

(b) whether any discussion was held in the matter and if so, whether any agreement was concluded as a result thereof ?

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT, INTERNAL TRADE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI F. A. AHMED): (a) and (b). Hindustan Machine Tools are Presently negotiating with Messrs. Boeing Aircraft Conclusion of U.S.A. matters relating to the sale of their (HMT'S) Products. The question of conclusion agreement will arise only after completion of these negotiations.

Statement correcting Answer to Unstarred Question No. 3962 dated 19.8.1969 re.

Loss in Production and damage to property of Durgapur Steel Plant as a result of labour troubles

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF STEEL AND HEAVY ENGINEERING (SHRI K. C. PANT) : In answer to part (a) Question No. 3962 on 19th August, 1969, it had been stated that estimated loss of Production due to labour troubles during 1968-69 was 78,485 tonnes + 100 wheelsets. I would like to point out that the correct figure in this respect is 58,556 tonnes.

12.15 hrs.

CALLING ATTENTION TO MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

REPORTED INSTRUCTIONS BY CENTRAL GOVERNMENT TO MYSORE GOVERNMENT TO STOP WORK AT CAUVERY BASIN

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA (Hassan) : I call the attention of the Minister of Irrigation and Power to the following matter of urgent public importance and I request that he may make a statement thereon:-

The instructions reported to have been given by the central Government to the Mysore Government to stop the work at Cauvery Basin and its implications.

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (DR. K. L. RAO) : Certain differences of opinion have, of late, arisen between the States of Mysore and Tamil Nadu over the Hemvathi, Harangi and the revised Kabini projects proposed by Mysore. Tamil Nadu wanted that these projects should be cleared in the light of the provisions of the agreements of 1892 and 1924, between the Government of Mysore and the erstwhile Government of Madras. Kerala, to whom some areas in Cauvery basin of Madras were transferred consequent on the reorganisation of States in 1956, have represented that the Kabini project would submerge certain areas within its boundaries and also that they should have an equitable share of the waters of the tributaries of Cauvery flowing through Kerala.

Of the three projects mentioned above, Kabini Project providing irrigation for 30,000 acres was sanctioned by the planning Commission for Rs. 2.5 crores. Now, the Mysore Government is stated to be proceeding with a bigger project costing Rs. 24.8 crores, the area proposed for irrigation being increased to 126,000 acres. Hemavathi and Harangi projects have not been cleared by the Technical Advisory committee as these projects involve inter-state aspects not yet resolved.

The Government of India have been making efforts to settle the differences by negotiations. Since 1967, several discussions were held at the technical level and at Minister's level. In August, 1968 meeting, in which the Chief Minister of Mysore and Ministers from Tamil Nadu, participated, differences were considerably narrowed down and it was hoped that it would be possible to arrive at an amicable settlement. A meeting was again held on 9th February at New Delhi at which Ministers of Mysore and Tamil Nadu and senior officers of Kerala Government participated. In the light of the discussions held, certain proposals were drawn up by the Ministry of Irrigation and Power towards a settlement of the difference and forwarded to the Chief Ministers on the 11th February, 1970, for their consideration.

On receipt of the proposals made towards the solution of this problem, the Chief Minis-

[Dr. K. L. Rao]

ter of Tamil Nadu wrote to the Government of India stating that assurances had not been given by the representatives of Mysore during the discussions on February 9, 1970 that the existing agreements would be honoured, and that the projects under discussion, viz., Hemavathi, Kabini and Harangi Projects, would not be proceeded with, pending consideration of the proposals for settlement. He therefore, made request that the water dispute arisen in the matter might be referred for adjudication to a Tribunal constituted under the Inter-State water disputes Act, 1956.

