

PUNJAB RIVER WATERS: SADDE PANI SADDE HAQ

INTRODUCTION

1. Punjab has exclusive rights over its rivers enshrined in the constitution of India as per Article 246 (Part XI), entry 17 of list II. The rights regarding water usage from a natural resource such as a lake, stream or a river are known as riparian rights. Riparian rights¹ determine who can and cannot use the waters. The word "Riparian" comes from Latin word 'Riparius' - meaning dwellings or living along the banks of river or other body of water. Riparian rights is a natural right, it can neither be taken away nor it can be granted. If we look at the map of India, the state boundaries are clear proof that Satluj, Beas and Ravi only flow in Punjab state before they enter from Himachal / J&K. The Satluj flows a hundred kilometers, the Beas two hundred kilometers and Ravi three hundred kilometers from Haryana border and even more from Delhi & Rajasthan. Therefore, it is factual that no other state other than Punjab, Himachal & J&K have riparian rights over Satluj, Beas and Ravi.

2. In 1966, when Haryana was created, Centre by inserting clauses 78, 79 & 80 in Punjab Reorganization Act also divided the Punjab river waters. Yamuna which flowed in undivided Punjab was left out and for that centre has not given any reasonable answer till date. These clauses pertain to rights and liabilities for the 'purpose of Bhakhra-Nangal / Beas Projects. 'Purpose' of the project must have been mentioned in Project Reports prepared before the launch of the projects. Division of water was arbitrary. "On what basis are the successor states deemed as rightful stake holders of waters? There is no parallel to such contestation of water rights by a non-riparian successor states. In this respect there is a significant precedent when state of Madras was bifurcated, it lost all the rights to the water of Krishna and Pannar rivers because Madras became non-riparian in regard to these rivers which after bifurcation belong to Andhra Pradesh^{1A} alone. These clauses mentioned in the Punjab Reorganization Act are ultravires and unconstitutional.

3. In fact, no province in India gives its river waters to non-riparian state, but Punjab is an exception. Non riparian state Rajasthan takes away 11.2 MAF, Haryana 6 MAF and Delhi 0.2 MAF, a total of 17.4 MAF out of available 28.5 MAF water in Punjab. Being a food bowl of India and a agrarian state, Punjab's agriculture is dependent upon 14 lacs of tubewells which are depleting ground water. Now, ground water is being pumped from more than 350 feet depth i.e. from third layer which takes millions of years to get recharged. Water table has been depleted to such an extent that Punjab is moving towards desertification. Punjab government vide suit no. 2 of 2007 filed in Supreme Court of India has challenged the vires of Sector 78, 79 of Punjab

Re-Organization Act, 1966. Dr. Dharmvir Gandhi, Ex-MP from Punjab and others have also challenged vide CWP 12422 of 2018 in Punjab & Haryana High Court clauses 78, 79, 80 of the Punjab Reorganization Act, declaration of section 14 of inter-state river water disputes act as unconstitutional, claimed compensation of Rs.32 Lakh Crores to Punjab in lieu of river waters supplies to non riparian states of Rajasthan and others decision of courts is awaited. As on date 18 cases pertaining to river waters are pending in courts (Annexure-1).

4. The issue of distribution of the waters of Punjab rivers as it stands now, is hopelessly complicated, best brains have been employed to distort and confuse it. Keeping this in view, issues related to Haryana have been delinked and not covered in this paper for the purpose of clarity. This paper deals with as how most of the water from all the three rivers of Punjab with utter regard to constitution has been forcibly diverted to the "Thar Desert" without any economic considerations.

5. In fact, loot of Punjab river water was planned through a well thought out strategy. Rajasthan canal project was conceived in 1948 and digging of canal was done during fifties when Punjab was healing the wounds of partition. Work of Harike Head Works on the confluence of Satluj and Beas rivers with the provision of gates for Rajasthan canal was completed in 1952. Ravi water could not be brought to Rajasthan, this was done by linking Ravi Beas canal thorough Madhopur Head Works. In 1955, the centre allocated 8 MAF of water to Rajasthan. The order was passed on a "secret" file which was later given the shape of an agreement by the centre by putting pressure on Punjab Government. To mollify Punjab a 'clause' for making payment towards the cost of water to be worked out later was inserted in the order which has not been honored till date. Centre says water to Rajasthan was given to justify 'water-use' for negotiations with Pakistan for signing the 'Indus Water Treaty' in 1960, which is not true.

5 (a) Punjab's "Upper Riparian" claims over Indus water frustrated Nehru³ as Kashmir issue taken up by India with UN was pending and he was ready to sacrifice 'water' for 'peace'. US viewed strategic importance of Pakistan⁴ in view of situation prevailing in the Middle East and also to check Soviet influence in SE Asia. India without following any riparian laws/ doctrines on water sharing was too generous to give 80 percent of Indus water to Pakistan at the cost of Punjab and other North Indian states. Plausible reason would have been to get some favourable settlement on Kashmir and some economic concessions like wheat supplies from US⁵. But results were catastrophic, Pakistan after signing IWT and receiving American Arms attacked India in 1965. Delhi, having failed at international diplomacy came down heavily on

Punjab to rob river waters which were not sufficient for Punjab's own use. The process was set in motion to take more than 50% of water of Eastern rivers from Punjab to Rajasthan through Rajasthan canal (now known as Indira Gandhi canal).

6. Only, natural resource Punjab has is river waters. No state gives its natural resource free. Bihar, Assam, Jharkhand sell their coal and raw iron. Madhya Pradesh gets royalty for coal and teak. Similarly, Rajasthan sells its marble and clay. Water is a need, so is coal for power plants, raw iron for steel mills, stones / teak for building materials, oil for machines and vehicles. What logic can Delhi offer to Punjab that its water is a national need and hence to be shared, but the other needs of Punjab like coal oil, stone, gas can only be fulfilled through payments? If water is to be divided, the other resource should also be divided free of cost with Punjab.

INDUS WATER TREATY (IWT) - INDIA'S WATER SHARE

7. It is important to understand IWT regarding water sharing signed between India and Pakistan as it has affected Punjab's interest most. IWT was signed by Jawahar Lal Nehru, Prime Minister of India and Mr. Ayub Khan, President of Pakistan on 19th September, 1960 under the aegis of UN Body (World Bank). India gave away four-fifths⁶ of the total waters of Indus system to Pakistan. The average replenishable flows of western rivers given to Pakistan were computed 135.5 MAF per year while India settled its share as 32.8 MAF yearly through three small rivers i.e. Satluj, Beas and Ravi. Experts feel that this was more of a diplomatic action to reduce hostility in Kashmir, thereby interests of our basin states Punjab, J&K and Himachal were compromised.

8. The Indus sharing formula was heavily weighed in Pakistan's favour because India's 'upper riparian' claims were ignored. The other factors⁷ spelled out in customary international law given below were also ignored:-

(a) Contribution of water by Indian basin state was not considered. Jhelum, Chenab, Ravi and Beas rise in India, while maximum water contribution to Indus and Satluj which rise from Tibet is also from India.

(b) Size of population dependent upon basin waters of each country i.e. India has much more larger population to feed than Pakistan.

(c) Future national needs i.e. for industrial, power generation and exponential rise in population.

(d) About 400 kms. of Indus basin is in Indian territory.

9. Had such a holistic framework been the basis of the treaty negotiations, a much different sharing formula would likely have emerged. India gave away 80% of Indus water to Pakistan. Punjab being an agrarian state is affected most. One of the Indian Negotiator Mr. Niranjana Gulati, candidly admitted in his book "Indus Water Treaty" - India went for negotiations without any study / preparations⁸. It has thrown up many questions. Negotiations for the treaty went on over a decade. Who was heading the negotiations? It appears from the exchange of letters between India & Pak that Indian PM himself was acting as a Chief Negotiator. Nehru, shot down East Punjab's 'upper riparian' claims and the World Bank too did the same. The World Bank realized that the 'Absolute Sovereignty Principle'⁹ of using waters within territory as per Harmon Doctrine was unfavourable to Pakistan. The second option, principle of 'Equitable Utilization'¹⁰ was considered. Here again factors mentioned above as enunciated in Art 6 of UN water courses convention were ignored. Pakistan should not have got more than 50% of water from Indus System. It is a matter of deep concern that why was India so magnanimous to give water of three largest rivers to Pakistan. As an upper riparian state of Indus basin and most of the Head Works in India, Delhi was under no obligation to enter into a legal agreement. India could have asserted for "Full Rights" over the rivers as per international law of "Absolute Right Theory." Under the 1944 US-Mexico Water Treaty¹¹ US gives 1.5 MAF of water per year out of yearly 14.5 MAF of flow of Colorado river while India gives nine times more water to Pakistan. China is unwilling to enter into any bilateral water-sharing agreement with its co-riparian states i.e. India, Russia and others. China does not agree to water sharing formula's like existing water-use and historical entitlements.

10. Despite Pakistan's continuing hostilities against India since 1947-48, Nehru personally signed IWT that apportioned four-fifth of the Indus water to Pakistan - a munificent allocation by an upstream country unsurpassed in scale in the annals of international water pacts. Suspending or terminating a treaty during armed conflicts is not an uncommon practice. However, India has so far chosen not to do so. There are some provisions for India to use waters of western rivers as per Article III of IWT, which India should utilize. Having done that, under Article 62 of Vienna convention, India should reopen the IWT in apportioning a reasonable and equitable share keeping in view above referred factors and changed circumstances like climatic, hydrographic, hydrological, ecological characteristics of the basin. Article XII, para 3 & 4 of IWT also mention 'modification of the provisions' by another duly ratified treaty between

the two governments. However, of late, India has issued a notice to Pakistan for modification of Indus Water Treaty as per 'Tribune' news dated 27.01.2023.

