and Deputy Educational Officer in their office by 12th December, 1977.

The Deputy Inspector of Schools and Deputy Educational Officers will in their turn hand over the clothes and other material to Shri Mohd. Jaleel Pasha, President, National Students of Union of India, Andhra Pradesh or his duly authorised representatives.

The National Students Union of India will arrange to send these collections to the Cyclone-affected victims.

Sd/- D. C. Venkata Sabenna"

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI : What is wrong in it? (*Interruptions*)

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY : Sir, thus it would be seen that governmental machinery has been utilised for party purposes. I would like this to be brought to the notice of the Government and through Government to the notice of the President of India, so that the President of India may dismiss the Andhra Pradesh Government for this utilization of governmental machinery for party purposes. ..(*Interruptions*)

13·40 hrs.

(iv) SHORT-FALL IN PRODUCTION OF CEMENT

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT (Jaunpur): With your permission, under rule 377, I wish to bring to the notice of the House the position of cement supply in the country and the shortfall in its production....

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Are they making a walk-out, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : They are going for lunch.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT : Sir, as the Minister of Industries has admitted, there is a shortfall in cement production the result of which has been that cement has gone totally into the black-market and also underground and is not available at the controlled prices. The price has shot up to Rs. 30 and upwards and has led to an acute scarcity condition in the country which has led to the stoppage of all private building activities.

This is a very serious matter affecting the consumer whether he is in the city or in the rural areas and the ordinary man is unable to do repairs to his house.

I hope and request that the government will look into it and take all necessary measures to put a stop to all black-marketing in cement on the one hand and, if necessary, import cement so as to stop this shortag of cement in the country due to shortfall in production.

13·42 hrs.

MOTION *RE*: AGREEMENT BETWEEN INDIA AND BANGLADESH ON SHARING OF GANGA WATERS AT FARAKKA.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai) : I beg to move:

"That this House do consider the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 14th November, 1977 regarding the Agreement between the Government of the Republic of India and the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh on sharing of the Ganga Waters at Farakka and on augmenting its flow."

At the outset, I just want to draw your attention to the absence of the Ministers who are really concerned with the subject. I want to know who will actually reply to the debate.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The External Affairs Minister.

AN HON. MEMBER : Are you replying?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I am sorry to point out that he is neither the father of the 1975 Indo-Bangladesh agreement nor is he the father of the 1977 agreement....

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur): May I make one submission? We are very happy that the Foreign Minister, Shri Vajpayee is here but this will be primarily a matter relating to the Irrigation Ministry and the Transport Ministry. Therefore, we would request the Ministers concerned to be present because this is a very vital matter and we do not want to deal with it in a partisan manner at all.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I think the External Affairs Minister also is very vitally concerned.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: But he will deal with it in his own way. This concerns other Ministries very much. It is not merely a question of an agreement between the two countries but its repercussions on the whole eastern region of the country and how to promote and develop that region. Therefore, those Ministers also should be present....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : He is posted with all the facts.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I am sorry to say that Babu Jagjivan Ram was the father of the 1975 Indo-Bangladesh agreement on Farakka and he has been also the godfather of the 1977 agreement and Mr. Barnala is the real father and I do not know the legitimacy of whose child our External Affairs Minister will be defending. I know his predicament. He was getting himself absent..*(Interruptions)* That is the real difficulty. He has been given an assignment to justify the legitimacy of a child that has been produced not by him but bysomebody else.That is the difficulty.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE) Your are also a bachelor.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is why I am finding the difficulty in answering him.

AN HON. MEMBER : He can adopt the child.

SHRIMATI PARVATHI KRISHNAN (Coimbatore) : The Adoption Bill is pending with the Rajya Sabha.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: The statement in this House has not been made by the Minister of External Affairs. It was made by the Prime Minister himself and I am really sorry to say....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : He is coming.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I am really sorry to say that the stand taken by the Government on this serious matter is not commendable.

Sir, I have gone through the text of the pact as also the statement made by the Prime Minister. I was rubbing my eyes once again and I had to ask myself the basic questions as to for whose interests the Farakka Barrage Project had been constructed.

Again, for whose interest has this Agreement with the Military Regime of Bangladesh been entered into ? When the original, document of the Project Report on Farakka Barrange was adopted by Government, it was made clear that the main objective of this project was 'preservation of Calcutta Port'. If you look—certainly you are looking into it—at the text of that agreement as also the statement made by our Prime Minister, it appears to me that the agreement has been made not on technological or scientific grounds but this was absolutely a political agreement. The statement that has been made on behalf of the Government is nothing but a political apologia, political agreement, with the intention of politically appeasing the military regime in Bangladesh.

Sir, I will try to raise a few basic questions here.

Will this Pact, will this Agreement, serve the very objective of construction of Farakka Barrage? I want to know from the Government—is this Farakka agreement with Bangladesh justifiable on technological and scientific grounds? I also would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it was like a a model experiment that was carried out in Poona or was it an actual experiment that was done in the river Hooghly?

Was the agreement signed with the Military Government of Bangladesh on the basis of the findings of our own model experiment or was the actual experiment carried out in the river Hooghly taken into consideration? And on the basis of that, has this agreement been justified?

I also want to know from the Government —is it in any way an improvement upon the agreement that was reached in 1975 with Bangladesh?

Also I want to know from the Government—is there any technologically, scientifically or nationally or internationally accepted norm of sharing the Bangladesh water and on the basis of that, this recent pact has been entered into? I also want to know from the Government—was there any commitment on behalf of the previous Government when they entered into a pact in 1975, on the basis of which this Government felt obliged to enter into an agreement with Bangladesh? It has been said that there is an interim agreement. I want to know whether it can be treated as a final agreement. I also want to know from the Government whether they can justify the sacrifices of our short term interests in protecting the Calcutta Port by this agreement instead of by a longterm solution in the matter of distribution of Ganga water with Bangladesh?

I also want to know whether the Government has really come to any kind of long-term solution in regard to the distribution of water from Ganga with India. I shall myself try to answer all these questions that I have raised. But, before I answer them, I will once again say that this agreement is a political agreement, and the statement that has been made by the hon. Prime Minister is also nothing but a political apologia in defence of a political policy of appearing the Military Government in Bangladesh.

Sir, I know when Babuji was in Calcutta he remarked that it seemed everybody claims to be expert on hydrology. And our Prime Minister said that all Bengalis are emotional people and it is no wonder there has been universal criticism in West Bengal against the recent pact on Farakka.

Well, Calcutta is in the heart of West Bengal. They may be emotionally upset or exercised but Sir, Callcutta Port is not the port of Bengal it is rally the economic lung of Eastern India. On it trade, industry and commerce of at least ten States of Eastern India depends. Export and Import trade of Nepal and Bhutan depends exclusively on Calcutta Port. Further, Sir, one third population of the metropolis Calcutta are those Indians who had not their birth in the soil of Bengal. 72 per cent of the labour population there are the Indians who moved to West Bengal in seeking employment there. Therefore, if any body says that the Farakka issue is the issue of West Bengal only, it is wrong. It is a national issue. That national issue has exercised the mind of West Bengal people because Calcuttta is situated in the heart of West Bengal.

Sir, the need for Farakka Barrage was felt by everybody when Calcutta Port was facing extinction. This question exercised the mind of not only our Government but also the pre-Independence Government.

Sir, in the early part of this century, out of 365 days for 250 days the Calcutta port was workable, that is, ships with 26 feet draft movement could come to the Port for 250 days in a year. In 1930 this number came down to 200 days a year and in 1956 it became 180 days a year. In 1970 it was merely 50 days a year. Why is it so? It is because the upland flow of water was decreasing. There are fifteen sand-bars and crossings. There is no upland flow of Ganga water in the Hooghly and as a result thereof, there is sand-bar formation. The salinity has increased twelve times near Palta. It was this reason which caused anxiety to our government and earlier governments also, before 1946. There were five committees which were set up; I do not want to go into the history of these developments. Each committee recommended additional quantum of discharge of water from Ganga so that flushing of the sand could be made possible. It is known to everybody that Murshidabad was a Muslim majority district and Khulna was a Hindu majority district. Still Cecil Radcliul gave Khffena to the then Pakistan and Murshidabad to India. The whole reason was that without this arrangement Calcutta Port could not be protected.

A number of expert committees were there and I shall come to them later. I want to know from the government whether it is a fact that since January 1977 not a single hydrological expert was consulted by the government whenever they met their counterpart in Bangla Desh. Either it was a politician or some IAS secretary who had not had an iota of expertise in hydrology who looked into this matter. But their counterparts in Bangla Desh were assisted each and everry time by hydrological experts and scientists; it is they who represented their delegation. It is a fact that the government was giving a very misleading statement which has created a wrong impression? Both the Prime Minister and Babuji more than once said that only for ten days they have agreed to a discharge of 20,000 cusecs from Farakka. It is absolutely wrong: it is contrary to the data they have given. They are giving in this statement that from April 11 to May 10,20,000-21,000 cusecs of discharge was there.

In the Pune Hydrological Research station two experiments were conducted to find out some data: if this discharge is allowed for this period only, what will be the extent of silting. It was found that the extent of silting would be 1·7 million tonnes. This is a faulty and fallacious way of deciding. Because siltation or desiltation does not depend upon merely ten days of flow. It is a gradual process, continuous process. It is a process all over the area and it depends upon the pettern of discharge of water all along the year. Therefore, in the Pune experiment, when the figure for the whole year was fed into computer with all the variables, it was found that nearly 2·6 or 2·7 million tonnes of deposit would be there, if this type of agreement was entered into. This figure was before the government. I have been told that these figures had been suppressed. When there was a discussion with the Bangladesh government, those figures were not taken into consideration.

14.00 hrs.

Perhaps to create an impression that these figures are not dependable, there is a sentence in the statement made by the Prime Minister that "Hydrology is not an exact science". Is there any science which

[Shri Samar Guha]

is exact? Even mathematics is not as exact as it was earlier, because you have to start with certain presumptions or axioms. They only wanted to justify themselves why they had ignored the Poona Model Laboratory data and its finding which showed that if you enter into this kind of agreement, it will have disastrous consequences on Calcutta Port. This is not all. There is much more than that. You may argue that this was a model laboratory experiment. But there had been actual real experiments in the very bed of Hooghly. In the 1975 agreement, first there was 11,000 cusecs discharge. But after two or three months, this quantum was increased to 36,000 to 40,000 cusecs. It was increased during 1975 to 1976 and it was found that there was a removal of the silt to the extent of more than 12 million tonnes. If this process was allowed to be continued, the Hooghly channel would have been saved and within 10 or 15 years there would have been no probelm at oll. But in 1976 and 1977, the quantum of discharge was changed to fifty-fifty. The minimum quantum was 27,000 to 32,000 cusecs. You are talking about 20,000 cusecs. Even when the fluctuation was 27,000 to 32,000 cusecs, the result was that there was again serious re-silting and also that the navigable channel was shifted by 200 feet. I know it may be difficult for the hon. Minister to understand it and reply. But Babuji repeatedly said that he was a B.Sc. student. I wanted Babuji to be here today. Babuji negotiated the 1977 pact. It was Babuji who got the Farakka agreement prepared and Mr. Barnala just signed on the dotted line. I ask Babuji, on what basis has it been done? Computers do not fail. All the variables were taken into consideration by the Poona Hydrological Laboratory and experiments, conducted with the help of computers, have shown that there will be disastrous consequences if this pattern of sharing of water either for lean months or for the whole year is taken into consideration. What to speak of the model experiment? I just now said that the actual experiment conducted in 1975 and 1976 showed that if a discharge of 36,000 to 40,000 cusecs was maintained, there was removal of silt to the extent of 12 million tonnes. Within 10 years Calcutta Port would have been drought to its original health of the thirties, where, in a year, 200 ships of a depth of 20 feet could handle the trade in the Calcutta Port. It is very difficult to understand the commonsense—what to speak of the scientific or technological sense—behind it.

ow dare you ignore the scientific data? Was there any tangible data or not? You signed the agreement with Bangladesh—but for what reason? I want an answer from the hon. Minister, about the effect of the model experiment, and actual experiment domin the river Hooghly in 1975 and 1976. (*Interruptions*) I have already said that it is creating a mistaken impression as if only for ten days, 20,000 cusecs of water will be discharged. I will show the data. I have mentioned about all this. I want to know from the hon. Minister, did you find any tangible experiment anywhere or any data? How did you arrive at the conclusion that 20,000 cusecs dischage of water through the lean months would enable Calcutta Port to preserve its navigability—i.e. the navigability of river Hooghly?

I know that the Government have taken recourse to a statement made by Dr. K.L. Rao in Lok Sabha on 16th August 1972. What is the statement of Dr. Rao? He took advantage of certain statements made by Mr. Man Singh's expert committee. That expert committee on the river Hooghly and the improvement of its head-water supply, submitted its report in October 1952. It fixed the discharge of water from the feeder canal of Ganga at 20,000 cusecs. In the same statement, Dr. Rao agrees that Mr. Man Snigh had his doubts. He said that, that experiment was not foolproof. In the same statement, he had referred to the smallness of scale of the model. At that time, the process of experiment—had not been perfected. There was no feeding of the computer with data viz. questions and answers. The computer, or the proto-type, in the modern sense, was not available. Therefore, in the same statement on the Man Singh Committee report, it was said:

> "The smallness of the scale of the models made it difficult for the research station at Poona to determine the minimum drv water discharge required to maintain the river in the region."

In April 1960, Dr. Rao, while presenting the report of the Farakka Barrage, laid the scheme of discharge of water throughout the year, where he mentioned that right from 15th March to 15th May, upto 20,000 cusecs were available. But he again made it conditional. It was not a fool proof or a five-vear conclusion. In his statement, he said:

> "The suggested operational programme based on the available hydrological data will have to be further examined and improved, with the help of more data that will be subsequently collected and will be tested at the Central Water Power Research Station, Poona....."

DR. K.L. RAO agreed :

"In the last few years, the controversy regarding the quantum of water to be

let down in the feeder canal during the lean months of the mid-March and mid-May has been going on."

On the basis of that, what was his final conclusion? In the same statement he says:

"The exact requirements of water are based and determined by observation of proto-type itself. It is, therefore, decided to conduct the following procedure for operation of Farakka Project."

Then he concluded:

"For five years after the water is let down in the feeder canal, the feeder canal will carry the full discharge of 40,000 cusecs throughout the year, including the lean months."

Therefore, it was not only a travesty of truth but, I should say, misleading the House, misleading the country and playing on the gangerous ground. They have just taken Man Singh's Report, which was a very tentative report, a report of 1952 based only on a proto-type experiment, and they have avoided all the statements that were made by Dr. K.L. Rao, where he had categorically stated that, for at least five years, experiments should be made throughout the year, including the lean period, with 40,000 cusecs of water.

This is not the opinion of only Dr. K. L. Rao. Thereafter, Government invited national and international experts to determine the quantum of discharge of water from Farakka so as to preserve the Calcutta Port. It is known to you that Dr. Hanson, a hydrological expert of international repute from West Germany, who is also consultant to other international bodies, was invited to give his advice. When Man Singh's data was produced before him, first he agreed that 20,000 cusecs may be sufficient but, immediately, he added a rider "I have to go into further experiments, make further experiments because I want further data, real data". He suggested getting data from the river itself. On the basis of that experiment, he immediately said that 46,000 to 46,000 cusecs would be the minimum, not the optimum, of water.

Again, in 1960 or 1962, another international expert from Netherlands, a very well known hydrologist, Dr J.J. Droukers was invited. Let me quote what he said:

"super-imposing corresponding velocity in it during the period together with the changes in the periods of the floods and ebb, it is seen that the discharge of the order of 50,000 cusecs need be maintained. However, taking into conventional allowance the plus-minus 10 per cent of such computation it would appear that... a discharge of the order of 45,000 cusecs would be necessary."

Again, the Government took the opinion of another Indian expert, a very well-known export, Dr. G.V. Joglekar, Director of the Central Water and Power Research Station, Poona. What was his opinion?

He said:

"I consider that 40,000 cusecs from the Farakka Barrage with the measure mentioned (he recommended some river training measures also), the 1936 condition will be restored. Though assessment of the required discharge is of the order of 46,000 cusecs against 40,000 cusecs expected from the Farakka Barrage, I do not consider that a small reduction in the available discharge will have any harmful effect, as the headwater will be relatively silt-free."

From 46,000 to 40,000 cusecs—he refers only to a reduction from the upper limit, not the lower limit.

Mr. A.C. Mitra, Chairman of the Technical Advisory Committee, Farakka Project, had also examined this controversial issue and stated:

"Under the present river conditions, headwater discharge of 40,000 cusecs will be necessary during the non-freshed season to neutralise the landward drift of sediments throughout the tidal portion of the river. This effect could be expedited with a discharge of the order of 45,000 cusecs or so from Farakka through the feeder canal to the Bhagirathi-Hooghly during the non-freshed season, particularly in the first few years of the operation."

Why did Government invite the opinions of all these experts, why did they spend so much money, why did they go into experiments and get the opinions not only of national but even international experts, and then throw them into the dust bin? The opinion of a gentleman Minister and a gentleman ICS Secretary is considered more important on the scientific and technological aspects than the opinion of experts and has been taken into consideration jeopardising the future not only of the Calcutta Port, but the future of the economy of the whole of eastern India, and for that matter of the whole country.

What is the basis of sharing the waters? Throughout the year India will get 37·3 to 45 per cent and Bangla Desh 62·7 to 55 per cent. What is the criterion that made us agree to this kind of sharing of the waters?

[Shri Samar Guha]

The Ganga river flows for 1,370 miles in India and only 88 miles within Bangla Desh; 94.7 of the irrigation potential and 94 per cent of the population of the Ganga basin are in India; 90 per cent of the main Ganga channel lies in India. Is there any international river or agreement anywhere where the lower riparian country, having less than 5 to 10 per cent of that water, claiming the major share of the water at the cost and risk and danger of crippling the major port of the other country? The port of Calcutta is still handling 45 per cent of your exports and 31 per cent of your imports. It was the first port of India, but due to navigational hazards now, it has been reduced to the fifth position. There are many rivers flowing through different countries of the world, but such a kind of unequal sharing is completely unparalleled in the world.

You may say, well, Bangladesh has been historically ours; we were brethren; just for 30 years, we were separated from one another; if there is a necessity of Bangladesh, why should we not sacrifice ourselves ? Is this argument justifiable?

When Bangladesh was in Pakistan, in 1960, 1961, 1962 and 1968, there had been meetings between the representatives of India and Bangladesh on the question of sharing of Ganga waters. At that time, the Farakka project was to be constructed. In early 1960, the quantum of water required by them was only 3,500 cusecs ; in late 1960, it jumped to 18,000 cusecs. In 1961, it came to 29,000 cusecs; in 1962, it further increased to 32,000 cusecs and, in 1968, it jumped to 49,000 cusecs. There has been so much of a quantum jump. You look at the quantum jump. What does it mean? If they were really serious, could there be such a type of quantum jump from 3,500 cusecs in 1960 to 49,000 cusecs in 1968, just in eight years ?

