

[Shri Sezhiyan]

I am sure he would have accepted my Bill, because it takes his argument to its logical conclusion, by providing that all the national languages of India could be used here. All the national languages of India should be given equal dignity and opportunity and they should be treated equally at the highest forum where all the people meet. With these words, I again commend my Bill for the acceptance of the House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Constitution of India be taken into consideration."

श्री शिव नारायण (बस्ती) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरे मित्र ने जो प्रस्ताव रक्खा है मैं जसमें थोड़ा सा संशोधन करना चाहता हूँ। उन्होंने 14 भाषाओं की मांग की। मैं मांग करता हूँ कि इस देश में एक दक्षिण की भाषा और एक उत्तर की भाषा हो। उत्तर की भाषा हिन्दी हो और दक्षिण की कोई भी एक भाषा हो। हम भी सीखें और वह भी सीखें। मैं आप के द्वारा सरकार से भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ और सदन से भी कहना चाहता हूँ, हर मੈम्बर से अपील करना चाहता हूँ कि अगर हम को निहायत ईमानदारी और नेक-नियती से देश को एक रखना है तो हम को और आप को गठबध्न्न करना होगा, मिल कर रहना होगा और देश में एकता लाना हांगी क्योंकि हमारे देश की चारों सीमाओं पर लड़ाई के बादल मंडरा रहे हैं। इस समय देश में कोशिश की जा रही है कि हम को भाषा के नाम पर लड़वाया जाये, इंटेग्रिटी के नाम पर लड़वाया जाये, दीन के नाम पर लड़वाया जाये और रोटी के नाम पर लड़वाया जाये, रोटी के लिये हम को अमरीका मांगने जाना पड़ता है, मिग मांगने के लिये हम को रूस जाना पड़ता है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सब परेशानियाँ हल हों और हम छोटी छोटी बातों को खत्म करें। अभी कल इस हाउस में हिन्दी

के नाम पर बड़ा उबाल आया। गवर्नमेंट की तरफ के लोग भी गर्म हो गए। तब मैंने कहा था कि अगर अंग्रेजी बोलनी हो तो करेक्ट अंग्रेजी बोलो, हिन्दी बोलनी हो तो करेक्ट बोलो। यह नहीं होना चाहिये कि एक ही वाक्य में प्रेजेंट टैस भी और फ्यूचर टैस भी जुड़े हुए हों। मान्यवर, नब्बे परसेंट यहां गलत अंग्रेजी बोली जाती है। मान्यवर मैं आपके आशीर्वाद से आठ बरस तक इंग्लिश का टीचर रहा हूँ। मैं देखता हूँ कि नब्बे परसेंट गलत अंग्रेजी लोग बोलते हैं। इस से तो बेहतर यह है कि लंगड़ी लूली हिन्दी बोली जाए, टूटी फूटी तेलगू, मराठी, बंगला आदि भाषायें बोली जायें। वह ज्यादा बेहतर होगा।

ज्यादा नहीं चार भाषायें आप लें। एक मराठी लो, एक बंगला लो, एक दक्षिण की भाषा लो और एक हिन्दी लो। चार ले लो लेकिन अंग्रेजी को जरूर सलाम बोलो। चौदह को आप चार करो। इस से देश का काम चल सकता है। बंगला, उड़िया, मराठी गुजराती के अक्षर एक हैं। डा० राजेन्द्र प्रसाद ने एक सर्जेशन दिया था कि इस देश में एक डिक्शनरी बनाओ जिस में सभी भाषाओं के शब्द देवनागरी में लिखे हों। चार पांच बरस के अन्दर अन्दर देश की सभी भाषाओं के लिए आप देवनागरी लिपि को अपना लें। वही हमारे लिए रोमन लिपि है। इंग्लिश की लिपि रोमन है और हमारी भाषाओं की रोमन लिपि देवनागरी लिपि है।

जहां तक संस्कृत का सम्बन्ध है . . .

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : माननीय सदस्य अगली बार अपना भाषण जारी रखें।

17.32 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION

VISIT OF PAKISTANI EXPERTS TO FARAKKA BARRAGE SITE

SHRI CHENGALRAYA NAIDU (Chittoor): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir,

the Farakka Barrage dispute is another blow to our Government's weak policy. We all know that due to our Government's faults, we had to forego all our rights in the Indus waters' dispute and even now we are paying Rs. 10 crores every year to Pakistan for Pakistan to take up additional works. We have to pay about Rs. 100-and-odd crores to Pakistan in foreign exchange due to our Government taking the issue to the World Bank.