On the 26th February, 1970, I wrote a letter to the Chief Minister, Mysore stating that a settlement by negotiations would be preferable and might still be possible. Further, I suggested that pending this, the work on the projects not yet approved by the planning commission may not be proceeded with. A reply has been now received from the chief Minister, Mysore, stating that a detailed study of the proposals made for the settlement of the water dispute would have to be made by his Government and that this might take three or four weeks more. Meanwhile, the Chief Minister, Mysore, has made a clarification on the 5th March, 1970 in the Mysore State Assembly on the subject, when he stated that he was not thinking of stopping any of the projects.

All the aspects of the presents Cauvery dispute are under careful consideration of the Government of India with a view to finding out how the present water dispute can be settled.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA : It is rather very unfortunate to observe in the statement just now made by the hon. Minister that two important things which ought to have been mentioned by the hon. Minister are missed. One is: what are the alternative suggestions proposed by the hon. Minister to the disputed State chief Ministers? Second is: whether he is going to confine himself in his authority to the conditions and terms of the agreement of, 1924 positively, whether the chief Ministers suggestions have been taken into consideration, whether any categorical reply has been sent to the Government of Mysore or the reaction of the Chief Minister has been taken on that. Then,

with regard to the construction of the Kabini Project, is the Kerala Government now coming forward with a method to be adopted at the interference of the Central Government? I want know whether there were any terms and conditions that were incorporated in any of the past agreements which the hon. Minister has quoted in his Statement pertaining to 1924 or earlier agreements? In the absence of such terms and conditions, when a technical clearance has been given to a project, where is the necessity to incorporate a mandate pertaining to the Kabini project after complicating the issue at the instance of the hon. Member between the Governments of Kerala and Mysore? I want to ascertain from the hon. Minister whether he has got any idea about the terms and conditions of the 1924 agreement and under what circumstances such an agreement came into being between the Governments of Mysore and Madras, for what purpose and for what concrete reasons. The concrete reasons are the construction of some reservoirs across the river Cauvery and its tributaries, for the water allocation between the Governments of Mysore and Madras and for regulation of all these things. What I want to ask him very categorically is: whether he has understood the implication and the spirit of the 1924 agreement and what are the benefits that will accrue to Mysore? 45 tmc of water has been agreed in that agreement to be given to Mysore. What has Mysore done? It has not utilised that particular quota of water which has given to Mysore all these days. Who is responsible for it? If at all anybody on the face of the earth is responsible for the Mysore Government and the Mysore people for not using this quantity of water, it is Dr. K.L. Rao. With due respect to Dr K. L. Rao who was kind enough to visit the Harangi, Hemavathi and Kabini projects as far back as 1963 and having himself Selected the sites, he said that the recommendations should be submitted to the central Government where he will try his best to get the technical clearance and all the required clearances. What happened to Dr. K. L. Rao now? Why has he not given a naya paisa for the construction of any of these projects to utilise this 45 tmc of water which was categorically admitted and binding under the agreement? I only want to know the position. If the Government of Mysore has not utilised a drop of water, who is responsible? These projects were undertaken at

the instance of the Mysore Government and our people and not due to the mercy of the central Government. Has he realised the difficulty if he issues such a mandate or creates any further problem? The projects which are under construction have already uprooted $1\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs of people.

What will be the fate of those people? Will they have to come and sit before the hon. Minister's house? Or, will they have to take poison and die? Then, what will happen to the crores of rupees already invested. I do not have the exact figure with me now. Sir, he has not understood the real difference or the real difficulty; nor has he placed the real difficulty or the difference of the two Government and the full facts of the controversy that has arisen. As per the agreement Mysore can utilise 45 t.m.c. of water and Mysore is entitled for it. Can the Minister say that Mysore Government is not entitled to utilise this 45 t.m.c. of water which is according to the terms of the agreement? Has he bestowed the same discretion judiciously enough and according to law, which he has exercised against the Chief Minister of Mysore, with regard to the other arbitrary consideration of so many other beautiful projects, including projects in his own area, of the Great Narmada disputes and on other disputes? Why is he adopting such an attitude of drastic *narashtra* against the people of Mysore? It is because of the political pressure tactics, because of the Central understanding with that of the Madras Chief Minister and because of the prejudice over the Mysore Chief Minister. By this he is doing an injustice to the people of Mysore. Are they to take poison and die. My question is this.