What is the international opinion? There is a thousand million acre ft. water from the mighty rivers of Padma, Brahmaputra and Megna emptying into the Bay of Bengal annually. At that time, Bangladesh was in Pakistan. Pakistan could tap this stupendous waste of a thousand million acre ft. water. It was known to everybody. The problem of Bangladesh was not the problem of this Barrage but the problem of flood control. It was also the problem of navigability, not the problem of salinity. This is the World Bank report where they have said that if a withdrawal of this order, that is, 40,000 cusecs from the river system of Bangladesh could cause no excessive salinity, the withdrawal of 40,000 cusecs at Farakka would have practically no effect on the river system of Bangladesh.

Not only that. There can be no question of salinity in Bangladesh; there is no question of irrigation problem. It is a question of flood control. There is no question of lack of water there. The only question may be; what about the movement of ships ? Is it not known to you that beyond Golan, there is no mechanised ship lying between Farakka and Golan? What is the justification? Is that, in a way, we are jeopardising the interests of Bangladesh? We are not doing that. In no way, we are jeopardising the interest of Bangladesh. About the problem of salinity, no; about the problem of irrigation, no; about the problem of flood control, it is just the reverse; about the navigation problem, no. It is an international opinion, the World Bank's opinion.

Then, yet, what is the reason of entering into an agreement which will jeopardise our interest, ending the future of Calcutta port. Giving the water only to satisfy a military regime, to have a smile with a military cap, when the gentlemen is coming here, to have his smile in Delhi, is really baffling for me to understand. It has been said that we had no alternative, but to honour the commitment made in 1975. I have no love for that lady, the empress of Emergency, who entered into that pact with Bangladesh. But it will be wrong to say that the committed India to any kind of thing. There was no necessity for asking the permission of Bangladesh for commissioning of Farakka project. There is no international obligation. Nowhere in any country of the world where any such kind of a dam was prepared, there was any necessity for getting the permission of the lower riparian country, whose share of water is less than ten percent, five or seven percent. Yet out of the goodness and friendship with Bangladesh Government, they entered into a certain pact for a few months from 11,000 cusecs to 16,000 cusecs. It was said that it was a tactical move to allow in a friendly way for the commissioning of the Farakka barrage. Then, what happened? After just a few months, the quantum of discharge was increased. I have already said that it was 36,000 to 46,000 cusecs in 1975-76. I have already mentioned about its result. It would, therefore, be wrong to say that we had any previous commitment to Bangladesh. It was only one year's commitment. We had no previous commitment with Bangladesh, from which we could not disentangle ourselves. We have ourselves, of our own eagerness to appease the military regime taken the decision. I would like to ask; is it in any way an improvement on the 1975 pact ? That was only for one year.

Secondly, there was a clause of joint survey, observation and comparison of the data of what will be the result of the flow.

I do not want to go into that pact. There, although it was agreed that for commissioning of Farakka, this much amount of water will be there, yet what was said and I quote]:

> "The two Prime Minister took note of the fact that Farakka barrage project would be commissioned before the end of 1974."

It was not a conditional agreement. They agreed that India has a right to commission of its own, but it was only a friendly gesture with that Government that they agreed for the time being to releasing 11,000 to 16,000 cusecs of water for six months.

Again, it is said that it is an interim pact. What you have entered into- is that an interim pact? The pact is for five years and the survey result would be available within three years. Earlier, it was only for one year and the survey was to be done each year. Is it an interim agreement ? It may so happen that within five years the things may go far away. By that time, Calcutta port may not only dwindle and collapse, but it will perish and perishing of the Calcutta port would mean perishing of the West Bengal and perishing of the West Bengal would amount to perishing of the economic lungs of Eastern India.

If it is an interim pact and if you can extricate yourself before five years, what face will you have in international affairs? Earlier, when the pact was for one year, it was understandable, but one cannot understand this five years' interim pact. If you extricate yourself from this pact, uptil now all the international opinion, World Bank and others were lending support to India for its claim to 46,000 cusecs of water, their opinion will be reversed.

Then, is it a long term solution? It may be said that in view of our expectations of a long-term solution, we have sacrificed our short-term interests. What is the long-term solution ? Is it Ganga-Brahmaputra linkage and joint survey ? They have refused ; you could not even make them agree to what Mujib agreed, that is, a joint survey of the effect of the discharge as will be apportioned between India and Bangladesh. What will be the effect on the Padma channel and also the Hooghly channel? You have failed to make them agree even to what they agreed to in 1975. In 1975 they agreed to a joint survey, observation, comparision and analysis of the data on the basis of which the character of the pact will be changed. This year they have not agreed. But agreed to what ? 3 years. I know it is for 3 years. But it is not a joint observation. But if on the basis of the data made on a joint survey of their own... Whether those data will be cooked up data or not, God alone knows.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : The hon. Member's time is up.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I am concluding.

About the Ganga-Brahmaputra linkage, they have not made any firm commitment. Within 3 years they will make a survey. Only just a survey. Just talk and talk. A talkie-talkie business will be there for 3 years. After 3 years Bangladesh will see. There may not be any Ganga-Brahmaputra linkage even if you want. Then what will happen ? It will take 10-15 years. By that time the Calcutta port will be finished.

About the catchment in the upper region, is it possible ? Would you be able to get water from the Kosi ? For the last 10-15 years they have been trying to persuade Nepal to allow one of the tributaries flow into the Ganga to have a catchment— there and from that catchment to increase the discharge of water into the Farakka area. Could you do it? Nepal is there and it will not allow. For how many years you have been trying ? 10-15 years. Even then you could not persuade Nepal to get into a single agreement to enter into an agreement to form a catchment so as to feed the Ganga for augmenting the Farakka discharge. That you cannot do. Therefore, this also is again a day dreem that sacrifices our immediate interests of the Calcutta port. We have not opened up any possibility of a long-term solution.

I will conclude with one single sentence. It was not a sincere agreement based on technological or scientific data, I will call it a bankruptcy of our intelligenee. But I know the agreement is not based either on technological or scientific data. They have their data. They have deliberately ignored it . It was one gentleman Minister and one gentleman IAS Secretary. You will know that not a single hydrological expert since January 1977 was allowed to enter into any kind of delegation or enter into any kind of talk. I would ask. Mr C. C. Patel—after January 1977 did he participate in any of the discussions ? Is he a hydrologist ? Is he not a Civil Engineer , a graduate civil engineer who has no knowledge of hydrology at all ?

Then I will again say. We have misunderstood the military regime of Mr. Zia-Ur-Rahman. We have tried to placate and appease him. What has

[Shri Samar Guha]

result? Even the ink had not dried up in your Farakka agreement but within a few days, the gentleman-General, Mr. Zia-Ur-Rahman made a statement to the BBC correspondent where he accused India that India had its hand in the recent coup in Bangladesh. This is the reward of your appeasement of a military regime in Bangladesh, we have got. Yet you did not hesitate to offer in the form of a statement based not on any scientific or technological justification but just only a political apologia for your policy of political appeasement of a military regime in Bangladesh.

Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Motion moved:

"That this House do consider the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 14th November, 1977 regarding the Agreement between the Government of the Republic of India and the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh on sharing of the Ganga Waters at Farakka and on augmenting its flow."

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): I beg to move:

That for the original motion, the following be substituted namely :—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 14th November, 1977 regarding the Agreement between the Government of the Republic of India and the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh on sharing of the Ganga Waters at Farakka and on augmenting its flow, recommends to the Government of India to take the following steps :—

(a) to regulate the quantity of Ganga waters sought to be diverted from the main flow through various up stream projects already executed or to be executed in future in order to ensure the maximum availability of head water flow at Farakka to meet the minimum needs of flow during the lean months considered necessary for the survival of the Calcutta Port;

(b) to augment the flow at Farakka;

(c) to prepare a comprehensive greater Ganga Basin Scheme with the object of augmenting flow of water at Farakka ;

(d) to move the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to review the needs of water for the two countries every year; and

(e) to ensure the survival of the Calcutta Port and its all out improvement in the interest of the entire nation." (1)

SHRI SAUGATA ROY (Barrackpore) : I beg to move :

That for the original motion, the following be substituted,namely :—

"This House, having considered the statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on the 14th November, 1977 regarding the Agreement between the Government of the Republic of India and the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh on sharing of the Ganga Waters at Farakka and on augmenting its flow, disapproves the Agreement as being indequate for supplying water to Bhagirathi so as to save the Calcutta Port." (2)

Sir, Prof. Samar Guha earlier has moved his motion and made a very detailed survey of the background of the Farakka Barrage Agreement signed between our country and Bangladesh, very recently.

Before going into the details, I must state, at the out-set, that for whatever has happened, I shall not blame the two honourable gentlemen sitting on the Treasury Benches, who are representing the Government, in this discussion namely Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee and Shri Surjit Singh Barnala because, unfortunately, they were at no stage, seriously involved in the Farakka Barrage negotiations. So, it is not surprising that they will not have much knowledge nor such sentiments associated with the Farakka negotiations.

I also want to state emphatically that though newspapers had called this agreement as a sell-out for political purposes and though they called this agreement as a black agreement, they had no intention of questioning the motives of those who have signed this agreement. Possibly what they have done was to their best intentions and the purest possible motives. But, what has come out as the outcome of that is that the interests of the Calcutta Port, the interests of West Bengal, the interests of hundred million people who are being starved by the Calcutta Port in its hinterland have been bartered away and Shri Samar Babu was very correctly pointed out that it was for getting a smile out of the military regime. Let me make it quite clear

that I havegone through the Prime Minister's statement very carefully and also I have gone through the agreement reached very carefully. There is no economic or technial consideration that was shown with regard to this agreement. In fact, the Prime Minister himself in his statement on the 14th November, has said :

> "The hon'ble Members would also appreciate that the negotitations involved not only the sharing of waters between the two countries—nor only augmentation of its flows—but also the political imperative of improving relations with our closest neighbour, which is an acid test of the effectiveness and credibility of our entire foreign policy."

But, this acid test of our credibility of our foreign policy is to prove that you are a very good negotiator, you are very fast in signing agreement to prove that you are very peace-loving. But, you have not gone into the technical consideration; you have not also gone into the interests of the calcutta Port. This agreement on the sharing of the Ganga waters at the Farakka Barrage was to sell away our rights with or without intentions. If I may say so, that was not on a technical consideration as to how much of water does Bangladesh need from the Ganga. Bangladesh will need only 6,500 cusecs—5,000 cusecs for the Barrage and the rest for Ganga Kabadat Project. What you have given is this. You have given them in the leanest period-April-May 62·5 percent of the water which amounts to 55,000 cusecs in the leanest season. Out of this, 37,000 and odd cusecs of water will flow down the Ganga which will not serve the interests of Calcutta Port and it will not serve the entire port but it will serve the interests of Military Junta, the political interests; they are torturing the people of Bangladesh. This is what the agreement amounts to.

So, Sir, as Samar Babu had very aptly pointed out, this is not based on the technical advice. I may remind here that when this country was partitioned, I was one of those unfortunate victims of that partition. It was Shri Radcliffe, who drew the map of India. He divided India. And he awarded Murshidabad District to India though Murshidabad was a muslim majority district, instead of giving that Hindu-majority district of Khulna to India, Murshidabad was awarded to India. Even the judge, Radcliffe had no knowledge about the Calcutta Port. That was why he wanted that the place of Farakka should fall within the Bengal and not in Bangladesh. This was the judgment of that British judge who had no knowledge of the Indian conditions but who had only read the report given by different experts. The problems of this port were studied as early as 1953 by Sir Authur Cotton and were continued by Vernon Harcourt in 1896, by Mr. Reak in 1913, by the Stevenson-Moore Committee in 1916-1919, by Sir William Willcocks in 1930, by Mr. T.M.Oag in 1939, by Mr. A. Webster in 1946 and by Mr. Walter Hensen in 1957 among others who gave this decision. He had in mind these reports. We have not had the consideration of going through all these reports. If I may say so, the Administration which began the negotiation for Farakka has changed, the political leadership has changed but two people have remained unchanged, namely, one is Babuji, who is the Defence Minister and who as Food and Agriculture Minister ealier conducted the negotiations. The second is the Foreign Secretary who continues to be the same though the change in the Government.

Sir, I have a copy of the excerpt of the speech of our Foreign Secretary made at the United Nations when Bangladesh tried to internationalise the issue. The Foreign Secretary had said in that speech that less than 40,000 cusecs of water still can not solve the problem of Calcutta port. He was not then talking through his head. In fact, he was only repeating what the experts had said earlier that nothing less than 40,000 cusecs can save the Calcutta Port.

Sir, it is not a question of saving the Calcutta Port alone. In the Calcutta Port traffic has gone down from 11 million tonnes to 7·5 million tonnes in 1974-75. It relates to the whole ecological plans in the lower reaches of Ganga. Unless fresh water comes into Ganga every day salinity of the water goes up. Formerly ships used to ply upto Allahabad. Now in the upper reaches of Ganga there is no navigability. Sir, it is not only a question of survival of Calcutta Port or for that matter people of Calcutta where 8 million people live but it is also the question of survival of the economy of India. We have bartered away Farakka for the sake of having a good agreement. I know in international agreements it sometimes happens that we have to give and take.

Farakka barrage was not constructed for political reasons. When the work was taken up on this project in 1962 the considerations were economic. At no time had the then Pakistan Government agreed to building the barrage. It was only in 1974 when the friendly Goverrment of Sheikh Mujib was established in Bangladesh that we could come to an agreement that the Farakka barrage could be commissioned. So, if this whole barra e

[Shri Saugata Roy]

was constructed for economic reasons how can the political considerations or the question of improving relations with our neighbour or the acid test for effectiveness and credibility do come up now ? I do not know. Does this agreement promise anything for the future ? It promises only one thing, that is, in the leanest period—April-May—when Calcutta port would need 40,000 cusecs of water it will get only 20,000 cusecs of water. The tidal bores which formerly used to happen for only 40 days have increased to 160 days and hydrologists say that in five years it will be 200 days. No ships will ply in the port of Calcutta. In 1936 ships upto a draft of 26 feet were coming into the Calcutta port: now even ships of 18 feet draft could not come into the Calcutta port. There is no future. This agreement does not spell out anything for the future. The Prime Minister's statement says that it is a short term sacrifice. The statement says :

> "We have accepted the short term sacrifice involved in the arragement for sharing because it is also linked to measures for finding a solution to the long-term problem."

What is the solution to the long term problem that the government has in mind? Before this agreement was signed word had leaked out when Babuji came back on April 18th, Bangla Desh had said : we will talk about Farakka only if you talk about giving back those political refugees who are there in Meghalaya. It was agreed that the political refugees would be driven out. We hoped that we would get the grace of the military regime but we did not get it. Our Prime Minister met Zia while in London on June 9. There also was the same talk. Jia said : give back our refugees and those people who are against our undemocratic regime and we will talk. At that time word leaked out that only 20,000 cusecs of water would be available. On behalf of my party, as a worried citizen of Bengal, I met the Prime Minister on the 12th. 18 days before the agreement was signed and the Prime Minister told us : you have your patience; we will see that the best interests of West Bengal and India will be served. An all-party delegation of West Bengal met the Prime Minister. When the Prime Minister of the country assures the delegation, when he says that if you create a row over this, my hands will be weakened, nobody takes to political agitation. We did not take to political agitation. What did we get ? 20,000 in the lean months after spending 150 crores and 13 yrs. No ships will come to Calcutta. I request Mr. Vajpayee to come to the port of Calcutta and see how a port which was the second biggest port in India has now come to occupy the 5th position. In five years it will go down to the 10th position. You will see how the city is dying, how the port is dying, how a city is sick, a city which has already been hit by the truncation of the country, how it has been hit by natural calamities and how it is dying and then he can tell me. We are not interested in taking acid test for our foreign policy. It is not my purpose to impute motives; we do not want to weaken our leaders' hands in international negotiations by saying that they acted under pressure. I say that they acted in haste to prove that their foreign policy was sound; they acted in haste to save the military regime which is on its last legs in Bangla Desh and sacrified the interest of the port of Calcutta, the state of West Bengal and the whole of the eastern region. It has not been the practice in this House to disapprove international treat and for reasons which I mentioned I have given a substitute motion calling for the disapproval of the treaty though I know that it is not the practice in this House. It is to record my disapproval as a citizen of West Bengal of this treaty which in future years will strangle our state to death.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur) Sir, I rise to participate in the discussion with a full sense of responsibility but with deep anguish in my heart. While laying the copy of the agreement on Farakka on the Table of the House on 14th November, 1977, the Prime Minister said that the problem must be seen as non-partisan national issue. We also want to do it. But when we find that the State Governments vitally concerned with this matter were not consulted at all and were not taken into confidence, we feel that the larger national interest was not kept in mind. We yield to none in our keenest desire to have the most cordial and friendly relations with the people of Bangladesh. We feel that bilateral issues should be solved by bilateral discussions and negotiations and agreements. That is why we were concerned when an attempt was made to internationalise the issue, which would not have been to the benefit of either country. We also realise that this agreement cannot be undone and it is not that we ask for the scrapping of the agreement. But it is my duty to place before the House and through it before the country the real problems that have to be faced as a result of this agreement, because we feel that it is the duty and responsibility of the entire nation to find out a solution and to act speedily and with seriousness and sincerity. Otherwise, if West Bengal dies, the rest of India will not survive. But at the end of the discussion, we will have to ask ourselves, and I hope our esteemed Foreign Minister will answer, as to at what cost

and what effect has this agreement been arrived at. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on 16th August 1962 said:

> "If the port of Calcutta goes, where will the city of Calcutta be ?"

Even our present Prime Minister said in the House the other day:

> "No one in India can Minimise the importance of this port for the city of Calcutta and for the economy of the entire eastern region on which depend a vast segment of our population."