17.33 hrs.

[SHRI R. D. BHANDARE in the Chair.]

Now, again due to our Government's weak policy Pakistan has disputed it. When the Pakistan Government has disputed this, when we do not have good neighbourly relations with Pakistan—our Government was at war with Pakistan when they attacked us—at this juncture our Government had no business to invite the Pakistanis to visit our dams. There were many engineers who visited that dam. God alone knows how many real engineers were there and how many defence personnel were there included as engineers. The defence engineers may have taken the plans of the Farakka Barrage and when hostilities break and when we are at war with Pakistan, they may do harm. The Government had no business to invite the Pakistani engineers to visit our site.

The Farakka Barrage was taken up long ago but so far they have not been able to complete this. I expected very much of our Minister of Irrigation and Power. He is one of the ablest and great engineers in the world, but he is not able to complete this project due to Government's weak policy or due to the Planning Commission's indifferent policy. At the time of the construction of the Aswan Dam in Egypt he saw that one of the ministers who was in charge of the execution of the Aswan Dam was living there itself and was

supervising the work for quick execution. Here we are having so many ministers. Why does not our Government appoint one minister to be in charge of the Farakka Barrage and ask him to stay at the site so as to quickly complete this project? I do not know why our Government is indifferent to the execution of this project. So far, they have not been able to show much progress.

The hon. Minister once told the Informal Consultative Committee, in June, 1966, that it will be completed by 1970-71. I think, he still holds that view. If that is so, the hon. Minister has to take some steps by which he can complete the project by the time he has mentioned.

Again, the Farakka Barrage was once considered to be an important project. Why should he take so long time to complete the project? Is it because it did not suit Pakistan and that they were interfering in the matter? I may point out that upto March, 1967, out of the total 109 bases of the Barrage, only 32 were completed by April, 1967. It was pointed out by the experts that the total cost of the project would be twice that of the original estimate of Rs. 69 crores. God alone should know what is the total amount they have spent so far.

I ask: Is it not a fact that the project suffered a great deal because of the Centre's indecision? In 1963, the then Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, suggested the postponement of the project. That shows what interest the Government is having in completing the project.

In June, 1963, a supervisory board was set up in addition to two other committees. I do not know what purpose was served and what work was done by this board and the two other committees. The result is that this board and the committees were able to spend only 30 per cent of the amount allotted for the project and were able to complete only 20

[Shri Sezhiyan]

per cent of the estimated work. Thereafter, nothing has been done. After 1967, they have not spend much on this project. The only amount, I think, they have spent is on taking these Pakistani engineers to the Barrage site, feeding them and entertaining them.

There are two reasons for irritating opposition from Pakistan. One is that it wants to win concessions for itself similar to those which it got under the Indus Water Treaty signed under the auspices of the World Bank and the other is the habitual hostility towards India's interests. The Foreign Minister of Pakistan, Shri Arshad Hussain, told the National Assembly of Pakistan, on 20th June, 1968 that the Farakka Barrage issue will not be allowed to be continued any more and that it must be resolved at an early date through recourse to an international forum. It shows that Pakistan is not interested about the project but it is only to defame India internationally. I may warn the Government that the experts view is that if the project is not completed soon, the port of an international important might be lost for ever at Calcutta.

I want to know why should the Prime Minister of U.S.S.R. dare to write a letter suggesting to settle the Farakka Barrage issue with Pakistan on the pattern of the Indus Water Treaty? May I ask whether it does not amount to interference of our internal affairs? I demand that the letter of the Prime Minister of U.S.S.R. at least the portion of the letter which related to the Farakka Barrage, may be placed before Parliament. I have got a definite information that the Prime Minister of U.S.S.R. has threatened our Government that if we do not settle this Farakka Barrage issue with Pakistan, they are going to help Pakistan by giving more arms to them.

Regarding Farakka Barrage, our Government's indifference is not in

the interest of our country. They have only started the construction of Farakka Barrage and the feeder canal. It is not enough. They must try to connect the feeder canal so that it might join the river Bagirathi and there is a good flow of water towards Calcutta. They must also start dredging in the Bagirathi river so that it will be useful for navigational purposes.