MR. SPEAKER; I am almost in your speech.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA; My question is, first, is the Mysore Government not entitled under the agreement to use this 45 T M C of water? Why has he not used the same weapon of Central interference with regard to other disputes and awards? Why has he not come forward with alternative suggestions to both the Chief Ministers? Why is he not placing the full facts on the Table of the House to enlighten the hon. Members? What is he doing to solving the problem by

means of negotiations? What is his reaction? These are my questions.

DR. K.L. Rao: With regard to the Kabini project asked by the hon. Member I want to mention the facts about the dates here. The Kabini project was sanctioned in 1958 by the planning commission on the distinct understanding that the cost of the project is to be Rs. 2½ crores and the area to be irrigated will be 30,000 acres. Now, the Mysore Government has not sent any revised estimates so far for our consideration. But I understand, and it is also confirmed that they are now constructing a project which is ten times costlier in size. The cost of the project is estimated to be 25 crores increasing the irrigation area from 30,000 acres to 1,26,000 acres. The Kabini project sanctioned originally has nothing to do with the Kabini project which they now want, because when a project of this type is entirely enlarged and changed, it is entirely different and only the name remains. Therefore it is necessary for the planning Commission and the Government of India to sanction the project afresh.

Then, the hon Member asked another question why I have not placed my concrete proposals on the Table of the House, the proposals that I have made to the respective Governments for a compromise. Obviously those proposals are not to be made public because of their confidential nature. That is just in the way of trying to get at a compromise to see that these projects are sanctioned and taken up. It is with a view to do that I have made certain proposals between the three States concerned. We are awaiting their reaction on that. The Mysore Chief Minister has also written that he is studying proposals very carefully and that it will take 3 or 4 weeks, and then he will give his reactions.

With regard to the third question, it is obvious that the matter has to be referred to arbitration. Now, according to the present Act, it is to be referred to a judicial tribunal.

That was why before referring this matter, we wanted to make certain and be sure.....

SHRI RANGA (Sriakulam): There was an agreement of 1924 according to which Mysore was allotted a particular quantity up to which they can go on building their own irrigation

[Shri Ranga]

projects, why should the hon. Minister not reply to that point? Is it within that quantity or not?

DR. K. L. RAO: I am coming to that.

There, we have got to satisfy the 1924 agreement. In terms of 1924 agreement, the technical advisory committee has technically cleared the Hemavati and Harange projects as far back as 1966, subject to one condition, and that condition was that those projects must be cleared or accepted after the rules of regulation were accepted between the two states. You cannot simply sanction a project anywhere without effecting the rules of regulations. So, they said that these projects must be sanctioned after the rules of regulations had been accepted [Interruption]. These rules of regulations are the ones that have been under discussion, and they are in technical terms. For instance, there are limit flows which are provided for in the 1924 agreement. According to the 1924 agreement, Mysore can impound water only under certain conditions and those conditions have to be observed, if we have to observe the 1924 agreement, and that is exactly what we have been trying to do both at the Ministerial level meeting held in 1968 and that held in 1970, and that matter is now being considered by the Government of Mysore and the Government of Tamil Nadu, SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: Are we not entitled to build up to 45 TMC?

The hon. Minister has not categorically answered my question. He has evaded it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Member can ask another question.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: I am asking a very categorical question, in addition to reiterating earlier any question. May I know whether the Mysore Government is not entitled to utilise 45 TMC of water and whether it is not incorporated in the same agreement that if the Government of Mysore is not going to complete the construction of these projects within 1974, they will lose the right to the use of these waters? My second question is this. The Madras Government as early as 1890-1963 had repudiated the 1924 agreement and had violated it, and constructed without the sanction of the Central Government the Upper and Lower Bhavani projects. What was Dr. K. L. Rao doing at that time? When the Mysore Govern-

ment had launched a protest, why was it not referred to arbitration?