We wonder whether these hard facts were kept in mind, because we find these are not reflected in the agreement. We have necessarily to say that these facts were not borne in mind. During the long three decades of Congress regime in this country, we have found that the development of the eastern region has remained an anathema to the powers that be. We have been charged with emotionalism. I am not ashamed to be ane motional person. But when we feel that people who have given the National Anthem to this country have received only national apathy, if not antipathy, surely we have some grievance. I demand that the Central Government should give due regard to the problems of the eastern region and provide for its speedy development. Shri Samar Guha described Calcutta port as the economic lung. I would describe the River Hooghly as the very lifeline of the people of the eastern region. Our real and genuine apprehension is that as a result of this agreement, this lifeline may be snapped. Therefore, this is not just a mere matter of bilateral agreement between two countries. We have no enmity with the people of Bangladesh, but what was the object behind the project of Rs. 156 crores—as it was thought of, and implemented ? I want the Minister to reply; was the Farakka barrage project formulated, conceived and carried out for the purpose of saving the Calcutta Port—or not ? Was it not the main object for spending Rs. 156 crores ? According to your political considerations, you have entered into an agreement; but I would have understood it if, in this lengthy statement of the Prime Minister, that fact had really been adverted to. I am not entering here into the question whether an international issue like this should be discussed here or not. We have our reservations, not on the basis of considerations of external relations, but from the point of view of saving a large number of people of this country; and since the Prime Minister has agreed that it is a vital thing, and that the future of the Calcutta Port is vital for the economy of the country, how can you completely ignore the practical aspect ? I do not wish to go into great details; but it is necessary, and it is my duty to draw the attention of the House to this. The Prime Minister himself has said the other day that the Farakka barrage project has been designed mainly for the protection and improvement of the Calcutta Port. I should have thought that it was wholly so. The sum total of the situation is that our country has provided the entire cost of Rs. 156 crores, for this project which will neither protect nor improve the Calcutta Port. This is not the feeling of the people of this country, of West Bengal or of the eastern region alone. We have been told for the last 100 years that unless there is a discharge from the upland into the river Hooghly, the port cannot be saved; and this was not a political point of view. This was the unanimous view of international experts, as also of our national experts. The reason is this. Owing to the diversion of the main flow of the Ganga into the Padma, less and less water flowed into the river Hooghly, from the Ganga, *via* Bhagirati. I am reading from a report of the West Bengal Government :

> "This has caused progressive deterioration of the Hooghly. During the 3 monsoon months, the drift of the silt and sediment brought down by the monsoon flow, is sea-ward. During the remaining 9 months, when there is no up-land discharge, the flood tides from the sea which become strong, re-distribute the material to the upper reaches, where it accumulates."

14·59 hrs.

[DR. SUSHILA NAYAR *in the Chair*]

There have been 11 expert reports, between 1853 and 1930; and the unanimous decision has been that 40,000 cusecs were necessary and that there has to be some availability of water from the uplands. It is very important to note that dredging of the river bed alone will not be sufficient to protect it.

15 hrs.

This is very important. They felt that improvement by dredging had reached its limit and all of them thought that adequate head-water supply to the navigation channel by diversion from the Ganga could provide the only remedial measures. Then, that happened ? In 1948, the Central Board of Transport initiated the Ganga Barrage (Farakka Barrage) investigation for improvement of the head-water supply to the Hooghly for the benefit of the Port of Calcutta. On 22nd February 1957, Dr. Walter Hensen, a German engineer of international repute on tidal hydraulics, came to this country at the invitation of the Government of India in connection with the Farakka Barrage studies and he was asked to give a report. He fully recommended the proposal for construction of a Barrage across the Ganga. The Farakka Barrage Project was based on Dr. Walter Hensen's report and the project was taken up for implementation some time in 1963.

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

In January 1962 the Calcutta Port Commissioners set up a specialised Hydraulic Department and they also gave a report. Then followed the study by the Central Water and Power Research Station of Poona, followed by Dr. Walter Hensen in 1967, by Dr. D. V. Joglekar, Director, Central Water and Power Research Station, Poona, in 1968, by Dr. J. J. Dronkers the Chief of Hydraulic Research, Government of Netherlands in December 1968, by the Director, River Research Institute, West Bengal, in March 1969, by Shri A. C. Mitra, Chairman, Technical Advisory Committee, Farakka Barrage Project. Again Dr. Walter Hensen was consulted in 1961 and he categorically stated that a supply of the order of somewhat higher than 40,000 cft. is needed throughout the year to reverse the process of sending up ship route to Calcutta Harbour.

All these studies, investigations and conclusions have been unanimous. So far as their recommendation is concerned, it is that 40,000 cusecs was the minimum quantity that was required. This was not some *ad hoc* idea that was given by one expert, or by some people of West Bengal without proper study. This is not our figure, this is the figure which has been given from 1948 by experts in this line.

It was evident that the river problem had been investigated thoroughly and for a very long period of time, and the Central Government also had accepted the position and reiterated that there was absolute need for diversion of 40,000 cusecs of Ganga water into the Bhagirathi throughout the year.

The Farakka Project was formulated to achieve, what has been decided by experts as the minimum quantity of water, 40,000 cusecs which has to be diverted. Now the other problem, was in the mean time, various upstreams projects were allowed to be sanctioned for diverting the Ganga water. It was to study this problem that a proposal for setting up of the Ganga Basin Water Study Organisation was mooted by the Special Cell in 1956 and Shri K. K. Framji was appointed as the first Chief Engineer by the Ministry of Irrigation and Power in 1956. The purpose of setting up this organisation was to collect dependable discharge data at about 60 sites on the Ganga and its tributaries. This is very important.

I am reading from an article by Mr. Debes Mukerjee, a well-known expert.

> "Another function which this organisation was entrusted with was to examine the proposals for withdrawal of Ganga water, and if need be, to propose practicable adjustments in the pattern of irrigation for the upstream projects for minimising the consumptive water requirements of the proposed projects in the critical months of minimum flow in the Ganga. Such adjustments were very much necessary for the maximum conservation of the supplies of the Ganga.
>
> For some unknown reasons, the above practice of keeping a control on the consumptive use of Ganga waters above Farakka was radically changed in the late sixties. By 1969-70, when the completion of the Farakka Barrage—the largest of its kind in the world—was very much in sight, the same Ganga basin organisation in the Ministry of Irrigation was actively engaged in clearing quietly some major projects for large-scale diversion.....".

This is very important. Here no international question is involved. It is a question of diverting water for purposes of use in other States. And that was done after the Farakka Barrage scheme had been approved and implemented.

The article continues:

> "....large-scale diversion of waters from some major tributaries of the Ganga, as also a large number of medium projects for diversion of waters from the Ganga and its tributaries for consumptive use during the dry months."

The hon. Prime Minister said:

> "Meanwhile, as the nation has progressed and as agriculture has modernised, the demand for consumptive and non-consumptive use, particularly for irrigation, of the Ganga water has increased and is likely to increase even more rapidly in future. Therefore, rational arrangement for increasing the availability of water through some long-term scheme is imperative for meeting both our upstream and downstream requirements even aside from the needs of Bangladesh."

Therefore, the hon. Prime Minister has admitted that in the upstream irrigation projects a large quantity of Ganga water is being diverted, but there is no proposal as to what is to be done in regard to the diversion of water in the upstream for the other irrigation projects. Now, the result is that today though the Farakka Barrage was brought into existence for the Calcutta port to get this minimum quantity of water it will not get it under the agreement. On the other hand, a large quantity of water is being diverted to the other irrigation projects. We do not want that any State

should suffer for want of irrigation or water facilities, but so far as the Calcutta port is concerned, we cannot save it by digging tubewells while you can have irrigation by proper tubewells. What is the way out ?

I do not want to say anything which will create any misunderstanding between our country and Bangla Desh with which we want the best of relations, but my appeal—not only appeal, it is our demand—is that you cannot allow the Calcutta port to die an unnatural death because of the policy that you have adopted. Either you give that water from the Farakka Barrage or you see that the Ganga water reaches up to the mouth of the Bhagirati, the mouth of the Farakka barrage, and that there is greater discharge of water there, so that we can have better results.

The hon. Prime Minister said in his statement in the Lok Sabha:

> "Hydrology is not an exact science and, therefore, hydrodynamic model studies are not capable of predicting effects of withdrawal within negligible margins of error."

Probably it was to meet the possible point, the obvious point, that has been made by experts in this country, unanimously recommending a particular quantum of discharge. It further says:

> "However, on the basis of both model experiments and prototype studies of actual effects so far carried out by Indian engineers, it can be stated that the schedule of withdrawals agreed upon in the Agreement, would enable us to arrest further deterioration in the Port of Calcutta and, with the help of such other measures as dredging, river training, prevention of soil erosion, etc. to bring about improvement in the Port."

Therefore, it is realised and it has been admitted that the flow of water that we will get from the Farakka after this agreement will not be sufficient to keep even the Calcutta Port functioning. Such other measures like, dredging, river training, prevention of soil erosion, etc. are essential steps to be taken. Where is the indication of it ?

The hon. Prime Minister, on the other hand, said :

> "The improvement of Calcutta Port as a result of headwater supply from the Farakka Barrage is bound to take time and cannot be achieved too quickly."

What is the solution then ? Certainly, I am not disputing for a moment, or doubting for a moment, that the Prime Minister has not got the interest of Calcutta port in mind. I had the occasion to go with an all-party delegation of West Bengal legislators headed by the Minister of Irrigation. When we called on him, he was kind enough to assure us that nothing will be done which will prejudice the interests of Calcutta port. But if he has not been able to do it, how does he propose to save the Calcutta port ? The Calcutta port is not a symbol, the Calcutta port is not be considered in isolation. It is a part of the economy of this country. It is a lifeline of the people of this country. We have been asked to make sacrifices and we have made sacrificed for the nation. Let the nation now make sacrifice for us. That is what we only want.

SHRI M. S. SANJEEVI RAO (Kakinada) : Mr. Chairman, Sir, the Agreement between the Government of India and the Government of Bangladesh in sharing the Ganga waters not only disappointed the entire country but depressed the entire nation. The Farakka Agreement does not just involve the Calcutta port alone. But it involves the entire 600 million people of our country.

The trade from Calcutta used to go through the sea, through the Hoogly river which has a distance of nearly 200 km. The deterioration of the Calcutta port started with the silting of the Hooghly river which is due to the sea tides coming from the south and lack of regular flow coming from the north on account of the sudden change of course of the river Ganga which had been always flowing through the Bhagirathi, started delivering into an other channel, due to a sudden and devastating earthquake in the year 1972.

With that the, decline of the Calcutta port started. I am sorry to say that the traffic handled by the Calcutta port in 1974-75 is just 7·5 million tonnes compared to 11 million tonnes in 1964-65. Calcutta, the biggest city in the country with a population of 8 million people is a commercial nerve centre and an industrial heart of the Eastern India. What is the fate of this great city now ? It is dwindling. May I tell you only it served the entire eastern India but it also served the countries, like, Nepal and Bhutan. Several Committee, to be exact, 13 expert committees went into details as to how to rehabilitate this port.

Engineering expert like Sir Arthur Cotton, Vernon Harcourt, Stevenson and Sir William Will cock were of the opinion that dredging and excavation of a new

[Shri M. S. Sanjeevi Rao]

shipping channel was not the answer, but construction of barrage across the Ganges at Farakka was the only answer for rehabilitating this Calcutta Port.

With this historic background and with the full knowledge of not only the then East Pakistan and the present Bangla Desh, but all the world communities, India completed the Farakka Barrage in the year 1975 at a cost of Rs. 156 crores.

We must be proud that our designers have built this great Barrage. The experiments conducted by the Hydrolic Research Laboratories of the Central Water and Power Commission after building the models have proved that our scientists are second to none. Thanks to the resolute and dynamic leadership of the earlier Government, we could get nearly 40,000 cusecs of water in the year 1976. As a result, the port authorities reported that there was no need for dredging the river for thirty miles down the port. The channel itself was stabilised and 26 feet draft was achieved for the whole year. This is exactly what the scientists had predicted after their hydrological tests in the laboratories and this tallied with the results achieved after flushing the Hooghly river to the extent of 40,000 cusecs after building this Farakka barrage.

India is served by three perennial rivers, the Indus, the Ganges and the Brahmaputra and we can call the river Ganges truely Indian, the reason being that the main channel of 1925 kilometers flows through the Indian territory 141 kilometers passes through Bangladesh and only 112 kilometers is the common river boundary. May I emphasise here that the Farakka Barrage is built across river Ganga where 99% of the catchment area of this river lies in India and 94.5% of the ultimate irrigation potential of this river is in India and 94% of the population in the river basin is in India

Sir, after building this historic Barrage at a cost of Rs. 156 crores mainly to feed the Calcutta Port, what do we get out of this Janata Government agreement? We get only 37.5% of the storage capacity compared to Bangladesh getting about 62.5%. Please remember that we have built this barrage not to stabilise and regulate the water supply to Bangladesh but to feed and rejuvenate the Calcutta port. We just get 20,000 cusecs whereas we need a minimum of 40 000 cusecs to save the Calcutta port.

Now I come to one more main point. It is a pity that the government proclaims that it is not a political problem but a technical problem. May I ask you? Did you involve any technical man in it? All the negotiations are handled by a bureaucrat. So also if you refresh your memory, in the Indus waters dispute our main spokesman was the Chairman of the Central Water and Power Commission of the Irrigation Ministry. Now we have technically competent technologists but we have not associated them in this matter and suddenly we have made a change from a technically competent technologist to a white-collared bureaucrat and that is why we are in this terribleness.

Then, Sir, did we analyse this problem? What are the exact requirements of Bangladesh and of India? Are we aware that Bangladesh is having enough water resources to divert to their irrigation purposes. You are aware that Bangladesh is not only having Padma, Brahmaputra but the Meghna river also and their tributaries to enhance their water supplies. Are we not aware that the then Pakistan wanted only 2500 cusecs? Are we not aware that the World Bank assessed the requirements of Bangladesh at 5000 cusecs. But with all that what did we do? We give 62.5% of the storage capacity. Now if you go into the details of the Bangladesh's requirements, the Farakka barrage feeds the river Padma and Padma in turn feeds its tributaries, Gorai and Madhumati which feed the three districts with a population of 30 million people. The main requirement of Bangladesh for Ganga waters is for irrigation under the Ganga-Kobadak project, and they need only 1500 cusecs for this purpose and they need another 5000 cusecs to be pumped into Gorai during the lean season and all told it may not be more than 9000 cusecs whereas we have provided them 20,000 cusecs. We drew 35,000 cusecs in 1976. On the other hand what is the requirement of India? On the other hand the river Ganga loom s large in the economy and in the socio-economic and cultural life of people in habiting the Ganga basin. The geographical area in India dependent on Ganga waters is nearly 211 million acres. Nearly 250 million people live in this Ganga Basin area. Only one-fifth of the population get the proper irrigation facilities. Now, unfortunately, if we take the distinction that our country has the lowest per capita income in the whole world, then the eastern region has the distinction of having the lowest per capita income in the entire country.

Now, I come to Calcutta Port. You know, Sir, that I have already told that Calcutta Port started declining rapidly with the silting of the Hooghly river. Now it is only handling 7.5 million tons whereas it used to handle half of the foreign trade in the earlier years. Whereas the other ports like Madras, Bombay and Vizag have

doubled their foreign trade and actually, it has come down from the second position in 1961 in the matter of handling of cargo to the fifth position in 1971. In this way, Calcutta port is going down. When we go into the details of the industrial growth in West Bengal, on the eastern sector, we find that the growth rate is deteriorating as compared to the rest of the country mainly due to the inefficiency of the Calcutta port and its dwindling capacity to handle the engineering exports.

According to the Engineering Export Council, they have fixed the target of Rs. 575 crores worth engineering goods for the country. They fixed Rs. 120 crores only for the Eastern India even though they all know that in the whole of India, only in eastern sector, we have all the steel plants located—Heavy Engineering Corporation at Ranchi and a number of engineering concerns are in the eastern India. The share of Eastern India engineering exports in 1975 is only 15% of the total all India exports.

If you check up your memory, in 1966 West Bengal had the distinction of exporting 66% of the engineering goods of India. So, what I am trying to conclude is this. It is because of the Calcutta port's inefficiency the industrial growth of the Eastern India has collapsed. So the flow of 40,000 cusecs of water for the Calcutta Port is a must.

I now come to one more important aspect. With all the sacrifices what do we get from Bangladesh in exchange—not even a commitment for cooperation for connecting Brahmaputra with Ganga. This is very important point which I request the Prime Minister to think about.

If you recollect, in the early fifties, after the partition of India and Pakistan, we had a similar problem like the Farakka, the Indus River dispute. There, with the monetary help of the World Bank, we had a package deal according to which the eastern tributaries Sutlez, Beas and Chanab of the Indus was exclusively given to India and the World Bank and India in trun will help Pakistan to build Mangla Dam and Therbala Dam across the Indus to augment their water supply. I want the Prime Minister that we should also have a similar package deal regarding the Farakka so that Bangladesh Government will construct the link channel connecting Brahmaputra with Ganga. You are all aware that at no time Brahmaputra discharged less than one lakh twenty thousand cusecs. It discharges 2,00 lakhs cusecs in April and it discharges 5 lakhs of cusecs in May. With this fantastic river, once we connect Brahmaputra with Ganga, there won't be any shortage of water. With this present Farrakka agreement, I am absolutely certain that Bangladesh won't move an inch for constructing this link channel until all the three years are over, and we will start all over again. So, Sir, I appeal to you that at least after one year let us negotiate and see that we have this package deal so that Bangladesh agrees to construct this link channel connecting Brahmputra with Ganga so that and at least after 4 years the efficiency of Calcutta port is improved and inturn the industrial growth is established in West Bengal thereby creating stability and prosperity in the country.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT (Chandigarh) Madam Chairman, today in this House we are not merely discussing the Farakka agreement but also the changing geography and history of the region in the last more than 200 years.

At the outset may I refer to the earthquake of 1962 which changed the geography of this region. Had it not changed the geography of this region, the water of Ganga would have continued to flow in Bhagirathi and Hooghly and there would have been no problem. But when earthquake took place the water started going to the area which is now Bangladesh and it started not merely giving water for crops but also for ecological purposes to the people of Barisal, Pakkawali and Faridpur. If for more than 200 years the area had not been using these waters then to the problem of salinity probably the Government and experts might have found certain solutions which weare now finding through Farakka.

In the meanwhile another geographical change took place. That was in the year 1947 when this area became two countries. In the meanwhile some other historical changes have also taken place. Earlier we were under the British and then India became free. At the time of partition, as my friend have also said, Redcliff carved out a line so that Farakka barrage could come to India and we could build a barrage there so as to save the Calcutta port. Some experts say if Redcliff had been more considerate and had drawn the line 10 miles more East then the Farakka could have been built at a more appropriate place where straight waters could be taken from Ganga to the Bhagirathi. But that did not happen.

Another historical change took place in that area. First it was India, then it became East Pakistan and now it is Bangladesh. Further when Bangladesh was formed there was Banga Bandhu, then came Khandakar Mustaq Ahmed and now there is Gen. Zia. Because of these changes that have taken place sometimes sentiments, emotions, prejudices and

[Shri Krishan Kant]

interests clashed and also some of the things which are being said here and outside would not have been said. It would not have clouded our vision to have a balanced look at the whole situation.

Another historical fact which this Government had to undertake was that Mrs. Gandhi had signed an agreement with Mujib in 1975. Madam Chairman, Shri Samar Guha in his speech has said that this is something which this Government has done to appease the military regime of Bangladesh. May I say that I am not fond of military regimes any where? I am for the establishment of human rights, civil rights in all countries; sometimes we criticise that and we are misunderstood in Bangla Desh. We must make a distinction how the government does its work and how we as a people feel about certain things. Here we are a democratic polity. But a government has to deal with another government. Here we can have our views: we can express our views and demonstrate against some policy. But the government of a capitalist country has to deal with the government of a socialist country; a democratic government deals with a dictatorship and *vice versa*. That is why I am not here to criticise what the earlier regime did or what the new regime did. It is a continuous process. When we deal with a country, we deal with the people of that country. Rulers or governments come and go but it is the people who live, who cultivate the lands, navigate the seas and rivers and who lead their lives and do their work. If we look at this agreement from this point of view, I say that it is an advance from 1975.

