

Hindi, Kannada, Kashmiri, Malayalam, Marathi, Orya, Punjabi, Sanskrit, Sindhi, Tamil, Telugu and Urdu. The object of my Bill is to include Nepali in the Eighth Schedule.

Nepali belongs to the Indian languages. And Nepali script is definitely Indian, as there is no difference between the Nagari script used for modern Hindi and the script used for modern Nepali. The Bengali and Nepali languages have a very close affinity. There are two to three crores of Nepali-speaking people in India. And there should be an opportunity to develop their language and culture within the framework of the Constitution. The actual figure might be much higher, as Nepali is one of the dominant languages of the lower Himalayan and sub-Himalayan regions. As a matter of fact, Nepali is a kind of *lingua franca* used widely throughout the Himalayan area.

It is, therefore, in the fitness of things that this language be added to the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution.

Sir, this is the object of my Bill. Now the Article 351 of our Constitution enjoins upon the inclusion of the national languages in the Eighth Schedule. Nepali is one language which can enrich Hindi. Nepali can contribute to a very large extent to the evolution and enrichment of Hindi in our country.

As you know, there have been many reports on this subject. I only want to quote Mr. Suniti Chatterjee, a National Professor. He said, "Other Indian languages are to be added in (Eighth) Schedule, following the wishes of the speakers and their importance e.g. Sindhi and Nepali." Sindhi has been accepted as the language of the Eighth Schedule in 1967. Now I do not know what are the reasons for the non-inclusion of Nepali in the Eighth Schedule of the Constitution of our country under Article 251 of the Constitution.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can continue it in the next session. Let us start half-an-hour discussion on Shipyard at Haldia. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu.

18.04 hrs.

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION SHIPYARD AT HALDIA

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour): This is a very serious matter. In that it is a clear and glaring instance as to how the Central Government has deliberately sabotaged the important project for Eastern India which was so very important and necessary for the unemployed youths, growth of our industry and economy. Mr. Sharma in reply to the question has stated that a techno-economic working group on the Haldia Shipyard was set up by the government to evaluate both the technical and economic consideration. The site proposed by the various State Governments into the Haldia was based on the report of the technical working group. The consultants were commissioned for preparation of the preliminary report etc. etc. I will prove here with documentary evidence that excepting the efforts to sabotage this Haldia Shipyard Project the Government of India has done nothing; and Mr. Sharma, whom I cannot hold responsible for this because he was not a Minister at that time, has got the onerous task on his shoulders to tell the House a story. Now what are the conditions? If you kindly read page 496 of the uncorrected debate you will find extremely poor soil condition which would result in difficult civil engineering work, heavy rainfall, etc.

Now I will show you from the Baveja Committee Report what is the position. What is stated here is totally baseless and fabricated. On page 37 of the Report, it is stated:

"Haldia was chosen as the most satisfactory location for sitting of

the satellite port because of the availability of requisite depth and minimum dredging."

For a port, a dockyard, it is the most important criterion. They have talked about heavy rainfall. I have got a copy of the meteorological department report on annual rainfall. The annual rainfall in Gangetic West Bengal is 1310.5 mm, for Orissa it is 1233 mm, for Gujarat, 1132 mm for Saurashtra and Kutch 1477.9 mm, for Konkan 2816.6 mm, Coastal Karnataka 2971.6 mm and so on. What is meant by heavy rainfall, I am yet to learn from the hon. Minister. He is a literate person, I take it. Therefore the heavy rainfall, what has been written by the bureaucrats or by hired saboteurs is nothing, but a concoction, and unmixed untruth; it is a lie.

I should come to another part of the report. On page 4969 there are stated the reasons for not providing a site near Haldia for setting up a shipyard given by the consultants, A B. Spelador of U.K. and a firm in Yugoslavia. I should like to know from when the Government has started putting more reliance on private foreign companies who could be purchased to do a thing for a consideration; they will write any report and give any opinion and by-pass and ignore and cold-storage the report drafted by the Government committee headed by senior-most persons in the field.

