

All the Members are co-operating with me and I am thankful for that.

Shri Hem Barua (Gauhati): May I submit that it was the impression of a child about the performance of her grandfather. You should not take it into account, if I may say so with respect.

Mr. Speaker: If it had been about her grandfather alone, she could have told me at home, but that was about the Members!

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): It was a child-like or a childish remark.

श्री राम सेवक यादव (बाराबंकी) :
श्रीमी मैं ने एक बात कही है, उस की सफाई
नहीं हुई है ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं ने आप से कहा है
कि मैं आपको भेजता हूँ । आप इसी वक्त
चाहते हैं यह कैसे हो सकता है । मैं ने
कहा है कि अभी इत्तिला देता हूँ । और आप
क्या चाहते हैं ?

12.07 hrs.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS*—Contd.

MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on the Demands for Grants under the control of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power. **Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh.**

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy (Koppal): I want to raise a point of order.

Mr. Speaker: About what?

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: About the discussion that has started now. I shall just take one minute. I want to place before you and the House one point, since you are the custodian of the privileges of the House. It is about the validity of the decision of the Minister of Irrigation and Power which he announced before this House on the 23rd March, with regard to the Godavari-Krishna river basin. During the last budget discussion also, the

Minister of State, **Shri Alagesan**, and the Minister of Irrigation and Power, **Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim**—both of them—assured this House that as soon as the Gulhati Commission's report, which was a fact-finding report, was out, it would be placed before this House, and the House will be given an opportunity, and after that, the Ministry or the Minister would take a decision, whatever it may be. Though the report was submitted in August, 1962, it was not placed before the House. For such a long time, they had considered the report behind the scene, and only a statement saying that the Commission had been appointed was made in the Lok Sabha on 3rd May, 1961. But the Commission's report has not been placed before this House earlier, and we have not been given any opportunity to place before the House our views at least on the facts. The facts are clearly stated.....

Mr. Speaker: He cannot go into the facts now.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: I am not going into the facts. I am only saying that an opportunity has not been given to us to make our views known before the House. The decision taken by the Ministry should be made null and void.

Mr. Speaker: Very well, I have followed him.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: After giving us an opportunity, they may take whatever decision they want to take. That is my submission.

Mr. Speaker: Let him hear the reply of the hon. Minister first. **Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh.**

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh (Parbhani): Sir, Frankly speaking, I must confess at the outset that I rise to condemn the statement made by the hon. Minister of Irrigation and Power—the statement he was pleased to make—to the best of my ability, be-

*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

[Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh]

cause I think that it is the requirement not only of the regions of Maharashtra and Mysore but it is in the interests of the nation as a whole. Let us not forget this basic fact,—

Mr. Speaker: Did he say, "condemn" the statement?

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy (Kurnool): He says he condemns it.

Mr. Speaker: That is not the usual language that they should use. He can contest it, he can controvert it, he can give his arguments against it, but it is not the usual procedure to use such a word or phrase, as "condemn". (Interruptions).

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: I would like to amend it this way, then.

Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur): Since you have been pleased to give a ruling that.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun): It is not a ruling. I think it is not a ruling.

Shri Nath Pai: Let me raise my point. Mr. Speaker, you have been very pleased to remark and observe that whereas the Member is free to controvert, to challenge, he is not well-advised to condemn. May I know if it is not quite within the right of the Members of this House to condemn the decisions by the Government if they think so? (Interruption). It is not derogatory; it is not unparliamentary, and he is within his rights. I think the Member is absolutely entitled to say that he condemns it.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. That is not fair on the part of the hon. Member without listening to me just to say that he was perfectly within his right. I have just advised him that it is not usual to say like that. When a Minister has made a statement, the other can say all things that he requires. He has still to give those facts. Before listening to me, the hon. Member says that he is perfectly

within his rights to say that. I did not debar him from saying anything he liked, but I told him that it is not usual to say at the outset, when an hon. Member begins his speech that, "I condemn the statement of the hon. Minister." Let him give out those facts; let him give the counter-arguments, controvert the Minister's statement and then that might be the conclusion he can arrive at the end. Let him give his arguments.