I know the problem of the Calcutta port. My friend Samar Guha read out from certain reports and said that experts had said that they needed 46,000 cusecs, 50,000 cusecs or 56,000 cusecs all the year round. When Farakka barrage was constructed the capacity of the canal was kept at only 40,000 cusecs. Even though experts had been saying like this, when Farakka barrage was constructed, technologically they felt that 40,000 cusecs would be needed and so they constructed the canal with a capacity for 40,000 cusecs. There may be other reasons. But the main question is: why was the capacity of the canal kept at 40,000 at that time? Why not 60,000, 45,000 or 50,000 as recommended by experts earlier? The optimum flow required or possible or useful must have been the main consideration at that time.

SHRI CHITTA BASU : The expert's report that 40,000 cusecs of water was needed for the survival of the Calcutta port had nothing to do with....

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please do not interrupt him now; you can have your say when your turn comes.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : The fact is that the canal has been constructed to take 40,000 and it cannot take more water. It means that all the facts and figures read out by Shri Guha and others had become irrelevant when you finally decided in 1960 that we must have a capacity of 40,000 cusecs. Now he read out one part of the speech of Dr. K. L. Rao. After carrying out the tests finally the Ganga barrage project was prepared in 1959 and when the project came up for approval, the Planning Commission observed:

> "The Planning Commission had accepted the project as being necessary for the preservation of the port of Calcutta and for its other side benefits. On the basis of general consensus of technical opinion the scheme was technically sound."

Even if there is suspension of the withdrawal from the barrage during March--May, even if there is zero discharge during March —May, the Planning Commission says on the basis of technical expert opinion that the Farakka barrage was the correct thing to be done. They knew this problem at that time. The whole issue must be looked in perspective. When water came for the first time in 1975 after the agreement, the whole of Bengal was happy and Amrit Bazar Patrika said: it was a giant step forward. At the time 11,000 cusecs came. I do not know English, what should we call when 20,000 cusecs came? A Gianter step? We wanted at that time 40,000 cusecs throughout the year. Now we are getting water for 10 months, or 8 or 9 months. So the question is one of two months. We would be happy if we get 40,000 cusecs throughout the year. Calcutta port is most important not only for Bengal but for the whole of India. But we are dealing with the people of Bangladesh. I am not interested in Zia. But the people's emotions are being aroused against India. I would say that this agreement has done one thing. I am not criticising Mrs. Gandhi what the previous regime did was done with the best of intentions. They did what they thought was best for the country. We have also done what we think is best at this time. There is continuity in the formulation. What we could not got for 215 years, we have got for 8 to 10 months in the year. Is it not a gain? It gives water where it was not available before. Another great achievement is it is a bilateral agreement. We refused to sign under international pressure: whether it is the United Nations or non-aligned Muslim conference. Is it not a gain?

I feel it is a very important achievement that we have told Bangladesh that within the next three years, we will have to work out schemes bilaterally. We have not agreed to include Nepal in this. If we are to have reservoirs in Nepal, Nepal should have been a party to it. It is not a party. We have made Bangladesh agree to have a discussion on Brahmaputra-Ganga canal. That is also an achievement. So, this agreement must be looked at in the proper perspective. Now the responsibility rests on the Government of India to see that the spirit of this agreement is fulfilled within the shortest possible time. Another aspect is the long-term view of the whole thing. Previously we could not have a long-term view. Now we can have it.

A psychology had been built up in Bangladesh that they would not accept anything less than 50,000 or 55,000 cusecs. Maulana Bhashani wanted to march to Farakka for demanding 55,000 cusecs. But now because of the reasonable attitude adopted by the Government, of India, they have agreed to a reduced quantum. Also, the obscurantist and reactionary elements in Bangladesh who were always preaching a hate India campaign have been given a set-back by the signing of this agreement. It would depend on the future wisdom—not generosity—of both the governments as to how this agreement is utilised to give a set-back to such elements, so that the friendship between the people of Bangladesh and India may continue, whether the particular governments may remain or not.

The point of Calcutta port has been raised. If we look throughout the world, we find that river ports are losing their credibility. Science and technology have developed so much that there are ships of 80,000 tonnes and more. That is why we have Haldia. Of course, we should not mix up the issues and I want that we should do everything possible for Calcutta port to remain.

I would like the Government of India not to wait for three years but to start negotiations through joint river commissions so that even before three years, an agreement is arrived at for the linking of the Brahmaputra and Ganga, at the shortest possible time. Even if you decide on it, it will take 5 to 10 years to build it up. You may start at both the ends. That is the most important challenge. Janata Party is committed to irrigate all the irrigable agricultural land during the next 10 years. The biggest basin in India which can produce food is the Ganga basin with 57 million hectares of land in the basin; and twenty million hectares are at present being irrigated in the Krishna and Godavari basins. No scheme in the Ganga basin should be reduced in size, but we should try, on the other hand, to get water from Brahmaputra through Bangladesh and come to a settlement with them on this, and get water through Bangladesh *via* Siliguri. It is important that we have the Ganga basin, and increase agricultural production. This entire agreement must be looked into from a proper perspective of relationship with the people of Barisal and other areas, between the people of West Bengal and Bangladesh as a whole. In the present circumstances, this is the best patriotic thing that the Prime Minister could do; but the real test will come after the agreement—when we see whether we can come to have a canal agreement with Bangladesh and get water from Brahmaputra.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat) : Madam Chairman: I am particularly privileged to speak after my good friend Mr. Krishan Kant, who posed certain historical perspectives before this house while discussing this particular motion. We are clear that our party—and most of the Members of this House view this particular problem on the basis of 2 fundamental premises, viz. first, to maintain and strengthen further the bond of friendship with the people of Bangaladesh and second to ensure the survival of the Port of Calcutta and its overall improvement, not only in the interests of Calcutta or eastern resign alone, but also in the interests of the entire nation.

When I take part in this debate, I am not swept away by any emotion, nor are we in a position to discuss this matter in an isolated way, divorced from the historical perspective, *viz* of the need for the people of India to maintain and strengthen the bond of friendship with the people of Bangladesh—I do not speak about government. We are quite conscious of the perspective. So far as myself and my party are concerned, we made it known to the Prime Minister long before the agreement was reached. In this connection, in order to put things on record, I only want to quote a portion of the letter which I wrote to the Prime Minister on August 13 this year.

> At the outset I wish to make it clear that we are in agreement with the Government, that the problem must be resolved through common understanding and bilateral negotiations, and also to the mutual satisfaction of the two neighbouring and friendly countries. We further deeply appreciate the spirit underlying the consensus reached among the non-aligned nations for settling the issue bilaterally, instead of internationalizing the issue."

[Shri Chitta Basu]

I want to inform my good friend, Shri Krishan Kant that we are not divorced of any kind of historical perspective and the fundamental responsibility that lies on our shoulders in the matter of having friendly relationship with our neighbouring countries.

The question is : what are the present issues? In this connection, I would like to mention the reply the hon. Prime Minister was pleased to give me in this connection. It s aysl

"They have striven"

—he means the team on behalf of India who were conducting the negotiations with the representatives of the Government of Bangladesh—

"They have striven, and will continue to strive, in terms of their brief to seek a satisfactory solution. We are conscious that we have to take care of our national interests, including the interests of Calcutta Port".

Now the question is. the House should understand, what really constitute the national interests and the interests of the Calcutta port particularly, in the given context. The given context is of sharing of waters between Bangladesh and Indi, and in that matter, I would like to point out, the national interest is to secure 40,000 cusecs of water through out the year for ensuring the survival of the port of Calcutta.

The mover of the motion. Shri Samar Guha, traversed a long range. Therefore, I do not like to repeat them. All the same, in order to reply to the question or the point raised by Shri Krishan Kant, may I request him to take pains to go through the reports I mention? I may mention the PAC Report of 1975-76 and the Brochure published by the Government of India, External Affairs Ministry, regarding Farakka. If he would look at pages 4 and 5 of that Brochure, he will find his own answer. Then, would he kindly take the pain of reading or consulting the report of Dr. Walter Hensen, his report in June 1957, his report in December 1962 and again in 15th November 1971? Then I would mention the Farakka Barrage Project Report of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power, 1958 and 1961. the Report of the Specialised Hydraulic Department set up by the Calcutta Port Commission in January 1962, the report of Dr. D V Joglekar, Director Central Water and Power Research Station, Poona in January 1968 and many other reports. Since I do not have enough time, I would hand over to him the list for his consultation and for his benefit. If he goes through them, he will understand that 40,000 cusecs is the irreducible minimum water required for the survival of the port of Calcutta.

Lastly, I would only mention the speech delivered by Mr. Jagat Mehta in the Political Committee of the United Nations.

"Mr Mehta said that throughout the period of designing and construction of the project great care was taken to ensure that its operation did not have any adverse effect on Bangladesh. Experiments and independent experts' opinion establish that 40,000 cusecs of water was required to achieve the purpose which would still leave adequate flow of water to meet the reasonable present and foreseable requirements of water of Bangladesh."

He speaks in favour of continuity of Government, while Mr. Jagat Mehta, the then Foreign Secretary made a statement before an international body only a year before, on 16th November, 1976, clearly indicating that 40,000 cusecs of water was the erreducible minimum required for the survival of the Calcutta port. Therefore, it is in the national interest and in the interests of the Calcutta port that this should be taken note of.

Let us also at this stage listen to what virtually amounts to the dying declaration of the Calcutta port.

Until 1936 the occurrence of bores in the Hooghly was restricted to about 40 days a a year. At present they occur on more than 160 days. In 1938, ships of a draught of 26 feet could use the port for nearly 300 days in the year, but in 1961 it could not be opened to such vessels for even a single day. The port handled only 7·5 million tons of traffic in 1974-75 as against 11 million tons in 1964-65. The volume of traffic handled in the year 1974-75 was much lower than the total capacity of 13 million tons.

I am not opposed to the agreement as such, but the question remains that, having inview the interest of the Calcutta port and the interest of the nation as a whole, some alternative arrangement has to be made. In that connection also there is no positive commitment from the side of Bangla Desh.

I only want that there should be adequate provision for the availability of headwater at Farakka for silt clearance. In

that connection I want to point out that a study by the River Research Institute, Poona, in 1970, complained that apart from the Kosi-Gandak protect in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh's irrigation schemes were withdrawing about 30,000 cusecs from the Ganga. The 124th Report of the Estimates Committee has also stated:

"The Committee note that the Government would not agree for any project which might affect the Farakka Barrage Project. The Committee recommend that all possible precautionary measure should be take well in time to avoid any possibility of damage to the Farakka Barrage Project."

I am very much in favour of Bihar, U.P. Rajasthan and other States getting adequate supply of water from the Ganga so that irrigation purposes can be fulfilled, but you cannot save the port of Calcutta after signing this agreement unless there is a possibility of further quantity of water at the Farakka point.

You would also note that in reply to a question of mine on the 5th of this month, it has been said:

16 hrs.

Already, six projects have been executed or given clearance by the Planning Commission. Still, eleven projects are awaiting clearance. I want that the projects which are cleared should be executed early. Many more projects ought to be there to meet the needs of Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, etc. But Farakka dies; the Calcutta Port dies. There should be a comprehensive plan to see that the water is properly exploited to meet the needs of Farakka and other regions also.

I would conclude by saying that the hon. Prime Minister and the Government should consider the alternative suggestions which I have made in my substitute motion. I have mentioned that some alternative arrangement has to be made if the commitment of the hon. Prime Minister and the commitment of the Government is to be honoured by way of protecting the interests of the Calcutta port and the interest of the country as a whole. I hope the Government will give consideration to the substitute motion that I have moved in this House.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT (Jaunpur): Madam Chairman, I rise to support the Farakka Agreement entertd into by our Government and the hon. Prime Minister.

I have been sitting here and patiently hearing the speeches of my hon. friends. I can only make out the emotional points which are very common everywhere in this hot country. One is that my hon. friend, Mr. Samar Guha, has asked: In whose interest the Farakka Agreement has been entered into? May I humbly beg to draw his attention to the situation and our relations with Bangladesh after the death of the late lamented Mujibur Rahman? A sort of wall was getting between us. The reactionary elements were active in Bangladesh. As my hon. friend, Mr. Krishan Kant, has just now said, there was a threat of 60,000 to 70,000 people marching towards the Farakka Barrage. The relations between the two countries were embittered. Gradually, a position was being built with the embittered relations and hardened position that the matter may have gone to the UNO. Have you forgotten the bitter lessons of Kashmir in UNO? Even our just cause has been denounced. Even for our just cause there have been vetoes from our friends. Do we want to repeat that very sad experience?

Our hon. Prime Minister by this Farakka Agreement has by one stroke washed away that hardened attitude. That is one of the greatest gains of this arrangement. We have now started talking.

A lot of noise has been about 40,000 cusecs or 50,000 cusecs of water and various export committee reports. I do not wish to go into these figures. There is a very famous proverb: Too many cooks spoil the broth. Too many experts never agree. May I remind this House of a very interesting story?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Here, all the experts agree. That is the difficulty.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT: For Mr. Samar Guha's information and for my hon. friends information, may I point out what the project report says? It says, 20,000 cusecs of water.

May I again quote Man Singh Report which said that Calcutta port can work on 24,000 cusecs of warer? Here, there are too many confusing reports. Whom are you going to believe? There is a famous story in this country and a fact too, that some experts said that Dalda when fed to rats makes the third generation blind; the next day, we had a report in the press that Dalda had all the vitamins and the fifth generatio n will become giant. Whom do we believe? The only thing to believe is the practical approcach and the pragmatic approach.

[Shri Yadvendra Dutt]

Now, may I for the information of my hon. friend, Shri Samar Guha quote certain figures of November 1976 to September, 1977 about the number of ships that have come to Calcutta port. The Calcutta port never took ships of 35,000 or 40,000 tonnes; these were 7,000to 14,00 tonnes. The lean period is April to May ery year. Even in that lean period with 20,000 cusecs of water, 67 and 161 ships of the TWG 7,000 to 14,000 tonnes came there.

I can assure my hon. friends, specially from the West Bengal area that the Janata Government will not allow the Calcutta Port to die, but they must remember one thing that Calcutta Port can never be a deep sea water port. The entire trade of Calcutta has been hit by one latest development. Shri Jagat Mehta, Foreign Secretary's speech in he year 1976 in the UNO has been quoted here. But have we also seen the other side of the picture ? The modern international shipping trade has taken a different pattern altogether. It is now not the pattern of small ships—tramp ships— of 14,000 to 20,000 tonne capacity, it is now the container system of 35,000 50,000, 60, 000 tonnes ships or even a lakh and above that. For that we need very deep sea ports. The problem of Calcutta port is silting. not 20,000 or 25,000 cusecs of water. Who brings the silt ? Does the Ganga dring the silt ? It comes from the sea, what they call in West Bengal, the high tide and rushes into the Calcutta city itself.

What the Government should do and I would request them to do and I believe that the Government has already a plan of desilting the entire Calcutta and Haldia ports.

I have been asked, what advantage have we got out of this agreement. Mav I for the information of my friends quote a few facts :

> "Whereas no water was flowing from April, 1975, there is now going to to be steady flow of water during the year. India will be able to draw between 35,000 and 40,000 cusecs from June to January. In the remaining period of the fair weather flow, India will draw 32,100 cusecs for 64 days and 22,800 cusecs on an average during the critical period of mid-March to mid-May.

would not like to make any comments on it, because foreign policy is a continuous process.

Now, further,

> "With the commissioding of the Farakka Barrage the problems of salinity for drinking water supply for the Calcutta city and for that region in general has been, more or less, solved.
>
> The project has already provided road-cum-rail communication over the Barrage since 1971, thus linking the North and South Bengal.
>
> The project will facilitate inland navigation along the Ganga which had declined owing to the silting of the Hooghly river and almost complete absence of flow in it during the dry months".

Now, may I for the information of my friends indicate the economic advantages which we will get ?

This is from the joint Indo Bangladesh Declaration :

> "(i) A cement plant at Chatak in Bangladesh based on limeston from Meghalaya in India.
>
> (ii) A Clinker plant in Meghalaya for supplying clinker to Bangladesh.
>
> (iii) A Fertilizer plant in Bangladesh for the supply of urea to India.
>
> (iv) A Sponge Iron plant in Bangladesh based on the supply of iron ore from India."

Have we not clinched a part of our old country which-I would not blame anyone—due tocertain mistakes has been taken away from us and which has been united with us bythis strong economic link. Is this not an achievement ? I think it is an achievement of which the Prime Minister and the Foreign Minister and the entire government of India should be proud and they should be thanked .....

SHRI SMAR GUHA : Proud over the pyre of Ca cutta.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT : My friend, Mr, Samar Guha has said that the agreement is political. I fail to understand what he means. What is our foreign policy after all ? Is it a foreign policy of gifting away things ? Our foreign policy is non-aligned but keeping our interests well to the fore. We cannot sell our interests and the Prime Minister has not done that. He has been called an appeaser. I fail to understand. Where is the appeasement ? Who has been appeased ? Appeasement, as I un-

derstand, Madam, is gifting away something for nothing. The British appeased in the Munich the Germans by gifting them Czechoslovakia to gain time. But here we have gifted away nothing. We have given them goodwill and we have got goodwill. To call us appeasers, Madam, I fail to understand. My friend and my senior and esteemed colleage, professor Samar Guha could call us appeasers. I can only remember our Prime Minister's *Obiter dicta* one day that professors are never precise.

My friend has said, 'What is the basis of our agreement ?' Have I not made the basis clear ? Economic gain to us and economic gain to them goodwill and further strenghening of our ties.

A great play has been made about Zia's government. Granted, it is a military dictatorship. So is Iran. So is Gadaffi's regime in Libya. Do my firiends here want us to play the role of a moral policeman of the world No. Madam, because with our present economic strength and with our developing sense, we should not have that idea. After all a people will get the government they want. You and I cannot change it. How would my friends here and there like some of the dictatorships of the socialist countries saying. 'How dare India turn into a democracy ?' Will they enjoy it ? We will protest against it. Similarly may I not ask a similar treatment from our hon friends here to governments outside the country ?

MR. CHAIRMAN : The hon Members time is up.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT : Please give me ten minutes more.

MR. CHAIRMAN : No, Please. Only two more minutes.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : You can give him some of my time.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT : The Foreign Minister is a bachelor and he can always oblige a married man ....

(*Interruptions*)

I hope we are old friends and, therefore, we can cut a joke on each other.

SHRI KRISHAN KANT : Not publicly.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT : A public joke is more welcome than a privatre joke. A private joke is more dangerous. My friend may not know about it.