I will come to the report. This is the introduction to Baveja Committee report, which I shall be laying on the Table of the House with your permission, by Government of India, Ministry of Shipping, a most high powered committee. It was dated 2-7-1971. Under what conditions? In the context of the necessity of some urgent measures for industrial development in West Bengal a suggestion for setting up a shipyard in public sector at Haldia has been made. The

project would serve as an important focal point around which further industrial growth of this area could be planned to a considerable extent. This may also provide considerable workload to the engineering industry apart from providing some relief to the acute unemployment problem in West Bengal. With the above object in view it has been decided to constitute a working group to study in depth the question of setting up a shipyard at Haldia. The terms of reference to the working group were as follows; projections for demand of ships and the types likely to be in demand, availability of existing shipbuilding capacity and its adequacy for meeting the demand, necessity for additional shipyard, location, probable range of construction to be undertaken, facilities required and available therefor, recommendation as to feasibility, broad financial implications. This is what the report says.

The working group comprised of representatives of the ministries of shipping and transport, finance, commerce, industrial development, planning commission, Government of West Bengal, three public sectors shipyards, namely, Hindustan Shipyard Ltd., Cochin Shipyard Limited, Garden Reach Workshop Limited, Calcutta Port Commissioner, Central Inland Water Transport Corporation. By sabotaging this they have damned their own people who are proficient in their own sphere. They imported ticky-push consultants from London whom they could buy and write a Report to their advantage for a few thousand pounds. They completely brushed it aside. Is it not an insult to these officers also?

I have given details.

Shri G. C. Baveja, Joint Secretary, Shipping and Transport.

Shri S. K. Sehgal, Joint Secretary, Ministry of Industrial Development.

Shri T. K. Sarangan, Director,
Transport, Ministry of Commerce,
Joint Secretary, Ministry of Finance.

Deputy Finance Officer, Ministry of
Finance, Deptt. of Expenditure.

Joint Director, Transport, Planning
Commission.

Shri P. C. Mitra, Deputy Chair-
man, Calcutta Port Trust etc.

The best available persons, 12 of
them were brought but they could not
be trusted because the Report did not
suit the then masters in Delhi. I
cannot tell. But one day I may be
able to tell you what was the consi-
deration who were after it. I am at
it. I will take a little time, but I
shall be able to bring skeleton for the
House. The Committee stated:

At this stage the composition of the
Sub-Group was intended to include
Shri S. Kasthuri, Chief Project Offi-
cer, Cochin Shipyard, S. Shri M. G.
Kutty, T. R. Sheshadri of Hindustan
Shipyard Limited. The Sub-Group
was headed by Shri M. K. Biswas
who was assisted by in his work by
Dr. S. K. Bhattacharya, Director,
Institute of Port Management
and Chief Hydraulic Engineer
He has gone to Indonesia on loan
on United Nations assignment. About
the Indian Institute of Foreign Trade,
on project study making a quantita-
tive commoditywise, portwise and
countrywise projection of Indias
Overseas Trade till 1979 since this
project could be commissioned only
in October 1972 the study was not ex-
pected to be completed in time. The
urgency was so very great. The group
could in the meantime proceed on the
basis of evaluation already made by
the Ministry of Shipping and Trans-
port and in Planning Commission and
shipping tonnage needs of the Fifth
Plan. How urgent was the project?
How much need was there for the
project? Yet the unseen hand of the
ghosts came. They came and sabotag-
ed it and these officers were insulted
for a good job that they had done.

Shipping and Ship-building industry
in India according to them suffered
serious set back primarily due to
neglect of the Government and second-
ly due to the country's inability to
keep pace with the advances in mari-
time technology.

Indian tonnage amounts for only 1
per cent of the total world tonnage as
it was in 1973. 16th in the rank of
the ship-building nations in the world.
In spite of that this was sabotaged and
the Government has the responsibility.
Mr. Sharma has the responsibility to
tell us who had done it and why was
it done?

