposed to be taken. He should not form another committee and then again change the government's stand. I have no hesitation in saying that there appears to be some foreign hand behind the delays being caused to this project. Hurdles are deliberately being created to manipulate the award of the contract to certain parties. My hon. friends have asked questions in respect of all aspects from the hon. Minister. I would like to know from the hon. Minister if U.P. stands to gain in any way? if electricity is made available to U.P. after 50 years, then U.P. will not be able to make progress. We want an early decision in the matter and the people of U.P. must know what benefits they can expect from this project.

[English]

SHRI MANABENDRA SHAH (Tehri-Garhwal): Mr. Chairman, Sir, it is a recognised thing in advanced countries that no dam is allowed to be constructed unless the disaster management programme is made. The hon. Minister has just now said that no disaster management programme has so far come to him. Therefore, how was this Tehri Dam constructed when the pre-condition had not been fulfilled and more so, the disaster management programme had not come before the Ministry, before the Government and before this House?

The second question that I would like to ask is this. If a war breaks out, then the frontal areas are now not attacked first only the belly is attacked. So, I am not asking questions on environment; I am not asking questions on rehabilitation and I am not asking questions on earthquake potentials. But, if there is a war, and when the missiles are fired on Tehri Dam, then there will be a great devastation. Has the Government considered this aspect irrespective of whether it is earthquake prone or not, whether rehabilitation has been satisfactory or not or whether environmental conditions have been fulfilled or not? Once a war breaks out and when the belly is attacked, you can understand what repercussions it will have on our operation. So, this aspect has to be very seriously considered.

Lastly, it is obvious that there is a tug-of-war amongst various Ministries. If Government pass the buck to the House, I think this House can very well accept to have a Parliamentary Committee to go into all the aspects. So, will the Minister agree to have a Parliamentary Committee go into all the aspects? These are my questions.

DR. R. MALLU: Sir, I do not want to ask a question, but I want to give some information.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am not allowing you now. First, let the Members who have given notices ask questions..

SHRI BHUWAN CHANDRA KHAN-DURI: Sir, in the reply, the Minister has said that his Ministry had given a direction that the design will be at the level of 8.5 m. Now, he had said that it had been accepted as 7.5 m. How can there be a change now?

Secondly, I had asked a question and it has not been replied by the Minister. Is there any scope for improvement in the design on the ground? If there is space only for 1,100 metres foundation? It is constructing a foundation for a two-storeyed house and then building 20 on it? Let the Minister clarify this also. (*Interruptions*)

DR. R. MALLU: I want to give my impressions to the hon. Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly listen to me. Rules provide that those who have not given notice are not entitled to ask the question.

DR. R. MALLU: I do not want to put any question. But I want to tell something about the dam.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You must give a notice whatever you may like to ask.

DR. R. MALLU: I am given to understand that already Government has spent Rs. 600 crores on the construction of the Tehri Hydro-electric Dam.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I agree with your concern. You cannot go beyond the Rules. Ultimately we have to follow the rules.

DR. R. MALLU: I want to say something about these necessity of the Dam to be completed immediately without further delay. I want to say something about this dam.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Sir, Hon. Rabi Ray Ji feels that there is a domination in courage which I earlier had. Let me assure him that there is no erosion in my courage from the day I answered the question till today.

I completely share the concern espe-

cially on the points made out by the hon. Members with regard to the safety and defence aspects of it.

The first point I have to answer which has been raised by hon. Rabi Ray Ji is that I would very emphatically state that I shall not permit any compromise in the conditions which may lead to any serious consequences on the stability of the Dam and the safety of the Dam. We are not going to compromise on these conditions. These conditions are not put as a matter of routine.

This is a major Project. Several Committees had gone into it. As I said, it was on the anvil from 1972.

These conditions which were put were put after very careful consideration.

There will not be any compromise on these conditions.

With regard to the Defence aspect of it, I am not aware of this.

My Ministry made no reference to the Defence Ministry on this.

If the Members so desire, we are willing to make a reference to the Defence Ministry on this to find out because we do not get into a project which has major defence ramifications.

I do not know whether the Power Ministry went into it. But I think they must have.

There is a procedure for certain Projects to get clearance from Defence angle. I do not know.

But my Ministry did not get in touch with the Defence Ministry for clarification. (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

SHRI RAJENDRA AGNIHOTRI (Jhansi): Sir, please ask the hon. Minister to give replies to the questions that have al-

ready been raised. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Sir, even those who have not put questions are asking for replies. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RABI RAY: Sir, reply to question put by Dr. Gaur has not yet been given. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI RAJENDRA AGNIHOTRI: I am on a point of order. Hon. Members were permitted to ask questions and everyone was interested in asking questions on this very important issue. (*Interruptions*) Now when replies are being sought the hon. Minister should give clear-cut answers.

(*Interruptions*)

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM): I have a point to ask.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you also have a Point of Order on the same point or on some other point? I would like to know this so that I can rule it out.

SHRI RANGARAJAN KUMARAMANGALAM: Sir, I am on the same point. Normally, we have adopted the system - in the matter of Half-an-Hour discussion - that by a particular time-limit in the morning - by 11 O' Clock - those who wish to join in the discussion and raise questions should give their names and it is those who would be called now to participate. The others, it is expected, would not intervene. This is done in order to facilitate the technique that within half-an-hour, we can finish the matter.