There is another important point. In the interest of our country they must start another irrigational canal from Farakka Barrage to Assam. At present we are connected with Assam only by railway line and whenever there are floods and rains, the railway line is washed away. Now Pakistanis are not allowing our boats to go to Assam. So, there is no navigation at present. They seized our boats also at the time of war. In the interest of our country, in the interest of defence also, we must provide a canal from Farakka Barrage to Assam so that we might use it for navigational purposes and also for defence purposes. If the amount is too much, Government can do one thing: they can take up this project and part by part at least they can complete the navigational canal within a period of five years or so. These things must be done on a war-footing, and they must complete this project. They must connect this feeder canal with the Bagirathi river and they must re-align and see that dredging is completed. If this is not done, the international port at Calcutta will become useless; it will not serve us any purpose if Government neglects this.

**SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR** (Sambalpur): I am glad that the hon. Minister will now have an opportunity to clear the whole issue regarding the Farakka Barrage. Pakistan has been creating trouble regarding its share in the Ganges water and the matter has gone so far that the Prime Minister of U.S.S.R. on behalf of the Government of Pakistan has addressed a

letter to the Prime Minister of India on this subject. Uptil now Pakistan was harping on the Kashmir issue and evidently from now onwards they will also be harping on the sharing of Ganges water. Therefore, in this context, it has not only a scientific and hydrological significance but also a political significance. I am glad that in the answer that has been given to the original question it has been definitely pointed out by the hon. Minister that they will never be agreeable to refer this alleged dispute with Pakistan to any third party or to any arbitrator. I hope that they will stick to this stand to the last and there will be no outside interference in this matter . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: He may ask his question.

SHRI SRADHAKAR SUPAKAR: I want a definite assurance from the Government that they will stick to this stand and I want to know what is the point at dispute and when the specialists from Pakistan came to India to discuss this matter and for an inspection on the spot, what were the points at issue, what were their demands and what is our stand, and when the data were collected by both sides, whether we could satisfy them. This is the proper forum to satisfy not only the members here but the people of India and also the entire world that our stand is justified. I am glad the Minister has that opportunity now to explain the whole matter to the satisfaction of this House and of the entire world.

श्री मधु लिनये (मुंगेर): सभापति महोदय इस सवाल के जो दो पहलू हैं, उन के बारे में मैं सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। इस सदन में उप प्रधान मंत्री ने तीन दिन पहले हम से कहा

"In the matter of the Farakka Barrage or Ganges waters, Soviet Russia has not told us that we should go to arbitration or we should take anybody as mediator.

They have not told us. They only tell us 'Please talk on these matters' because they must have told them that we are not talking on these matters"

उसी तरह हमारे सिचाई मंत्री ने भी साफ शब्दों में कहा है कि रूस ने हम को मध्यस्थता स्वीकार करने के लिए, या पंचों के आगमने जाने के लिए नहीं कहा है। मैं उन से एक सीधा सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। मेरे पास डाका, पाकिस्तान, से एक खबर आई है, जिस को मैं संक्षेप में पढ़ कर सुनाता हूँ। यह भारत की 23 तारीख की खबर है :

"A high government official of Pakistan claimed today that international opinion was in favour of a settlement between India and Pakistan by a third party over the Farakka Barrage which India is building on the Ganges".

आगे वह कहते हैं :

"The Soviet Union made the suggestion of a third party settlement in a letter to the Indian Government on July 5".

क्या सिचाई मंत्री ने या उप-प्रधान मंत्री ने स्वयं कोसीगिन साहब का पत्र पढ़ा है : यदि पढ़ा है, तो हमारे मन में इस खबर से जो संदेह उत्पन्न हुआ है, उस को दूर करने के लिये श्रीर इस बारे में निर्णय करने के लिए, क्या वह कोसीगिन साहब के उस पत्र को सदन के टेबल पर रखेंगे ?