Shri Tyagi: It was an advisory remark. (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: I only said that it is not usual to start like that.

Shri Nath Pai: It was advisory, not mandatory.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath (Hoshangabad): Can the House take it that you do not consider that the word "condemn" is in any way unparliamentary....

Mr. Speaker: Did I say that?

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: ... but only it should not be used at the outset. You said, it should not be used in the beginning and it is wrong to use it at the outset. He has said so and he may give the reasons now.

Mr. Speaker: I said that it is not usual to start with that observation. First the hon. Member should give those arguments. He should develop his point. He should controvert the statement that has been made by the other and then he can come to that conclusion and use that word if he is so pressed. (Interruptions). I do not know what more I can say to explain, if even now I had not been able to explain it.

Shri Hari Vishnu Kamath: Suppose at the outset, I say, I strongly object to the Minister's statement and then I give my reasons. Is it wrong? (Interruptions).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Mr. Deshmukh may continue.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: I am sorry for having flared up the feelings so high by the initial remark that I was compelled to make. Still, I cannot help making that remark, but instead of using the word "condemn", I would prefer to say that I very strongly object to the Minister's statement.

Mr. Speaker: Nobody objects to that. It was only a reaction, because the Members on this side wanted him to say that. That might have been relished by them, but I did not relish that.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: Looking at the statement which has been made by the Minister for Irrigation and Power, one cannot help thinking that it is a revival of the 1951 agreement, though apparently and ostensibly the statement starts by condemning the agreement of 1951 and making it clear that the Ministry of Law and the Attorney General thought that the agreement is illegal *ab initio* and not enforceable in law. Precisely my grudge is that what is illegal, what is unenforceable in law is being enforced or brought into by the back-door.

Precisely the object of the 1951 agreement was to distribute the undistributed portion of the share of Krishna and Godavari waters by way of a conference. The way by which the conference arrived at the decision and the legal flaws in the agreement made it unenforceable in law. Precisely the objection of the Maharashtra and Mysore Governments to this was that over and above being illegal and unenforceable in law, the agreement is unjust, not based on equity and of an arbitrary nature. The same objection, the same story, still stands in spite of the statement of the Minister, because while going through the proceedings of the conference, one finds that 240

TMC were allotted to Bombay, 280 TMC to Hyderabad, 10 TMC to Mysore and 470 TMC to Madras out of 1000 TMC of waterflow that was adjudged by the conference to be available for distribution. The conference then held that 700 TMC of water out of Krishna was already committed and under actual use. Therefore, now, when the Gulati Commission says that 2500 TMC of water is still available in Krishna, when the Gulati Commission does not seriously challenge this estimation of 2500 TMC of water, when in the proceedings of the 1951 conference itself it was made clear by the then Chief Engineers of Madras and Maharashtra, that the co-efficient at Vijayawada weir being wrong this calculation of 1700 TMC of water is itself wrong when the Chief Engineer of Maharashtra also objected that it does not take into consideration the factor of regeneration of water which is most vital and when the engineers were agreed on this point that it is absolutely an under-estimate to calculate 1700 TMC discharge in Krishna at Vijayawada, the politicians anyhow came to an agreement that it is only 1000 TMC of water which remains and it was decided on the basis of 50:50 taking into consideration the demand and supply. Obviously, this very fact shows that in spite of the statement of the hon. Minister it remains in the same form as it is, because even in 1951-56 TMC of water was held to be under use by the then Bombay State, 19 TMC of water by Hyderabad, 68 TMC by Mysore State and 65 TMC by the then Madras State. Thus the previous Bombay State then had 295 TMC of water,—that is the water that was allotted from the un-utilised portion and also the water that was held to be under utilisation—Hyderabad had 370 TMC of water, Mysore had 78 TMC of water and Madras had 535 TMC.