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA - 1955 DECISION FOR WATER ALLOCATION

11. The total availability of water of Satluj, Beas and Ravi on the basis of 1921-22 flow series at that time was 32.58 MAF that included Satluj 13.30 MAF, Beas 12.85 MAF and Ravi 6.43 MAF. The dependable availability was 26.94 MAF. The Bhakhra project had already been conceptualized and partly implemented by that time to utilize the entire Satluj water. The issue was with Ravi and Beas water based on the mean supplies of 15.85 MAF.

12. The meeting of the inter-state conference on the development and utilization of waters of the rivers Ravi and Beas in the context of above flow assessment was held in Delhi on 29 Jan, 1955. This meeting was presided over by Union Minister of Power & Irrigation and attended by Punjab Irrigation Minister Chaudhary Lahri Singh, besides irrigation ministers from PEPSU, Rajasthan and J&K. The proposal was sent to Punjab Government by Centre on 01 Feb, 1955. This was not acceptable to Punjab Government. Chaudhary Lahri Singh Irrigation Minister of Punjab raised objections vide Punjab Govt. letters dated 07 Feb, 1955 and 14 Feb, 1955. Centre kept on mounting pressure on Punjab and wrote a strong letter on 8/9 Aug, 1955¹³. Finally, Chaudhary Lahri Singh under extreme pressure from centre signed the proposal on 2 Sept, 1955 after seven months.

13. That was the time when Punjab should have planned a new network of canal systems. The Indian Punjab mainly had the upper Bari Doab on Ravi taking off from Madhopur, Sirhind canal system on Satluj from Ropar and western Yamuna canal from Tajewala, now in Haryana. Present Punjab was under gravity flow. All these three canals were from the pre-partition period. It was only Bhakhra project that was undertaken during the post-partition period.

14. Allocation of water from Ravi and Beas was made as per decision / minutes of meeting attached (**Appendix A**). A large share of water was allocated to Rajasthan a non-riparian state as under:-

a)	Punjab	:	5.90 MAF
b)	Rajasthan	:	8.0 MAF
c)	J&K	:	0.65 MAF
d)	PEPSU	:	1.30 MAF
	Total	:	15.85 MAF

15. Two of the clauses under 1955 allocation are important.

Clause 1: In case of any variation in total supplies the shares shall be changed on pro-rata on the above allocation subject to the condition that no change shall be made in the allocation for Kashmir state which shall remain as 0.65 MAF.

Clause 5: The question of allocation of the cost of water including the cost of storage and other works may be taken up separately as the conference was concerned only with distribution of supplies.

16. Work on Rajasthan feeder was formally inaugurated on 31 March, 1958 by Union Home Minister G.B. Pant and water released on 11 October, 1961¹⁴. That was phase 1 of the project known as the Indira Gandhi canal. In Phase 2 canal water was taken upto Jaisalmer and Barmer. It is worth mentioning here that **firstly** neither centre nor Rajasthan Governments have taken any action to pay the cost of water to Punjab as per clause (5) of the Note 29 Jan, 1955. Rajasthan receives 8.6 MAF of water through Indira Gandhi Canal, 1.5 MAF through Bhakhra main line and 1.1 MAF through Gang Canal making total of 11.2 MAF of water. **Secondly**, Rajasthan continues to draw full water rather more than the allocation, though mean flow in Ravi and Beas has reduced due to climatic and ecological changes. Flow rate has not been verified during last 60 years. **Thirdly**, 1955 decision / agreement was never ratified by the state cabinet/ Punjab Assembly (violation of Article 299). **Fourthly**, There were good arable lands in districts of Punjab which later became part of Haryana and were left out as these required lift irrigation¹⁵, therefore, in accordance with instructions from Govt. of India, were not included for irrigation. However, this aspect of gravity flow was violated going by the lifts in Rajasthan as areas in west of Rajasthan Canal are not under gravity flow. Total of seven lift¹⁶ canals taking off from Rajasthan feeder have been provided.

17. There is yet another dimension as Rajasthan feeder canal project was originally finalized on 29 Oct, 1948. The work on the Harike Barrage from where this channel was to take off was completed in 1952. The project report on Rajasthan canal was already there when the 1955 allocation was decided. It is intriguing that Central Government claims Rajasthan areas were included for irrigation during negotiations with Pakistan as water sharing was done on actual water use basis. So, to say ploy used to outfox Pakistan was actually used against Punjab. **Surprising, Rajasthan Canal project finalized in 1948, provision for Rajasthan Canal made at Harike in 1952, water allocation of Ravi-Beas waters made in 1955, IWT signed in 1960 to retain Ravi & Beas waters in full while giving away all western rivers to Pakistan**

speaks a well planned strategy to rob water from Punjab and favouring Rajasthan. This allocation is now being justified as logic of protecting India's interest against Pakistan, while it is a robbery of water from Punjab on following counts :-

Firstly, Signing of IWT and Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan were overlapping. India gve away four-fifth of water to Pakistan from Indus system thereby using it a diplomatic tool to soften Pakistan's stand on Kashmir and also please Indian Muslim voters. At the most, India could have settled by giving 50% share to Pakistan and the water could have been used by our Northern states including Punjab.

Secondly, Union Govt. allocated 8 MAF (50%) of water from Ravi-Beas to Rajasthan a non riparian state which is unconstitutional.

Thirdly, Delhi betrayed Punjab by agreeing to give cost of water to be supplied to Rajasthan which has not been paid till date.

Fourthly, Harike is a reservoir in Punjab and all the rain water coming to Satluj from catchment areas is also being supplied to Rajasthan.

Fifthly, Provisions exist in IWT for India to use 7.01 Lakh acres of water from western rivers for irrigation over and above areas irrigated as on 1st April, 1960 and also construct reservoirs upto 3.6 MAF capacity for water for non-consumptive use. J&K should use water for western rivers instead of drawing 0.65 MAF from Punjab.

1955, ALLOCATION OF WATER TO RAJASTHAN - UNCONSTITUTIONAL

18. Rajasthan is a non-riparian to Ravi, Beas and Satluj rivers. Entry 56 of list I of Indian constitution limits the union's authority to "regulate and develop" Inter-State rivers only. It is so because there is no provision in constitution for exercise of the powers of union to deprive a riparian state of its legal right to ownership and control of its river waters. In fact, there is no doctrine / provision for favouring other non riparian states to allow them to use those waters without prior consent of the riparian State's Legislative Assembly or people. Further, it may be added that regarding a river, the unit state has full and exclusive legislative and executive powers under Article, 246 (3) and 162 of Indian constitution. Proprietary and sovereign rights of riparian states over the rivers flowing in their territory are fully acknowledged and protected by provisions of entry 17 of state list of the constitution.

19. It may be added that the aforesaid constitutional concept of supremacy of riparian states was also upheld in the case of Narmada water dispute where a

tribunal¹⁷, set by Govt. of India in 1969 to resolve the dispute over sharing of Narmada waters by the riparian states of Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Gujarat, rejected petition of Rajasthan on the ground that Rajasthan being non-riparian state was not entitled to any portion of waters of the Narmada.

20. It can be seen that allocation of more than 50% of water from Punjab a riparian state to Rajasthan a non riparian state by Union Govt. is arbitrary and unconstitutional. It is surprising that the quantity of water given by the riparian states of the country put together, to other non-riparian states is less than 20%¹⁸ of what Punjab alone has been compelled to give of its water to its neighboring states.

21. Ministry of Irrigation and Power, New Delhi vide its report 1972, Vol. III (Part-I) states Rajasthan's drainage area 15814 sq. kms. and Haryana's drainage area 9.939 sq. kms. as part of Indus Basin. Indian Water Resources website, also includes Rajasthan and Haryana as part of Indus Basin. River Basin has been defined by conference of International Law Association, held in 1958, as follows:-

"A drainage basin is an area with in territories of two or more states in which all the streams of flowing surface water, both natural and artificial, drain a common water shed terminating in a common outlet or common outlets either to the sea or to a lake or to some inland place from which there is no apparent outlet to a sea." The whole of the area drained by a river and its branches or tributaries is called river basin. But, Haryana, Rajasthan and Delhi do not feed the Satluj or other rivers in any way.

Above mentioned report of irrigation and power ministry has included river Ghaghar in Indus Basin by linking it with non-existent river Saraswati to justify Rajasthan claim on Punjab rivers. Ghaghar is the only river which rises from Shivaliks between Satluj and Yamuna. Few streams rising from Shivaliks converge into the Ghaghar. Therefore Ghaghar is an independent river with its own basin and also constitutes demarcation line between the Satluj and Yamuna i.e. between Indus and Gangetic basins. **That's why, neither on the riparian basis nor on the basin basis do these states have a claim on the waters of Punjab & Himachal Pradesh.** The matter is crystal clear¹⁹.