कुछ दिनों पहले मैं ने यहां पर सवाल किया था कि क्या फरक्का बैरज पर काम करने वाले कुछ इंजीनियरों ने फरक्का बैरज के नक्शों, ब्लूप्रिंट्स, पाकिस्तान को दिये थे और क्या उस के बारे में एक मुकदमा दायर किया गया था। उस के जवाब में कहा गया है कि यह बात सही है। जब इस तरह का जासूसी का काम हो रहा है और उस के बारे में मुकदमा चल रहा है, तो मंत्री महोदय बतायें,

[श्री मधु लिमये]

कि क्या ऐसी हालत में यह उचित है कि वह पाकिस्तान के लोगों को दावत दे कर बुलायें कि वे आ कर सब चीज देखें। मैं इस सवाल के दोनों अंगों, पहलुओं, के बारे साफ साफ जवाब चाहता हूँ।

श्री रबी राय (पुरी) : सभापति भेहोदय, मैं नायडू जी को घन्यवाद देता हूँ कि आधे घंटे की इस चर्चा के जरिए फरक्का बैरेज के सवाल को वह सदन में उठाए। मैं कोई लम्बा भाषण देने के लिए खड़ा नहीं हुआ हूँ। लेकिन मैं आप को बताना चाहता हूँ कि नायडू साहब ने आसवान बांध के बारे में जिक्र किया। आसवान बांध को बनाने के लिए अमेरिका सरकार ने जब रुपया देने के लिए मना कर दिया तो नासिर साहब ने हिम्मत कर के स्वैज कौन्सिल का राष्ट्रीयकरण किया। यह तो एक बढ़िया साहसी कदम एक तरफ नासिर साहब ने दिखाया लेकिन दूसरी तरफ फरक्का बैरेज के बारे में और उस के पहले सिन्धु 'नदी' के करार के बारे में वर्ल्ड बैंक जो कि अमेरिका के दबाव में काम करता है उस के दबाव में आ कर भारत सरकार ने सिन्धु नदी के इकरार नामे को मान लिया। अभी फिर मधु लिमये जी ने जो सवाल उठाया है मैं उसी को दोहराना चाहता हूँ कि कोसीगन साहब ने जो चिट्ठी के जरिए फरक्का बांध के सवाल को मध्यस्थता और पंच के जिम्मे सुपुर्द करने को कहा है, मंत्री महोदय को आज सदन को आश्वासन देना चाहिए कि वह सदन के पटल पर कोसीगन साहब का वह पत्र रखने हैं, और उन्हें सदन का यह भी आश्वासन देना चाहिए कि गवर्नमेंट फरक्का बांध के सवाल को पंच-निर्णय या मध्यस्थता के लिए नहीं भेजेगी।

SHRI SAMAR GUHA (Contai): I am afraid that our otherwise well-intentioned Minister has allowed himself

to be led into the through of the intriguing politics of Pakistan. I come from East Bengal and I know everything about it. The problem of East Bengal is not of getting more water, but of less water. Therefore, East Bengal will be much benefited by the Farakka Barrage. Also, demands are being made that the Brahmaputra and the Ganga should be connected. If that is done, that will also benefit East Bengal.

The reason is this. The Ganga that flows through East Bengal is known as Padma. The Teesta coming from North Bengal also runs through East Bengal and is known as the Jamuna. In the other area the Brahmaputra is known as Meghna. These three are very voluminous rivers and it is the problem of East Bengal.

I do not know how many of you know it, but for six months in the year the major portion of East Bengal remains sub-merged not in knee-deep water, but double the height of a man. For six months in the year, without a boat you cannot travel there. (Interruption). I still consider it to be my homeland, although these people have betrayed it. So many people talk about Kashmir and other things. Do you think we can forget our homeland?

I do not know how the Irrigation Minister has been misled by his advisers. Pakistan wants to involve India in as many international disputes as they can create. Secondly, by artificial propaganda they try to create an impression in the minds of the East Bengal people that the Ganga Barrage will do a lot of harm to them, to divert their attention from the conflict with West Pakistan.

Therefore, if Government can prepare a good booklet explaining how by the Farakka Barrage East Bengal will be benefited by way of flood control and in other ways, that will convince international opinion that the

whole demand of Pakistan to have a dispute on Farakka Barrage is nothing but politically motivated.

It would be extremely wrong, unjust and I should say diplomatically peurile to allow the Pakistan experts to visit the Farakka Barrage. It is absolutely wrong. Will Russia like India to suggest to her that she should solve her dispute with China about the Siberian border or Chinese Turkestan? Will they like to have international arbitration? If they would not like, it is some sort of an insult to the whole personality of the Indian nation for Mr. Kosygin to suggest that the dispute about the Ganga barrage should be settled by international arbitration. I think that India should have the courage to reply with national dignity and say that no outsider has anyright or business to interfere in the internal affairs of our country.