Therefore, the figures of 400 TMC to Maharashtra, 600 TMC to Mysore and 800 TMC to Andhra, which have been allowed by the hon. Minister for Irrigation and Power under this agree-

[Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh] ment, are precisely the same figures arrived at by the 1951 agreement. So when a show is being made here on the floor of the House that Mysore and Maharashtra have been given 120 TMC each more, I think this argument falls to the ground if we take into consideration the fact that Marathawada areas which were formerly constituted into Hyderabad have now come to Maharashtra, certain areas in the two districts of the then Bombay State have gone to Mysore and Kannada-speaking districts of Hyderabad had gone to Mysore. If this regional distribution is taken into account, the figures of 600 TMC to Mysore and 400 TMC to Maharashtra are exactly the same figures that were there before the 1951 agreement. It is because of this reason that we say, when the 1951 agreement proceeded on the basis of 1700 TMC of water and when the hon. Minister is said to distribute 1800 TMC of water.....

Shrimati Yashoda Reddy: What is the area that you lost and the area that you gained after the SRC?

Shrimati Vimla Devi (Eluru): 12,000 square miles.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: The hon. lady Member knows what was the area ceded from Bombay to Mysore. It is much less than the area which ultimately Maharashtra got from Marathawada and Vidarbha.

Mr. Speaker, when the hon. Minister for Irrigation and Power rises and makes a statement that he is going to distribute 1800 TMC of water, 100 TMC more than what it was before the 1951 agreement and distributes only 50 TMC to Maharashtra and 50 TMC to Mysore, as if they were crumbs or pieces of bread for distribution between Maharashtra and Mysore, what kind of equity, what kind of good conscience, what kind of justice is it? The hon. Minister for Irrigation and power thinks that with whatever they have allotted to Maharashtra and Mysore, it would be quite possible, in the circumstances, for the

development of Maharashtra and Mysore. On the contrary, the people of Maharashtra and Mysore very honestly and sincerely feel that their future fate in the matter of development on both the irrigation and the power fronts has been completely sealed by this statement, and it has been profusely stated in the papers of Maharashtra and Mysore that this agreement virtually is the signing of the death warrant of Maharashtra and Mysore for no fault of the people of those States. This *ex parte* judgment of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power, based on the same considerations that were there before the 1951 Agreement, placing Maharashtra and Mysore on even worse condition than Maharashtra and Mysore were in 1951, instead of being any help towards progress and solution of the problem, will ultimately open the floodgates of resentment and dissatisfaction in Maharashtra and Mysore which it will not be possible even for this Government to control, unless proper steps are taken to revise the agreement and assure the people of Maharashtra and Mysore that their needs will be looked into with a sympathetic attitude at New Delhi.

The hon. Minister of Irrigation and Power conveniently forgets that there are opposition parties in Maharashtra and Mysore Legislatures and they will go to the extent of carrying their problem to the streets. People who are conversant and familiar with the agitation in Maharashtra know it only too well that problems that should have been settled by politicians in the cool atmosphere of the chambers of the legislatures, if those problems are allowed to be taken to the streets, it leads to violent agitation, and those violent agitations, instead of helping anybody, ultimately leads us nowhere.

Shri Mansinh P. Patej (Mehsana): There should be no challenges in this House.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am not allowing the hon. Members to settle their arguments between themselves.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: Much has been said about the westerly diversion for Maharashtra State by the hon. Members and Dr. K. L. Rao was pleased to state that Maharashtra, instead of throwing water in the Arabian sea, should use it for irrigation purposes. I think an engineer of Dr. Rao's understanding and learning should know it that hydel electricity costs less than half of thermal electricity, and in the case of Maharashtra it does not cost a single naya Paisa for transmission because the site of the hydel projects are right on the consumption zone, which has been referred to by my hon. friend, Shri Khadilkar.