Dr. K. L. RAO: The 1924 agreement is an open book and any body can see it. What the agreement says is that the Mysore Government can construct storages of 45 TMC: that is, they can construct storage capacity of 45 TMC, and use the water for irrigation of 1.1 lakhs acres. (Interruptions)

I am only mentioning the provision in the agreement. Further, it was said that if there was any reservoir constructed on the tributaries of the Cauvery by Madras, offset reservoirs to the extent of 60 per cent. of that can be constructed by Mysore. But in both the cases, the agreement laid down that the limit, flows or the regulations of the river must be adhered to under the 1924 agreement. That is what we are trying to do. Nobody is denying the waters required by Mysore. In fact, I cannot make myself public, but I know fully the case of Mysore much more thoroughly than my hon. friend. But the point here is this. If you are going by the 1924 agreement, then you have got to observe certain stipulations. In fact, it is with a view to see that these projects come up before 1974 that I have insisted that I shall be trying to get these projects sanctioned but if they do not come to my help, then what can I do? After all, the rules of regulations have got to be accepted under the terms of the 1924 agreement. For example, I shall tell you a very simple case. (Interruptions)

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA (Tumkur): River dispute cannot become a pawn in the political game. I represent an under-developed state like Mysore. The interests of the state have got to be safeguarded by the Centre. The 1924 agreement is outmoded. It was entered into when the Britishers were there. We had not achieved Independence then. After Independence, these things are coming up. In 1956, we had the reorganisation of states also. Many parts have been merged with the Mysore state such as Coorg and other parts of Madras. I would like to know whether the 1924 agreement can still hold good for all time. I would like to know what the political motive behind the Ministry is? For the Centre is using these border disputes and river disputes as a political weapon.

Before I come to my question proper, I would just like to mention one thing. When the Gandharvas imprisoned the Kauravas, the Pandavas went to see them, and the

work at Convery
Basin (C.A.)

Gandharvas asked them, why are you seeing the enemies? The Pandavas said when a common enemy is there, We are 105.'

So far as the rights of my State are concerned, so far as the riparian rights of my state are concerned, we are all united. So, how can the Central Government discriminate against us? I have, no doubt, got my reservations in regard to the State Government of Mysore, it has got a feudal character also because at times they have not done what they should have done. The Central Government have no reason to issue an ultimatum when the works are in progress. The expenditure incurred on the works in progress is as follows: In the case of the Kabini project, the expenditure incurred is Rs. 548.72 lakhs. on the Svarnavati dam, which is in rapid progress the expenditure incurred is Rs. 142.40 lakhs. The Hemavati is in progress and other dams also have been taken up, and the expenditure is Rs. 242.06 lakhs. There are also the Harange, Machanapal and Gandal projects. Nearly a sum of Rs. 10 crores has been spent by the Mysore Government to feed the hungry people of Mysore.

MR. SPEAKER: I am waiting for the hon. Member's question.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: I am giving facts to show how the Central Government have discriminated against the Mysore Government. Even according to the agreement of 1924, the Mysore Government are entitled to 45 TMC. The Central Government are applying double standards, so far as the construction of dams is concerned. When the Madras Government constructed the Pullambidi, New Kattalai and Bhavani projects under the same agreement, was the same principle applied, when the Mysore Government had asked the Madras Government in that regard? Will the same principle be now applied so far as the construction of projects by the Mysore state is concerned? May I know why there are double standards? There are constructions of projects under tributaries of the Cauveri. For instance, take Kabini. It is not within the agreement zone of this agreement. What right has the Central Government to issue an ultimatum under the law and under the Constitution? This is nothing but a mischief within the ambit of the IPC, and the hon. Minister should be punished for that, because he wants to set the Madras State against the Mysore State,

and he wants to set Maharashtra against Mysore. He has set these enemies against Mysore so that Mysore may not get its due rights? ...

