

## Water in Concurrent List

### Why in news?

\n\n

The Centre recently held discussions with states on the issue of bringing water into the Concurrent List of the Constitution.

\n\n

### What is the current situation?

\n\n

- \n
- India water is a State subject, but the provisions are quite complicated.
- \n
- The primary entry in the Constitution relating to water **Entry 17** in the State List.
- \n
- It brings water including water supplies, irrigation and canals, drainage and embankments, water storage and water power under state list.
- \n
- But it also enables the Union to deal with Inter-State rivers if Parliament legislates in public interest, via Entry 56 in the Union List.
- \n
- This provision has not been used by Parliament.
- \n
- Under Entry 56, Parliament enact the River Boards Act 1956 to the establish River Boards for inter-State rivers.
- \n
- But no such board has been established under the Act.
- \n
- It is because of the strong resistance by State governments to any enhancement of the role of the Central government.
- \n
- Therefore each riparian state has an unrestrained hold over the portion of the river that runs through its territory.
- \n
- The Centre cannot intervene unless asked by the contending parties or directed by the judiciary to do so.

\n

\n\n

## What will happen due to the change?

\n\n

\n

- If a subject is added to the concurrent list, both the state and the centre can make laws on that subject.

\n

- In case of conflict between the central and state law on the subject, the central law prevails.

\n

- But if the state law is reserved for the consideration of the President and he gave his assent, then the state law will prevail in that state.

\n

\n\n

## What is the need?

\n\n

\n

- **Principle** - The current provision disregards the principle of equitable sharing of common property.

\n

- Countless inter-state water disputes of the present days are due to this.

\n

- **Resource depletion** - The extravagant and wasteful usage of river water one state deprives other states to meet even their essential needs.

\n

- Same is the case of over-exploitation of ground water at one spot can have detrimental effects in neighbouring areas.

\n

- **Non Compliance** - The states most often reject pleas by the Centre or awards of tribunals appointed by it to arbitrate on these matters.

\n

- The court judgments also remain unimplemented. e.g Verdict on Cauvery waters and Sutlej-Yamuna Link Canal.

\n

- **Constitutional Error** - Moreover, the Constitution-makers could not have anticipated the water scarcity and crisis of present times. Neither they could have foreseen the climate change and its impact on water resources.

\n

\n\n

## **What should be done?**

\n\n

\n

- In 2011 Ashok Chawla Committee underscored the need for a comprehensive national legislation on water either by bringing water in the Concurrent List or through a legal framework for treating water as a unified common resource.

\n

- The parliamentary standing committee on water resources and Parliament's Public Accounts Committee also have favoured the shift.

\n

- The states should co-operate with centre on this.

\n

- If the states refuse, the Centre should explore other options effectively using Entry 56 in the Union List.

\n

- But at the same time enough safeguards should be taken to avoid centralisation which deprives states of their rights.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Category: Mains | GS-II | Polity**

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n\n

\n