We have spent so far Rs. 66 crores for diverting 67.5 TMC water for the Koyna Project. According to scientific study carried out by eminent economists with an additional investment of only Rs. 4 crores the income that would be due from Koyna Project would double itself. At present we hope to get Rs. 10 crores from selling power that would be available from Koyna. By investing Rs. 66 crores which is the nation's money which this House has sanctioned, Maharashtra hopes to get Rs. 10 crores by way of selling electricity and the maintenance charges amount to Rs. 9.70 crores, which means that Maharashtra hopes to get a paltry Rs. 30 lakhs by diverting 66.5 TMC water. If we could divert an additional 40 TMC of water, the return from sale of electricity leaps to Rs. 20 crores and the volume of electricity produced is more two and a half times. So, Maharashtra gets Rs. 10 crores per annum for a further investment of a paltry sum of Rs. 4 crores, and it will not require even one year for the completion of the project. (*Interruptions*). Is it not reasonable to expect, purely on grounds of national sentiment, purely on grounds of economic considerations that the modest and very reasonable demand of Maharashtra should be acceded to? (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: I would only advise him to be a little more moderate, because he is being opposed by ladies.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: Further, much hullabaloo is made of the westerly diversion in the statement of the hon. Minister himself. It is not as if every drop of water that is diverted to west ultimately goes to the Arabian Sea. We have the instance of one individual, Shri Jamshedji Tata, who with his ingenuity diverted 40 TMC of water at Mushi and Pophli lakes and today we have the prosperous and magnificent Bombay city with its huge population, merely out of 40 TMC of water. What enormous industries will grow if virtually the Koyna water up to 100 TMC is diverted? In that case, waters flowing in the westerly direction, instead of falling into the Arabian Sea, will virtually go to the sea of industry for industrial consumption, and nobody, not even Dr. Rao, can challenge the statement that industrial requirements of water should have the first priority over even the irrigation requirements. There it is not as if the westerly diversion is not to be touched with a pair of tongs by the Ministry of Irrigation and Power. Therefore, I say that the whole attitude of the westerly diversion is based on prejudices, rather than based on pure economic considerations; rather than on national interest, it is based on certain basic prejudices against Maharashtra. Koyna and other hydel projects are not purely hydel projects. They are irrigation-cum-hydel projects. So, what has been stated specifically in this statement debar Maharashtra from westerly diversion of water even for irrigation purposes. I hope, on purely human considerations, the demand of Maharashtra and Mysore will be reconsidered and the statement revised if at all this problem is to be solved to the satisfaction of all parties concerned.

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Minister.

Shri K. N. Pande (Hata): I only want to ask one question.

Mr. Speaker: I will allow him to do so afterwards.

The Minister of Irrigation and Power (Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim):

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the discussion on the Demands of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power was held in this House yesterday and I heard very attentively what was said here. When we adjourned yesterday I came to the conclusion that the reply by my Minister of State covered the ground in connection with the various matters which were raised here. Therefore I do not feel it necessary to go into any of those matters except this question of the Godavari and the Krishna waters. But before doing that, I will place some information before hon. Members about a few things because I feel that that information should also go to hon. Members and they should know it.

There was much discussion about the shortage of power in the country. Something was said about it; but there is some information which was not with us yesterday and we got it today in order that I may place it before this House in order to show what actual steps have been taken, where they have been taken and what the effect of them may be expected to be. So, I shall state what has been done in order to remove the shortage of power, which is there at present, as far as possible.

I will read out something from this paper which I have. They are:—

Installation of a third unit of 75 MW at Durgapur Coke Oven Power Station of West Bengal.

Installation of 6 x 1.5 MW turbo-alternator sets at suitable locations in West Bengal. These are expected to be installed during the current Plan.

Installation of additional 9 MW unit at Jaldhaka Stage I Project.

Substitution of 2 x 30 MW units agreed to for expansion to the Barauni thermal station in Bihar by 2 x 50 MW units,

1 x 5 MW unit for the Disalgarh Electric Supply Company.

1 x 50 MW unit for the Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation. This should be commissioned by October this year.

Assam: 10 MWs.

This is the region which is known as the Eastern Region. Now, I come to the Central region.