SHRI SONAVANE (Pandharpur): May I know whether the use of the word 'enemy' is proper?

MR. SPEAKER: Let the hon. Member come forward with his question now.

My question is this. The agreement is outmoded and does not hold good now; after the reorganisation of States, that agreement has not been revised. Purposely and wilfully the Planning Commission has been adopting a discriminatory attitude towards Mysore. The Mysore state's requirements have not been given priority in so far as the projects of the State are concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: I am not going to allow him any further. If he does not come out with his question in one minute, I will have to call on the other members on the list.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: Why have the Central Government not applied the same principle when crest gates were put up in Nagarjunasagar? Why did he not give an ultimatum to Andhra then to give protection to Mysore? Why has such an ultimatum been sent to Mysore now? Is it not political? Is it not vindictive? Is it not discriminatory? Is it not a step-motherly attitude? In view of this, I have no hesitation in saying that Mysore has not received justice at the hands of Dr. K. L. Rao and I would ask him whether he will voluntarily resign or will have to be reprimanded for such lapses on the part of the authorities here.

DR. K. L. RAO: There is nothing more I can add except to say that there has been no political motive in dealing with these problems. It is purely technical. If I may repeat, the Kabini project that was sanctioned in 1958 was of a much lower magnitude costing Rs. 2.5 crores only. Now the proposal is to increase it tenfold. I am surprised the hon. member is arguing out that case. They have not even submitted revised estimates for the kabini project. If without sending us the revised estimates, they say 'we have spent Rs. 6 crores', what is the meaning of this?

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: When the Madras Government undertook some projects without

[Shri K. Lakkappa]

the Centre's approval, what was he doing ? Did he adopt this attitude then ?

DR. K. L. RAO : There are also some complications in this particular case. It will submerge some areas in Kerala. We cannot therefore sanction such a project without taking into consideration all the aspects. Similarly, there are certain regulations which have to be followed. In spite of all this, I will repeat—and I would request the hon. member not to indulge in this insinuation—that there is no personal or political motive in this.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA: He has not answered my question. Three crores of the people of Mysore are suffering without food. They are poverty-stricken. Irrigation facilities are not there. Madras is having 22 lakh acres of irrigation and we are not even having 2 lakh acres. Why have these double-standards been applied regarding construction of projects by Madras and Mysore ? Why was not the same principle applied in the case of the construction of crest gates at Nagarjunasagar ?

MR. SPEAKER : His question is why there has been a double-standard.

DR. K.L. RAO : As I have already submitted, there has been no double-standard or discrimination whatsoever.

SHRI RANGA : Does he stick to his statement that it is not an ultimatum ?

SHRI A. SREEDHARAN (Badagara) : My call attention was addressed to the Minister of Home Affairs because this is not merely a water dispute. Here is a State Government which is blatantly, aggressively and violently refusing to carry out the directive of the Government of India and this question should have been replied by the Minister of Home Affairs.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : I protest against this remark. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI A. SREEDHARAN : the Minister's reply is an essay in apology and an epic in surrender. Here is a Government which says that there are water disputes between Kerala—Mysore and Madras. Three states are involved. Kerala and Madras have always been

advocating that they are prepared to sit round the table and resolve this issue peacefully and amicably. We have stretched our patience to the utmost limit and said that we are prepared to discuss, but here is the Government of Mysore which says that in spite of the Centre's directive they are going to go ahead with the work on the project.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA : Precedent has been established by the Centre.

SHRI A. SREEDHARAN : So, my question is very straight and simple. The hon. Minister said that he was still thinking in terms of negotiations, while the Chief Minister of Mysore on the floor of the State Assembly says that he will not stop the work on this project, which means that the Chief Minister of Mysore has thrown Dr. K. L. Rao's letter into the dust bin of the Vidhan Sabha. And now the spokesmen of Mysore are advocating that the kabini project is a fait accompli.