It was said, at present there are
only three shipyards in the country.
The first being under the Ministry
of Shipping and Transport, the re-
maining two under the Ministry of
Defence. They are made to build
certain particular type of vessels. Re-
cently the Shipyard completed a dock
which shall alleviate the necessity for
ship built by them to be sent to Cal-
cutta for free delivery dry docking
and inspection and has enabled the
shipyard to undertake dry docking
and large scale repair of the market
ships. They have dealt with it elabo-
rately.

18.14 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

The Study Group under Chapter III
has brought out the position that dur-
ing the Fifth Plan Period acquisition
of ship tonnage will have to be of the
order of 2.25 million GRT comprising
Tankers, Bulk carriers, Tramps ves-
sels, Container vessels, Liner vessels,
cargo, etc., account for 5 lakh GRT
comprising as follows:

This should mean a total gap of
17.5 lakhs GRP in the Fifth Plan which
has to be met through purchase of
overseas shipyards. In spite of that
they did not proceed to build vessels.

Beyond the Fifth Plan Period,
against the annual demand of 8 to 10
lakhs GRT the annual capacity avail-
able of the four shipyards based on

sanctioned programme for development is only 2 lakh GRT. Thus demand will exceed supply by 8 to 9 lakh tonnes per annum. Even on the basis of exploiting the fullest expansion potential available in the shipyards, the annual capacity works out to only 4.75 lakh GRT. This leaves a gap of 3.25 to 6.25 lakh GRT per annum. The Group, therefore, recommends that the new ship-building capacity should be planned so as to cover this gap fully.

They have said in clear language that it was not that they should confine themselves to one shipyard. They have said that the country could easily take even two new shipyards, but the whole thing was totally ignored. We are not pleading for Haldia alone. Paradip, which is an equally suitable place, should also have a shipyard.

On page 29 they have gone into the fullest details like "Basic Norms for Location Siting..." etc. On page 30, they have demolished what Mr. Sharma had said clearly in his reply to different questions here. On page 30, para 7.4, they say:

"The following considerations will govern the selection of a site:—

(a) Availability of large open land adjoining waterfront at a reasonable elevation above the highest tide.

(b) Sufficiently firm soil conditions to minimise the cost of foundations, columns and structures which will have to withstand heavy loads etc."

So, they have said, "sufficiently firm soil conditions." Those who have told you, Mr. Sharma, have told a lie and nothing but a lie. I would not go into the details. But they have said in clear language that Haldia was the best available site for a shipyard and it was a priority project, okayed and cleared by a government machinery.

They have said in conclusion on pages 32 and 33 as follows:

"The Working Group has considered carefully whether Haldia or its vicinity is suited from the technical and economic angles for the location of a shipyard. The answer is in the affirmative for the following reasons:—

(i) It is within reasonable distance from practically all the steel mills so far built. These include TISCO, IISCO, Durgapur, Rourkela and Bhilai. Thus, the basic raw material, namely, ship-building quality steel will have to travel minimum distances to reach the shipyard.

(ii) Calcutta and its hinterland right up to Jamshedpur and Ranchi constitute an area in which engineering industry, heavy, medium and light, is fully established.

(iii) Haldia port, as a satellite deep-water port of Calcutta, having been developed as a major outlet for the export trade emanating from the eastern region, the requisite transport network has had to be developed fully.

(iv) With its long tradition of fully developed engineering industries, heavy, medium and light, skilled labour in such trades as steel fabrication, welding, rigging, erection, joinery work etc. is available in the immediate hinterland; equally the requisite managerial skills are also available.

(v) The Government of West Bengal has assured that electric power and fresh water needs of any shipyard will be fully met even as it has been done for the port project.

(vi) Haldia will be a terminal port. The ships calling at this port will include ore carriers, colliers, bulk carriers, bringing raw materials..." etc.

While recognising exactive features, they have pointed out certain figures,

but they have themselves dismantled it. Mr. Sharma, you are talking about Appledore & Co., a ticky-push company, in London. I know these mushroom companies. They were heavily relying on a *sahab* company.

On page 34 it says:

"In this connection, the Working Group took note of the fact that the U.K. Shipyard Mission had examined Diamond Harbour and Geonkhali sites in 1858. The U.K. Mission had rejected Diamond Harbour as unsuitable but had placed Geonkhali as No. 5 in five sites deemed worthy of further consideration by Government."