Installation of 2 units of 30 MW each at Kanpur. These are likely to be commissioned during 1964-65.

Installation of the sixth generating unit of 60 MW at Rihand.

120 MW captive power plant near Rihand for the Hindustan Aluminium Corporation.

In the Northern region—

Installation of 15 MW thermal generating set at Faridabad.

Installation of 15 MW thermal generating plant in Delhi.

Ten 1 MW units for Punjab.

For Jammu and Kashmir 10 MW plant at Kalakot to be raised to 20 MW.

Southern region.

Two gas turbo units of 10 MW each for Andhra Pradesh are due to arrive in the month of June.

Two similar gas turbo units of 10 MW each for Mysore.

Additional power from Neyveli through the process of integrated grid system between the Southern States.

This is the arrangement which has been made for the various States where there are shortages which will also help during this emergency.

Shri Priya Gupta (Katihar): How many were Hydel power and how many thermal power?

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: I have stated. What has been provided, I have stated. (*Interruptions*).

Something was said about the utilisation of irrigation potential. It has reached 70 per cent. We have been taking several steps and they were also mentioned here previously in answers to questions and they have been brought to the notice of hon. Members. But, I may say one thing about it particularly. My Ministry and the Planning Commission have emphasised on the State Governments the need for utilisation of the remaining potential as speedily as possible. The State Governments have been requested to enact suitable legislation to ensure that this is done. Recently, I sent one team of experts to the various States to discuss these and other matters regarding irrigation and power projects with the State Governments to ensure that the targets are fully achieved. Steps are being taken wherever necessary to see that all bottlenecks are removed. This is the attempt which we are making in this connection.

The next thing that I have to say is this. I regret, because no reliance is placed on my words by Members of this House.

Several Hon. Members: No, no.

Shri Harish Chandra Mathur: We have full reliance.

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: Hear me what I am saying. In your presence I gave a very clear assurance in this House in regard to the construction of the Farakka barrage. Very clear. A question was put to me and I gave an answer to that. I said very clearly that there is nothing which can prevent us from constructing the Farakka barrage. We shall construct it. It is going to be constructed. It is being constructed at present. It will be completed by 1969.

As far as Flood control is concerned, something was said about Assam. For Assam, over and above their

normal requirement, Rs. 120 lakhs were provided in 1962-63 and Rs. 150 lakhs have been provided in 1963-64, for additional flood control schemes. The other State Governments are also taking necessary short term and long term flood control measures for mitigating the suffering of the people and minimising the danger to life and property.

There is one thing that I should mention. There were certain disputes in regard to floods, etc. with Nepal. They have been settled. That is good news for U.P. particularly and for Bihar particularly and for so many others.

As far as foreign exchange is concerned, it was notoriously known that one gets foreign exchange after a very long time, sometimes one year and two years. We have—when I say we, I mean the Ministry of Irrigation and Power; I may say we by mistake; I am nothing; I am part and parcel of the Ministry—my Ministry has curtailed that. I am sure of one thing. Generally, you will get it within two weeks. The whole procedure has been overhauled and so many unnecessary stages have been curtailed and the time has been reduced to two weeks.

I may say again that an Indo-Nepal Co-ordination Board has been established for this purpose with two Chief Engineers on either side and they will meet from time to time to discuss important issues in regard to disputes between the State of Nepal, U.P., etc. What I said about Nepal, one thing may be kept in mind. The hope is strong that everything will be settled amicably now.

Now, I come to the controversy about this. First, I will say this. Not only now as Minister, not only as a Member of Legislature, in spite of being a legal practitioner in my life, I have always believed that there should be no litigation and if there arise some disputes, they should be settled amicably. When this dispute arose, hon. Members might remember now that I

[Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim]

myself, accompanied by the Deputy Minister who was at that time Shri Hathi, and the Secretary, approached the States. We went to them, had talks with them over this matter and they came to the view, yes, this should be settled amicably, and this sort of thing which had been there should not be there. Then, this matter was taken up and the Gulhati Commission was set up.