22. Central Govt. has no legal right to deprive specific areas of Punjab (PEPSU²⁰) of the water earmarked for them in the 1955 agreement. No part of 7.2 MAF of water allocated to Punjab & PEPSU under 1955 agreement could be given to the Haryana areas not considered in the 1955 agreement. **If these areas in Haryana were to be supplied water, the 1955 agreement should be re-opened.**

23. There is yet another intriguing aspect. It is the Ravi and Beas waters that were allocated. Waters of Ravi could not be brought to Rajasthan directly. Harike is at the confluence of Satluj and Beas. Ravi water has been diverted to Beas through Madhopur link. **Water from catchment area of Satluj which belongs to Punjab also goes to Rajasthan.**

RAJASTHAN CANAL

24. Rajasthan canal project (Now known as Indira Gandhi canal) was launched in 1958 to carry water allocated to Rajasthan as per 1955 notification. As stated earlier gates for canal were already constructed in 1952 at Harike Head Works. Decision to dig 650 kms. of canal against natural flow of water through sand dunes was taken without making any feasibility study. No well meaning government could have undertaken such a big project with so little thought. In 1958, when the project was under progress, Indian Govt. invited US Bureau²¹ of Reclamation to examine the project. The US team said in order to make comprehensive study for irrigation of 4.5 million acres of land, making land classification and agricultural economics they will need years. However, government went ahead with the digging of canal without any technical and economic consideration. **Inference can be drawn that aim was to take away water from Punjab.**

25. Canal was taken upto Mastiwal (Hanumangarh) in stage-I, commencing irrigation in 1960 while stage-II irrigation was commenced in 1980 taking canal upto Jaisalmer. Project was completed for about twenty years behind the schedule. Total culturable command area was about 20 lac hectares. Areas, North-West of canal along the Pakistan border are under gravity flow while areas South-East of canal are irrigated by using six lift canals which adds to the tremendous cost. Environmental degradation²² are as under:-

a) Water logging

Initially, the project area had a deep water table therefore provision of drainage was not included. About 45000 hectaers of land in North of canal has become water logged. The mean water table rise in Stage-I is about 1.1 meter a year thereby substantial areas are likely to be water logged. Stage-II areas have substratum of gypsum within ten meter of surface so about 40% areas are vulnerable for water logging.

Saline ground water in regions of Mukatsar, Bathinda & Faridkot districts of Punjab is steadily rising. Rajasthan canal and Sirhind feeder canal are main cause for water logging in the areas of Punjab.

b) Seepage and Evaporation

Canals, distributaries and water channels pass through intense desert having high ambient temperatures. Channels / distributaries become dry much before they reach tail end. About 40% of canal water is wasted because of seepage and evaporation. Most of the water channels are filled with sand.

c) Cost Benefit Analysis

Fresh cost benefit analysis of the Rajasthan canal needs to be undertaken in terms of water per unit supplied for irrigation. This cost should be treated as cost of input for the crops. The basic principle is to use every input in a way that output is the highest. Input cost should include water cost, water carrying cost, water losses and maintenance of canal's cost.

d) Drinking Water

Drinking water needs can be best met without losses in case the water is supplied from reservoirs through pipes rather than carrying through canals.

e) Optimum Utilization

Taking water from a river hundreds of miles away and then lifting it to the parched fields goes against all canons of optimal utilization. A pragmatic approach is needed. Optimum utilization²³ is basic to the utilization of river waters. Clause IV of the functions of Bhakra advisory board also states about optimum utilization of river waters.

The Failed Ambition²⁴

26. Carrying water from river valleys of Punjab to the sand dunes of Rajasthan, IGMPs intricate networks of canals, tributaries and minors can be called one of the man's most absurd attempt to tame nature; in this case, centuries-old desert. As per allocation Rajasthan government decided to utilize 8 MAF of water for irrigation through the construction of Indira Gandhi Canal. Within Rajasthan, the canal is 450 kms. long covering seven districts. While IGMP Stage-I restricted to Sriganganagar, Bikaner & Hanumangarh, did bring in some prosperity to the area in mid 1970, Stage-II spanning Jaisalmer and Barmer is a far cry from the earlier achievements.

27. According to official figures, command area of Phase-II in Jaisalmer covers 4.63 lakh hectares with canals measuring upwards 3400 kms. However, ground situation is quite different. Tanot distributary Sagarmal Gopa Branch of canal near Ramgarh irrigates about 96,000 acres west of branch as the area is under gravity flow. On the Eastern side towards Longewala, the long bricked channels, meant to hold water, dryout. Filled with sand at many places, broken at others, these bricks and mortar structures run over several kilometers looking out of place in the dry land punctuated by Phog, Aak and other hardy desert grasses. The lush green land reclaimed from desert and clean drinking water supply remain a mirage. Irrigation system is worst in areas like Gandhidham and Habur. Tibra minor system originating from Sada distributary is no better. The system feeds three minors and out of designed capacity of 140 cusecs get only 35 cusecs, rest is wasted out.

28. S.K. Mandal of National Institute of Technology, Patna, who studied the project, writes in his paper: "People in some quarters raised serious doubts about the suitability of the semi-arid land, termed fragile lands" for intensive agriculture and challenged the use of irrigation on these lands, on the grounds that the light of sandy soils of the desert may be unsuitable for irrigated farming or any type of intensive cultivation.

29. Apart from supplying this water to major cities like Jodhpur, industries, making reservoirs for water sports at Jaisalmer & other places, **Rajasthan government is also using this water for commercial purposes**²⁵. Refinery at Barmer worth Rs.40,000 crores is being established as a joint venture between Rajasthan Govt. and Hindustan Petro Chemicals Ltd. (HPCL) and the joint venture will be known as HPCL-Rajasthan Refinery Ltd. i.e. HRRL. States share in this joint venture will be 26% and HPCL to have 74%. Rajasthan government will supply 5-6 million gallons of water per day to the refinery through a 230 km. pipeline from Indira Gandhi canal. Annual cost of water to the refinery alone works out Rs.9 Crore approx. **Rajasthan government is violating 1955, Central Government Notification in terms of Water-Use.**

30. It is suggested that 1955 agreement may be re-opened as Rajasthan fails to make optimal use of water for irrigation and using lift canals which against the terms of reference for the areas to be irrigated. **Non supply of water to erstwhile PEPSU areas under 1955 allocation and change of water use by Rajasthan government apart from non payment to Punjab.**

PUNJAB'S REQUIREMENTS OF WATER

31. Total area under cultivation is 1.05 crores acres. About 98% of this area is irrigated and double cropped. Total cropped area of about 2 crores acres requires more than 50 MAF²⁶ of water annually. Canal water available is about 14.5 MAF (About 27%) and taking rains into account water availability becomes 25 MAF and rest 25 MAF is ground water pumped by 13 lakh tubewells. Annual recharge is about 15 MAF leaving a deficit of 10 MAF annually. This excess extraction of ground water results in depletion of ground water by about two feet annually. Now, water is being pumped out from a depth 350 feet or more. It is pertinent to mention here that it takes millions of years to charge third layer of ground water. 105 Blocks out of 138 blocks²⁷ have been declared as "Dark Zone". Punjab is fast moving towards desertification.

32. **As stated above, Govt. of India while allocating water as per 1955 decision had written to states to include only the areas for irrigation under gravity flow (Lift canals were not to be included). So Punjab excluded Southern districts²⁸ which now form part of Haryana as these were not under gravity flow. However, this aspect of gravity flow was violated going by the lifts on Rajasthan canal. In Punjab 73% land is being irrigated through tubewells adding to tremendous cost of electricity / diesel for pumping water from an average of 300 feet or more.**

RECOVERY OF COST OF WATER FROM RAJASTHAN

33. The conference of 29.01.1955 was called in great hurry and only for the purpose of distributing Ravi-Beas waters. Para 5 of decision taken in conference stipulates: **"The question of allocation of the cost of water including the cost of storage and other works may be taken up separately as the conference was concerned only with distribution and supplies."** The reason why the question of payment of cost for water to Punjab remained dormant for 57 years is that Rajasthan started getting initial water supply from Rajasthan canal only after 10 years of the conference. The canal faced severe technical and financial constraints which led to modification of plans. Five more lift schemes were added and the command area of Stage-II was increased to 21 Lac hectares and the project was completed around 20 years behind the schedule. According to information provided by Punjab Govt., the 1955 agreement was never ratified by the state cabinet. Punjab presented no other plan to utilize these waters. No where, it is laid down or decided in any meeting or conference that non-riparian state of Rajasthan would get Ravi-Beas waters free of cost.

34. **It was on the basis of clause 5 that Punjab demanded royalty from Rajasthan. The resolution adopted unanimously by the Punjab Assembly on 16 Nov, 2016 is as follows:-**

"It is a historical truth that before independence a riparian state used to get royalty for sharing water with non-riparian states." **One** - water was given to Patiala, Nabha and Jind states in 1873 and it was clearly specified that Punjab being a riparian state had right over these waters and accordingly, these states had to pay royalty in lieu of water. **Two**- Bikaner state paid royalty to Punjab for the water it received through Gang canal on the request of Maharaja Ganga Singh of Bikaner state.

35. Therefore, considering the aforesaid facts this house strongly directs Punjab Government to immediately taking the matter with the Central Govt., Rajasthan and Delhi regarding securing cost / royalty in lieu of river water so as to undo the injustice meted out to the state for decades by congress led governments at Centre and in Punjab. Resolution attached as **Appendix 'B'**.

Water Rates / Costing (Worked by Dr. Dharmveer Gandhi²⁹)

36. In 2008, Central Water Power Commission Team (CWPC) worked out cost of 100 cusecs of water which used to leak from Madhopur head works and go to Pakistan and annual value of this water was Rs.100 crores i.e. Rs. One Crores for one cusec daily for one year.

One cusec x 24 hrs. = 1.98 Acre Feet.

So, one cusec per day for 365 days = 1.98 x 365 acre feet
= 722.7 acre feet

So, Cost of 1 acre feet of water = Rs. 1,00,00,000 ÷ 722.7 = Rs. 13838/-

Or Say Rs.14,000/- per acre feet of water.

