

Commission have taken up the plan for the construction of a second Howrah bridge. May I know whether the Planning Commission can assure this House that this Howrah bridge will be completed within the fourth plan?

Shri Asoka Mehta: This question does not relate to Howrah bridge.

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: That is also linked up with the railway matter.

12.00 hrs.

Dr. Ranen Sen: Sometime last year, on the basis of the previous reports of the feasibility committees that were set up earlier in this decade, the West Bengal State Assembly unanimously passed a resolution requesting the Government of India to expedite the setting up of this circular railway. Last year, the hon. Labour Minister announced in this House the constitution of a Committee on behalf of the Government of India in which there were representatives of the Port Commissioners, the Railways, there were economists, financial advisers and all types of people. May I know what actually that Committee has done so far during the last six or seven months with regard to this circular railway?

Shri Asoka Mehta: That Committee that I have been referring to all the time is a Study Team of Metropolitan Transport. It is this Committee that has gone into the matter and discussed with the study group of the West Bengal Government, authorities of the Eastern Railway and representatives of the Port Commissioners. While I fully recognise that there is a great amount of hardship that the people of Calcutta are suffering, let us recognise the fact that if a circular railway is laid down it would complicate both the transport of the railway lines as well as of the port. It will not solve the problem, it will only aggravate the problem. Therefore, in trying to solve the problem

it is necessary to see that every possible condition and consideration is fully looked into (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: The Question Hour is over.....

Shri Dinen Bhattacharya: How can he express such an opinion that it will aggravate the problem?

Dr. Ranen Sen: The Planning Commission has already come to the conclusion as Shri Asoka Mehta said, that these difficulties will be there.....

Shri Asoka Mehta: I have not said that (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Order, order. Let us proceed now.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS

Supplementaries on Short Notice Question No. 1 regarding Cochin Shipyard

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up Short Notice Question No. 1 which was not concluded yesterday. The question was put and an answer given. Then a point was raised and the Minister was asked to look into it and come prepared with the answer.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Sir, before.....

Mr. Speaker: The Minister might give his answer first. Then if the hon. Member is satisfied with the answer, probably there may not be any occasion for him to raise this point and he may then put his supplementaries.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Yesterday the hon. Minister said that there was no record to show that an assurance was given.

Mr. Speaker: Perhaps the Minister also might have seen that. Let us hear him first.

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Sri

C. M. Poonacha: Sir, with reference to Short Notice Question No. 1 of 3rd August, 1966, and arising out of the supplementaries, I wish to explain the position relating to the Cochin Shipyard Project as follows.

When I was interrupted yesterday, I was trying to explain to the House that there was no record of an assurance relating to the inclusion of the Shipyard in the Third Plan but there was an assurance given in 1960 relating to its location at Cochin. Hon. Members may recall that there were as many as nineteen sites investigated for locating the Second Shipyard and that there were speculations about the Second Shipyard's location. As far as the Third Plan period is concerned, the then Minister had expressed a hope that the work will be taken in hand in the Third Plan itself. In this connection, I would draw the attention of the House to the statement made by the then Transport Minister on the 18th March, 1960. Dr. Subbarayan had been observed:

“that the decision to locate the Second Shipyard at Cochin is final and there is no going back on it”.

This was an assurance in regard to the location of the Shipyard but not in regard to its inclusion in the Third Plan. The then Minister at that time explained to the Members of the House that the reports which had appeared in the Press about the decision of the Government to drop the Second Shipyard Project were not correct. “The decision to set up the Second Shipyard at Cochin” he stated, “still stands”. In regard to the inclusion of the Second Shipyard Project in the Third Five Year Plan, the then Transport Minister stated “that the Project has been included in the Ministry's proposals for the Third Plan and the matter is under consideration of the Planning Commission.” “It will, however, be appreciated”, said the then Transport Minister “that the Planning Commis-