May I say one thing which is not relevant to this? I remember one Gentleman from that side said that he did not know what the report is. I placed a copy of the report on the Table of the House. Not only that...

Shri Hanumanthaiya (Bangalore City): What the hon. Member wanted was an opportunity to discuss that report in the House before coming to a decision.

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: Through you, may I bring this to the notice of the hon. Members that this will be detrimental to the interests of the States concerned. It will be detrimental always in a dispute in any way to discuss it here in this House.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: It was discussed now.

Mr. Speaker: Order, order.

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: This is no discussion. This is an attempt at understanding. I have got some doubt in my mind. I am clearing that up. That is nothing. The Member rises and says this sort of thing. That should never be done.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: They have discussed it.

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: This is a personal matter. But, I speak here in this House on the basis of the experience of legislature since 1922. There have come examples before me, before I came into the Government and after coming into the Government both

times, and I have found that it has always proved very detrimental. (Interruptions).

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I rise to a point of order. To say....

Shri Basappa (Tiptur): On a point of order....

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: I am not yielding....

Some Hon. Members: It is a point of order. (Shri Hanumanthaiya resumed his seat).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. I am glad that age in India is still respected.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I fully respect his age.

Mr. Speaker: Is it a point of order?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Yes. (Laughter). It is too serious a matter for joking and laughter.

Shri Osman Ali Khan (Anantapur): What is the point of order?

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I am coming to that. The Speaker will ask what the point of order is. The point of order is this that the Minister says that it would be dangerous and it would be infructuous to take this House into confidence on such matters....

Some Hon. Members: No, no.

An Hon. Member: He did not say that.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: I want the proceedings to be read as to what he said. I do not want the evidence of people who get excited.

Very often it has happened, and I read in the papers also—I was not in the House—that it has become the fashion for the Treasury Bench Members to take privilege under secrecy and to deny the right to this House to discuss matters and come to a decision. I am firmly of the opinion that this kind of psychology ought to be

resisted. If at all, the Ministers ought to take advice and by having consultation they have to guide themselves instead of riding the high horse and saying that this House is incapable of taking decisions by saying that it would be dangerous to discuss such things.

Mr. Speaker: I have followed it. There is no point of order. Now, the hon. Minister may continue.

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: I was speaking about the Krishna-Godavari Commission. At the outset, I must congratulate Mr. Gulhati and the companions who worked with him in this connection. I also thank the States; they helped us and they co-operated with us in this matter. I must thank also my Ministry and particularly my Secretary who has done a lot in this connection, and who has been very very helpful. He has thrown light also on so many matters, and we have been able to understand so many things from him. So, all of them are entitled to our thanks.

Shri Sivamurthi Swamy: The spirit of the Gulhati Commission has been dishonoured.

Some Hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: It would be better if we listen to the Minister patiently and then ask any questions that we want to ask.

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: What has been said by Members today was said yesterday also. The same things have been repeated from this side and that side. My suggestion is this, though this is now a past affair. But, rather, it should be remembered, and I would request hon. Members to accept this, that I am prepared to do what I am saying. If instead of discussing here and making speeches in that way, in that tone and with that pose which has been used in this connection, it would have been very useful if my mistakes would have been pointed out to me by coming to me and by sitting with my technical per-

sonnel; then I would have heard the hon. Members and told them the truth about what was said by them.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: Even that opportunity has not been given to us.

Hafiz Mohammed Ibrahim: That is my suggestion and that might be accepted. (*Interruptions*) If it is not a suggestion then that is another matter. But the real step which should have been taken was that we should have been approached, or I should have been called somewhere in order that I might be told whether I was wrong or whether I was right, or whether I was doing something against justice and so on. I may tell you that we have kept in view the interests of every State.

Shri Shankaraiya (Mysore): The Mysore members were not given full opportunity.