Madam are we to play the role of a moral policeman ? We have our interests. They are primary and they are absolute and essential and that has to be guarded at any cost. Every country is free to have a government they like. Outside this House, in the Chandni Chowk chowraha you can talk any amount of Bhai-Bhaism. That does not matter. But what we say here in this House, we must say that with responsibility because that will have weight. Whatever we say on the foreign affairs we must say with a definite weight and a sense of responsibility. So to say that this agreement made with Zia is bad—I do not agree. Some of my friends have brought round one saying going around, that Zia's regime will fall in a year or two. I do not know. If he is a Jyotishi I do not know, but in Delhi I see a lot of *Jyotishis* being welcomed by a lot of people who make them dance. I do not know who falls and who gains.

It is for the people of Bangladesh to decide and not for us. For us, what is essential is our talks or bilateral arrangements. And the principle for which we have stood for so long has been vindicated in the Farakka Barrage Agreement with Bangladesh. May I now humbly draw your attention to one thing? I think you may have seen all sorts of things practised in the Middle East. The results have yet to be seen.

Madam, we have been asked by hon. friends here about the Brahmaputra link with Ganga. I will say this with a full sense of responsibility. As a humble Member of this House, I am sure that this link by canal has been talked about and I am sure that although it has not been mentioned in the Agreement specifically, it is understood. I am also sure that given the good will and due time, our Prime Minister will be able to ajhieve this. There will be a definite link between the Brahmaputra and Ganga by a casnal which will enrich this country in all wavs.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : In how many years?

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT : Well, I ask Prof. Guha in return what is the number of years of a nation's life.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Have you any idea of siltation in any year during the lean months? Have you calculated that?

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT : Prof. Guha, it seems, has calculated the salinity of water there.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : In the whole of Calcutta, the people are living on saline water only. And crores of people in Calcutta now drink only saline water.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Prof. Guha you had your say. I do not want any interruption as far as possible. We have very little time. And he is wanting more time. You are taking away his time.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : You are enjoying, Madam, the game. This is a game in Parliament.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT : My hon. friend, Shri Guha plays the game very interestingly. If I may say so, it is like this. I quote here a Hindi couplet.

चालीस बरस तुहार ब्यो हो भाई
अबहूं न छांडि लड़काई ।

The translation of it is that you have reached the age of forty. But, still, you have not given up the childhood.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : I remain myself a s a child in the last days of my life.

SHRI YADVENDRA DUTT : My friend Shri Guha talked about the drinking of salt water in Calcutta. I have just read out that by this agreement when the water flows in the salinity is bound to be reduced and Calcutta will get a better drinking water.

The protection of Calcutta port is a longrange measure. Government will take up the deep dredging so that the port can increase its capacity of the handling greatly. With extension of peace, better ships may enter the port.

Madam, with these few words, I again with all the emphasis at my command beg to say that in the given circumstances we have softened the hardened internationalattitude towards us but at the same time we are not sacrificing our national interests. We have been able to soften that attitude and open up the channel of communi- cation and contracted certain give and take for our economic benefits. We have again built in thaat part of our country our economic ties and Farakka arrangement/agreement tis an achievement. With these few words, Madam, I support the agreement in its entirety.

SHRI TRIDIB CHAUDHURI (Berhampore) : Madam Chairman, I am a little hesitant to speak after the grand loquent support that has just been given to this agreement by our esteemed friend, Shri Yadvendra Dutt.

The problem as I see—howsoever, dismaved we may be about the future of Calcutta Port—is that we have entered into a solemn international agreement and into a commitment to reduce our claims of withdrawal of water at Farakka much below 40,000 cusecs which was the absolute minimum according to the opinion of all hydrological experts, national and international, consulted so far for saving the port of Calcutta.

Madam Chairman, much is being made of the fact that while Mrs. Indira Gandhi's government was satisfied with an agreement for withdrawing only 11,000 to 16,000 cusecs this Government has at least succeeded in persuading the Government of Bangladesh to agree to India's withdrawal of 20,000 to 21,000 cusecs for thirty days of the leanest period. But it is conveniently forgotten that the Agreement was for only one year and it is also conveniently forgotton that in 1976 we could withdraw—because there was no agreemeng—35,000 to 40,000 cusecs. The comparison really should not be between that one year temporary agreement and the present agreement. The comparison should be in the background of the universally accepted technological opinion of 40,000 cusecs as the absolute minimum for the saving of the port of Calcutta. The previous speaker made fun of Prof. Guha when he said that it was a *political* agreement. But may I remind Shri Yadvendra Dutt that Prime Minister *himself had* referred to this fact in his statement before this House and stated that

> "hon'ble Members should also appreciate that negotiations involved not only the sharing of waters between the two countries, not only augmentation of its flows bur also the political imperative of improving our relations with our closest neighbour, which is an acid test of the effectiveness and credibility of our entire foreign policy."

So it is really a case of technological opinion of hydrological experts being thrown overboard for a political reason for a political imperative, the imperative of an imaginary expediency, of trying to appear before the world as if we were having a friendly face with everybody.

I do not know what that means. Really the government placed the interest of Calcutta port on one side and the interest of its international image of friendliness and accommodation with neighbouring countries on the other side and weighed the two and then decided in favour of its bright international image and that was why this decision was taken.

Otherwise it is absolutely difficult to understand why our Prime Minister should go out to defend this miserable agreement on sharing waters at Farakka with an argument that in a situation of the kind that prevails in the lower Ganga basin where in the lean season there is not just enough water to meet the requirements. If there is not enough water to meet the requirements, why should our requirement be sacrificed for the supposed requirement of Bangla Desh. Actually hydrological experts and international bodies that had gone into the question of the quantum of water required by Bangla Desh, had a different view. Everybody knows that Bangla Desh really suffers from surfeit of water, not from paucity of water. In that background it is difficult to understand why the Government agreed to surrender more water to Bangladesh. Suppose that whatever quantum of water is available is not enough to meet the requirements of both countries, why should we agree to give a larger proportion of water for Bangla Desh and take a small proportion for ourselves ?

I may here refer to the figures agreed upon. During January 1 to January, 10 the total flow reaching Farakka is 98,500 cusecs of this we agree to withdraw 40,000 and we agree to give a larger proportion, 58,500 cusecs to Bangla Desh. In the same fashion for every ten day segment for these five months, we have agreed to give a larger proportion of water flow for Bangla Desh when it is known that Bangla Desh does not have sufficient use for that water. Howsoever it might have built up its case, at least international opinion was not hoodwinked when Bangla Desh sought to internationalise this issue and took it to the Islamic Conference, United Nations and the non-aligned Conference. Everywhere they were told to negotiate with India bilaterally. There is no evidence that international public opinion was taken in by the claims of Bangladesh about requirements of Ganga water. I do not have the time to go into the various reports of the World Bank and other internatoinal bodies about the requirements of Bangladesh for water, but there is no doubt about the fact that in this matter we have failed to keep in our mind the interests of Calcutta port uppermost and we have unnessarily agreed to and submitted to the claims of Bangladesh for a larger proportion of the available water, with the result that what we have agreed to take what will hardly enable Calcutta to survive.

Very much is being made of the possibility or likelihood of Bangladesh agreeing to recycle the large flows of Brahmaputra water through a canal to be constructed mainly through Bangladesh territory to join up with Ganga. If that could be done, perhaps the problem of Calcutta would be solved, but the fact is up till now Bangladesh has refused even to discuss this issue. Even if they discuss, there is the question of finances. It will require construction of a 300 KM long canal through Bangladesh territory. It will also require, for controlling the larger flows of water to be recycle from Brahmaputra through that canal to Ganga, perhaps the building of a bigger barrage than the Farakka Barrage. As for as we know, without meaning any disrespect, I can difinitely assert that Bangladesh is not in a position to undertake the financing of that gigantic project, even if they agree to it. So, ultimately we will have to go to some international financial agency like the World Bank and so on. We know ultimately at which country's behest the World Bank's politcies are decided. Perhaps the World Bank will step in and perhaps the United States also will step in. No hon. Member has referred to the fact that the one country which came forward to congratulate us on the conclusion of this water-sharing agreement, was United States. So, I can well imagine that the USA and the World Bank would be very much interested in having their grip over the economy of the eastern sub-continent of India, both in Bangladesh and also over the Calcutta Port and the Calcutta hinterland, Farrakka and so on ; and that is the meaning and significance of the congratulations that our Prime Minister received on the conclusion of this agreement from President Carter.

श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त (दिल्ली सदर) : सभापति महोदय, मैं ने कुछ अपने मित्रों के भाषण अभी सुने। कुछ लोगों ने तो इस एग्रीमेंट को सेल-आऊट कहा है, कुछ लोगों ने यह कहा है कि देश के हितों को कुरबान कर दिया गया और कुछ लोगों ने यह भी कहा कि क्योंकि दोनों मंत्री इस समस्या के साथ पहले से सम्बद्ध नहीं थे इसलिए उन्हें जो एग्रीमेंट करना चाहिए

[श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त]

था, वह नहीं किया । सभापति महोदया, यह भी यहां पर कहा गया और शायद ठीक कहा गया कि कलकत्ता पोर्ट की समस्या बहुत बड़ी है, वहां पर पानी की कमी होगी और बंगाल के लोगों को भी दिक्कत होगी और इस प्रकार से सारे देश के हितों को भी ठेस पहुंचेगी । इस में कोई दो राय नहीं हैं लेकिन सरकार ने अभी यह क्लेम नहीं किया कि इस से कठिनाई नहीं होगी एग्रीमेंट होने के बाद जब प्रधान मंत्री जी का भाषण हुआ था, और विदेश मंत्री जी ने जब इस बारे में कहा था तो यह कभी क्लेम नहीं किया कि इस से कठिनाई नहीं होगी । मेरा कहना यह है कि कठिनाई होते हुए भी देश के हित में जो कुछ किया गया, वह ठीक ही किया गया है और उन्होंने भी यह क्लेम किया था ।

सभापति महोदया, मुझे दुःख है कि कुछ लोगों ने इस को पार्टी लाइन में देखा, कुछ लोगों ने भावनात्मक लाइन में देखा और कुछ लोगों ने कठिनाइयां बताई । मैं समझता हूं कि जो लोग पार्टी लाइन पर सोचते हैं, वे सोचें, यह उन का अधिकार है परन्तु इस तरह की जो राष्ट्रीय समस्यायें हैं, उन पर मेरे विचार में दलगत राजनीति से ऊंचे उठ कर राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से सोचना चाहिए कि देश का हित क्या है । अभी मेरे एक मित्र कह रहे थे कि उन्होंने स्वयं प्रधान मंत्री जी से इस बारे में बात की और यह एक पोलीटिकल एग्रीमेंट है । एक बड़े ब्रोड पर्सपेक्टिव में इस प्रकार का एग्रीमेंट किया गया । यह ठीक बात है । आखिर यह एग्रीमेंट आइसोलेटिड ट्रान्जैक्शन नहीं है । यह इस बात को दर्शाता है कि भारत अपने आसपास के पड़ौसी देशों के साथ मित्रता के सम्बन्ध रखना चाहता है और एक-एक कर के वह समस्याएं सुलझाने में लगा हुआ है, चाहे वह पाकिस्तान हो, चाहे वह बंगला देश हो, चाहे वह चाइना हो, चाहे बर्मा हो और चाहे कोई और देश हो । जहां जहां भी गुत्थियां हैं, उन को आहिस्ता आहिस्ता सुलझाने की कोशिश इस सरकार की है । आप को याद होगा कि जब सरकार पलटी और 8, 9 महीने पहले देश में क्रान्ति आई, तो इस देश के बारे में विदेशियों के क्या विचार थे । आप रूस के समाचारपत्रों को पढ़िये या दूसरे देशों के समाचारपत्रों को पढ़िये, तो यही मालूम होता था जैसे कि इस देश में इस तरह से अंधेरा छाया हुआ हो और बाहर के लोग यही सोचते थे कि मालूम नहीं सरकार की विदेश नीति क्या होगी । 9 महीने की इस छोटी सी अवधि में, मैं कह सकता हूं सरकार ने जितनी उपलब्धियां की हैं उतनी पिछली सरकार ने शायद 30 सालों में भी नहीं की हैं । और हमें इस के ऊपर गर्व है ।

हमारे विदेश मंत्री हैं जिन के बारे में मुझे ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहिए । उनकी एक टांग यहां रहती है और एक टांग हवा में रहती है । जहां जहां भी वे गये, वहां वहां की यात्राओं के बारे में जो जो भी प्रतिक्रियाएं समाचारपत्रों में पढ़ने को मिलीं उनसे यही लगा कि हमारे देश के सम्बन्ध सभी देशों से सुधर रहे हैं । इसके बारे में जो गलतफहमियां कुछ हमारे देश के लोगों ने और कुछ दूसरे लोगों ने फैला रखी थीं वे आहिस्ता आहिस्ता करके दूर होती जा रही हैं । यह एग्रीमेंट भी उसी की एक कड़ी है, एक लड़ी है ।

यह ठीक है कि एक समझौते में सभी की जीत नहीं होती है । जो हम चाहते थे वह तो तभी हो सकता था जब कि हम जिया को पकड़ कर के कहते कि यहां पर हस्ताक्षर कर दो । यह तो कभी नहीं हो सकता है । कुछ देना होता है, कुछ लेना होता है । इसलिए

मैं समझता हूं कि इस पृष्ठभूमि में अगर इस एग्रीमेंट को हम देखेंगे, राष्ट्रीय दृष्टिकोण से अगर इसे देखेंगे तो हमें मालूम होगा कि यह समझौता राष्ट्रीय हित में है, इस से राष्ट्रीय अहित नहीं हुआ है।

अध्यक्ष महोदया, यह कहा गया कि बाजपेयी जी जब विरोध पक्ष में थे तब कुछ और कहते थे, अब मंत्री बन गये हैं तो अब कुछ और कहते हैं। यह ठीक है। एक लेजिस्लेटर के तीन चेहरे होते हैं। एक वह होता है जब वह विपक्ष में होता है। दो चेहरे तो मैंने भी देखे हैं। जब मैं विपक्ष में था तो बहुत सख्ती के साथ सरकारी नीतियों को, उस की परफारमेंस को क्रिटिसाइज किया करता था। अब जब वहां से बदल कर यहां आ गया हूं तो अब सरकार की नीतियों के बारे में कुछ ढीला पड़ गया हूं। मेरे से आगे जो लेजिस्लेटर्स हैं, जो मंत्री बन गये हैं तो उन्हें सरकारी नीतियों के बारे में यह सोचना पड़ेगा कि वे देश हित में हैं या नहीं, उनका विदेशों में क्या प्रभाव पड़ेगा। उसको उन नीतियों पर चलना पड़ता है जिनका आगे चल कर देश हित में प्रभाव होगा।

इसलिए मैं यह कहने के लिए तैयार हूं कि हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी ने और वाजपेयी जी ने जो विदेश मंत्री हैं और बरनाला साहब ने सारी परिस्थितियों को सामने रख कर के, देश के हित में जो कुछ संभव था, वह किया।

सभापति महोदया, आखिर यह मामला कब से पड़ा हुआ था ? सालों से पड़ा हुआ था और सुलझने में ही नहीं आता था। एक सरकार बदली, दो सरकारें बदलीं और यह मामला लम्बा खिंचता ही चला गया। शायद हमारे देश के इतिहास में थोड़े से ऐसे मामले होंगे जो आपस में बैठ कर, बिना किसी तीसरे के दखल के सुलझाये गये हों। इस के लिये यह सरकार बधाई की पात्र है और अगर यही रवैया और देशों ने भी अपनाया तो आपसी झगड़े बिना किसी बड़ी शक्ति या बाहरी शक्ति के, चाहे वह चाइना हो, रूस हो, या अमरीका हो, दखल के सुलझाये जा सकेंगे। हम चाहते हैं कि हम आपसी झगड़े आपस में बैठकर सुलझायें। भारत इस बात के लिये उत्सुक है कि हम अपने पड़ौसियों के साथ अपनी समस्याओं का निराकरण सीधे बात करके करें। हम नहीं चाहते हैं कि कोई बड़ा देश आ कर के, या कोई इन्टरनेशनल एजेन्सी आकर के हमारे आपस के मामलों में दखल दे।

यह कहा गया है कि वहां मिलिटरी जुन्ता है। जिया डिक्टेटर हैं। मैं जिया साहब को डिफैंड करने के लिए खड़ा नहीं हुआ हूं। अच्छा होगा तो उस देश के लिए और बुरा होगा तो उस देश के लिए होगा। क्या यह सरकार आदेश या परामर्श दे सकती है कि दूसरे देशों में कौन सा राज हो, किस तरह का विधान हो ? हम इस में दखल नहीं दे सकते हैं। बंगला देश में ही नहीं दुनिया के आधे देशों में आज मिलिटरी डिक्टेटरशिप है। कहां तक आप ठीक करेंगे ? चीन में है, रूस में है और जगह है (व्यवधान) चीन में डेमोक्रेसी आप कहते हैं कि है लेकिन आपकी और हमारी परिभाषा में फर्क है। इसलिए हम दोनों दो अलग अलग दलों में हैं। मैं नहीं मानता वहां डेमोक्रेसी है। जैसी व्यवस्था वहां वे चाहते हैं रख सकते हैं, हमें उन के बीच में दखल नहीं देना चाहिए।

श्री मुजीबुर्रहमान ने बंगला देश का निर्माण किया। यह ठीक बात है। लेकिन उसके बाद उन्होंने क्या किया ? सारी पालिटिकल पार्टीज को बैन कर दिया, हजारों लोगों को जेल में डाल दिया, समाचार-पत्रों को बन्द कर दिया। क्या वह बदल नहीं गए ? जैसे इंदिरा गांधी बदल गई थीं उसी तरह वे भी क्या बदल नहीं गए।

[श्री कंवर लाल गुप्ता]

उसके बीच में मैं नहीं चाहता हूं कि हमें दखल देना चाहिए। हर देश को अपना विधान बनाने का, अपनी प्रगति का रास्ता तय करने का अधिकार है। हमारी सरकार की नीति ठीक है कि हम उनके बीच मे किसी प्रकार का दखल देना नहीं चाहते हैं।

मैं समर्थन करता हूं कि भारत की धरती हर एक को शरण देगी, जो यहां आएगा, भारत की धरती पर रह कर कोई दूसरे देश के खिलाफ़ कार्रवाई वह करे यह ठीक नहीं है, हमारे देश के हित में नहीं है, ऐसा करके हम पड़ोसियों के साथ होस्टिलिटी क्रिएट नही कर सकते हैं। हमें चीन के खिलाफ़ शिकायत थी कि नागाज मिजोज जा कर वहां ट्रेनिंग ले कर यहां आते थे। हमें पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ शिकायत थी। हमें स्वयं ऐसा कोई कार्य नहीं करना चाहिए जिससे हमारे जो पड़ोसी देश हैं वे हम से इसलिए नाराज हों कि हमारे यहां वहां के लोग रह कर गलत कार्रवाइयां नेपाल के खिलाफ़, बर्मा के खिलाफ, या पाकिस्तान के खिलाफ करते हैं।

तीन साल के बाद हो सकता है कि कुछ कठिनाइयां या समस्यायें आ कर सामने खड़ी हो जाएं। जसे जैसे इसके वर्किंग का पता लगेगा कुछ दिक्कतें हमें हो सकती हैं बंगला देश को हो सकती हैं। मैं समझता हूं कि उसके बाद हमें दुबारा इस पर विचार करना चाहिए और हम इस पर तब विचार कर सकते हैं। मैं समझता हूं बंगला देश को भी इस बात का एहसास हो गया होगा कि भारत की मित्रता सही मित्रता है, भारत उसके साथ दोस्ती चाहता है, हर एक देश के साथ चाहता है। जब रिव्यू करने का सवाल आए तो जो कठिनाइयां महसूस हों उनको आपसी बातचीत से दूर किया जा सकता है।

हमारे देश की नान-इंटरफीयरेंस, नान एलाइनमेंट की नीति है। हो सकता है कुछ लोग कहें कि यह बेहूदा नीति है। हमारी सरकार ने कहा है कि नान एलाइनमेंट का अर्थ यह है कि हम किसी से स्पेशल फ्रेंडशिप नहीं चाहते हैं, हर एक के साथ बराबर का दर्जा चाहते हैं, हर किसी को बराबर का दर्जा दे कर उसके साथ व्यवहार करना चाहते हैं। यह एक आदर्श नीति है जिस के लिए सरकार बधाई की पात्र है।

मैं इस एग्रीमेंट का समर्थन करता हूं। यह ठीक एग्रीमेंट हुआ है। जो कठिनाइयां सामने आएं उनको बाद में बातचीत से हल किया जा सकता है। बंगला देश की सरकार को साथ ले कर हम को चलना चाहिए और जो दिक्कतें आएं उनको दूर करना चाहिए। कलकत्ता पोर्ट की पानी की कमी की जो दिक्कत है किस तरह से वह हल हो सकती है मैं चाहता हूं कि इसको भी सरकार देखे।

SHRI P. K. KODIYAN (Andoor): Madam Chairman, listening to the speeches made from the other side in defence of the Farakka Agreement, I have come to the conclusion that the Government of India has surrenderrd to the political blackmail of the present Bangladesh Government. More than the economical and social considerations involved in the whole question of the Farakka project, the Government have taken into consideration the question of good neihbourliness. That is what several Members from the other side of the House have tried to prove.