I would like to make it clear that the 1924 agreement is not binding on Kerala because the Government of Kerala did not exist at that time. The Kerala Government came into existence only in 1956, and no portion of that agreement will ever be applicable to Kerala, and if any attempt is made to clamp that agreement down on us, We will fight it tooth and nail.

I want the hon. Minister to give us an assurance, because his statement says :

"I suggested that pending this, the work on the projects not yet approved by the planning Commission may not be proceeded with."

And earlier on he says :

"Of the three projects mentioned above Kabini project providing irrigation for 30,000 acres was sanctioned by the planning Commission for Rs. 2.5 crores."

When these two portions of the statement are read together, it means that the kabini project has been sanctioned by the planning Commission and the Government has given a directive to the Mysore Government not to proceed with the work not sanctioned by the planning Commission. That means the

Mysore Government can go on executing the work on the kabini project. I want to ask the Minister if he will permit the Mysore Government to go ahead with the work on the kabini project because this is of vital concern to us. If this project is proceeded with, a vast area in Kerala will be submerged and also the question of sharing the waters arises. So, Will he give a categorical assurance that without the concurrence of the kerala Government the Mysore Government will not be permitted to go ahead with the work on the kabini project.

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : It is not covered by the agreement.

SHRI A. SREEDHARAN : We repudiate that agreement, we do not accept it.

Secondly, even when this issue is being discussed on the floor of the House, work on this project is progressing. If the Mysore Chief Minister refuses to come to the conference table and if he still proposes to go ahead with this work, may I know what steps the Central Government will take to stop the work on this project by the Mysore Government ?

DR.K. L. RAO : With regard to the first question of the hon. Member, I want to submit that the original project that was sanctioned was a small one which does not submerge any land in Kerala, which does not affect water distribution, because the water utilisation of that project is small in quantity. Now, what we understand is that the Mysore Government is proceeding with a much bigger project which even involves submersion of land in kerala and also utilisation of a much larger quantity of water. It is this project that has not been sanctioned. Therefore, the Mysore Government are at perfect liberty to go along with the project that was sanctioned in 1958 but not any project that is much bigger, but unfortunately their expenditure figures show that they have spent nearly Rs. 6 crores whereas the original project was to cost only Rs. 2.5 crores. That means it is a revised project.

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA : What about the rise in costs ?

SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAM (Durga) : Chitraguga Whatever has been done has been done with the connivance of Dr. Rao.

DR. K. L. RAO : I am fully aware of the rise in prices. But this increase is due to widening the scope of the project, providing more irrigation, bigger and higher dam and so on. The hon Member has asked for a definite assurance. Definitely the Government of India would take note of it. Any project which is not properly sanctioned by the planning Commission will not be given any Central assistance. Government will be most unhappy if the State concerned still goes on constructing it without any sanction. I shall give a simple illustration. I do not want this project to be proceeded with in this unhappy stage. I may put a simple question by way of illustration. Kerala is higher up in Cauvery. Suppose the kerala Government constructs a bigger reservoir higher up and water does not flow in Cauvery, what will be the situation? We shall be wasting money on kabini. Therefore, it is obvious that for the best utilisation of the water resources of this country, there should be planned and agreed action. The Government of India is anxious to go along on a planned and agreed manner, not any particular State going as it likes. I am unhappy about this..... (Interruptions.)