So cost of water to Rajasthan per year

= 1.12 (crore acre feet) x 14000 = 15680 crores per year

Or cost of 11.2 MAF (1.12 crore acre feet) of water for

50 years = 1.12 (Crore) x 14000 x 50 = Rs.7.84 Lac Crores

Cost of water to Delhi for 0.2 MAF = 0.02 (Crore acre feet) x 14000

= Rs.280 Crores per year.

Or cost of water to Delhi for 50 years = Rs.14000 Crores.

37. Dr. Dharamveer Gandhi had also worked out alongwith PAU team cost of canal water as Rs.23,500 for one acre feet in terms of value addition to the irrigated lands in Ganganagar district of Rajasthan. This cost works out for 50years @ 23500

= 1.12 x 23500 x 50 = 13.16 lac crores (Refer **Appendix C**).

38. Sh. P.S. Kumedan had further calculated cost in paise / liter i.e. (1 Acre = 43560 sq. feet, i.e. 1 acre = 4840 sq. yds. or 4840 x 9 = 43560 sq. feet).

1 cubic feet = 28.3169 liters of water.

Or 1 acre feet or 43560 cubic feet = 43560 x 28.3169

= 1233484.164 liters

Or 1233484.164 liters of water = 13787/-

Or cost of one liter of water = $13837 \div 1233484.164 = 0.011 = 1$ Paisa per liter

39. It is unfortunate that due to political consideration neither Akali - BJP government in Punjab nor Congress government followed up the assembly resolution to recover the water cost as during Akali - BJP time Rajasthan had BJP Govt. and later Congress has been ruling both states in Punjab & Rajasthan. Now AAP government also not taking any action as Delhi Govt. ruled by AAP is also getting 0.2 MAF of Satluj water free of cost. **It is pertinent to mention that Delhi AAP government pays to Himachal Rs.21 Crores royalty annually for the Yamuna water as per MOU signed between Delhi and Himachal governments (Refer Appendix D) but refuses to pay to Punjab.** In this regard, Sardar Balwinder Singh Bains, MLA - Lok Insaaf Party Chief also submitted a petition signed by 21 lac Punjabis with the "Petition Committee" of Punjab Assembly through speaker to recover the cost of water from Rajasthan and Delhi. Keeping in view the economic interests of the state, Punjab government without bothering about political considerations must recover the cost of water.

40. Surprisingly, in 1956 payment of seigniorage³⁰ to the state of Punjab by Rajasthan, the successor state of Bikaner state was discontinued in an arbitrary manner without consulting Punjab in violation of the principles of natural justice and against the provisions of law and the constitution of India. State of Punjab must demand the payment of seigniorage from the state of Rajasthan with retrospective effect from 1956, when it was illegally discontinued due to unauthorised and unconstitutional action. In case of refusal by state of Rajasthan, this unauthorised and illegal order for discontinuance of seigniorage or royalty may be challenged in the Supreme Court of India under Article 131 of the constitution of India or water supply to be stopped for the violation of the treaty.

CONCLUSION

Since independence, Delhi has been bulldozing its way and pressurizing Punjab through letters, notifications, agreements, political settlements to give more and more waters to non riparian states. These notifications / agreements being unconstitutional / illegal have been repudiated by Punjab Assembly and superseded by Center itself one after the another as a result of this none of the settlement is implementable. There is a saying when you don't want to resolve the issue "confuse it", exactly centre is doing same with Punjab. Delhi is confusing the water issues by bringing new buzzwords like "successor states", basin states' and camouflaging 'riparian laws' prevailing in our country and the word over. Punjab has been trying to resolve the messed up issues politically which are purely constitutional and legal. To get out of the mess Punjab should deal the cases of 'successor states' and 'non-successor states' separately.

Rajasthan and Delhi are non-successor and non-riparian states drawing river waters from Punjab. Rajasthan owes Rs.7.84 lac crores and Delhi state owes Rs.14,000 Crores to Punjab towards the cost of water supplied during last 50 years. civil society, farmer unions and people of Punjab through a organized movement should pressurize Punjab government to recover the cost of water from Rajasthan and Delhi.

Col A.S. Hira
M: 8130740978

References

1. Paper on Punjab Waters By Dr. Gurmeet Singh Institute of Sikh Studies," Cauvery Water Dispute Tribunal" (1992 SC 522), JPC Report, Narmada Water Dispute Tribunal.
- 1A Harjagmandir Singh Paper "Real Cause of Punjab Crises" Institute of Sikh Studies," Chandigarh dated 30.07.2019.
2. Indira Gandhi Canal en.m. wikipedia.org and "Rivers on Fire" by Jagtar Singh, page 232.
3. Indus Basin uninterrupted by Uttam Kumar Sinha, Making of Indus Water Treaty, page 247.
4. Indus Basin uninterrupted by Uttam Kumar Sinha Making of Indus Water Treaty, page 249.
5. Indus Basin uninterrupted by Uttam Kumar Sinha Making of Indus Water Treaty, page 243 and Rivers on Fire, page 230 by Jagtar Singh.
6. Water Asia's New Battle Ground by Brahma Chellaney, chapter 2, page 77 and IWT 1960.
7. Water Asia's New Battle Ground by Brahma Chellaney, chapter 2, page 78, Absolute Right Theory by Harman & 1997 UN Water Course Convention.
8. Water Asia's New Battle Ground by Brahma Chellaney, chapter 2, page 78.
9. Indus Basin uninterrupted by Uttam Kumar Sinha Making of Indus Water Treaty, page 247.
10. Indus Basin uninterrupted by Uttam Kumar Sinha Making of Indus Water Treaty, page 247 and page 78 of Water Asia's New Battle Ground.
11. Water Asia's New Battle Ground by Brahma Chellaney, chapter 2, page 77.
12. Harjagmandar Singh Paper - Real Cause of Punjab Crisis, Institute of Sikh Studies, Chandigarh, page 6 and Rivers on Fire by Jagtar Singh, page 232.
13. ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਪਾਣੀਆਂ 'ਚ ਮਧਾਣੀ - by Sardar Gurdev Singh, I.A.S. Retired.
14. Rivers on Fire, page 234 by Jagtar Singh.
15. Rivers on Fire, page 234 by Jagtar Singh.
16. Indira Gandhi Canal en.m.wikipedia.org and Rivers on Fire by Jagtar Singh, page 232.
17. Paper 22 Harbinder Pal Singh - Institute of Sikh Studies January 1997, page 65.
18. 'Rivers on Fire' by Jagtar Singh, page 235.
19. Punjab Journeys Thorough Fault Lines by Amandeep Sandhu, page 233, 234 and Paper by Dr. Khark Singh " A Way Out of Water Dispute" - Institute of Sikh Studies, page 50.
20. Clause 1, Govt. of India, Ministry of Irrigation 1955 decision. Appendix A to this paper.
21. Paper by Harjagmandar Singh, 30.07.2019, Institute of Sikh Studies.

22. 'Rivers on Fire' by Jagtar Singh, page 248.
23. 'Rivers on Fire' by Jagtar Singh, page 228.
24. <https://www.goimonitor.com>, www.theweekendleader.com
25. Economic Times 21 Feb, 2023.
26. Punjab Assembly Resolution dated 16 Nov, 2016, para 7/2.
27. Punjab Assembly Resolution dated 16 Nov, 2016, para 7/2.
28. Rivers on Fire by Jagtar Singh - Page 234, page 236
29. Para 96 of PIL No. 12422 of 2018 filed by Dr. Dharmvir Gandhi and others in Punjab & Haryana High Court.
30. Paper by Dr. Khark Singh, A Way-out of Water Dispute, page 51, Institute of Sikh Studies and paper by Sardar Harbindar Pal Singh, page 63.

LIST OF INTER STATE RIVER WATER DISPUTE CASES (15.8.22)

I. SUPREME COURT

Sr No.	Name of case & No.	Status
1.	IA 6 in Original Suit 6 of 1996 filed by Haryana on 31/05/2016, in the Hon'ble supreme court, for enforcement of decree dated 15.1.2002 and 4.6.2004 for construction of SYL Canal (Punjab Portion).	<p>During the hearing on 11.07.2017, the Hon'ble Supreme Court took note of submission of the Ld. Attorney General of India that the Central Govt. is trying its best to bring both states to reconciliatory stage so that the decree may be amicably executed.</p> <p>During the hearing on 09.07.2019, the Hon'ble Supreme Court requested the Chief Ministers of Punjab and Haryana to form committee of officers and also ensure that both of them deliberate with the intervention of the Central Government at the highest level and if possible to work out a solution.</p> <p>In compliance to order dated 09.07.2019 of Hon'ble Supreme Court, committee of the officers of State of Punjab and State of Haryana had been constituted and three meetings were held on 16.08.2019, 21.08.2019 and 06.12.2019 under the chairmanship of Secretary, Water Resources, Govt. of India. The matter came up for hearing on 03.09.2019 and on the request of Ld. Attorney General, the Court had adjourned the matter for four months.</p> <p>The matter was heard on 28.07.2020 through video conferencing where Hon'ble Court made the following orders:- <i>"A meeting of various stakeholders be convened at the high level and the outcome of the same, if any, be informed to this Court. List the matter in the third week of August, 2020".</i></p> <p>As per the directions of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India dated 28.07.2020, a meeting was convened by the Union Minister, Water Resources on 18.8.2020 with the chief ministers of Punjab and Haryana to work out a solution for amicable settlement of Sutlej Yamuna Link (SYL) canal Matter.</p> <p>The matter is However, not listed so far.</p>
2	Civil Appeal 3365 of 2005 filed by Punjab against Judgement of Rajasthan High Court, dated 02.05.2005 directing handing over of Ropar, Harike & Ferozpur Headworks to BBMB	The SLP (11192 of 2005) was granted by the Supreme Court and Judgement of Rajasthan High Court Stayed. The case is to be heard after decision in suit 2 of 2007 (at Sr. No. 3) as per orders dated 28.11.07 of the Hon'ble Supreme Court.
3	Suit 2 of 2007 filed by Punjab in the Supreme Court of India Challenging vires of Sections 78 & 79 of the Punjab Re-organisation Act, 1966	Evidence completed on 11.9.2018. The case was listed on 17.02.2020 and was adjourned for 17.04.2020. Since then the case is pending for hearing in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India due to prevalent Covid-19 Pandemic.
4	Suit 1 of 2008 filed by State of Haryana Vs State of Punjab & others- regarding handing over Headworks of Ropar, Harike & Ferozpur to the BBMB interms of Section 79(1)(c) of the Punjab Re-organisation Act, 1966.	Evidence completed on 26.7.2016. The case was listed on 17.02.2020 and was adjourned for 17.04.2020. Since then the case is pending for hearing in the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India due to prevalent Covid-19 Pandemic.