I do not think that a change of Government will bring about a change in facts. Of course, a change in the Government will bring about a change in policy. Since I have very little time at my disposal, I do not want to go into the difficulties of the Calcutta Port, etc.

I want to quote from a speech of Shri Jagat Mehta made in the UN Political Committee when that Committee was

discussing the Farakka issue on a complaint made by the Bangladesh Government. This is what he said. I quote:

"Mr. Chairman, whatever criteria we apply, withdrawal of 40,000 cusecs of water by India at Farrakka is well within the entitlement of its equitable share of the Ganga Waters. It may be worth recapitulating that 90 per cent of the total population in the Ganga basin lives in India. 99 per cent of the catchment area of the Ganga and 91.5 per cent of its entire irrigation potential lie within our country. On the other hand, the length of the main channel of the Ganga in Bangladesh is only 140 kms. The Ganga and its tributnaries flow through a catchment area in Bangladesh which is hardly 0.7 per cent of that of India. The Ganga basin in Bangladesh contains 6.1 million acres and is inhabited by 12 million people. In quoting figures of the total area and populations affected by Farakka withdrawals lying in the Ganga basin in Bangladesh the Bangladesh Government appear to have included the entire area and population of all the Districts of Bangladesh which about the Ganga basin and not that part of the districts which actually lie in the Ganga basin."

Now, these are the facts. The change in the Government could not have resluted in the alteration of these facts.

According to the present Agreement, the Government of India has been very liberal in giving the Ganga waters to Bangladesh specially during the lean period. Shri Jagat Mehta continues to point out:

"The distinguished representative of Bangladesh has stated that Bangladesh requires 49,000 cusecs of water for irrigation. No details have been given on how this figure is arrived at According to the data made available to us, at present, only 1,000 to 1,500 cusecs are utilised for irrigating no more than 75,000 acres."

Now, since Shri Jagat Mehta made the speech in the UN Political Committee, I do not think that the Bangladesh Government has given any further technical data in order to strengthen its claim over a demand of 49,000 cusecs of water.

The purpose of the Farakka Barrage was desilting the Calcutta port and the Hooghly river and stabilising the channels. Several hon. Members have argued that this agreement had reduced India's share during the lean period, very much less than what is required just for the junctioning of the Calcutta port. Shri Krishan Kant pointed out that it is only a question of two month of lean period for the rest of the year, India is going to have enough water. But, it is not a question of two months alone, it is a question of five months from January to May. I also do not agree with the comparison that certain hon. Members sought to make between this agreement and the agreement that was signed during the previous regime. That agreement was for a period of ten days in the month of April and for thirty days in the month of May, not even for one year. The present agrement will make India to draw less water not only for a period of two months, but five months.

Further, this agreement has also not resulted in creating a good image of India in the international sphere. Of course, the idea of building good neighbourly relations is a very laudable idea and we have to try our best to strengthen our relations with all our neighbouring countries but this should not be done by sacrificing the interests of our country.

Nobody can deny the fact that Calcutta port is dying and Shri Chitta Basu went to the extent of saying that it has already made a dying declaration. I do no tunderstand the logic behind the agreement with regard to the sharing of water during the lean period of five months. During this five-month period, India's share gets reduced from 40,000 cusecs to 20,500 cusecs in the month of April, and then in the month of May it goes up to 26,750 cusecs. At the same time, Bangladesh gets 58,500 cusecs in the beginning of January for the first ten days and then it never goes below 34,000 cusecs in all the five months period. So a much bigger share than Bangladesh's actual entitlement.

17 hrs.

[Shri Tridib Chaudhuri in the chair]

I want to point out another aspect also. This sharing of waters under this agreement was based on the calculation that there will be a total 75% availability as per data observed between 1948-1973. After 1973, that is after 1972-73, in the last five years there are reports that there has been an increased utilisation of the Ganga waters in the uplands amoun-

]Shri P. K. Kodiyan]

ting to on an average 1000—1500 cusecs. That means that in the last five years the total must have been about 7500 cusecs. That much should be reduced from India's share because we have already committed to give a particular amount of water to Bangladesh under the present agreement. So, whatever happens, whether the total availability of water increases or whatever be the developments in the last five years, we have to supply Bangladesh the amount of water during this lean period as has been agreed to under this Farakka agreement. This also is a disadvantage to India.

Lastly, I do not know. When I heard several senior members on this side, defending this agreement and particularly, Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta giving an explanation, I started wondering how he has changed when he has now gone to the Treasury Benches and listening to other members also, I think that some members are capable of arguing both for the accused as also for the defendant alike. Those whose blood used to boil the moment they heard the possibility of making some concessions to our neighbours whether it is Ganga waters or some territory to our neighbour, China.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Territory?

SHRI P. K. KODIYAN : The possibility of conceding as a sort of agreement....

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: You are equating water with territory?

SHRI P. K. KODIYAN: I am not equating. The moment they heard this, their blood used to boil. Of course, every Indian's blood will boil. It is a question of national interest. But the same type of people are not submitting and giving all sorts of explanations to an agreement which has a sacrificed the national interests. I do not know what is the magic wand and whose magic wand it is that has brought about this change. This change is not in the interests of our country.

I disapprove the Farakka agreement which has been concluded between India and Bangladesh.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR (Pondicherry): With a mingled feeling of joy ad sorrow we have to only oppose this Farakka agreement.

I take it, as I read from the satement made by the Prime Minister as also by the Minister of External Affairs, Mr. Vajpayeeji, that it is a good thing that we made an agreement with Bangladesh because it is the goodwill that counts most. As I said earlier, it was with a mingled feeling the sadness and the feeling of depression being due to the fate Calcutta port will have to face for the coming three years due to this agreement.

But, one thing I am happy to see here is this. Only the Members from West Bengal spoke on this subject with an utomost feeling because they are the people who are really hurt. I do agree with good saying that only the nation has to feel for it. But, somehow or other, I do not find from the Members of West Bengal from the Janta Party getting up to support this Farakka Agreement. (*interruptions*). Irrespective of party affiliations, all the Membrs from West Bengal spoke with a sense of feeling. There is no question of not getting the support from Parliament. I am fully in agreement with this. It may not be useful to have a post-mortem done on this. I am happy to see that even Shri Kanwar Lal Gupta said that after all this agreement is for three years and after the period of three years, we must start some negotiations with the Government of Bangladesh and do something for Farakka. But if you take this in a technical angle, I wonder whether it will save this port. In the lean months —April-May—the optimum requirement is 20,000 cusecs of water. This is the minimum requirement even as per the opinion of experts right from Mr. Hensen to Shri Jagat Mehta who clearly stated in the year 1977 that without 40,000 cusecs we cannot save Calcutta port. I do not want to go into the technality of it. We have to see how far it will affect the port.

Sir, we know about Koovum river in Madras. Shri Karunanidhi failed to have the silt taken out from there. Still the dirty water stagnates in that river. If that is the position in the case of small river Coovum, you imagine the position of Ganga water in Farakka. If you are not able to take the silt I am afraid, the problem will be there and it would be difficult to solve it. I am not in agreement with the experts stating that these are days of modern techniques where we have to see large ships entering the port. But once you allow it to die, you can never get back the Calcutta port at all.

This is not a matter that in a few years you will be able to solve this problem. It is a matter of future generation.

We have to be careful about it. I am not blaming the Janta Government. You are trying to have the goodwill from this Government. I am afraid that some mistake was committed by the previous Government. It was in 1969 the very same members with vehemence were opposing this agreement. But the very same Members did not speak a word when Government conceded the Kacha Thivu to Sri Lanka. They had failed to understand the feelings of the people of Tamilnadu at that time. Let us not mix up that issue. We have to see the future prosperity of this country. Therefore, Sir, I appeal to Government through you Mr. Chairman, to reconsider it. Because, the agreement is, after all, a document but it is not *sanctum sanctorum* that it cannot be reviewed. If you feel, you can review it. In the meanwhile we can also think about getting the Brahamputra water and leaving it in the Ganga so that Calcutta Port can be saved.

Whatever be the experiences, let them come forward with such an agreement or such a proposal or at least let them give a solemn assurance to the people of Calcutta that it will be saved from silt because for the entire eastern region, Calcutta is the main source of communication. I am in full agreement with some of the Members when they said that we should not cut the agrarian rights of the people for the riparian rights. You have to be very careful in these matters. When I say 'very careful' I say that certain mistakes are bound to happen in a matter of this kind. It is not a very big mistake. But it is a vital mistake which we have committed and we have to rectify that. Somehow or other when we expressed our feelings, I find Members from West Bengal expressed their feelings in this agreement very vehemently. I have a feeling that I have a right to speak because Pondicherry has benefited a lot due to that great Saint, Arabindo because it was he who influenced the people in Pondicherry. I have a right to support the people. There are still many Bengali people living in Pondicherry. Saint Arbindo gave the spritit for us and led the Independence Movement from there. I have seen Pondicherry port but I want to see Calcutta Port. I want Calcutta Port to be saved somewhow or other. So, I take it that it is a matter not only concerning Calcutta but also other people. In the solution of such matters there should not be element of great hurry. You have to solve these problems in a peaceful and calm manner calculating the interests of the people concerned and the totality of the nation's progress.

The previous government used to take everything for granted because it had steam-roller majority. The present Government does not have a closed mind. They have an open mind. We have to congratulate the present government for this matter.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Please, try to conclude now. The time is very little and many Members have yet to speak.

SHRI A. BALA RAJANOR: Mr. Chairman, you may give me some more time. I am the alone speaker from my party and I am speaking for your cause.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please try to finish soon.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: Sir, I say that we have to approach this problem in an impartial manner. In this matter I suggest to the present government to re-consider and, if possible, send missions to Bangladesh. Afterall they are also our kith and kin. I do not see any difference between Prof. Guha and the present President of Banghdesh because they speak the same language.

SHRI SAMAR GUHA: Even we fought together during the liberation struggle for Bangladesh.

SHRI A. BALA PAJANOR: So, it is easy for us to solve the problem. Earlier, we had the name of Pakistan. Now, it is Bangladesh. It is better to send missions of Members of Parliament—including Membrs from West Bengal—so that they can arrive at some kind of better agreement. I know the Foreign Minister who is known for his long freindship can create good friendship with countries like this. Because it is not a question of reparing a right. I went through the entire agreement which they signed there. It is not a question of agricultural right. It is a question of survival of human beings. There are human beings in Bangladesh, in West Bengal also, in India also. For that I say that if you close Calcutta port, there is no economic solution. It is not only West Bengal, not only the eastern region. The economy of the entire country will be upset. To me it is a major port and if that port is affected the entire balance of the economy will be badly affected. Take Cape Comorin or Kerala. We have to feel that sense of gravity. You should approach that angle, not in the angle: there is no use having post mortem, the agreement has been signed already. The Janta government has an open mind. So, when you go with an open mind, Bangla Desh will also have an open mind to reconsider it in such manner as not to wait for three years.

[Shri A. Bala Pajanor]

Within three months it might be reconsidered. Especially April is coming. Once it is closed it cannot be revived. Let us pray to God also. If there is only 20,000 cusecs I hope they will not be so strict technically. They should send that minimum 20,000 cusecs to save Calcutta port. Pray to nature to be not harsh. We were hit by cyclone and floods. Let nature be kind to them. West Bengal people should be saved. Calcutta port should be saved. I think the Janata Government would be kind enough to reconsider this matter. They may send good will mission; they can send technicians and experts but let them not confuse the issues. Let them solve this issue.

श्री ओम प्रकाश त्यागी (बहराइच) : सभापति महोदय, प्रधान मंत्री और विशेष रूप से बाबू जगजीवन राम जी को मैं इस अवसर पर धन्यवाद देता हूं कि उन्होंने एक ऐसी समस्या को हल किया है जो तीस साल से लटकी हुई थी और जिस का समाधान नहीं हो पा रहा था और मैं समझता हूं कि इसके लिए समूचा देश उनका आभारी रहेगा। बड़ी खूबी के साथ यह समझौता करके उन्होंने देश के शत्रुओं के तमाम स्वप्नों को समाप्त कर दिया है और उनका दिल बैठ गया है। इसी मामले के आधार पर हमारे शत्रु बड़ी बड़ी योजनाएं बना कर बैठ हुए थे और सोच रहे थे कि बंगला देश को भारत के लिए एक सिरदर्द बना करके खड़ा किया जाएगा। परन्तु उनके स्वप्न समाप्त हो गए हैं। अगर समझौता न हुआ होता तो बंगला देश भी इसको पकड़ कर खड़ा रहता और हमारी सीमाओं पर तनाव रहता। इसका परिणाम यह होता कि जियाउर्रहमान जैसे इस समस्या को संयुक्त राष्ट्रसंघ में ले गये थे इस पर जोर देते रहते। हमें यू० एन० का थोड़ा सा अनुभव है। आजादी मिलने के पश्चात काश्मीर की समस्या को भी हमारी ओर से यू० एन० ओ० में ले जाया गया था और आज भी वह समस्या ज्यों की त्यों बनी हुई है, वहां न्याय नहीं मिला है, वहां गुटबन्दी के आधार पर समस्याओं पर विचार होता है, वहां जो ब्लाक बैठे हुए हैं, जो हमारे शत्रु बैठे हुए हैं वे इस समस्या का उपयोग करके हमारे ऊपर दबाव डालते और हमारी समस्याओं को और भी टेढ़ा बनाते। इस लिए इस समस्या के समाधान से एक बहुत बड़ी आफत से हम बच गए हैं और इसके लिए मैं इन सभी नेताओं का आभारी हूं।

दूसरी चीज यह है कि हमारी विदेश नीति की सफलता का यह महान प्रतीक है। विदेश नीति की सफलता इसी बात में होती है कि कितनी संख्या में हमारे मित्रदेश बनते हैं। यह सौभाग्य की बात है कि आज संसार में हमारे मित्र देशों की संख्या सबसे अधिक है। जबसे जनता पार्टी की सरकार आई है तभी से विदेश मंत्री महोदय ने विशेष रूप से करिश्मा दिखाया है कि मित्रों को और गहरा मित्र बनाया। हमारे पड़ोसी देश जो शंकाग्रस्त थे उनकी शंकाओं को दूर करके सही रूप में उनको मित्र बना कर खड़ा कर दिया है। बंगलादेश से समझौता करने के बाद अभी हमारे प्रधान मंत्री और विदेश मंत्री नैपाल से लौट कर आये है। कितनी बड़ी समस्या का समाधान हुआ है। काठमाण्डू के समाचार-पत्र जो लगातार हमारी आलोचनायें करते थे उन्हीं समाचार-पत्रों में आज भारतवर्ष की सरकार और भारत की नीति की सराहना हो रही है।

मैं विशेष रूप से अपने कांग्रेस पार्टी के मित्रों से कहना चाहूंगा कि आपने इस समझौते का विरोध किया है परन्तु मैं एक प्रश्न पूछना चाहूंगा कि उस दिन तो आप तालियां बजा रहे थे जिस दिन मुजीबुर्रहमान, जोकि तब बंगलादेश के शासक थे, हमारे मित्र थे उनके साथ कांग्रेस सरकार ने 11 हजार क्यूसेक्स से 16 हजार क्यूसेक्स का समझौता किया था—उस दिन तो आप तालियां बजा रहे थे लेकिन इस

समझौते के अन्दर 16 हजार क्यूसेक्स से बढ़ा कर 21 हजार क्यूसेक्स पानी ले लिया तो इसको आप कहते हैं कि जनता सरकार ने देश को बेच डाला। मैं जानना चाहता हूं कि सन 1971 की लड़ाई के पश्चात जब शिमला में बैठ कर समझौता किया गया था जिसमें जीता हुआ कश्मीर का भाग थाली में रख कर पाकिस्तान को दे दिया— उस दिन आप कहां थे ? वह केवल जीती हुई भूमि ही नहीं थी बल्कि अपनी भूमि थी, जो छंब जोड़ियां का एरिया था वह तमाम दे दिया। उसको आप समझौता कहते हैं (**व्यवधान**)

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI : You want it to be occupied? You are not a Jan Sanghi now. You belong to the Janata Party. Change your thinking !