About Haldia, it had nothing against. Then it says:

"The requisite infra-structure facilities have been developed. Considerable river training works have been done during the last 15 years."

Therefore, there is a full proof case for Haldia to become a shipyard.

On page 47, in Conclusions (para 1) they said:

"By world standards, the growth of Indian Shipping during the last quarter century cannot be described as large when compared with the growth of tonnage in other National fleets. Among many factors which have restricted the growth of shipping, the most important one has been the woefully small capacity of the indigenous shipbuilding industry."

On page 50, para 123, it was pointed out:

"From the conclusions set forth above, it will be clear that the working Group has done its best to consider, precisely and specifically the issues arising from the terms of reference assigned to it. In the light of these conclusions, the Group recommends that:

(1) there is a clear case for the establishment of at least one additional shipyard and even two

more shipyards during the Fifth Plan..."

On page 85 they concluded that Haldia qualifies itself as a very suitable location for such a shipyard and may be selected for the purpose.

I would like to ask from my friend, Sharmaji—kindly take the House into confidence once and tell us—who had suppressed this report. Why was it not immediately given effect to? Why the work was not started? If you read the preface and the terms of reference, urgency is very much there. Who invited the U. K. Consultants, for what commission and how much slush money went out of it? I would request you, I would beseech you to give an assurance to this House and to the whole of Eastern India that the Baveja Committee recommendations will be implemented and we shall be most grateful to you.

THE MINISTER OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SHRI A. P. SHARMA): When my friend, Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, raised the discussion I thought that the discussion was about the port at Haldia. But all through in the discussion that he has before this House, he has only discussed the Baveja Committee report. That is the only thing he has done. Perhaps, he has forgotten that the discussion is not about the Baveja Committee report.

Sir this Committee was set up, no doubt, at the instance of the West Bengal Government and the Ministry of Industrial Development. A working Group under the chairmanship of Shri G. C. Baveja, the then Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Shipping, was set up in July, 1971 to study the question of setting up a shipyard at Haldia. This was the question before the Baveja Committee when it was set up. That Committee examined the position of other places near Haldia also and submitted its report. While the Baveja Committee submitted the Report to the Government of India, in the meanwhile, the Gov-

ernment received requests from several other maritime States, and that is how another Committee was set up to consider the requests of the maritime States.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: On what date?

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: I will give you all the facts. Please have patience. So, Techno-economic Working Group was set up in May, 1973, headed by Brigadier Narula, the then Development Advisor in the Ministry, to examine the various sites, including Haldia. So, first of all, the Baveja Committee examined only Haldia. The Working Group under Brig. Narula was set up in 1973, after the Baveja Committee Report was submitted. That Report was received in December, 1973. Thereafter, three foreign consultants were appointed to prepare the project report. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu asked as to whose idea it was to engage these foreign consultants. I think Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu can tell many things which he knows better than me. But I can only say that these consultants...

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Who appointed Appledore?

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: Why are you worried only about Appledore? There were three consultants.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Because in your reply you have referred only to two parties.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: The foreign consultants came to the conclusion that there were certain other places, other than Haldia, which were more suitable for setting up shipyards.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: What was the fee paid to Appledore?

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: Will you please listen, if you want me to give a reply? At the same time, I will also tell you something which you may not like. The report of the foreign consultants was evaluated by a group set up by this Ministry in May, 1975, which referred to Hajira

in the West Coast and Paradip in the East Coast. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu was talking about sabotage of Haldia, because it is on the eastern region. Later on, he corrected himself, I could see, because he mentioned about Paradip also... (Interruptions) At this point of time I want to say that I am new to this Ministry. So, I do not know who sabotaged it and for what purpose. This could be mentioned by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu himself better. So far as I am concerned, I am placing the facts before the House.