5	Suit 3 of 2009 filed by State of Haryana Vs State of Punjab & others-- for seeking share in generation of electricity from the Anandpur Sahib Hydel Project, Mukerian Hydel Project, Thein Dam Project, UBDC Stage-II & Shahpurkandi Hydel Scheme; Also for Handing over Madhopur Headworks, Thein Dam Project & Shahpurkandi Project whenever completed to BBMB, construction of Shahpurkandi Project by BBMB or through any Central Agency.	Evidence completed. To be listed for hearing.
6	CWP No. 537 of 1992 filed by Comdr. Sureshwar D. Sinha Vs Union of India & others-. Orders issued by Hon'ble Supreme Court for Supply of additional 125 cs. of water (Ravi-Beas) to Delhi through Narwana Branch, over and above Delhi's allocated share of 0.20 MAF.	Case pending in the Supreme Court.
7	Suit 1 of 2007 filed by State of Punjab Vs State of Haryana & others- seeking dismantling of Hansi-Butana Canal.	Cross-examination of witnesses completed on 02.02.2015. The suit heard on 17.09.2019. At the joint request of the learned counsel for the various States in this case, the Court adjourned the matter for the period of four months, as the issue arising in the suit is pending before the Committee for resolving the SYL issue in terms of orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 09.07.2019 (Sr. No. 1).
8	Suit 3 of 2007 filed by State of Rajasthan Vs State of Haryana & others seeking restraint against Haryana from further digging Hansi -Butana Link canal.	linked with suit 1 of 2007 (Sr. No. 7)
9	SLPs filed by State of Punjab Vs State of Haryana & others- against the decision dated 17.05.2007 & 23.07.2007 of Punjab & Haryana High Court with regard to CWPs in Hansi-Butana link canal	linked with Suit 1 of 2007 (Sr. No. 7)
10	Suit 1 of 2011- filed by State of Rajasthan Vs Union of India, Haryana and others- seeking directions to the Union of India for taking decision on the reference made by BBMB on 3.8.2006 regarding release of 0.17 MAF of Ravi -Beas waters to Rajasthan Ex-Nangal through BML Canal.	Written Statement filed by Punjab on 9-10-2014. Suit heard on 25.09.2019 and Hon'ble Court adjourned the hearing for four months as some negotiations are going on.
11	Suit 2 of 2011- filed by State of Rajasthan Vs State of Punjab and others- seeking handing over of possession and control of Headworks at Ropar, Harike & Ferozpur to the BBMB in terms of Section 79(1)(c) of the Punjab Re-organisation Act, 1966.	Written Statement filed by Punjab on 4-12-14. Suit heard on 25.09.2019 and Hon'ble Court adjourned the hearing for four months as some negotiations are going on.
12	Suit 1 of 2014- filed by State of Rajasthan Vs. State of Punjab and others Seeking direction for execution of Shahpurkandi Project through BBMB or any other central agency. - Share of electricity generation from 5 projects i.e. Anandpur Sahib Hydel Project, Mukerian Hydel Project, Thein Dam Project, UBDC Stag II and Shahpur Kandi Project -Handing over Madhopur Headworks, Thein Dam Project, M.B.Link and Shahpur Kandi Project whenever completed to BBMB.	The Written Statement has been filed by Punjab on 04.9.2017. Hearing Pending.
13	Suit 1 of 2015 filed by Punjab in the Supreme Court Seeking directions to U.O.I to constitute appropriate tribunal U/S 4(1) of the ISRWD-Act, 1956 to adjudicate the disputes relating to equitable distribution of waters of River Ravi & Beas as raised by Punjab in its complaint dated 11/1/2003 filed before UOI.	The suit heard on 17.09.2019 along with Suit 1 of 2007. At the joint request of the learned counsel for the various States in this case, the Court adjourned the matter for the period of four months, as the issue arising in the suit is pending before the Committee for resolving the SYL issue in terms of orders of Hon'ble Supreme Court dated 09.07.2019 (Sr. No. 1).

14	Suit 6 of 2020 -filed by State of Rajasthan Vs. State of Punjab and others Seeking restoration of 0.6 M.A.F remaining Ravi Beas Waters in pursuance to the Agreement signed among Punjab, Haryana and Rajasthan on 31.12.1981, where Rajasthan was allocated 8.60 MAF Ravi-Beas waters out of the assessed net surplus of 17.17.	The Written Statement has been sent to Legal team, New Delhi for Filing.
15	Presidential Reference 1 of 2004 under Article 143(1) of the Constitution of India - Legality & validity of "The Punjab Termination of Agreements Act, 2004"	Hearing started on 29.2.2016 and concluded on 12.5.2016. Advisory opinion given on 10.11.2016 that the Termination of Agreements Act is not constitutionally valid. However, our legal is of the view that the Act still stands as no State has challenged it validity in any court.

II. HIGH COURT, DELHI

Sr No.	Name of case & No.	Subject Matter	Status
16	State of Punjab Vs Union of India & others-CWP No. 3928/2004	Challenging reconstitution of Ravi-Beas Waters Tribunal.	Proceedings held in abeyance in view of the pendency of the Presidential Reference. (Reference since decided on 10/11/16) In June 2003, the Eradi Tribunal was reconstituted which was virtually dormant for so many years. The State of Punjab filed a Writ Petition before the High Court of Delhi inter-alia seeking a writ or appropriate order setting aside the notification dated 10.06.2003 reconstituting the Eradi Tribunal and prohibiting the Government of India from publishing decision dated 30.01.1987 passed by the Eradi Tribunal under Section 5(2) of the Act of 1956.

III. RAVI & BEAS WATERS TRIBUNAL

Sr No.	Name of case & No.	Subject Matter	Status
17	Allocation of Ravi-Beas Waters.	Review applications filed by various states against the award dated 30-1-1987.	Central Government has reconstituted the Ravi Beas water tribunal and appointed Mr Justice Vineet Saran (former judge of Hon'ble Supreme Court of India) as its Chairman on 22.4.2022. Tribunal has given the time to the states till 22 nd September 2022 to file the objections/written statement of the case.

IV. PUNJAB AND HARYANA HIGH COURT, CHANDIGARH.

Sr No.	Name of case & No.	Subject Matter	Status
18	CWP 12422 of 2018 Filed by Dharamvir Gandhi & Others Vs. Govt. of India & Others	i. Seeking declaration that section 78, 79 & 80 of the Punjab Re-organisation Act are un-constitutional. ii. Seeking declaration that Section 14 of Inter-state River Waters Disputes Act is un-constitutional. iii. Compensation of Rs. 32 lakh crore to Punjab in lieu of river waters supplies to non riparian states of Rajasthan & other states.	The orders dated 29.11.2018 of Hon'ble Court is reproduced below:- "Status report filed by State of Punjab is taken on record. The status report makes it clear that Suit no. 2 of 2007 and Suit No. 1 of 2008 filed by the States of Punjab and Haryana, respectively, challenging the vires of Sections 78 and 79 of the Punjab Re-organisation Act, 1966 are still pending before the Apex Court. In such circumstances let proceedings of this petition adjourned sine die awaiting the outcome of the decision of the Hon'ble Apex Court."

1955 Decision

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWERRECORD OF THE DECISIONS ARRIVED AT THE INTER-STATE CONFERENCE ON THE
DEVELOPMENT AND UTILISATION OF THE WATERS OF THE RIVERS RAVI AND BEAS,
HELD IN ROOM No. 12, NORTH BLOCK, NEW DELHI ON THE 29th JANUARY, 1955

After a brief discussion of the demands for the waters as given by the various States, the following decisions were taken:

1. The supplies both flow and storage in the rivers Ravi and Beas over and above the actual pre-partition utilisations based on mean supplies in the rivers shall be allocated as under:—

Share of Punjab	5.90	M.A.F.
Share of Kashmir	0.65	„
Share of Rajasthan	8.00	„
Share of PEPSU	1.30	„
TOTAL	<u>15.85</u>	„

In case of any variation in total supplies the shares shall be changed pro rata on the above allocations subject to the condition that no change shall be made in the allocation for Kashmir State which shall remain as 0.65 M.A.F.