sion has to consider each project on its own merits and allot *inter se* priority having regard to the available resources both internal and external”. In short, what he emphasised then was that the project had been included in the Transport Ministry's recommendations for the Third Plan but the final Government's approval had yet to be obtained. He, therefore, expressed the sanguine hope in the following words: “I hope we shall be successful in our efforts and it will be possible to start the construction of the Yard in the Third Plan period itself”. It will be appreciated by the House that though there was no categorical assurance for the inclusion of the Second Shipyard Project in the Third Plan period, there was a hope expressed that this would be done and that the project would be taken in hand in the Third Plan itself. I am glad to report in this connection that Government did succeed in having the Cochin Shipyard Project included in the Third Plan. Moreover, as the rupee resources were forthcoming necessary preliminary action for the acquisition of land was promptly taken and considerable land has been acquired already. Moreover, negotiations with the Japanese consultants have progressed successfully and further necessary preliminary action was taken last year involving outlay of foreign exchange for obtaining the project report as well as the soil survey report. The consultants have submitted these reports to Government recently. I may, however, bring to the notice of the House that the present difficulty in obtaining foreign exchange and paucity of rupee resources now felt is causing some anxiety in respect of expeditious implementation of this project. Nevertheless, every effort will be made to progress the matter.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: There is some truth as well as twist in what the Minister has said. I want to show it, and it is for you, Sir, to decide whether it is an assurance or not.

Mr. Speaker: There is one thing that I would like to point out to him. If, as the Minister says, it has been included in the Third Plan then the discussion becomes only academic whether it was an assurance or not. When it is actually included in the Plan, what is the grievance?

Shri Umanath: We are interested in construction and not in inclusion in the Plan.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: The first point that he mentioned was about allocation of funds. Here I want to quote what the Speaker then said about certain assurances not being implemented. After a discussion of the subject and the circumstances leading to it, the Speaker said:

"I have heard sufficiently over this matter. I am going to allow the adjournment motion. Two points have been raised by Shri Tyagi. One is that it is not an urgent matter and there are opportunities to discuss these things. I do not know the decision of the Government. The question is that the decision is not subject to finances being available but subject only to the suitability of the land as to whether it sinks or not. If the land is suitable, the Shipyard can be located there. All the circumstances which have been laid before the House repeatedly by the hon. Minister have been subject only to one condition. That condition also seems to have been satisfied. Now, over this, Government want to go back on a new ground, namely, that finances are not available. This is a matter which ought not to be treated like that."

Then the Speaker stated that after giving so many assurances and promises the Government should not go back. It is on that that a statement was given, which was mentioned now.

After that 35 questions were put and the answers to all those 35 ques-

tions from 1960 onwards have been shown; then something else will be shown, but because it is only a question I do not want to go into that. Here I want to read out only three sentences from here. It says:

"I can, therefore, assure the Members, particularly those coming from the Kerala State, that the decision to locate the second shipyard is final and there is not going back on it."

That is one thing. The second thing is:—

"Accordingly, Government are taking immediate steps to secure the necessary technical and financial collaboration. I hope we shall be successful in our efforts".

It says, "I hope we shall be successful". The word "shall" has got a meaning. It continues:

"and it will be possible to start the construction of the yard."

The word "will" also has a meaning. It does not say about including it in the Third Plan. If I am wrong, the Speaker must tell me so. There is a difference between saying, "It will be included in the Third Plan" and "Construction of the yard will be in the Third Plan itself".

So, the promise or hope or whatever it is—I say, it is not a hope, it is a promise—was that the construction of the yard will be taken up in the Third Plan itself. It is not the question of whether it is included in the Third Plan itself. As far as the Minister is concerned, the Minister has made a promise that it will be possible to start construction of the yard in the Third Plan itself. He has not said, "We will try"; he has said "in the Third Plan itself".

Now, as far as this question is concerned, when the question was put day before yesterday, they came and they did not even see that question. Nobody was prepared to answer the question. I even phoned both the Ministers and told them that this is

the question. They said that they did not get the question. Then I phoned the Secretary and asked why it was not sent. It was sent after that. They were not prepared even yesterday. If you look into the proceedings, you will find that I made a request, "Tomorrow they may come prepared for this". Then, why was this reply not given yesterday? Yesterday this reply was not given. The reply given was that there was no record. There is a record. That record has not come today. If this is the way....

Mr. Speaker: Now I have heard him enough. At least he should appreciate that the Minister has brought that record and has explained that yesterday he was not allowed to complete the sentence. That is what he has said. He wanted to say that there was no assurance so far as inclusion was concerned; there was an assurance so far as location was concerned. This is what he wanted to say to complete it but he was not allowed then. Now he has explained that though there was no assurance about its inclusion, yet it has been included and it was possible to include it in the Third Five Year Plan. But in spite of it the hope that was expressed that construction would begin has not materialised; that has not been fulfilled. Now he might put the supplementary, whatever he wants to ask.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: May I know, why, in spite of the fact that the assurance was given that the construction of the yard will begin in the Third Plan itself, the construction of the yard was not taken up?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: As explained all along in respect of this question, the first stage of detailed technical project report is finalised by competent technical consultants was not completed. The report was received only on the 27th April, 1966, that is, this year. The project report is under the examination of a technical committee of the Ministry of

Transport with representatives of other ministries and that technical report of technical officers is being expected to be received by the middle of this month. Further consideration by Government would be continued after the receipt of that report by from technical experts.