So, my questions are: whether the Government will prepare a statement or white paper for international consumption describing how a barrage on Farraka or in Brahamaputra would not hinder but in fact would immensely help the people of East Bengal to control floods there.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBIAH (Nandyal): This half an hour discussion is mainly about the visit of the Pakistani experts to the Ganga barrage and Mr. Naidu made two or three points, whether the engineers should have been allowed to visit the barrage; whether the team included some agents of Pakistan who could take advantage of this visit for some aggressive purposes and whether Mr. Kosygin's letter to the Prime Minister suggests third party's help to settle this dispute. This barrage will go a long way to improve the Calcutta port and offer navigational facilities. I should ask whether this had happened because of the Tashkant agreement by which India and Pakistan agreed to settle among themselves any disputes that might arise. I want

to know whether Mr. Kosygin's letter to the Prime Minister is in pursuance of the agreement reached at Tashkant and if so what is the exact wording used by him and also whether it goes against the agreement that we have reached in Tashkant. It is alleged that he has suggested that the Indus Water Treaty Agreement could be made the basis of settlement of these disputes with regard to the Farraka barrage. I want to know if he has mentioned it in that letter. Due to the mishandling of our case by one of our officers who had been deputed for this purpose, we had been the losers in the Indus Water Treaty and posterity had to pay for it. So, I wanted a categorical answer from the hon. Minister of Irrigation and Power to say that there has been no pressure from the Soviet Government and this matter will not be referred to a third party; that it will be in the best interests of the country and we will adhere to what we have been doing so far as the Farakka barrage is concerned, and also give an assurance to this House that this gigantic project, which has got a multi-purpose utility not only for West Bengal but for the country as a whole, will be completed as expeditiously as possible.

18 hrs.

श्री: कं.र. ज्ञान गुप्त (दिल्ली-सदर) : सभापति महोदय, कोसिगिन ने हमारी सरकार को जो पत्र लिखा है, उस के सम्बन्ध में प्रधान मंत्री जी ने यह बताया है कि उन्होंने यह कहा है कि आपस में आप पाकिस्तान के साथ बैठ कर बातचीत करिए । मैं समझता हूँ कि यह सजेशन देना भी हमारे देश के आन्तरिक मामलों में दखल है । मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि हमारी सरकार उन को साफ तौर से बता दे कि हम इस प्रकार का दखल ग्रच्छा नहीं समझते और इस के खिलाफ प्रोटैस्ट करते हैं । सभापति जी, शुरू में ऐसी ही सजेशन आया करती है, फिर कोई डैफिनेट सजेशन आ जाती है, फिर कोई इन्टरफीयेरेन्स आजाती है—हमेशा

[श्री कंवर लाल गुप्त]

इसी तरह से होता है। मैं ने यह सुना है कि एक प्रोपोजल यह भी है कि यह मामला वर्ल्ड बैंक को सौंप दिया जाय। हम ने जो चिट्ठी इस के बारे में कोसीगिन जी को लिखी है, वह भी एपोलोजिटिक टोन में लिखी है, उन को सफाई से नहीं बताया है कि हमारे मामले में दखल देना ठीक नहीं है। मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि इस सदन के सामने यह धारणा करें कि वह रूस को बतायेंगे—हैड्स आफ, अब इस मामले में हम दखल नहीं चाहते।

दूसरी चीज—हमें आप के लचर-पचर जवाब में विश्वास नहीं है, आप कहते कुछ हैं, करते कुछ हैं, खाली बातें बनाना चाहते हैं। कोसिगिन साहब की कौन कौन सी चिट्ठियाँ आई हैं और आप ने उन के क्या क्या जवाब दिये हैं, अगर आप देश को विश्वास में लेना चाहते हैं तो वे सदन के पटल पर रखे जाने चाहियें। इसलिये मेरा प्रश्न यह है कि क्या आप यह विश्वास दिलायेंगे कि आप रूस के प्राइम मिनिस्टर को "हैड्स आफ" कहने की नीति अपनायेंगे—दूसरे, क्या वह सारी कारसपोडेंस आप सदन के पटल पर रखेंगे, अगर नहीं तो क्यों नहीं ?