2. The distribution of flow supplies shall be in the same ratio as the allocations mentioned above.

3. The splitting up of the allocated supplies between Kharif and Rabi may be left to engineers. The matter may be referred to the Government of India if they cannot arrive at an agreement on this issue.

4. The proposed capacity of Madho Beas Link may be increased from 8,000 to 10,000 cusecs.

5. The question of allocation of the cost of water including the cost of storages and other works may be taken up separately as the Conference was concerned only with the distribution of supplies.

6. It is left to each State to decide as to how best to utilise the supplies allocated to it. The States, however, must submit their proposals in this regard immediately to the Government of India (Planning Commission).

ਬੁੱਧਵਾਰ, 16 ਨਵੰਬਰ, 2016
(10.00 ਵਜੇ ਸਵੇਰ ਤੋਂ 01.40 ਵਜੇ ਬਾਅਦ ਦੁਪਹਿਰ ਤੱਕ)

1. ਅਕਾਲ ਚਲਾਣਿਆਂ ਦਾ ਵਰਣਨ

ਮਾਨਯੋਗ ਸਪੀਕਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਨਿਮਨਲਿਖਤ ਦੇ ਅਕਾਲ ਚਲਾਣਿਆਂ ਦਾ ਵਰਣਨ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ :-

1. ਸਰਦਾਰ ਸ਼ੇਰ ਸਿੰਘ ਗਾਗੋਵਾਲ, ਸਾਬਕਾ-ਰਾਜ ਮੰਤਰੀ, ਪੰਜਾਬ ;
2. ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਰਾਮ ਸਵਰੂਪ ਬਾਗੀ, ਸਾਬਕਾ -ਐਮ.ਐਲ.ਏ;
3. ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਰਾਮ ਪ੍ਰਕਾਸ਼ ਬਾਲੀ, ਸਾਬਕਾ -ਐਮ.ਐਲ.ਏ ;
4. ਬ੍ਰਿਗੇਡੀਅਰ (ਰਿਟਾਇਰਡ) ਜਗਦੀਸ਼ ਗਗਨੇਜਾ;
5. ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਗੁਰਸੇਵਕ ਸਿੰਘ, ਜ਼ਾਂਬਾਜ਼ ਸੈਨਿਕ;
6. ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਸਤਨਾਮ ਸਿੰਘ , ਜ਼ਾਂਬਾਜ਼ ਸੈਨਿਕ;
7. ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਮੋਹਰ ਮਿੱਤਲ, ਉੱਘੀ ਸ਼ਖਸੀਅਤ ; ਅਤੇ
8. ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਤੁਲਸੀ ਰਾਮ , ਸੁਤੰਤਰਤਾ ਸੰਗਰਾਮੀ ;

ਮਾਨਯੋਗ ਸਪੀਕਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਵਰਣਿਤ ਮਹਾਨ ਸ਼ਖਸੀਅਤਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਂਜਲੀਆਂ ਭੇਂਟ ਕੀਤੀਆਂ ਗਈਆਂ ਅਤੇ ਸਦਨ ਨੂੰ ਸੂਚਿਤ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਕਿ ਸਵਰਗਵਾਸੀਆਂ ਦੇ ਦੁਖੀ ਪਰਿਵਾਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸ਼ੋਕ ਸੁਨੇਹੇ ਭੇਜ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਜਾਣਗੇ।

ਸਦਨ ਨੇ ਵਿਛੜੀਆਂ ਰੂਹਾਂ ਦੀ ਯਾਦ ਵਿੱਚ ਸਤਿਕਾਰ ਵਜੋਂ ਦੋ ਮਿੰਟ ਲਈ ਖੜ੍ਹੇ ਹੋ ਕੇ ਮੌਨ ਧਾਰਨ ਕੀਤਾ।

2. ਸਦਨ ਨੂੰ ਥੋੜ੍ਹੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਲਈ ਸਥਗਿਤ ਕਰਨਾ

ਮਾਨਯੋਗ ਸਪੀਕਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਸ਼ਰਧਾਂਜਲੀਆਂ ਭੇਂਟ ਕਰਨ ਉਪਰੰਤ ਸਤਿਕਾਰ ਵਜੋਂ ਸਦਨ 10.30 ਵਜੇ ਸਵੇਰ ਤੱਕ ਲਈ ਸਥਗਿਤ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ।

3. ਮਾਨਯੋਗ ਸਪੀਕਰ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਪੈਨਲ ਆਫ ਚੇਅਰਮੈਨ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਐਲਾਨ

ਮਾਨਯੋਗ ਸਪੀਕਰ ਨੇ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਵਿਧਾਨ ਸਭਾ ਦੀ ਕਾਰਜਵਿਧੀ ਅਤੇ ਕਾਰਜ ਸੰਚਾਲਣ ਨਿਯਮਾਵਲੀ ਦੇ ਨਿਯਮ 13 (1) ਅਧੀਨ ਨਿਮਨਲਿਖਤ ਮੈਂਬਰਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਭਾਪਤੀ ਨਾਮਾਵਲੀ ਲਈ ਨਾਮਜ਼ਦ ਕਰਨ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਐਲਾਨ ਕੀਤਾ:

1. ਸਰਦਾਰ ਟਿਕਬਾਲ ਸਿੰਘ ਤੂੰਦਾ
2. ਸਰਦਾਰ ਗੁਰਪ੍ਰਤਾਪ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਡਾਲ
3. ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਬ੍ਰਹਮ ਮਹਿੰਦਰਾ
4. ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਮਨੋਰੰਜਨ ਕਾਲੀਆ

4. ਸਕੱਤਰ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਐਲਾਨ

ਸਕੱਤਰ ਵੱਲੋਂ 13ਵੀਂ ਅਤੇ 14ਵੀਂ ਵਿਧਾਨ ਸਭਾ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਕ੍ਰਮਵਾਰ ਇਸ ਦੇ ਗਿਆਰਵੇਂ ਅਤੇ ਤੇਰਵੇਂ ਸਮਾਗਮ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਪਾਸ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ ਬਿਲਾਂ, ਜਿਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਤੇ ਰਾਸ਼ਟਰਪਤੀ/ ਰਾਜਪਾਲ ਜੀ ਨੇ ਆਪਣੀ ਸਹਿਮਤੀ ਦੇ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਹੈ, ਦਾ ਵੇਰਵਾ ਸਦਨ ਦੀ ਮੋਜ਼ ਤੇ ਰੱਖਿਆ ਗਿਆ।

5. ਪੰਜਾਬ ਵਿਧਾਨ ਸਭਾ ਦੀ ਕਾਰਜ ਵਿਧੀ ਅਤੇ ਕਾਰਜ ਸੰਚਾਲਣ ਨਿਯਮਾਵਲੀ ਦੇ ਕੁੱਝ ਨਿਯਮਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਮੁਅੱਤਲ ਕਰਨ ਸਬੰਧੀ ਪ੍ਰਸਤਾਵ

ਸੰਸਦੀ ਮਾਮਲੇ ਮੰਤਰੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਹੇਠ ਲਿਖਿਆ ਪ੍ਰਸਤਾਵ ਸਦਨ ਵਿਚ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਅਤੇ ਪ੍ਰਵਾਨ ਹੋਇਆ:

"ਇਹ ਸਦਨ ਸੰਕਲਪ ਕਰਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਵਿਧਾਨ ਸਭਾ ਦੇ ਚਾਲੂ ਸਮਾਗਮ ਜੋ ਕੁੱਝ ਜ਼ਰੂਰੀ ਅਤੇ ਮਹੱਤਵਪੂਰਨ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਕੰਮ-ਕਾਰ ਲਈ ਵਿਸ਼ੇਸ਼ ਸਮਾਗਮ ਹੈ, ਦੇ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਕੇਵਲ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਕੰਮਕਾਰ ਹੀ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਵੇ ਅਤੇ ਹੋਰ ਕੋਈ ਵੀ ਕੰਮਕਾਰ ਜਿਸ ਵਿਚ ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਨ , ਧਿਆਨ ਦਿਵਾਉ ਨੋਟਿਸ ਅਤੇ ਕਿਸੇ ਪ੍ਰਾਈਵੇਟ ਮੈਂਬਰ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕੀਤੇ ਜਾਣ ਵਾਲਾ ਕੋਈ ਹੋਰ ਕੰਮ-ਕਾਰ ਵੀ ਸ਼ਾਮਲ ਹੈ, ਇਸ ਸਮਾਗਮ ਦੇ ਦੌਰਾਨ ਸਦਨ ਦੇ ਸਾਹਮਣੇ ਨਾ ਲਿਆਂਦਾ ਜਾਵੇ ਜਾਂ ਸਦਨ ਵਿਚ ਨਾ ਕੀਤਾ ਜਾਵੇ ਅਤੇ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਵਿਧਾਨ ਸਭਾ ਦੀ ਕਾਰਜ ਵਿਧੀ ਅਤੇ ਕਾਰਜ ਸੰਚਾਲਣ ਨਿਯਮਾਵਲੀ ਵਿਚ ਇਸ ਵਿਸ਼ੇ ਨਾਲ ਸਬੰਧਤ ਨਿਯਮ ਉਸ ਹੱਦ ਤੱਕ ਮੁਅੱਤਲ ਕੀਤੇ ਗਏ ਸਮਝੇ ਜਾਣ। "