Mr. Speaker: What are the future hopes? Now when would construction begin?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: After the feasibility of the shipyard is precisely established and the technical report is received. Government will examine each and every aspect; the scope of the project as well as the foreign exchange requirement of the project and necessary action will be taken.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: It is reported in a section of the press two weeks back that the reaction of the Planning Commission was not favourable to the project specially in view of the high cost. May I know what is the position today?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: It is rather premature for me to venture to offer an opinion on this matter because the matter is now being considered by the Technical Committee, by the experts. After the report is received, we will be able to say what is the scope and the feasibility.

Shri Nambiar: May I know whether the Government have taken any action other than that of acquiring the land so far as the construction of the shipyard is concerned?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: The main thing hinges on the project report. Government have taken expeditious action in getting the foreign consultants. The matter has been thoroughly examined and the project report has been received. That is all what Government could do. Without that, how can construction of a shipyard be taken up in hand?

Shri Vasudevan Nair: You will appreciate the feelings of the members coming from Kerala because we feel honestly that for the last ten years this Government has been trying to dupe our people. I shall come to a later date when the hon. Minister, Shri Sanjiva Reddy, took over. On April 5, when he was winding up the debate on the demands of his Ministry, I asked him:

"What about the second ship-building yard? It is hanging in the air for many years."

He said:

"Some foreign companies have already been given consultancy. They are doing it."

He did not know which foreign consultancy.

I then asked him:

"Will it come up?"

He replied:

"It will definitely come up. I do not know why a doubt has arisen about it."

I said:

"The doubt arises because of our bitter experience in the past."

This is a very categorical statement by the Minister that it will definitely come up,

Mr. Poonacha, when he was in Kerala after the last session, also announced in the Press that the Cochin shipyard is coming. Then when the Prime Minister was there—they have often come there during the last ten years, I think, for elections—

Mr. Speaker: He may put his question.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: . . . she promised that she will personally expedite the decision on ship-building yard.

Now the entire thing, according to the Minister, rests on the Technical Committee's report—the feasibility report. That means, it is still in the air.

Mr. Speaker: If he desires a discussion, that is a separate thing. He should now ask his question.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I am coming to the question.

Mr. Speaker: After such a long journey!

Shri Vasudevan Nair: I want to know from the Minister whether the statement made by him in the House that it will definitely come up still stands, whether he sticks to it in spite of all kinds of feasibility and all that, and whether he can give an assurance that this shipyard is coming in the Fourth Plan.

The Minister of Transport, Aviation, Shipping and Tourism (Shri Sanjiva Reddy): I think the position has been explained very clearly by the Minister of State. Yesterday I had to be in the other House; there were two call-attention notices. I am really sorry I could not be present here yesterday. I was actually standing on my legs at that time in the other House.

About the assurance, I can say that we are anxious to have the ship-building yard at Cochin. We are taking steps to see that the project report which has been received is examined as quickly as possible and I am hopeful that the Planning Commission also would allot enough money, foreign exchange, rupee finances and all that. We are as anxious as the Opposition to see that the Cochin Shipyard is taken. It, of course depends on so many other considerations—rupees finance, foreign exchange and all that. . . .

Shri Vasudevan Nair: How did he say that it will definitely come up?

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: We are not responsible for Planning Commission and Finance Ministry. Our desire is that it should come and we want to pursue. As Dr. Subbarayan had said we shall certainly make our best efforts to see that it comes up.

Shri P. Kunhan: May I know who are the members of the Technical Committee and whether they are technical persons or administrative officers?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: The Technical Committee consists of the Development Adviser to the Ministry of Transport (Ports), the Naval Headquarters Director, a technical person, the representative of the D. G. Shipping, the Chairman of the Cochin Port Trust and an Administrative Officer of the Ministry.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: The word "feasibility" has been repeatedly used by the Minister of State. I take it that the Government gave the assurance on behalf of the entire body, the Cabinet. Do I now take it, in view of what has been said, that all assurances and expressions of hope are contingent upon the feasibility examination by experts, financial agencies and certain other instruments of administration, and till then the whole thing hangs fire and the old assurance will not be implemented?