Secondly, normally when a Minister is on his feet and he is talking, we do not stand up and interrupt on a regular basis. Mine is a request, through you, Sir, to all Members

that they can always request the Minister to yield and ask questions because certain comments are being made about it which is worrying me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Your observations should be note by all.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let me complete my ruling on the point of order. Those who have asked questions have already given the notices and those Members only have asked questions. That is the first point. The second point is about the Minister's observations. You have raised a valid point. I would request the Members not to disturb the Minister. If you want to say, you can say. He will yield the floor and then you can ask questions.

SHRI MUKUL BALKRISHNA WASNIK: Sir, I think the point of order of the Member has been over-ruled.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Sir, I thank you for your ruling. Before I finish it, I am told I have not answered the points. I am still in the process of answering it.

MR: CHAIRMAN: Please try to be brief so that the replied can be understood by them.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: I can be very brief. The Defence Ministry was approached for purposes of Defence clearance and information sought was regarding number of roads etc. to be submerged. But no reference has been made to the Defence Ministry from an attack angle. So, I just wanted to give this information. The question of the validity or propriety of-whatever be it - appointing prof. Jai Krishna was raised. I am sorry, I got a little bit confused. It is Prof. Jai Krishna...(*Interruptions*) I am confused between Jayaram and Jayakrishna... (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI VASUNDHARA RAJE
(Jhalawar): Sir, I just take a minute.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want the
Minister to yield the floor to you?

SHRIMATI VASUNDHARA RAJE: I
would love it, if he would do it.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Yes, Sir, I yield the
floor.

SHRIMATI VASUNDHARA RAJE: Sir,
it is very gentlemanly of you and the hon.
Minister who have given me this opportunity
to speak. But I believe that the Minister is
throwing so much dust into the eyes of all the
Members who are sitting here. There are so
many dams and projects that he is con-
nected with and that is why he is confused
with the name of the people concerned with
them. He has stated a lot of things and the
other Members have also put so many things
together to him. Ultimately, we have not
been able to get the crux of the matter. All I
can say is that he has given a long speech.
In the middle of the speech, what I can gather
from it is that he has stated that Rs. 600
crores have been spent.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please don't stretch
too much. If you want to say something,
please say.

SHRIMATI VASUNDHARA RAJE: He
has stated that a sum of Rs. 600 crores has
been spent and a lot of water is coming to
Delhi; the land is going to get irrigated etc.
But after having spent this much of money,
these benefits are going to come from it. All
of us are worried about environment. But we
don't think the development should be
stopped.

This is what I feel.

[Translation]

It is said that the Environment Ministry is
holding everyone to ransom. Please let us
know the names of the people who have

written to him. It would be better if the work
is executed.

SHRI MUKUL BALKRISHNA WASNIK:
Sir, all the information about the person
being referred to should be given to the
House so that we can also understand. The
hon. Minister should also give full informa-
tion about the person who was appointed as
an expert.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would just suggest
to the Minister that those who are interested
in getting information should contact the
Minister. You may kindly pass on the infor-
mation to them.

SHRI KAMAL NATH: Thank you, Sir. I
will be very brief. There is nothing confiden-
tial or secret in this matter. I will, very willingly
give any information which hon. Members
may want on this. There is nothing secret.

So, I will very willingly give them any infor-
mation they want. In conclusion, I only like to say
that my Ministry will not be compromising or
yielding on any of the safety aspects or on
any of the conditions if they have any impli-
cations on safety or threat to the region or on
the ultimate danger which the construction
of these dam may lead to.

(Interruptions)

DR. R. MALLU: I think, I can speak now
because others have spoken.....

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: We will do like this.
You please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will try to accomo-
date you. You kindly resume your seat.

(Interruptions)

SHRI DIGVIJAYA SINGH (Rajgarh): All
the Members who want to ask any question,
they should visit the ante-room in the Par-

yavaran Bhavan of the Minister's chamber. (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Let us not make it like this. You please sit down. The situation is like this. As I have already told you that the rules do not provide Members to ask questions. But as a very very special case and in order that there should be no precedent, I am allowing you to ask one question. This is an exception to the rule and this will not be treated as a precedent. Only one Member can ask the question.

DR. R. MALLU: I just want to express my views. Though I am not technically qualified to understand what he has spoken, yet I could understand one thing after hearing about the technical knowledge about this dam. I am given to understand that there is lot of electricity that is going to come for our country. I am also given to understand that there is lot of land that is going to come for irrigation purpose. Another thing which I have understood is that the drinking water is going to be supplied to the Delhi people as the Delhi people are suffering due to lack of water. These three things, I think, in my view, are very important things. Our country needs lot of electricity. It is also needed for irrigation purpose.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want the Minister to reply?

DR. R. MALLU: The Government has

already spent Rs. 600 crores. Keeping all these things in view and after going through the report by checking and re-checking, all these things have come to the notice. I would like to request the hon. Minister that the clearance for this dam is to be given in the interest of the country. Somebody was saying, "if this dam breaks out, what will happen." "There are so many dams constructed in India. If you think of Pralaya." (*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Kindly ask your question.

DR. R. MALLU: No question. I wanted to tell the Minister about all these things.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. CHAIRMAN: If you do not want to ask any question, you please resume your seat. There is nothing on which the Minister can reply to you.

As I have said, I have made one exception to the rule and that also will not be a precedent quoted subsequently.

Now the House stands adjourned to meet again tomorrow at 11.00 A.M.

18.29 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, August 30, 1991/ Bhadra 8, 1913 (Saka)