तीसरी चीज पाकिस्तान के अफसरों को आप ने बरेज दिखाने की बात कही है—गंगा नदी हमारे देश की नदी है, यह हमारी नदी है और इस के बारे में कोई झगड़ा नहीं है, इस के साथ पाकिस्तान का कोई सम्बन्ध नहीं है। आप से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आप हर एक चीज को झगड़े में क्यों डालते हैं। क्या आप पाकिस्तान को सफाई से कहेंगे कि हम आपसे इसके बारे में कोई बात-चीत नहीं करना चाहते। यह हमारे देश की नदी है, यह हमारा बरेज है, इस के बारे में कोई अफसरों की बात-चीत, कोई मिनिस्टरों की बात-चीत, किसी तीसरे की बात-चीत, हम बिल्कुल नहीं करेंगे। क्या आप यह एटीचड लेना चाहते हैं या नहीं, यदि नहीं लेना चाहते हैं तो क्यों नहीं ?

आखिरी प्रश्न—इस बरेज को जल्द से जल्द बनाने के लिये आप क्या कोशिश कर रहे हैं ? क्योंकि जब तक यह बरेज नहीं बनता, कलकत्ते के पोर्ट का इस्तेमाल ठीक ढंग से नहीं हो सकता। इस के लिये आप क्या कदम उठा रहे हैं, इस काम को जल्द पूरा करने के लिये क्या कोशिशें कर रहे हैं ?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Tenneti Viswanatham.

SHRI TENNETI VISVANATHAM (Visakhapatnam): No, Sir; thank you. I leave it to the Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister.

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH (Rohtak): What about my name? I gave my name. What is this? Ask your office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: May I read the rule for you?

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: I do not want the rules. I gave my name to the office.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. May I tell you the rules?

SHRI RANDHIR SINGH: I gave my name.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The rule is, if there are more than four names there ought to be a ballot and, unfortunately, the hon. Member's name has not come in the ballot. Therefore, I call upon the hon. Minister to reply to the discussion.

THE MINISTER OF IRRIGATION AND POWER (DR. K. L. RAO): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I am very glad the House is taking a lot of interest in this very important project of our country. I shall first clear up the points raised by the hon. Member, Shri Naidu, and later on answer the questions put by other hon. Members.

The first question raised was about the progress of the project. I want to say that the progress of this project is going even ahead of what we thought. We originally thought that this project will be ready only in June, 1971. But we are proceeding at such a rapid rate—and I must say the river has been very kind to us so far—that we hope now that this barrage will be completed by June 1970—i.e. one year ahead. I must also tell hon. Members that this is one of the most difficult engineering feats of the world. It is not an ordinary thing to construct a barrage at the very end of Ganga. It is a very difficult problem and such a thing has not been attempted so far in any country. In fact, Pakistan was afraid of constructing a barrage in their own territory, otherwise they would have suggested one long ago. Only after seeing our work they are more courageous and they are suggesting a barrage lower down in their country. As I said, it is a very difficult project and it involves an expenditure of more than Rs. 150 crores. The Government of India is very anxious about this project. We are doing everything possible to see that this project is completed as early as possible. In view of the very difficult conditions it is not possible to switch on the date of progress beyond what we are doing. Two-third work has been done on the barrage and 40 per cent work has been done on the feeder canals. These are the two main components of this project. Therefore, the House should really be glad to know that we are going to do this work one year ahead of schedule.

The second question was about the invitation given to their engineers to visit the project. It is not correct. No such invitation was made. What happened was, we agreed for a bilateral discussion between this country and Pakistan at the experts level.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA:  
 Why? Why did you do that when there was no dispute

DR. K. L. RAO: After all, in any problem we can always have bilateral discussions.

SHRI KANWAR LAL GUPTA:  
 When this is not under dispute, why do you make it a disputed case?