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: I would like hon. Members to appreciate that on technical matters, naturally, we have to take the advice of the technical people and we shall have to await their report. It is coming in about a month's time. It is not as if several years are going to be taken for this; we are expecting the advice of the technical committee by the end of the month or some time during this month.

An hon. Member: What is the meaning of the assurance then?

Shri Ravindra Varma: This project has been in the incubator or the refrigerator for about fifteen years, and now we are told that the feasibility is being looked into. May I know whether the foreign consultants, namely Mitsubishis were asked to submit a detailed project report or a feasibility report, and if there is a detailed project report, may I know whether there is any truth in the report that two kinds of reports are being simultaneously considered, one a skeleton project for ships of low tonnage, and the other a much more detailed project report, and if not which one of these projects is under consideration?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: A detailed project report has been received, and the technical committee is now examining the various aspects of the detailed project report and it will advise the Ministry as to what precise action should be taken with regard to the financial outlay as well as the scope of the project as such. This is the position that has been referred to the technical committee. On receipt of the report of the technical committee, further action will be taken.

Shri Ravindra Varma: My specific question has not been answered. I asked whether there were two sets of project reports. There has been no answer to this question.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: There is only one project report and that is the detailed project report.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: May I know whether the technical committee has been directed by the Minister to go round other ports and examine the feasibility in those areas also, and whether the explosives dock, the establishment of which in Cochin was definitely objected to by the Mitsubishis is being surreptitiously brought in to sabotage the scheme?

Shri C. M. Poonacha: The reference to the explosives berth is not quite germane to the point that we are considering now.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: It is there in the report.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: It is not the port but it is the second shipyard with which we are concerned now. With regard to the ship building yard we have had the report, and as I have already mentioned, the matter is under active consideration...

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: My question was this. Has the technical committee been asked to go round the other ports and examine its feasibility there? The hon. Minister should answer that question.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: The detailed project report has been received and it is now under examination by the technical committee. They need not go to any other port.

Mr. Speaker: Next short notice question. Shri Madhu Limaye.

Shri Mohammed Koya: My name is also there. But you have not called me.

Mr. Speaker: I am sorry. I cannot allow any more questions on this now. We have already spent about 25 minutes on this question.

Shri Mohammed Koya: When our names are there, you do not call us. But when our names are not there, you simply say that our names are not there. What is this?

Some hon. Members rose—

Mr. Speaker: If hon. Members want a discussion they might have recourse to other methods.

Shri P. Kunhan: Last time, I had given notice of a half-an-hour discussion, and the hon. Minister had asked me to withdraw it in view of the assurance that he had given that the shipyard would be coming up soon.

Mr. Speaker: Now, Shri Madhu Limaye.

श्री मधु लिमये : प्राध घंटे की उनकी बहस मंजूर कर लीजिये, अध्यक्ष महोदय।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नोटिस देंगे तो देख लूंगा।

श्री मधु लिमये : नोटिस दे दीजिए न, गोपालन साहब।

Institute of International Studies

S.N.Q. 3. Shri Madhu Limaye:

Shri Bhagwat Jha Azad:

Shri Sidheshwar Prasad:

Shri Kishen Pattanayak:

Dr. Ram Manohar Lohia:

Will the Minister of Education be pleased to refer to the reply given to Short Notice Question No. 37 on the 16th May, 1966 and state:

(a) whether the Director or the Academic Council of the Institute of International Studies, Delhi have since paid Mr. Ved Pratap Vedic his scholarship or stipend on the basis of his application in Hindi; and

(b) whether it is also a fact that the said Council have decided that students may submit their thesis in any Indian language, if they so choose?

The Minister of Education (Shri M. C. Chagla): (a) Shri Ved Pratap Vedic has been paid stipend upto June, 1966 and no dues are now pending.

(b) The Academic Council have decided that the Board of research Studies may in exceptional cases permit a student to write his thesis in any other language, provided it is satisfied that adequate research materials are available either in that language or in any other language in which the student is already proficient and that it can find a competent supervisor and examiners in the language of the thesis.

श्री मधु लिमये : जहाँ तक परीक्षक का एग्जैमिनर का सवाल है, बात कुछ समय में आती है। लेकिन जवाब में कहा गया है कि एक्सैम्पशनल केसिस में इस तरह की इजाजत दी जाएगी कि भारतीय भाषाओं में वे अपने