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA (Mandya): Sufficient poison has been injected into the body-politic of this country and let not parochial poison be injected into the sacred and serene waters of Cauvery. The entire dispute revolves around the 1924 agreement entered into between two unequal parties. Just imagine that the present State of Madras was then comprising the whole of Andhra Pradesh, today's Tamil Nadu, and parts of Kerala and of Mysore. I wholeheartedly agree with that part of the statement that Comrade Sreedharan made, namely, that there has been a qualitative change that has come about in the country. If Mr. Sreedharan says that the 1924 agreement is not binding on Kerala then we are all operating on different wave lengths, and a new situation emerges. It is said that appearances are deceptive. Look at Dr. K. L. Rao; he looks very innocent. Even the statement he made sounded rather innocent. Let us not be deceived by this innocent appearance of Dr Rao. I have said on the floor of the House that so long as Dr. Rao continued to head the Irrigation Ministry at the Centre, Mysore shall not get justice (Interruptions.) Political compulsions are there. My friend Mr. Narayana Rao need not get unduly agitated because Dr. Rao is not going to be displ-

[Shri S. M. Krishna]

aced; I am sure about it. what is Mysore's contribution ? I shall quote Dr. Rao, as creation, the Central water and power Commission's survey :

"A survey by the Central water and power Commission has estimated the total yield in the Cauvery basin around 553 TMC ft. water at 75 per cent dependability. Of this 417 TMC ft of water is contributed from Mysore area and the balance of 136 TMC ft. from the Tamil Nadu area."

After the 1924 agreement came into being, Mysore state has put in only krishnaraja sagar dam; thanks to the successive Congress that have been ruling Mysore State, they did not spend any money to exploit the Cauvery basin. On the other hand, what has happened to Madras State ? They have built a number of projects such as pullambudi, New kattalai, High Level Bhavani, and so on. All these projects had been taken up and executed. What is the comparative picture of Madras, Mysore and Andhra pradesh ? In Mysore the percentage of irrigation is 9, Whereas in Tamil Nadu it is 36 per cent compared to 40 per cent in Andhra pradesh. Among unequal partners, the greatest injustice has been done to Mysore. I should like to pose this question to Dr. Rao. Dr. Rao is a genius, shall I add that he is an evil genius. . . . (Interruptions.) I stand, by it; let him repudiate it.

SHRI K. NARAYANA RAO (Bobbili): In these matters, it is the Government of India as a whole which is responsible ultimately for taking decisions. Why should anybody hold only Dr Rao responsible ? Mr. Speaker, I want a direction from you.

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA: Worse names than evil genius have been called here and evil genius is comparatively a dignified term.

MR. SPEAKER : Since you started, you had been using such words. I do not say they are unparliamentary; still that is undesirable.

SHRI S. M. KRISHNA : The 1924 agreement is confined to Cauvery and the scheduled rivers in the cauvery basin. I should like to know from Dr. Rao whether the non-scheduled rivers had been included in the 1924 agreement. If the non-scheduled rivers are not part and parcel of the 1924 agreement, what prev-

ents the Government of Mysore from going ahead with the Hemavati, and kabini and other projects ?

Another point which Mr. Sreedharan made is about the Central Directive, which Dr. Rao has sent to the Government of Mysore. I am a great admirer of the late Annadorai; I know what happened to the directive which the Central Government sent to him on the NCC. My hon. friends from Tamil Nadu also know what happened to that directive. The Central Government will have to take into account the feelings of the people of Mysore State in setting right an injustice that had been meted out to them due to historical reasons. I am not going to blame anybody. I should like an assurance from Dr. Rao that he is going to withdraw the letter which he had sent to the Chief minister of Mysore.

DR. K. L. RAO : I want to submit to the hon. Member that he must be sure of his information. For example he said that Hemavathi and kabini were not scheduled rivers. They are scheduled rivers. . . .

SHRI N. SHIVAPPA: Only upto a certain point. . . . (Interruptions)

DR. K. L. RAO : They are included in the list of scheduled rivers. Kabini river and Hemavathi river have been included in the list. . . . (Interruptions.) I have got it here: if you went to see, you can very well see it.