6. **ਨਿਯਮ 16 ਅਧੀਨ ਪੁਸਤਾਵ**

ਸੰਸਦੀ ਮਾਮਲੇ ਮੰਤਰੀ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਨਿਮਨਲਿਖਤ ਪੁਸਤਾਵ ਸਦਨ ਦੀ ਵੋਟ ਲਈ ਰੱਖਿਆ ਗਿਆ ਅਤੇ ਪ੍ਰਵਾਨ ਹੋਇਆ :

"ਕਿ ਵਿਧਾਨ ਸਭਾ ਅੱਜ ਇਸ ਦੇ ਉੱਠ ਜਾਣ ਤੇ ਅਣਮਿੱਥੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਲਈ ਸਥੱਗਿਤ ਹੋ ਜਾਵੇਗੀ।"

7. **ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਮਤੇ**

1. **ਸੰਸਦੀ ਮਾਮਲੇ ਮੰਤਰੀ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਹੇਠ ਲਿਖਿਆ ਪੁਸਤਾਵ ਸਦਨ ਵਿਚ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਅਤੇ ਸੰਧੇ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਪ੍ਰਵਾਨ ਹੋਇਆ :**

"ਇਹ ਇੱਕ ਇਤਿਹਾਸਕ ਸਚਾਈ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਆਬਾਦੀ ਤੋਂ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਜਦੋਂ ਵੀ ਟਿੱਕ ਸੂਬੇ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਹੋਰ ਸੂਬੇ, ਜਿਸ ਦਾ ਕਿ ਰਿਪੋਰੀਅਨ ਸਿਧਾਂਤ ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਹੱਕ ਨਾ ਬਣਦਾ ਹੋਵੇ, ਨੂੰ ਪਾਣੀ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਤਾਂ ਰੀਪੋਰੀਅਨ ਧਿਰ ਨੂੰ ਇਸ ਦੇ ਬਦਲੇ ਕੀਮਤ ਅਤੇ ਰਾਇਲਟੀ ਦਿੱਤੀ ਗਈ। ਉਦਾਹਰਣ ਦੇ ਤੌਰ ਤੇ ਬਰਤਾਨਵੀ ਰਾਜ ਵਿੱਚ ਦੋ ਵਾਰ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਦਰਿਆਵਾਂ ਦਾ ਪਾਣੀ ਦੂਜੇ ਸੂਬਿਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਗਿਆ। ਪਹਿਲਾਂ 1873 ਵਿੱਚ ਸਤਲੁਜ ਦਰਿਆ ਦਾ ਪਾਣੀ ਪਟਿਆਲਾ, ਨਾਭਾ ਅਤੇ ਜੀਂਦ ਰਿਆਸਤਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਅਤੇ ਜੇ ਫ਼ੈਸਲਾ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਉਸ ਵਿਚ ਇਹ ਸਪੱਸ਼ਟ ਤੌਰ ਤੇ ਜ਼ਿਕਰ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਕਿ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਰੀਪੋਰੀਅਨ ਸੂਬਾ ਹੋਣ ਕਰਕੇ ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਪਾਣੀਆਂ ਉੱਪਰ ਸਿਰਫ਼ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦਾ ਹੀ ਹੱਕ ਬਣਦਾ ਹੈ। ਇਸ ਲਈ ਪਟਿਆਲਾ, ਨਾਭਾ ਅਤੇ ਜੀਂਦ ਰਿਆਸਤਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਪਾਣੀ ਦੇ ਬਦਲੇ ਮਾਲਕਾਨਾ ਦੇਣਾ ਪਵੇਗਾ ਅਤੇ ਇਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਰਿਆਸਤਾਂ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਇਹ ਮਾਲਕਾਨਾ 1945-1946 ਤੱਕ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਜਾਂਦਾ ਰਿਹਾ। ਇਸੇ ਤਰ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੂਜੀ ਵਾਰ 1873 ਵਿੱਚ ਹੀ ਬੀਕਾਨੇਰ ਦੇ ਮਹਾਰਾਜਾ ਗੰਗਾ ਸਿੰਘ ਦੀ ਬੇਨਤੀ ਤੇ ਬੀਕਾਨੇਰ ਰਿਆਸਤ ਨੂੰ ਗੰਗ ਕਨਾਲ ਚਾਹੀਂ ਪਾਣੀ ਦਿੱਤਾ ਗਿਆ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਤੇ ਬਦਲੇ ਵੀ ਬੀਕਾਨੇਰ ਸਟੇਟ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਨੂੰ ਮਾਲਕਾਨਾ ਅਦਾ ਕੀਤਾ ਗਿਆ।

ਇਸ ਲਈ ਉਪਰੋਕਤ ਤੱਥਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਗੰਭੀਰਤਾ ਨਾਲ ਵਿਚਾਰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਇਹ ਸਦਨ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਨੂੰ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਕਰਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਉਹ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਦਰਿਆਵਾਂ ਦੇ ਪਾਣੀ ਜੋ ਕਿ ਗੈਰ ਰੀਪੋਰੀਅਨ ਸੂਬਿਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਬਿਨਾਂ ਕਿਸੇ ਕੀਮਤ ਤੇ ਜਾ ਰਿਹਾ ਹੈ, ਉਸ ਉੱਪਰ ਕੀਮਤ ਅਤੇ ਰਾਇਲਟੀ ਹਾਸਿਲ ਕਰਨ ਲਈ ਮਾਮਲਾ ਕੇਂਦਰ ਸਰਕਾਰ, ਰਾਜਸਥਾਨ, ਹਰਿਆਣਾ ਅਤੇ ਦਿੱਲੀ ਕੋਲ ਤੁਰੰਤ ਉਠਾਵੇ ਤਾਂ ਜੋ ਦਹਾਕਿਆਂ ਤੋਂ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਅਤੇ ਕੇਂਦਰ ਦੀਆਂ ਕਾਂਗਰਸੀ ਸਰਕਾਰਾਂ ਵੱਲੋਂ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਨਾਲ ਕੀਤੀ ਗਈ ਧੱਕੇਸ਼ਾਹੀ ਅਤੇ ਬੇਇਨਸਾਫ਼ੀ ਦੂਰ ਹੋ ਸਕੇ।"

ਮਤਾ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਸੰਸਦੀ ਮਾਮਲੇ ਮੰਤਰੀ 05 ਮਿੰਟ ਲਈ ਬੋਲੇ।

ਨਿਮਨਲਿਖਤ ਮੈਂਬਰ ਸਾਹਿਬਾਨ ਨੇ ਮਤੇ ਤੇ ਬਹਿਸ ਵਿਚ ਹਿੱਸਾ ਲਿਆ ਅਤੇ ਉਹ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਮ ਸਾਹਮਣੇ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਗਏ ਸਮੇਂ ਲਈ ਬੋਲੇ:

1.	ਜਸਟਿਸ ਨਿਰਮਲ ਸਿੰਘ, ਸ਼੍ਰੋਮਣੀ ਅਕਾਲੀ ਦਲ	11 ਮਿੰਟ
2.	ਸਰਦਾਰ ਸਿਮਰਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਬੈਂਸ, ਅਜ਼ਾਦ ਮੈਂਬਰ	22 ਮਿੰਟ
3.	ਸਰਦਾਰ ਸੁਖਬੀਰ ਸਿੰਘ ਬਾਦਲ, ਉਪ ਮੁੱਖ ਮੰਤਰੀ	01 ਮਿੰਟ

2. **ਮਾਨਯੋਗ ਮੁੱਖ ਮੰਤਰੀ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਪੇਸ਼ ਨਿਮਨਲਿਖਤ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਮਤਾ ਸਦਨ ਦੀ ਵੋਟ ਲਈ ਰੱਖਿਆ ਗਿਆ ਅਤੇ ਸਵੀਕਾਰ ਹੋਇਆ :-**

"ਜਦ ਕਿ ਭਾਰਤ ਦੇ ਸੰਵਿਧਾਨ ਦੇ 7ਵੇਂ ਸ਼ਡਿਊਲ ਵਿਚ ਦਰਜ ਰਾਜ ਸੂਚੀ ਦੇ ਦਿੰਦਰਾਜ 14 ਅਤੇ 18 ਅਨੁਸਾਰ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਨੂੰ ਆਪਣੀ ਹਦੂਦ ਵਿਚ ਸਥਿਤ ਸਾਰੀ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਉੱਤੇ ਵਿਧਾਨਕ ਅਤੇ ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਾਸਕੀ ਹੱਕ ਹਾਸਲ ਹੈ।

ਜਦ ਕਿ ਸੰਵਿਧਾਨ ਦੇ 7ਵੇਂ ਸ਼ਡਿਊਲ ਰਾਜ ਸੂਚੀ ਦੇ ਦਿੰਦਰਾਜ 17 ਅਨੁਸਾਰ, ਇਸੇ ਸ਼ਡਿਊਲ ਦੀ ਸੂਚੀ ਇੱਕ ਦੇ 56 ਦਿੰਦਰਾਜ ਨੂੰ ਧਿਆਨ ਵਿਚ ਰੱਖਦਿਆਂ, ਜਲ ਮੁਖਲਾਈ, ਸਿੰਜਾਈ ਅਤੇ ਨਹਿਰਾਂ, ਡਰੇਨਾਂ, ਕਿਨਾਰਿਆਂ, ਜਲ ਭੰਡਾਰਨ ਅਤੇ ਪਣ ਬਿਜਲੀ ਉੱਤੇ ਵੀ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦਾ ਵਿਧਾਨਕ ਅਤੇ ਪ੍ਰਸ਼ਾਸਕੀ ਹੱਕ ਹੈ।