The Evaluation Group concluded that the East Coast would be a more suitable location for setting up the two types of shipyard contemplated at that time. The Evaluation Group considered the following as the demerits of Haldia. Do you want to know the demerits? I do not want to mention them, but there were certain demerits. The other day when I talked about the latest report, I was referring to this report, and I quoted four reasons before this House.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: I have got the figures.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: I have also got the figure of rainfall and, for the satisfaction of Shri Bosu. I may quote them... (Interruptions) Please listen to me. This book is not going to help you. I will give you the figures. The relevant figures are:

Paradip 1,400, Hajira 1,200 and Haldia 2,200

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: For which year?

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: This is not a debating society.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: But which year?

(Interruptions)

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: Sir, I would request Mr. Bosu to listen to me as I have listened to him. Therefore, so far as the Government is concerned, at this point of time I can tell you that nobody is interested in sabotag-

ing anything. We have to go by certain technical reports and according to the reports, as I said earlier in this House, Paradip has been considered to be the most suitable site and next is Hajira. The investment decision in this respect will be taken depending on the financial constraints and other priorities. That is the present position so far as Haldia and other places are concerned. Therefore, my friend, Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu will find that apart from the Baweja Committee Report, there are other Reports and I have said very clearly while answering the question the other day that whereas I am talking about the latest report, Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu is talking about a report submitted in 1973. He is never up-to-date. He is always behind. (Interruptions). He always repeats the old theory. (Interruptions).

Sir, it is not a question of West Bengal, it is a question of India... (Interruptions). Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu is never up-to-date. He is always behind time in every respect. He always repeats the old theory. That is why he is talking about sabotage. (Interruptions).

Now, for my friends, Mr Somnath Chatterjee and Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu and rest of the other hon. Members who are interested in this problem I would like to say that Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu is, like the other day, a little bit confused between a shipyard and a ship repairing yard. So far as the ship repairing yard is concerned, I would like to say that a detailed project report has been prepared by M/s. Garden Reach Shipbuilders and Engineers, a public sector undertaking of the Ministry of Defence. The project will take about 3 years for completion. The proposal is under the active consideration of the Government. This is the exact position so far as Haldia is concerned.

(Interruptions)

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री (पटना) : अध्यक्ष जी, (व्यवधान) मुझे अधिकार है, सवाल पूछने

का । आप बबराइये नहीं, मैं भाषण देने वाला नहीं हूँ क्योंकि मेरी जानकारी बहुत कम है । (व्यवधान)

हल्दिया में या पारादीप में शिपयार्ड का निर्माण किया जाए, इन दोनों का महत्व अपने अपने स्थान पर बहुत ही ज्यादा है, खास तौर पर उन इलाकों के विकास के लिए दोनों ही जगह ये होने चाहियें । मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि दो दो कमेटियां सरकार ने, एक ही सरकार ने बनाई ऐसा क्यों करना पड़ा । मैं यह भी जानना चाहता हूँ कि दोनों कमेटियों को अलग-अलग रिपोर्ट्स, तैयार करने में कितना समय खर्च करना पड़ा और कितना पैसा अलग अलग खर्च करना पड़ा ? ऐसा करने का औचित्य क्या है और जनता के पैसे का इस तरह से दुरुपयोग करने का आपको अधिकार क्या था ? साथ ही हल्दिया और पारादीप दोनों जगह शिपयार्ड का निर्माण किया जाए, इसमें कौन-कौन सी कठिनाइयां हैं और दोनों जगह आप क्यों नहीं बनाना चाहते हैं ? दोनों जगह बनाने में क्या कठिनाइयां हैं और सरकार उन कठिनाइयों पर काबू पाने की स्थिति में क्यों नहीं है ?

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER (Durgapur): Calcutta and Haldia ports are near each other. The Irrigation Minister assured us in this House that he was interested in supplying 40,000 cusecs of water in the lean period for the betterment of the Calcutta and Haldia ports.

MR. SPEAKER: Where does that crop in?

SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER: It is related.

The hon. Minister has admitted that the Baweja Committee was set up. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu has mentioned that the Government suppressed their report and set up another committee. I want to know why that report was not published why it was suppressed.

We have come to know something of the recommendations of that committee from Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu. I would like to get full details of the recommendations from the Government.