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: We have not done any injustice to any State. I claim it. No one can prove it to the contrary. If someone will raise this question how I say so, or on what basis I say so, then I shall have to answer him if anyone raises any such question, I would not bother him here but I would invite him to come to me, and I can make him understand fully that we have neither shown any favour nor have we shown any apathy to any State, and the rights of no State have been curtailed at all and they will never be curtailed. They will enjoy them in the future. This arrangement is for fifteen years. The schemes have been mentioned, and the quantities have been mentioned. If I have got schemes with me only worth 200 TMC why should there be schemes for any more water at the present moment? If you want to get water again, that is not refused. That will be distributed afterwards also. A period of fifteen years has been prescribed. For fifteen years, the schemes have been taken, and these schemes take care of every State. No State has been left out. So, I do not know, and I am unable to understand

[Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim]

what this attitude is. I do not know how this can be the attitude of any of the States. No Minister can have this attitude; no Minister to whom this matter relates can have that attitude; he cannot speak like this to me, I am sure he cannot blame me at all. My Ministry cannot be blamed in this connection.

So, the hon. Members of the House, of a House such as this, have to be calm and quiet, and they should understand and try to understand and then form opinions about it.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: This statement of yours has come as a bolt from the blue. We did not even have an inkling of it that it would come in this form.

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: My statement only came in that way in which statements have been coming in this House. (Interruptions) I need not take more time. I thank all the Members who have participated in the debate.

श्री काशीनाथ पंडे (हाता) : मैं एक बहुत जरूरी सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ ।

Mr. Speaker: With this tone and this conclusion, are there any further questions needed now?

Several Hon. Members: No.

Shri Khadilkar (Khed): I do not want to spoil the atmosphere . . .

Mr. Speaker: If one Member rises, then another Member will also rise and that will add to the controversy.

Shri Khadilkar: Excuse me, Sir . . .

Shri Thirumala Rao: The hon. Member is an active participant in the controversy and he would be spoiling the atmosphere by putting question now. But here is a gentleman sitting behind me, who wants to ask a question on something not connected with this affair at all. He is from UP. And he is wanting to have

a chance. But he is not being given a chance to put a question, while one of the active participants to the controversy like us is being allowed. I would beg of you, Sir, to allow Shri K. N. Pande to put his question.

Mr. Speaker: Shri Khadilkar is not putting a question. Shri Thirumala Rao should not be impatient. As far as I can foresee, what Shri Khadilkar is wanting to say is that a proper reply has not been given to all the points that were raised.

Shri Khadilkar: As I said, I do not want to spoil the atmosphere in which the Minister of Irrigation and Power has concluded his speech. It was a very short and a sweet speech. I must say that I have also all regard for age. I remember and ancient adage that old people should not be questioned! believe that:

वृद्धास्ते न विचारणीय चरितः ।

But I would submit one thing. Unfortunately, when an important decision is taken and debated in the House, and I must put it on record that you cannot treat the House in such a casual manner when so many States and so many millions of people are involved. There ought to have been an attempt to give some satisfactory reply to the points raised, but that has not been done. And that is my disappointment.

Mr. Speaker: That is right, and some other Members also might raise similar questions. But what the hon. Minister has pleaded is that it would be much better if those hon. Members sat with him together and then tried to understand what the implications of that report are. It would be much better discussed there. Here we would be only raising further controversies, and we would not be coming to an agreement. Can an agreement be reached here by putting questions and cross-questions?

Several Hon. Members: No.

Mr. Speaker: Some hon. Members might have some grievance against the decision, and in some it may be justified also. But we would not be able to reach an agreement here. Therefore, the Minister has only asked those Members concerned to go and sit with him and discuss all those things, and if after that discussion—I have got a notice also seeking to raise a discussion—the hon. Members or some of them feel that there ought to be some further discussion on that, then, of course, there are courses open to the Members to take it up.

Shri Shivaji Rao S. Deshmukh: I gave notice seeking to raise a discussion on the same statement.