श्री ओम प्रकाश त्यागी : मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि उस समय पर आपने विरोध क्यों नहीं किया जब कि इस देश के हित को कुर्बान कर दिया गया था। उस समय तो श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के गीत गाये जा रहे थे, यहां पर कौरवों की सभा बनी हुई थी, दुर्योधन अन्याय पर अन्याय करता जा रहा था और आप तालियां बजा रहे थे। (**व्यवधान**)

यह समझौता पहले के मुकाबले में ज्यादा अच्छा हुआ है। यह तीन साल के लिए है। अगर इसमें कलकत्ता पोर्ट के लिए कोई समस्या है तो 15 दिन के लिए है। ड्रेजिंग से तब काम चलाया जा सकता है।

आपने कहा कि इसका हमारे आयात-निर्यात पर बड़ा भारी असर पड़ेगा तो इसी बात को ध्यान में रखते हुए ही दया पोर्ट खड़ा किया गया है। बड़े से बड़े जहाज वहां पहुंच सकते हैं। इसलिए हमारे आयात-निर्यात को कोई भी हानि पहुंचने वाली नहीं है।

अगर फरक्का बांध न बनता और यह समझौता न होता तो क्या होता ? मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि गंगा यमुना के पानी का प्रयोग करने के लिए उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार बड़ी भारी योजनायें बनाये बैठे थे। इसलिए समस्या तो फिर भी सामने आती। इस समझौते से अगर कोई हानि सम्भव हो सकती है तो उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार वालों को हो सकती है। अब जब यह समझौता हो गया है और कलकत्ता पोर्ट की रक्षा का प्रश्न है मुझे डर है बिहार उत्तर प्रदेश की जो सिचाई योजनायें बनी हुई है वह खटाई में पड़ जायेंगी। और सरकार उन्हें मन्जूर करेगी या नहीं— हमें इस में भी सन्देह लगता है। इसलिए खतरा कहां हैं ....

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI: How can you have a port in U.P. and Bihar ?

श्री ओम प्रकाश त्यागी : इस लिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि हम उत्तर प्रदेश और बिहार वालों को यह चिन्ता है कि हमारी योजनाओं को सरकार मन्जूर करेगी या नहीं ?

मैं अधिक समय न लेते हुए, अन्त में अपने बंगाल के बन्धुओं से इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं कि उन्हें हमारी जनता सरकार में विश्वास रखना चाहिए। आज सौभाग्य से देश का प्रधान मंत्री वह व्यक्ति है, जो मर जायगा, लेकिन देश के हित की कुरबानी नहीं करेगा। उस के दिमाग में देश पहले है और अपना पद पीछे है, अपनी पार्टी का स्वार्थ पीछे है। इस लिए मैं अपने उन भाइयों से अपील करना चाहता हूं कि वे हमारे प्रधान मंत्री जी के नेतृत्व में विश्वास रखें और सरकार से कहना चाहता हू कि कलकत्ता पोर्ट की स्थिति को ध्यान में रखते हुए चाहे जितना धन लगे, कोसी या ब्रह्मपुत्र नदियों के अधिक से अधिक पानी को लिंक-योजना बना कर

[श्री ओम प्रकाश त्यागी]

गंगा में डालो ताकि अधिक से अधिक पानी कलकत्ता पोर्ट को मिल सके और वह अच्छे से अच्छा पोर्ट बन कर रहे।

इन शब्दों के साथ, सभापति महोदय, मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूं।

SHRI DHIRENDRANATH BASU (Katwa): Supporting the motion of my esteemed friend, Prof. Samar Guha, I rise to say that it appears that the importance of the Farakka barrage has not been properly understood by the Government. Farakka barrage was designed at a cost of Rs. 156 crores for the development of the Calcutta port and for protecting it and for the development of the industries in the eastern region.

You will find from the records that in 1962, there was a committee of the Calcutta Port Trust—of which I was also a member. Iwas the Commissioner of Calcutta Port Trust. This matter was discussed with the Central Government and written about to the Government of India. We submitted several proposals and explained the importance of Farakka barrage, clearly to them. The previous Government also did not complete it; and their actions did not come up to our expectations. The present Government, too, has not understood the importance of the matter.

It will be seen from the negotiations that Government was going to appease Bangladesh at the cost of the eastern region, and of the nation. It will be very difficult if at least 40,000 cusecs of water is not given to India, for the Calcutta Port and the neighbouring centres for irrigation purposes. But as far as the Calcutta and Haldia ports are concerned, the Hoogly river is almost dry. Ganga in Howrah, Hooghly and nearby places has been silted; and dredging is not being done properly. And it is also not sufficient, So, Government of India should protect the interests of the eastern region, the port of Calcutta and the subsidiary part of Haldia by taking at least 40,000 cusecs of water. Nothing less than this quantity will serve the purpose.

Mr. Chairman, Sir, you are fully aware that for export and import business, the eastern region depends mainly on Calcutta Port. And if the Calcutta Port is dry, West Bengal will go; the eastern region and the nation as a whole will go. I would, therefore, appeal to the Government of India to revise the agreement. This is a secret agreement that has been reached with Bangladesh to appease them; no thing else. In Bangladesh there is no dearth of water because of Padma, Brahmaputra and other rivers. More than 2 lakh cusecs of water is flowing through Bangladesh daily. Sometimes it reaches as much as 5 lakh cusecs. So, I would request the Prime Minister, the Minister of Irrigation and Agriculture, the Defence Minister and the External Affairs Minister to bear in mind that by this agreement we have given them a lion's share, namely, 80 per cent of the water.

Here I would like to point out that the West Bengal Government was not consulted at all. It was a secret agreement. Neither the present Government of Shri Jyoti Basu was consulted, nor the previous Government. It should have been done. In the end, I would again request them to reconsider the agreement in the interest of the nation.

SHRI VAYALAR RAVI (Chirayinkil): I want to ask only one question. Is it a fact during the negotiations the West Bengal Government was completely kept out, the former Chief Minister, Shri Siddhartha Shankar Ray as well as the present Chief Minister, Shri Jyoti Basu, and they have protested and written letters? Why did you keep the State Government in the dark ?

विदेश मंत्री (श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी): सभापति जी इस महत्वपूर्ण चर्चा में जिन मित्रों ने भाग लिया है, मैं उन्हें धन्यवाद देना चाहता हूं।

बंगला देश के साथ गंगा के जल के बटवारे का प्रश्न एक महत्वपूर्ण प्रश्न है और इस सम्बन्ध में सरकार ने जो भी समझौता किया है, वह सदन के सम्मुख है। हम आलोचनाओं का स्वागत करते हैं। सद्भावना से की गई आलोचना विरोधी को भी प्रभावित करती है किन्तु यदि नीयत पर शक किया जाएगा और वर्तमान सरकार पर यह आरोप लगाया जाएगा कि उसने यह समझौता कर के भारत के राष्ट्रीय हितों को बेच दिया है, तो मैं समझता हूं यह न्यायमूलक नहीं होगा और इससे अच्छी चर्चा के लिए वातावरण नहीं बनेगा। मुझे ताज्जुब होता है कि मेरे मित्र श्री सौगत राय ने 'बेच देने' की भाषा आठ महीनों में

इतनी जल्दी कैसे सीख ली । हमें तो इस को सीखने में 20 साल लगे थे ।

श्री सौगत राय : मैंने यह नहीं कहा था । मैंने कहा था कि अखबारों में लिखा है कि भारत के हितों को बेच दिया है ।

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, he stands corrected.

तो मैं उस में नहीं जाता हूं ।

दो-तीन बातें सदन को ध्यान में रखनी होंगी । फरक्का का विवाद पिछले 25 सालों से भी अधिक समय से उलझा हुआ था । यह विवाद पहले पाकिस्तान के साथ था । बाद में जब बंगलादेश की मुक्ति हुई तो बंगलादेश के साथ यह विवाद चलता रहा । पुरानी सरकार ने इसे हल करने की कोशिश की । मुझे यह समझने का कोई कारण नहीं है कि ईमानदारी से कोशिश नहीं की । लेकिन विवाद हल नहीं हुआ । बंगला देश इस मामले को इस्लामिक कांफ्रेंस में ले गया । गुट निरपेक्ष देशों के सम्मेलन में यह प्रश्न उठाया गया और यहां तक कि युनाइटेड नेशंस की जनरल असेम्बली के 31वें अधिवेशन में एक कांसेनसस तैयार हुआ जिसमें पुरानी सरकार भागीदार थी कि फरक्का के विवाद को हल करने के लिए भारत और बंगला देश को द्विपक्षीय वार्ता करनी चाहिए । सचमुच में दुनियां की बधाइयां मिली हैं कि हमने इस विवाद को आपसी बातचीत से हल कर लिया । जब समझौते पर प्रारम्भिक हस्ताक्षर हुए, उस समय मैं तो नई दिल्ली में नहीं था, न्यूयार्क में था, और यह कहना सही नहीं है कि केवल अमेरिका ने हमें बधाई दी है । बधाइयां देने वालों में सोशलिस्ट देश भी हैं, अरब देश भी है और गुट-निरपेक्ष देश भी हैं । सचमुच में मेरा यह कहना अतिश्योक्ति नहीं होगी कि सारी दुनिया ने इस द्विपक्ष समझौते का स्वागत किया है ।

इस समझौते के बारे में दो बातें महत्वपूर्ण हैं । प्रथम पानी पर्याप्त नहीं है । यह पानी भारत को कितना मिले, बंगलादेश को कितना मिले, यह झगड़ा है । पानी का सम्बन्ध विकास के साथ जुड़ा हुआ है । हरेक देश अधिक पानी चाहता है । अब यह कहना सरल है कि गंगा भारत की नदी है । हम तो जन्म के लिए भी और मरण के लिए भी गंगाजल चाहते है ? लेकिन हमें यह नहीं भूलना चाहिए कि गंगा पद्मा के रूप में बंगलादेश में भी बहती है । जैसा बाबू जगजीवन राम जी ने दूसरे सदन में कहा था कि कभी बंगलादेश भी भारत का भाग था । अगर बंगलादेश वाले गंगा को अपना कहें और उससे लाभ उठाना चाहें तो क्या हमें उनकी भावनाओं की कद्र नहीं करनी चाहिए ।

सभापति महोदय, यह कहा जाता है कि पुरानी सरकार ने युनाइटेट नेशंस में 40 हजार क्यूसेक की मांग की थी और बार बार हमारे फारेन सेक्रेटरी का नाम लिया जाता है, उनका बयान पढ़ कर सुनाया जाता है । वहां बयान केवल उन्होंने ही नहीं दिया था, श्रीमती मार्गरेट अल्वा ने भी बयान दिया था । उस समय हम अपना पक्ष अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय जगत के सामने रख रहे थे और आप जानते हैं जब अपना पक्ष रखना होता है, अपना पक्ष मनवाना होता है तो ऐसी बात कही जाती । फिर चालीस हजार क्यूसेक की बात आप्टीमम बात थी । लेकिन उसका हवाला देकर के आज हम यह कहें कि वह चालीस हजार क्यूसेक पानी आप प्राप्त नहीं कर सके, तो मैं यही कहूंगा कि प्राप्त नहीं कर सके क्योंकि चालीस हजार क्यूसेक पानी की जब बात कहते थे तब हम वह बात किसी के गले के नीचे नहीं उतार सकते थे जबकि वहां पानी कुल 55 हजार क्युसेक है ।

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

बंगला देश हमारा पड़ोसी है । प्रो० समर गुह ने विश्व बैंक की एक रिपोर्ट का हवाला दिया है । लेकिन हमारे दो विशेषज्ञ खुलना गए थे.

श्री समर गुह : मैं पद्मा नदी को जानता हूं । उसको मैंने देखा है । मैंने उम्र वहां बिताई है । बहुत साल तक मैं वहां रहा हूं ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अब हमें कुछ और बातों का ख्याल रखना होगा । बंगला देश का कहना है कि सैलिनिटी बढ़ रही है, मछलियों के लिए भी उन्हें ताजा पानी चाहिए, कुछ उद्योगों को चलाने के लिए भी उनको पानी चाहिए. . .

श्री समर गुह : इतनी दूर न जायें । बड़ी मुश्किल में फंस जायेंगे ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : बंगला देश क्या क्या कहता है मैं इसका उल्लेख कर रहा हूं । आपको एक बात का ध्यान रखना होगा । कोई भी समझौता करें तो वह लेन देन के आधार पर ही होगा । इसलिए प्रधान मंत्री जी ने अपने वक्तव्य में कहा है कि शेयरिंग आफ सैक्रिफाइसेज । कुछ माननीय सदस्यों को शिकायत हो सकती है कि भारत ने ज्यादा सैक्रिफाइस किया है, ज्यादा बलिदान किया है । प्रो० समर गुह नहीं लेकिन किसी और ने कहा है कि बलिदान शेख मुजीबुर्रहमान जब थे तब तो फ्रेंडली जैस्चर था, जब ग्यारह हजार से सोलह हजार क्यूसेक लेना मान लिया तब तो फ्रेंडली जैस्चर था. . .

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह बाबू जगजीवन राम की चतुराई की वजह से हुआ था ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उस समय उन्होंने चतुराई दिखाई तो इस समय चतुराई से काम नहीं लिया यह कहने का कोई कारण नहीं है ।

हमारे कांग्रेस के मित्र कहते हैं कि 1975 में जो एग्रीमेंट हुआ था वह एक साल के लिए था । एक साल के बाद आपको दूसरा समझौता करना था । क्या दूसरा समझौता जब करने का वक्त आता तो पिछले साल के समझौते का उल्लेख नहीं किया जाता ? जरूर किया जाता एक समझौता करके जिसमें ग्यारह हजार से लेकर सोलह हजार क्यूसेक्स तक आपने लेना मान लिया था, आगे आने वाली सरकार को भी बांध दिया था. . .आगे आने वाली सरकार आपकी नहीं होगी, इसका पता आपको नहीं था. . . उसको भी आपने बांध दिया था ।

17·42 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

श्री सौगत राय : 1976 में पूरा 40000 लिया था ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : इसलिए कि उसने आपत्ति नहीं की, अगर आपत्ति करता और मामले को दुनिया में ढोल पीट कर ले जाता तो आपके पास कोई जबाब नहीं था । लेकिन मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि किस आधार पर ग्यारह हजार से लेकर सोलह हजार क्यूसेक तक का समझौता किया गया । मैं यह उत्तर प्रो० समर गुह को नहीं दे रहा हूं. . .

श्री एम० सत्यनारायण राव : : आप उनको कनविंस करें ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : जैसा मैंने निवेदन किया यह समझौता सद्भावना के साथ किया गया है, इस बात को ध्यान में रख कर किया गया कि हमें जल की मात्रा बढ़ानी पड़ेगी, इसके सिवाय समस्या का कोई हल नहीं है । इसके लिए एक तो तात्कालिक हल है और एक दूरगामी हल है । बंगला देश ने स्वीकार किया है कि दोनों देश मिल कर लांग टर्म सालयूशन खोजने के लिए ईमानदारी से कोशिश करेंगे ।

यह भी तय हुआ है कि इंडो-बंगलादेश जायंट रिजवर्ज कमीशन, जिसकी स्थापना 1972 में हुई थी, फिर से अपनी जांच पड़ताल और अपना अध्ययन शुरू करेगा । मैं इस धारा के शब्दों की ओर माननीय सदस्यों का ध्यान खींचना चाहता हूं :—

"The Indo-Bangladesh Joint Rivers Commission established by the two Governments in 1972 shall carry out investigations and study of the schemes relating to the augmentation of the dry season flows and of the Ganga proposed or to be proposed by either Government with a view to finding a solution which is economical and feasible. It shall submit the recommendations to the two Governments within a period of three years."

इसमें कहा गया है, "विदिन ए पीरियड आफ थ्री यीअर्ज" । वह साल बाद भी हो सकता है । कई माननीय सदस्यों ने सुझाव दिया है कि भारत को इस संबंध में प्रयत्न करना चाहिए, और हम जरूर प्रयत्न करेंगे ।

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah). You say that there is scope of review of the agreement annually.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : The Agreement will be reviewed by the two Governments at the expiry of three years from the date of coming into force of this agreement उसके बाद छः महीने के बाद रीव्यू होगा । लेकिन अगर तीन वर्ष के पूर्व कोई नई परिस्थिति पैदा होती है, तो उस परिस्थिति की ओर बंगलादेश का ध्यान खींचने से इस समझौते की कोई धारा भारत को रोकती नहीं है ।

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE : After the expiry of three years, there shall be review.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आपने अखबारों में पढ़ा होगा कि कार्यवाही तो शुरू हो गई है ।

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE : That depends on you.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Of course, and we have decided to do our job.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: We are lacking that confidence due to our past experience.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : What type of past experience have you in regard to us ?

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE : The entire machinery that you have inherited.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : You are talking of the machinery and not of the men.

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Durgapur) : Can vou spell out the long-term programme to save the Calcutta port ?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर किसी दूरगामी समाधान की दृष्टि से जल की मात्रा बढ़ानी है, तो कई योजनाओं पर विचार करना पड़ेगा । माननीय सदस्यों ने सुझाव दिया है कि हम ब्रह्मपुत्र का लिंक बनायें । स्पष्ट है कि ऐसा कोई लिंक बंगलादेश की सहमति के बिना नहीं बनेगा । माननीय सदस्य कह सकते हैं कि बंगलादेश ने समझौता कर लिया है, लेकिन वह लिंक के लिए तैयार नहीं होगा । तो मैं इतना निराशावादी नहीं हूं । अगर ऐसी परिस्थिति पैदा होगी, तो सरकार उसका सामना करेगी ।

लेकिन एक बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आई कि जब 1975 में समझौता हुआ, तब तो उसका बड़ा स्वागत हुआ था । कलकत्ता में दीवाली हुई थी । यह कहा गया था कि कलकत्ता की पीने के पानी की समस्या हल हो गई है ।

श्री समर गुह : उस जमाने की बात कहना और सुनना भी गुनाह है ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी: मेरे सामने 20 अप्रैल, 1975 के **पैट्रियट** का एडिटोरियल है :—

"Ganga Waters—The agreement between India and Bangladesh on the sharing of Ganga Waters accords well with the spirits of deep friendship and

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

understanding that guides relations between the two countries. The question is not one of who has gained or lost, but of a solution."

श्री सौगत राय : मंत्री महोदय यह न भूल जायें कि मुजीब और जिया में फर्क है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हमने समझौता बंगलादेश से किया है। पैट्रियट ने आगे भी कहा है।

"India has made a concession to Bangladesh fears and agreed to limit to draw at Farakka to 41,000 cusecs daily from 21st April rising to 26,000 cusecs by the end of May as against the diversion of 40,000 cusecs considered necessary to keep Calcutta port silt free.

Study of observations made by the Joint Team of the experts from both countries of effects of the Farakka withdrawals will enable the two countries to approach the question for a final settlement with greater confidence and certitude."

यह पैट्रियट है। मैं नेशनल हैराल्ड का एडिटोरियल भी पढ़ सकता हूं :

"And certainly it will help deepen the Hooghly channel and thus facilitate the quicker turn-round of shipping at Calcutta port."

11 हजार क्यूसेक्स में शिप घूम सकता है लेकिन 20,800 क्यूसेक्स में नहीं घूम सकता है।

"Considering that a logjam has been removed, the step towards an interim agreement represents an important step towards a final and more satisfactory understanding on this important issue."

टाइम्स आफ इंडिया का एडिटोरियल मैं पढ़ूं, इसकी आवश्यकता नहीं है। अमृत बाजार पत्रिका का उद्धरण मेरे मित्र कृष्ण कान्त जी ने दिया :

"A joint step towards a final solution."