I agree that for a large country like India we require not only three, but even six shipbuilding yards. So, both Paradip and Haldia can be set up. Though both are in the eastern region, they are part of India, and we are thinking not only of the eastern region but the whole of India. We also know the difference between a ship repairing yard and a shipbuilding yard. So, may I know from the hon. Minister whether he will do some re-thinking and set up a shipbuilding yard in Haldia, and if so when?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur): The hon. Minister has been good enough to refer to different reports. I do not think that there is a virtue necessarily in the subsequent report. Two reports differ from each other. May I know from the Minister whether the Government will look into the matter once again and find out or apply its own mind, instead of going by the foreign reports only, as to which one is more acceptable in view of the very strong demand for setting up a ship-yard at Haldia, which was approved by the Technical Committee and secondly, even if the ship-yard is at the moment not granted and if they take time to come to a decision, will the Minister take into consideration that for the ship repairing yard, about which he has made a reference, land has already been ear-marked by the State Government within the basin of Haldia dock system: it will have very important result from the national point of view if an immediate decision is taken for setting up a ship repairing yard, without giving up our claim for a shipyard. A study group set up by the Ministry had

recommended the proposal to set up a ship repairing yard at Haldia-Garden Reach Ship Builders and Engineers Ltd. are one of our pioneering concerns in this field and we are proud of it. They assigned the task of preparing a Project Report to Engineers (India) Limited and the Report has been received and we believe that they are in favour of setting up a ship building yard. In view of the fact that all assistance has been promised and assured by the State Government, will the Central Government take a decision as early as possible so that the work is commenced?

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (Dum Dum): I would put certain questions to my good friend, the hon. Minister, Shri Sharma. Did or did not the original blue print for Haldia include a shipyard project also? What was the first advice given by the British and Yugoslav consultants on it? That too has been suppressed. It has not been published and put before the public.

Then comes the Baveja Committee Report. Is it not true that certain pressure lobbies, I do not want to name them, had some influence upon the Government of India so that they thought of appointing another Committee in order to reverse the Baveja Committee Report and get a report suitable to their ideas? It is not only a case of sabotage, but a case of conspiracy also against the entire Eastern India, comprising of 20 crores of people, because it serves the entire Eastern India. Is it not a fact that the ship building yard, to which the hon. Minister referred, was agreed to by the previous Government and according to that Project Report, the project, including an off-Shore platform for manufacturing oil rigs, was sanctioned and now when he says that it is under the active consideration of the Government, is he not reversing the decision of the previous Government?

श्री ए० पी० शर्मा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, श्री रामावतार शास्त्री ने यह पूछा कि यह जो दूसरी कमेटी थी, इसके गठन करने का कारण क्या था ? मैंने श्री ज्योतिर्मय बसु को जवाब देते हुए बताया कि बवेजा कमेटी की रिपोर्ट जब हम लोगों के पास आई, उस वक्त करीब-करीब जो दूसरे मैरीटाइम स्टेट थे, उनकी भी रिक्वेस्ट आई कि हमारी जगहों की भी जांच की जाये कि वह पोर्ट के लिये सूटेबल है या नहीं, इसलिये ब्रिगेडियर नरूला कमेटी सैट-अप हुई ।

श्री रामावतारशास्त्री : मैंने पूछा था . .

श्री ए० पी० शर्मा : आपने यही पूछा था कि दूसरी कमेटी सैट-अप करने का कारण क्या था । मैंने आपको बताया कि पहली कमेटी की रिपोर्ट के साथ-साथ जो दूसरी कमेटी सैट-अप हुई उसका कारण यह था कि मेरीटाइम स्टेट की रिक्वेस्ट आई थी, उसी के आधार पर दूसरी कमेटी सैट-अप हुई । पहली रिक्वेस्ट वेस्ट बंगाल गवर्नमेंट की थी और इन्डस्ट्रियल डेवलपमेंट मिनिस्ट्री की थी जिसके आधार पर बवेजा कमेटी की स्थापना हुई थी । इसलिये यह दो कमेटी सैट-अप हुई ।