Mr. Speaker: How can that take place before the debate on the Demands of the Ministry had taken place? If even after this debate and the further discussion with the hon. Minister, Members feel that there ought to be a separate discussion, they can give notice.

Shri Hanumanthaiya: Very good.

Mr. Speaker: That is the only thing we can do just at this moment. Otherwise, the atmosphere that has been created would, I think, not be maintained. Now we shall not put any further questions.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla (Mahasamund): I want to ask a question on other matters.

Shri K. N. Pande: The hon. Minister also knows that in two districts of eastern UP, Gorakhpur and Deoria, which are thickly populated, in the last two years crops in lakhs of acres of land have been destroyed by floods in the Bari Gandak. A bund was to be constructed at the rising place of the river to save that area. What has happened to that? Has some agreement been arrived at with the Nepal Government in this matter?

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: Probably the hon. Member did not follow what I said about the arrangements being

made between Nepal and India. There is a Committee which is going into these questions. This question will also come up there.

Shri Vidya Charan Shukla: What has come out of the Committee constituted under the chairmanship of Shri Sachdev, Secretary, Ministry of Irrigation and Power, to decide about the distribution of Rihand power between Madhya Pradesh and UP? Have any further steps been taken by the Ministry to solve this problem in an expeditious manner?

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: This matter has been mentioned before in this House. There was a discussion on that. In the reply thereon, I had said that the decision arrived at the Zonal Council regarding Rihand power to be given to Madhya Pradesh was that the two Chief Ministers should sit together and decide between themselves. Both the Chief Ministers sat together and came to a decision. Probably a committee was formed and they came to a certain decision. Something happened; on account of that, that has been upset, nullified. So that does not stand. Another committee was formed of which my Secretary was made the Chairman. That committee decided something. That also has not so far been accepted. The only thing I can say is that I will try; I pray God that I be helped by Him to settle this matter.

Regarding the question raised by Shri Khadilkar, the points regarding the Commission were replied to by my hon. colleague, Shri Alagesan. So I did not say anything about it.

Mr. Speaker: May I put all the cut motions together?

Some hon. Members: yes.

Mr. Speaker: I shall now put all the cut motions together to the vote of the House.

The cut motions were then put and negatived.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the respective sums not in the fourth column of the order paper, be granted to the President, to complete the sums necessary to defray the charges that will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March 1964, in respect of the heads of demands entered in the second column thereof against Demands No. 68, 69, 70, 133 and 134, relating to the Ministry of Irrigation and Power'.

The motion was adopted.

[The motions of Demands for Grants which were adopted by the Lok Sabha are reproduced below—Ed.]

DEMAND NO. 68—MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER

"That the sum not exceeding Rs. 24,94,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Ministry of Irrigation and Power'."

DEMAND NO. 69—MULTI-PURPOSE RIVER SCHEMES

"That the sum not exceeding Rs. 1,09,20,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Multi-purpose River Schemes'."

DEMAND NO. 70—OTHER REVENUE EXPENDITURE OF THE MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER

"That the sum not exceeding Rs. 5,01,71,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in

respect of 'Other Revenue Expenditure of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power'."

DEMAND NO. 133—CAPITAL OUTLAY ON MULTI-PURPOSE RIVER SCHEMES

"That the sum not exceeding Rs. 9,42,93,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Capital Outlay on Multi-purpose River Schemes'."

DEMAND NO. 134—OTHER CAPITAL OUTLAY OF THE MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER

"That the sum not exceeding Rs. 16,66,98,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of payment during the year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, in respect of 'Other Capital Outlay of the Ministry of Irrigation and Power'."

12.55 hrs.

MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up discussion and voting on Demand Nos. 71 to 74 and 135 relating to the Ministry of Labour and Employment for which 5 hours have been allotted.

Hon. Members desirous of moving their cut motions may send slips to the Table within 15 minutes indicating which of the cut motions they would like to move.

DEMAND NO. 71—MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr. Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the sum not exceeding Rs. 24,84,000 be granted to the President to complete the sum necessary to defray the charges which will come in course of pay-