Then, with regard to the Harangi project—there is on question of argument the Harangi river was not part of Mysore. It was part of old Coorg, and therefore it was not scheduled. What I want to submit is, if the hon. Member had correct information, probably he would not have dubbed me with the various terms that he has been kind enough to use. The only answer that I would like to make to my Mysore friends is that the best way to try to get the project sanctioned is to go in on the terms of the 1924 agreement, and whatever the agreement allows—if the agreement allows it—Mysore is perfectly entitled to it and it will get the water. There is no difficulty about it at all. But, if it is a question of revision of the 1924 agreement, I am afraid we cannot undertake it. Normally it has to go to the tribunal.

SHRI J. MOHAMED IMAM : When you visited Hemavati, you yourself made some

Mysore to stop work at Canvery Basin (C.A.)
clarification with regard to Harangi and Hemavati.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS ROSE.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri J. H. Patel.

SHRI J H PATEL (Shimoga) : (*Spoke in Kannada*).

MR. SPEAKER : There is no translation arrangement during the Question Hour.

SHRI J H. PATEL : I am putting my question in English.

AN HON. MEMBER : The Minister knows Kannada also.

MR. SPEAKER : Order, order. Let us listen to the question.

SHRI J. H. PATEL : I am referring to the statement which he placed before the House; I am not reading the entire statement. But, if you carefully go through it, you will find that all his intelligence has been used to make it appear that Tamil Nadu has all along been on the legal line and it is the Mysore State alone which has been illegal. He has put the whole matter in that way to the House. As a matter of fact, as long as Dr. Rao uses such intelligence and as long as Shri Chavan has his power, they will wield influence over the Central Government. I am not bothered about Madras Mysore or Kerala. The oath that they have taken at the National Integration Conference in Srinagar or somewhere or at some other place by somebody else, to uphold the integrity of the country and the unity of the country has been a farce and a drama. whatever it is, these two people have been entirely responsible for the disintegration, parochialism, disunity and division of the country.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER : Please put your question.

SHRI J. H. PATEL : They must first understand the problem correctly. We want very friendly relations with our neighbouring Tamil Nadu. I would like to have an assurance from the Minister that he will not interfere in this matter. Let the matter be left to Tamil Nadu and Mysore people and we will come to an amicable settlement. The very fact that he is intervening in it, will spoil the whole thing. Let him not interfere.

Now, in view of the regional imbalance, this irrigation problem must be solved not on any mathematical or arithmetical calculation but on the grounds of human and regional integration. As Mr Krishna pointed out, Mysore is the least irrigated State in the south except Maharashtra. Madras has 33 per cent, and Mysore has only nine per cent. Is it not this Minister's responsibility to allow Mysore to use its legitimate share of power? It has 45 TMC. But the Minister brings in all technical objections. I demand of him: is he going to assure the House that he would not interfere in this matter. Secondly, he should withdraw his letter which has been written to the Chief Minister of Mysore. Thirdly, he should cease operating as a stumbling-block and dividing the country, one State from another State. Finally is he going to uphold the oath which he has taken in the conference held at Srinagar, to uphold the integrity of the country?

DR. K. L. RAO : If Mysore Government can enter an agreement with Tamilnadu Government, we would be most happy. But unfortunately so far in spite of our very best efforts, it has not been possible to do so. The Tamilnadu Government has made a request that the matter may be referred to a Tribunal. It is at that stage now. If the hon. member can persuade the Chief Minister of Mysore to go and talk to the Tamilnadu Chief Minister and come to an agreement, I can assure him that on behalf of the Government of India, we would be most happy and I would have less of abuse from the hon. member. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI K. LAKKAPPA : I walk out in protest because he is not withdrawing that letter. (*Interruptions*).

(*Shri K. Lakkappa then left the House*)

13.06 hrs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE (AGAINST THE SAMACHAR "BHARATI"

MR. SPEAKER : I have to inform the House that I received a notice of question of privilege on the 9th March, 1970, from Shri Shashi Bhushan against the "Samachar Bharati", a news agency, for circulating a news report, as published in the *Nav Bharat Times* and the