DR. K. L. RAO: It is not a question of any dispute. Ganga was originally flowing into Bhagirathi. It was flowing by Calcutta. Padma was another branch. River Ganga was having two outlets—one was Bhagirathi and the other was Padma. This was 400 years back. Then, 400 years ago there was an avulsion and Padma became the main Ganga and Hoogly became the smaller Ganga without much water except during the monsoons. Therefore, a major portion of Ganga flows through India and a part of its waters enter into the sea through Pakistan. You can have a discussion on this problem between the two countries. That was agreed to as far back as 1957, that we shall have discussion at the experts level or the technical level. In pursuance of that we had four meetings and the fifth meeting was held recently in the month of May. In that meeting they said that they would like to visit the project. We said that we would like to show them the project at a later date. But they said that they would like to see it . . . (Interruptions) . . . immediately. Their engineers wanted to see the project. We have come to a stage at which we would like their engineers to come and see the project. They were under the impression that this project was not completed, it had not reached such a stage of development as we had stated. They were thinking that we were stating lies. So, when they said "all right, we want to come and see the project", we said "all right". And when they saw the project, what impression did they get? They have expressed the view that a major portion of the work has been done, more than two-thirds, there is nothing more which can be done and the project can be treated as a completed project.

**SHRI RABI RAY:** Not very convincing.

**DR. K. L. RAO:** At the same time, we insisted that our engineers should see their project, that project for which they were claiming waters, that is, Ganga-Kabadak-Fardipur-Barisal project. We said "let our engineers see the project" and they agreed. So, we are sending our engineers in the month of October/November to see what progress they have made.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** That project does not affect us in any way. You have fallen into their trap and allowed their experts to come and see your project. Your experts going there does not help you in any way.

**DR. K. L. RAO:** I will submit that there is nothing wrong in showing them a project which is completed. After seeing the project they are convinced that it is over. Their experts visited the project on 21st and 22nd June when the Ganga was flowing full. This has convinced them that two-thirds of the work has been done. So much for the Ganga.

With regard to the other question, he has made two suggestions.

**SHRI SAMAR GUHA:** You have failed to see that there is politics behind it. In East Bengal in every paper they are propagating against India. In East Bengal they were all pro-Indians; now they are creating anti-Indian feeling in them by misleading them. You have forgotten the politics. That is the tragedy.

**DR. K. L. RAO:** The hon. Member has made two valuable suggestions. We should look to the destination of Bhagirathi to ensure that the Canal and river lower down are ready to take up the water which can be used

for the Calcutta port. That is a very good suggestion; in fact, we are aware of that, but that is a work which has to be done in consultation with the Ministry of Transport. We will do that; it is a question of funds.

Another important question which he has raised is this. It is desirable to have a navigation canal from Farakka to Assam through Indian territory completely so as to avoid passage through Pakistan which our vessels have to take in normal conditions. Actually, this project is Farakka-Dhubri Project through Tista. This project has not been taken up so far only because of the financial difficulties. The project costs Rs. 200 crores and we cannot afford to spend that much money now. It will be taken up as soon as we are in a position to find the funds for it. The project has been fully investigated and we can put it on the field straightway. It consists of canals 300 miles long and it will enable our vessels to go from Ganga to Brahmaputra through Tista. It is a very valuable project and we will take it up as soon as we get a little better financially.

There is one point on which hon. Members were very critical. They have given various versions of it, specially its repercussions in East Pakistan and so on.

About that particular letter I want to submit and categorically state that the only sentence that it has got about this project expressed a desire that both countries should show goodwill in the search of a mutually acceptable solution as in the past in the case of the Indus system.

श्री कंबर लाल गुप्त : आप यह बतायें कि इन्डस का डिस्प्यूट और यह डिस्प्यूट एक है ?

**DR. K. L. RAO:** My hon. friend must be patient. I am just giving you the information.

श्री मधु लिमये : मेरा सवाल यह था कि क्या स्वयं आपने यह पत्र देखा है और पढ़ा है या किसी के कहने सुनने पर ही कह रहे हैं ? और अगर उस को आप ने स्वयं पढ़ा है तो उस को यहां पर रखने के लिये तैयार हैं ?

DR. K. L. RAO: I am not giving you any quotation.

SHRI PILOO MODY (Godhra): No quotation. Thank you.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Have you read the letter yourself and will you lay it on the Table?

DR. K. L. RAO: I have read the letter and the letter contains this statement that both will show goodwill.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: You give us a direct quotation.

DR. K. L. RAO: This is the main idea that is there, namely, that both will show goodwill in trying to solve this problem on a mutually acceptable basis as in the past in the case of the Indus river waters.

With regard to the laying of the letter on the Table, it is a letter written by the hon. Prime Minister of USSR to the Prime Minister of India and, therefore, it is a question which you should ask the hon. Prime Minister. But I can say that generally letters of this type cannot be laid on the Table unilaterally; it has to be done after getting the consent of the heads of both the Governments.