ਸਦਨ ਇਸ ਤੱਥ ਦਾ ਨੋਟਿਸ ਲੈਂਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਨੂੰ ਖੇਤੀਬਾੜੀ ਲਈ 52 MAF ਪਾਣੀ ਦੀ ਲੋੜ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਇਸ ਦਾ ਸਿਰਫ਼ 27 ਫੀਸਦੀ ਹਿੱਸਾ ਹੀ ਦਰਿਆਈ ਪਾਣੀਆਂ ਨਾਲ ਪੂਰਾ ਹੁੰਦਾ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਕੇਂਦਰੀ ਗਰਾਊਂਡ ਵਾਟਰ ਕਮਿਸ਼ਨ ਨੇ ਪਹਿਲਾਂ ਹੀ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ 158 ਬਲਾਕਾਂ ਵਿਚੋਂ 105 ਨੂੰ over exploited ਐਲਾਨਿਆ ਹੋਇਆ ਹੈ।

ਲੋੜੀਂਦੇ ਦਰਿਆਈ ਪਾਣੀਆਂ ਤੋਂ ਬਿਨਾਂ ਪੰਜਾਬ, ਜਿਹੜਾ ਮੁਲਕ ਦਾ ਅੰਨ ਭੰਡਾਰ ਹੈ, ਲਗਾਤਾਰ ਫੰਜਰ ਬਣਦਾ ਜਾ ਰਿਹਾ ਹੈ ਜਿਸ ਕਾਰਨ ਦੇਸ ਦੀ ਅੰਨ ਸੁਰੱਖਿਆ ਅਤੇ ਸੂਬੇ ਦੀ ਆਰਥਿਕਤਾ ਵੀ ਤਬਾਹ ਹੋ ਰਹੀ ਹੈ।

ਇਹ ਸਦਨ ਇਸ ਤੱਥ ਦਾ ਗੰਭੀਰ ਨੋਟਿਸ ਲੈਂਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਇਸ ਵੇਲੇ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਕੋਲ ਨਹਿਰਾਂ ਦਾ ਪਾਣੀ ਆਪਣੀ ਲੋੜ ਤੋਂ ਕਿਤੇ ਘੱਟ ਹੈ ਅਤੇ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੀ ਕਿਸਾਨੀ ਪਾਣੀ ਦੇ ਗੰਭੀਰ ਸੰਕਟ ਦਾ ਸਾਹਮਣਾ ਕਰ ਰਹੀ ਹੈ।

ਪੰਜਾਬ ਦੇ ਲੋਕਾਂ ਦੇ ਹਿੱਤਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਾਹਮਣੇ ਰੱਖਦਾ ਹੋਇਆ ਸਦਨ ਸਰਬਸੰਤੀ ਨਾਲ ਪੰਜਾਬ ਸਰਕਾਰ, ਕੈਬਨਿਟ ਅਤੇ ਸਮੂਹ ਸਰਕਾਰੀ ਅਧਿਕਾਰੀਆਂ ਅਤੇ ਕਰਮਚਾਰੀਆਂ ਨੂੰ ਹਦਾਇਤ ਦਿੰਦਾ ਹੈ ਕਿ ਸਤਲੁਜ-ਜਮਨਾ ਲਿੰਕ ਨਹਿਰ ਦੀ ਉਸਾਰੀ ਲਈ ਉਹ ਕਿਸੇ ਵੀ ਏਜੰਸੀ ਨੂੰ ਸੂਬੇ ਦੀ ਜ਼ਮੀਨ ਨਾ ਸੌਪੇ, ਨਾ ਹੀ ਇਸ ਉੱਤੇ ਕੰਮ ਕਰਨ ਦੇਵੇ ਅਤੇ ਨਾ ਇਸ ਮੰਤਵ ਲਈ ਕੋਈ ਸਹਿਯੋਗ ਦੇਵੇ।"

ਮਤਾ ਪੇਸ਼ ਕਰਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਮਾਨਯੋਗ ਮੁੱਖ ਮੰਤਰੀ 20 ਮਿੰਟ ਲਈ ਬੋਲੇ।

ਨਿਮਨਲਿਖਤ ਮੈਂਬਰ ਸਾਹਿਬਾਨ ਨੇ ਮਤੇ ਤੇ ਬਹਿਸ ਵਿਚ ਹਿੱਸਾ ਲਿਆ ਅਤੇ ਉਹ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਦੇ ਨਾਮ ਸਾਹਮਣੇ ਦਿੱਤੇ ਗਏ ਸਮੇਂ ਲਈ ਬੋਲੇ:

1.	ਡਾਕਟਰ ਦਲਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਚੀਮਾ, ਸਿੱਖਿਆ ਮੰਤਰੀ	24 ਮਿੰਟ
2.	ਸਰਦਾਰ ਸਿਮਰਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਬੈਂਸ, ਅਜ਼ਾਦ ਮੈਂਬਰ	08 ਮਿੰਟ
3.	ਸ਼੍ਰੀ ਮਨੋਰਜਨ ਕਾਲੀਆ, ਭਾਰਤੀ ਜਨਤਾ ਪਾਰਟੀ	28 ਮਿੰਟ
4.	ਸਰਦਾਰ ਵਿਰਸਾ ਸਿੰਘ ਵਲਟੋਹਾ, ਸ਼੍ਰੋਮਣੀ ਅਕਾਲੀ ਦਲ	18 ਮਿੰਟ
5.	ਜਥੇਦਾਰ ਤੋਤਾ ਸਿੰਘ, ਖੇਤੀਬਾੜੀ ਮੰਤਰੀ	15 ਮਿੰਟ

8. **ਵਾਕ ਆਉਟ**

ਸਰਦਾਰ ਸਿਮਰਜੀਤ ਸਿੰਘ ਬੈਂਸ ਅਤੇ ਸਰਦਾਰ ਬਲਵਿੰਦਰ ਸਿੰਘ ਬੈਂਸ, ਦੋਨੋਂ ਅਜ਼ਾਦ ਮੈਂਬਰ ਸਰਕਾਰ ਵਿਰੋਧੀ ਨਾਅਰੇ ਲਗਾਉਂਦੇ ਹੋਏ ਸਦਨ ਵਿੱਚੋਂ ਵਾਕ ਆਉਟ ਕਰ ਗਏ।

9. **ਮਾਨਯੋਗ ਸਪੀਕਰ ਦੁਆਰਾ ਸਦਨ ਦਾ ਧੰਨਵਾਦ**

ਮਾਨਯੋਗ ਸਪੀਕਰ ਨੇ ਸਾਲ 1997 ਤੋਂ 2002 ਤੱਕ ਅਤੇ ਸਾਲ 2012 ਤੋਂ ਉਨ੍ਹਾਂ ਨੂੰ ਸਪੀਕਰ ਵਜੋਂ ਸੇਵਾ ਨਿਭਾਉਣ ਦਾ ਮੌਕਾ ਦੇਣ ਲਈ ਮੁੱਖ ਮੰਤਰੀ, ਪੰਜਾਬ ਅਤੇ ਸਦਨ ਦਾ ਧੰਨਵਾਦ ਕੀਤਾ।

ਇਸ ਉਪਰੰਤ ਸਦਨ ਅਣਮਿੱਥੇ ਸਮੇਂ ਲਈ ਸਥੱਗਿਤ ਹੋ ਗਿਆ।

A. Value of Bajra / Acre in unirrigated land

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As per Govt. of India, Ministry of Agriculture in 2012-13, area under Bajra cultivation was 	3989000 Hectares (1 Crore Acres)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total produce of Bajra was 	38,76,000 Tonnes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Average yield per hectare 	972 Kg.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yield per acre 	3.89 Quintals

With Rs.1330 per quintal as MSP in 2016-17 value of Bajra per acre = $1330 \times 3.89 \neq$ Rs.5173 or 5000/-

B. Value of Wheat in Ganganagar District, Irrigated land

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yield of alternative crop i.e. wheat in Ganganagar district, irrigated land. 	= 20 quintals per hectare
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> With Rs.1625/- per quintal as MSP value of wheat in 2016-17, per Acre. 	$1625 \times 20 = 32500/-$
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of fertilizer, pesticides / acre 	Rs.4000/-
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost of produce per acre 	$32500 - 4000 = 28500$

C. Net value addition because of one acre feet of water (A-B)
i.e. $28500 - 5000 = \text{Rs.}23500/-$

D. Value of water @ Rs.23,500/- per acre feet for 11.2 MAF / year for last 50 years = $23,500 \times 1.12$ (Crore acre feet) $\times 50 = \text{Rs.}13.16$ Lac Crores

Himachal signs agreement with Delhi Govt for selling Yamuna water

By Rahul Bhandari - December 20, 2019



New Delhi: Himachal Pradesh Government signs agreement for sale of a share of Yamuna river water to the Delhi government today at New Delhi.

The agreement was signed between Secretary, Irrigation and Public Health Dr. RN Batta and Principle Secretary of Delhi government Manisha Saxena.

Dr. RN Batta revealed that as per a multi-state agreement signed in 1994, Himachal Pradesh gets three per cent share of Yamuna water. This share remained unclaimed since 1994. It was on the request of Delhi government that Himachal cabinet decided to sell share of Himachal Pradesh to Delhi. As a result, Himachal government will get Rs. 21 crore per annum.

Dr. Batta said that it is for the first time in the country that such an agreement has been signed between two states.