(व्यवधान) मेरे मित्र ऐसी जमीन पर चलने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं जो बहुत चिकनी है और आपका फिसलना निश्चित है। हम अपने घरेलू मामलों में हस्तक्षेप नहीं चाहते और हम किसी के घरेलू मामले में दखल देने की गल्ती नहीं करेंगे। समझौता व्यक्ति से नहीं होता है, देश से होता है। बंगलादेश की जनता पर भी उसका परिणाम होता है। उस परिणाम की ओर से हम आंखें नहीं मूंद सकते हैं।

श्री समर गुह : क्या जियाउर्रहमान बंगलादेश की जनता के चुने हुए प्रतिनिधि हैं ?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : समर बाबू, हमारा आपका यह विवाद बाद में चलेगा लेकिन इस सवाल को सदन में उठाना ठीक नहीं है। किसी समझौते की उपयोगिता या सार्थकता इस आधार पर कसना कि जिस देश के साथ समझौता किया गया है उस देश में कैसी सरकार है—मेरा निवेदन है यह कसौटी ठीक नहीं है। यह कसौटी डालने की हमें आदत भी नहीं पड़नी चाहिए। समझौता एकही कसौटी पर कसा जा सकता है कि उससे राष्ट्र के हितों का संवर्धन और संरक्षण होगा या नहीं होगा।

जहां तक कलकत्ता बन्दरगाह का सवाल है, वह मर रहा है, वह मर गया और वे कह रहे थे कि उसका डाईंग डेक्लेरेशन हो गया, मगर मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि 1975 के पहले कलकत्ता बन्दरगाह का क्या हो रहा था ? (व्यवधान) वह मरा नहीं है, कलकत्ता बन्दरगाह मरने नहीं पायेगा। (व्यवधान)

श्री समर गुह : 1956 में एक साल में 180 दिन चैनल खुली थी और 1970 में सिर्फ 56 दिन एक साल में वे हैंडिल कर सकते थे।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हमें कलकत्ता बन्दरगाह की ओर विशेष ध्यान देना होगा जल की मात्रा बढ़ाने का प्रयत्न जो दीर्घकालीन हो सकता है उस पर ध्यान केन्द्रित करना पड़ेगा। ड्रेजिंग बढ़ानी होगी। रिवर ट्रेनिंग करनी पड़ेगी। श्री चित बसु और बंगाल

के हमारे दूसरे मित्र यदि कोई और रचनात्मक सुझाव देंगे कलकत्ता बन्दरगाह को बनाए रखने के लिए तो धन की कमी कभी भी अनुभव नहीं होने दी जाएगी। लेकिन कलकत्ता बन्दरगाह की समस्या केवल बंगालियों की समस्या नहीं है, बल्कि सारे देश की समस्या है। इसीलिए अगर कलकत्ता बन्दरगाह में कुछ कठिनाई पैदा होती है तो उसी के लिए हल्दिया के बन्दरगाह का विकास किया जा रहा है।... (व्यवधान)...

SHRI CHITTA BASU : You cannot develop Haldia by killing Calcutta. It is a wrong notion.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैं यह कह रहा हूं कि आखिर कलकत्ते का बन्दरगाह कई वर्षों से कठिनाई-ग्रस्त है और समस्या ऐसी है जिसका हल कष्टसाध्य और व्ययसाध्य है... (व्यवधान)... फरक्का उसी के लिए बना था। लेकिन फरक्का बनने के बाद भी नदी के मुहाने पर बना हुआ बन्दरगाह आज बहुत बड़े जहाजों को नहीं ले सकता है, यह भी एक विश्वविदित तथ्य है। आप अगर 40,000 क्यूसेक्स भी पा जाते और 40 हजार क्यूसेक्स अगर लीन पीरियड छोड़ कर पा जाते तो एक नयी समस्या कलकत्ता में पैदा हो जाती। उस का भी आप को ध्यान होगा। इसलिए मेरा निवेदन है कि कलकत्ता बन्दरगाह पर ध्यान देना होगा। आप जानते हैं कि बंगला देश के राष्ट्रपति यहां आने वाले हैं। समर बाबू ने पहले विवाद में और आज के विवाद में कुछ मुद्दे उठाये हैं, उन में एक मुद्दा यह भी है कि हम तत्काल दीर्घकालीन योजना का काम शुरू करें और उसके लिये हम बंगला देश की सहमति प्राप्त करें। यह मामला उन के साथ उठाया जा सकता है और उठाया जायेगा। समझौता कर लिया और फिर आंखें बन्द कर के बैठ गये—ऐसा नहीं होगा। समझौते का सब से महत्वपूर्ण भाग यही है कि हम ने बंगला देश को पहली बार किसी लांग-टर्म-सोल्यूशन के लिये गम्भीरता से विचार करने के लिये तैयार कर लिया है, लेकिन हम किसी काम को सन्देह से शुरू नहीं करना चाहते हैं, विश्वास का उत्तर हमें विश्वास से मिलेगा—यह हमारा भरोसा है। हम ने सद्भावना के आधार पर समझौता किया है और हम समझते हैं कि बंगला देश से भी हमें सद्भावना का ही उत्तर मिलेगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं श्री चित्त बसु से कहूंगा कि वे अपने संशोधन पर बल न दें। क्योंकि उन से कोई मतभेद नहीं है और मैंने अपने भाषण में उस का उल्लेख भी कर दिया है। हमारे कांग्रेस के मित्र इस पर जोर देना चाहते हैं और कहते हैं कि हम पहली बार डिसएप्रूव करना चाहते हैं, मैं समझता हूं अगर वे समझदारी से काम लेंगे तो मुझे बड़ी खुशी होगी।

MR. SPEAKER : How long are you likely to take ?

SHRI SAMAR GUHA : Let this be finished to-day itself. I want fifteen minutes.

MR. SPEAKER : Is it the pleasure of the House to extend the time of the House by half-an-hour ?

SEVERAL HON. MEMBEMS : Yes, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : Mr. Guha may take 15 minutes from this. And the balance is for putting the motion to the vote of the House.

श्री समर गुह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे मित्र वाजपेयी जी ने आज जिस सुर में बात की और जिस ढंग से वे आज बोले, उस को मैं सुन रहा था, जैसे कोई विदेश मंत्री की वैदेशिक विषय पर चर्चा सुन रहा था, या कोई तकनीकी या वैज्ञानिक विषय पर चर्चा सुन रहा था—ऐसी बात नहीं थी। आज मुझे उन से थोड़ी हिन्दी में बोलने का इंस्पिरेशन हो गया है,

[श्री समर गुह]

इस लिए हिन्दी में बोलूंगा । मैंने देखा कि किसने डंग से अगर नाचना हो, एक ताल में नाचना हो, तो वे नाच सकते हैं, उन का नाच ठीक था, अच्छा था । लेकिन मैं एक बात कह दूं—ऐसी बेवकूफी कोई नहीं करेगा कि अगर हमारा विदेश के साथ कोई समझौता होता है—टैकनीकली बंगला देश विदेश ही है—उन के साथ जो हमारा "चुकती" हुआ है, उस को तोड़ना, उस को अपोज करना किसी भी मैच्योर कन्ट्री के लिए उचित नहीं है और हम ने यह कहा भी नहीं है कि इस को तोड़ दो या इस को फैंक दो । लेकिन जब मैंने इस पर चर्चा शुरू की तो थोड़ा भावावेश में बोला—ऐसा उन्होंने कहा भी है । लेकिन अंग्रेजी में एक शब्द है—"स्वानसांग", कलकत्ता बन्दरगाह के लिए "स्वानसांग" का डर है—इसलिए मैंने थोड़ा भावावेश में अपने विचारों को व्यक्त किया, लेकिन इस के साथ ही मैंने पूरे तकनीकी और वैज्ञानिक तथ्य भी दिये हैं, एक लाइन भी इधर-उधर से नहीं कहा है । किसी फारेन-डिबेट में पार्टिसिपेट कर रहा हूं—ऐसा मैंने नहीं किया है । मुझ पर इल्जाम लगाया गया कि मैंने पहले जो कहा था, उस को दृष्टि में रखते हुए यह पोलिटिकल एपालोजी है इस पर मेरे बहुत से दोस्त गुस्ता भी हो गए—ऐसी बात नहीं है । मेरे मित्र वाजपेयी जी ने जो भाषण दिया है—वह उन्होंने टेकनोलाजिकल डेटा या साइन्टिफिक डेटा या टेकनोलाजिकल ईशूज पर नहीं दिया है, उन्होंने अपने भाषण में सिर्फ मित्रता की बात कही है, पड़ौस के साथ प्यार के सम्बन्ध की बात की है । इसलिए मैंने यही कहा है कि आपने पौलिटीकल-पर्सपैक्टिव से किया है, पोलिटीकल दृष्टिकोण से किया है, यह गलत किया है या सही किया है, यह दूसरी बात है ।

लेकिन मैं एक बात कह दूं—आप ने एक बात कही है वह डेंजरस सही है जो आप के मुंह से नहीं आनी चाहिए थी—आपने कहा है कि 40,000 की ओपटीमम लिमिट है—

It was said that 40,000 cusecs is the optimum limit. 40,000 cusecs is the minimum limit. I challenge you. The other side may take advantage of your statement. It was not the optimum limit. Forty-thousand cusecs was the minimum limit.

18 hrs.

I want to draw your attention to the other point, namely, immediately what does it cost to you.

आप कह सकते हैं कि रुपये की कोई कमी नहीं होगी । अभी आप के पास 5 ड्रेजर है लेकिन आप को इमीजिएटली एक ड्रेजर और लेना पड़ेगा । उस में आप के 12 करोड़ से 15 करोड़ रुपये लग जायेंगे ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : यह तो हो जाएगा ।

श्री समर गुह : यही नहीं, इस में और भी बातें हैं । एक महीने पहले कुछ कैलकुलेशन्स की बेसिस पर शिपिंग की प्रेडेक्टिबिलिटी करनी पड़ती है ।

That basis has been upset now. As a result thereof, the predictability of ships will have to be changed. That will cost you quite a lot. Further, Sir, the whole river training scheme had been introduced in Calcutta port on the basis of a minimum discharge of 40,000 cusecs of water. Due to this there will be possibility of a ship drifting from this bank to another bank. It will cost you immediately Rs. 25 crores.

As regards the point about salinity, owing to this lean month the salinity point will go. The drinking water to Haldia could have been from Gaokhali. Now, it will be from upstream. It will mean another Rs. 15 to 20 crores. So, Sir, within a month you have to make available Rs. 50 crores.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, a point was made regarding Maulana Bhashani having a demonstration of sixty thousand people. That demonstration completely flopped. They could not even collect 5,000 people and, as such, Maulana Bhashani had to withdraw the demonstration. There was

no support behind that demonstration. As regard this issue being taken to UNO, I may say, Sir, if a group can be formed any issue can be taken to UNO. But just taking an issue to the UNO does not mean that the quantum of discharge from Farakka barrage had to be determined with the consent of Bangladesh. There is no international obligation. I can understand of moral obligation. I do not know how this kind of agrument was brought. Sir, so many expert committees had been formed which made model experiments and came to the conclusion that 40,000 cusecs was the minimum discharge required for flushing the river Hooghly. A fear has been expressed whether Ganges water in U. P. and Bihar will be allowed to be used for irrigation purposes. I did not raise that matter. When Farakka project was being considered, during the sixties, 204 small irrigation schemes were sanctioned by the same agency which had the responsibility of constructing the Farakka barrage. Whether it was right or wrong it was a different matter. I quite agree that the agriculturists of U. P. and Bihar have a right to ask for Ganga water for irrigation purposes. Government should have enquired into the matter. They should have gone deep into that matter.

But there is a one problem, the problem of alkalinity. If you use surface water too much that is what will happen. On the Pakistan side thousands of acres had been destroyed because of alkalinity. If you go from Delhi to Calcutta, in U.P. you see on both sides white patches in lands. That is sodium carbonate formed because of the use of excessive surface water. Because of that alkali that is there on earth comes up and land fertility is destroyed. It has happened in thousands of acres on Pakistan side. There should be proper balance between the use of surface water and the use of ground water. In U. P. and Bihar and other areas enough ground water has not been used by having deep tube wells. There is some theory that unless you use ground water and surface water in proper proportion, there is the risk of alkalinity in the surface level. How far it is true, I cannot say. But we see it practically on the Pakistan side. I would ask the hon. Minister of Agriculture to institute a committee immediately to go into the problem of alkalinity and find out whethr it is due to lack of use of ground water and if it is true you should provide for a large number of deep tube wells in U. P. and Bihar for irrigation purposes so that the hazards of alkalinity can be avoided. Still it requires scientific study and experimentation.

There was one possibility—Ganga-Brahmaputra barrage. The less said about it the better. Even a layman will understand the difficulties. I do not know how long it will take to reach an agreement and how long it will take to execute. Let us hope that they will agree. It will take fifteen years.... (*Interruptions*) How much money it will take, how much time it will take, how much material it will need is all difficult to say now. Water is at different level; it will have to be siphoned off from one level to another level. It will require at least ten years. It is a complicated project and before it is completed at least ten years will be over. I had given all the hydrological data; that was suppressed. In the Poona laboratory it was analysed; it was on the basis of three months data, on the basis of yearly data, it was analysed.

You will know what are the disastrous consequences if you do not take proper care in this matter. The studies made in Poona laboratory were completely suppressed. They say that hydrological science is not a perfect science and they have suppressed facts. What about available data, 1975-76 data, when there was a water discharge of 40,000 cusecs ? One data was there. 12 million tonnes of sand was removed. If it had been continued for five years, the problem of Calcutta port would have been solved and it would have been restored to the health it enjoyed in the thirties. When in a year it could handle 200 ships. You have taken a calculated risk, with good intentions, to cultivate friendship with Bangladesh. Nobody will be happier than myself if there is real friendship with Bangladesh. You have taken a calculated and serious risk. In 1975-76, just at the time, of the elections, the previous government suddenly reduced the quantum to fifty-fifty so that there may not be a hue and cry from Bangladesh. The result was, from 36,000—40,000 cusecs it came down to 2,000—32,000 cusecs and there was disastrous result. The channel shifted by 200 feet and again serious re-silting started. Not to speak of 20,000 cusecs, when the quantum was reduced from 36,000 to 31,000 cusecs. the channel shifted by 200 feet and there was a huge amount of silting. This is no laboratory experiment. This was the actual real happening. If that is so, naturally we have reason to be alarmed about what will happen after five years.

I would conclude by making an appeal to Babuji. He knows the art of persuasion. They are coming. At least keep one honourable channel open. Instead of three year survey, please persuade them to have a yearly survey, joint survey, joint observation and joint analysis of the data. If that is done, it would be found out that they do not require this amount of water and they have been demanding so much only because of political pressure. For two years, there was a joint survey, but the findings and the data were not compared because it was a political game of Bangladesh.

[श्री सत्तर गुप्त]

This is the fear of the Indian people. I have already said, Calcutta is not Bengali Calcutta, but it is Indian Calcutta, in reality not emotionally. I described it as the economic lung of the eastern region of India. Therefore, I appeal to you to persuade them to have a yearly survey, joint study, joint survey, joint analysis and joint comparison of the findings. On the basis of that, supposing with God's blessing, everything is all right, it can be there. But if it is not all right, on the basis of that, he will have to persuade them to make them agree to review the pact. This is an experiment which you have done not on the basis of scientific, hydrological data. It was done more out of political consideration than based absolutely on scientific and technological data. I will conclude by again appealing to Babuji to persuade them to have a yearly review, on the basis of joint study, joint survey, joint analysis and joint comparison of the findings by sitting together jointly on the effect of this pact.

MR. SPEAKER: There are two substitute motions. Mr. Chitta Basu, are you pressing your substitute motion ?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: I want to make some comments. In view of the fact that the hon. Minister of External Affairs has, on the floor of the House, given a very clear, categorical, unequivocal and firm assurance that the interests of the Calcutta Port will be properly looked after, and that he has also said that the issues raised during the debate would also be taken into consideration and taken up with the President of the Republic of Bangladesh when he comes here, I wish to withdraw my motion. He has also given another assurance that money shall not stand in the way of the protection of the Calcutta Port. I would also like to remind him about it. In view of all these, I withdraw my substitute motion.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: If the House so desires, there is no dearth of money.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Now he has started prevaricating.

MR. SPEAKER: He is not prevaricating. Ultimately he will have to sanction the money.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: In view of all these unequivocal assurances given on the floor of this House, I seek leave to withdraw my substitute motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member have the leave of the House to withdraw the substitute motion ?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

Substitute motion No. 1 was, by leave, withdrawn.

श्री सौगत राय : अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री वाजपेयी ने अपने भाषण में इस चर्चा के दौरान उठाये गये सवालों का जवाब देने की कोशिश की है। उन्होंने इस बात का भी उल्लेख किया है कि मेरी उम्र बहुत कम है और मैं यहां पर नया आया हूं, इस लिए मुझे इतना अधिक नहीं कहना चाहिये था। मैं जानता हूं कि श्री वाजपेयी पुराने सदस्य हैं, वह बहुत दिनों से संसद् में रहे हैं और बड़े भारी वक्ता है। अपनी वक्तृत्ता में उन्होंने जो कुछ कहा है, उस का तो मैं खंडन नहीं कर सकता हूं, लेकिन मैं आप के माध्यम से श्री वाजपेयी से यह कहना चाहता हूं कि वह आपने बढ़िया भाषण में किसी की आंखों से आंसू तो बहा सकते है, लेकिन गंगा में पानी नहीं बहा सकते हैं, और अगर गंगा में पानी नहीं बहेगा, तो कलकत्ता भी नहीं बचेगा।

जहां तक इस समझौते का सम्बन्ध है, मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि (1) इस से कलकत्ता बन्दरगाह के हितों की रक्षा नहीं होगी, (2) इस समझौते के बारे में पश्चिमी बंगाल सरकार से नहीं पूछा गया है, (3) इस समझौते के पीछे जितना राजनीतिक उद्देश्य था, उतना टेक्निकल कनसिडरेशन नहीं था,

(4) यह समझौता बंगलादेश में एक मिलिटरी जंटा के हाथ मजबूत करेगा ।

लेकिन मैं यह जानता हूं कि एक दूसरे मुल्क के साथ यह एक इन्टरनेशनल एग्रीमेंट हुआ है, और अगर हम संसद् के द्वारा इस का डिसएपरूवल करने की कोशिश करेंगे, तो हिन्दुस्तान के हाथ कमजोर हो जायेंगे । इसलिए मैं अपने सब्स्टीच्यूट मोशन को विदड्रा करता हूं ।

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. Member have the leave of the House to withdraw his substitute motion ?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

Substitute motion No. 2 was, by leave withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER : The House will now adjourn and will meet tomorrow at 11 hrs.

18.20 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Friday, December 16, 1977/*Agrahayana* 25, 1899 (*Saka*).

GMGIPND—M—3031 L. S.—II