Irrespective of that I would like to say that as in the case of the "Indus waters", does not mean that the world Bank has to come in. I can tell you that the USSR will be the last person to suggest the World Bank because the USSR is not a member of the World Bank.

SHRI MADHU LIMAYE: Third party mediation.

DR. K. L. RAO: There is no question of a third party. What it meant was that he wished that there might be an acceptable solution found out by the efforts of these two people. That is a general wish which anybody can express. We do not mind that. Our policy is very distinct and clear in the case of the Ganga and the use of its waters.

The case of the Ganga waters is entirely different from that of the Indus waters. The Indus has an intricate system of canals and rivers. Part of the headworks are in India and the canals are in Pakistan. It was an intricately connected system there, but in the case of the Ganga there is no such inter-connected system.

There are many other reasons why the Indus and Ganga systems are entirely different. For example, the Indus system irrigates an area where there is no rainfall—it is very highly dry and it is a completely dry system—whereas in the case of the Ganga system the rainfall in East Bengal is of the order of 100 to 150 inches.

What I mean to say is that they are two entirely dissimilar problems and there is no question about it. We are very definite that there is no necessity for any third party intervention and we will not allow any kind of intervention or induction of a third party into the question.

If anybody studies the problem in its scientific bearing, the legal issues and in its proper style, one would feel that the claims of Pakistan are rather unfortunately and unnecessarily exaggerated. For example, in the first meeting they wanted 3,500 cusecs; now they have gone to 49,000 cusecs. If really this water is granted to them, Professor Guha will be able to tell you that this will do them more harm than good because it is an area where really a drainage system is more indicated than irrigation. We know all the facts very thoroughly about the

[Dr. K. L. Rao]

whole thing. I will be very happy to consult Professor Guha if this problem comes up, because he comes from East Bengal and he will be able to help us very much if anything really comes up.

SHRI S. M. BANERJEE (Kanpur): Shri Madhu Limaye raised a very direct question. Certain documents were passed on to Pakistan. In that case Sunil Das, Mohit Chowdhury and, I am told, Atulya Ghosh are involved.

DR. K. L. RAO: I do not think Pakistan is really serious about the discussions when they suggest such a large volume of water. Nobody would, normally, suggest any such thing. If one is really interested in getting something, one must make a reasonable demand. No one goes to the extent of this absurd exaggeration. That defeats their case itself. I know the case. There is very little for us to feel, in any way, about having any kind of doubt on our stand about this issue. After all, Ganga river is an Indian river. It is entirely an Indian river. It serves about 40 per cent of India's population and the entire water, more than 99½ per cent, comes from India. Generally there should be no question of any discussion on the subject. But still if a neighbouring country wants to have a discussion, we do not want to deny it at the technical level. That is all to which we have committed so far.

Then, as I submitted, unfortunately, there is a misunderstanding about the letter of the hon. Prime Minister of U.S.S.R. As far as I know about the subject, there has been no such suggestion at all in that letter either for a third party or the World Bank or anything of that kind. All that it says is, "You please, both of you, discuss and come to a settlement." There is nothing wrong in that. It is

purely a bilateral discussion to which we have committed so far. Nothing more than that.

The hon. Member, Shri Madhu Limaye, asked about a pending legal case. There is nothing that we need to be afraid of because these plans of Farakka Barrage are entirely with us. Anyway, the Project is nearing completion. But about the pending suit I am not up to-date. I know that there was something like that. I shall write to the hon. Member, Shri Madhu Limaye, separately about that after I get the information on the subject.

SHRI YAMUNA PRASAD MANDAL (Samastipur): What about the submergence of some villages in Bihar?

DR. K. L. RAO: Then hon. Member from Bihar, which is a State upstream of the Barrage, is afraid of the Farakka Barrage itself. I only want to say, how much more vigilant we should be when Pakistan is trying to construct Barrage lower down. There is no question that anything of the type will be allowed to be done. We are the complete masters of the Ganga river. There is nothing to be afraid of.

I am most thankful to the hon. Members who have participated in the discussion. Be rest assured that the Government of India will never allow any kind of a third party intervention in this case and it will be entirely, if any discussions are held, bilateral discussions only.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned to meet again at 11 A.M. on Monday.

18.24 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Monday, July 29, 1968/Sravana 7, 1890 (Saka).