जहां तक यह प्रश्न है कि इन पर कितना खर्च हुआ और कितना समय लगा, तो समय की बाबत तो सुन लिया, खर्च का हिस्सा मंत्र पास इस समय नहीं है, मैं मदन को बतला दूंगा ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : लिखकर भिजवा दीजिये ।

श्री ए० पी० शर्मा शास्त्री जी को लिखकर भेज दूंगा ।

So far as my hon. friend, Mr. Halder is concerned, he brought in an accusation that there was suppression of the Baweja Committee Report. If the Baweja Committee Report is suppressed or hidden, how could my friends get it in their hands? It is an open document.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: 'It is absolutely a secret document. It had to be stolen . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: There is no suppression of anything. The Baweja Committee Report is not a secret document. It is an open document.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: It was refused repeatedly. Then, I had to use my master key and get it out.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: I want to tell my good friend, Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu, if he could not get the Report of the Baweja Committee, it was because of his friends' Government. If he had requested me, as soon as we assumed office, I could have easily given it to him.

I want to assure my hon. friend, Mr. Halder, that there is no question of suppression of any fact. The Baweja Committee Report is an open document. He can again read it. He can again either take it from Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu or from me and read it and tell me if there is anything that has been suppressed.

The hon Member, Mr. Somnath Chatterjee, I think, is more reasonable than most of these friends. He has seen the right point. It is not a question of ignoring Haldia; it is not a question of ignoring any other place. It is a question of comparative merits about the place which we are going to give first priority. That is according to the Report Haldia has been declared as the most suitable site and, therefore, we are talking about Haldia or Hajira. It does not mean that we have got anything against Haldia. I say Mr. Somnath Chatterjee is more reasonable than most of these friends. He has come with a complete suggestion. I have already assured that a detailed project report has been prepared by M/s. Garden Reach Ship Builders and Engineers, a public sector undertaking under the Ministry of Defence Pro-

ductions. The project will take about three years. I have said, 'about three years' because that is the time anticipated. But it does not mean that that time table will necessarily be stuck to. If it can be completed earlier, it will be completed earlier. There is no difficulty about that.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: When would you take the final decision?

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: We will keep that point in view. The time factor could be reduced. Again, it is dependent on so many other considerations. It is not in our hands only... (Interruptions).

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The experts went there and saw the land. The land has been kept reserved earmarked, for this project. All assistance has been assured. Therefore, I am earnestly requesting you to say that you will take a favourable decision by this month.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: We want to know whether it has been cleared, whether that particular project of ship repairing, the report of which has been received by you, has been cleared.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: I can repeat again. The detailed project report has been prepared by M/s. Garden Reach Ship Builders and Engineers which is a public sector undertaking. The next step regarding this is going to be taken.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: When are you going to Calcutta next! Please announce there. I will invite you.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: Mr. Niren Ghosh is my old friend like Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu. I am very sorry, in everything he sees a lobby. That is because he is an expert in lobbying. I want to assure him that, so far as I am concerned, there was no lobby. No lobby can bring any pressure on me. So far as this Government is

concerned, no lobby can work. Therefore, I want to assure him that the only reason for which we have not considered Haldia as the first choice is because of the report of the technical committee of experts.

SHRI NIREN GHOSH: He has not answered all my questions.

18.50 hrs.

RE. REPORTED ARREST OF MEMBER

MR. SPEAKER: Papers to be laid on the Table . . .

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: (Diamond Harbour): Sir, one submission. Mr. Devinder Singh Garcha, M.P., has been arrested and taken into custody. What is the reason, Sir? He is a Member of this House . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Have you any information on this? (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: We will check up.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Have you any information on this?

MR. SPEAKER: No information, so far. I am checking up.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Have you any information?

MR. SPEAKER: That is what I am saying. I am checking up. Mr. Bhishma Narain Singh.

18.54 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE— contd.

BIHAR GOVERNMENT ORDINANCES AND A STATEMENT

THE MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI BHISHMA NARAIN SINGH): Sir I beg to lay on the Table:

(1) A copy each of the following Bihar Government Ordinance under article 213(2)(a) of the Constitution read with clause (c)(iv) of the Proclamation dated the 17th February, issued by the President in relation to the State of Bihar—