

[Shri K. C. Sharma]

the whole of the administration is rotten, who'e of the administration is corrupt, I beg to submit, is not fair. Only a corrupt soul sees corruption everywhere.

I beg to say with all the force at my command that Indian judges have integrity, intelligence and impartiality second to no other judiciary in the world. They are among the best cadre of judges in the world. Look at their judgments. Look at their intelligence and their scholarship. I can say this in respect of almost every District Magistrate and with safe conscience, that none of them is corrupt.

Where is the corruption? Do you think that you can judge the present-day administration with the 2000 BC standard! Modern age is modern age. Every young man wants some comfort, some pleasure, some security for his children and his family. If the present structure of society is lacking what is called the rational structure, somebody is likely to go wrong. But taking the picture as a whole, I beg to submit, the Indian Administration....

Dr. M. S. Aney: Ideal.

Shri K. C. Sharma: I beg to submit, the Indian Administration has done its best. The proof lies in this fact, that though 50 countries have become independent, India is the only country which has maintained continuity, which has maintained its administrative set-up, which has maintained a democratic set-up. Others have failed. Do you think you alone, your ministers alone, or we alone have been able to keep up this democracy going? The administration has its own share. They have done well and they deserve a word of praise. I do not say that there are no black-sheep. I do not say that people are

not failing. But they are failing only to the extent to which others are failing. All over the world a new change is coming. Democracy itself is a new institution. It is quite new, so far as India is concerned. Therefore, there would be failings here and there; we have to meet them and correct them. But painting everything black is neither a good strategy, nor a good policy, nor good conscience. Let us give the devil its due. (*Interruption*). The hon. Lady Member understands nothing, knows nothing and cannot know these difficult problems.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Member may resume his seat. He may continue his speech tomorrow. We will now take up the half-an-hour discussion.

17 hrs.

*COCHIN SHIPYARD

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): Mr. Chairman, I am glad that Shri Sanjiva Reddy is here and I hope he would give a true and correct picture of the position. The question of the construction of the shipyard at Cochin is the biggest scandal. From 20.5.57 to 10.5.66, thirty questions were asked in this House about the construction of the second shipyard, besides an adjournment motion on 15th March, 1960. The answers given from time to time—I have got some of them with me here—contradict each other. Similarly, one promise after another was given and nothing has been done to carry out those

assurances or promises. The statements given by the Ministers will clearly show that there was a clever, calculated conspiracy by the Government to hoodwink the Members of Parliament, especially the Members from Kerala, and the people of Kerala. I am sorry to say that it was a deliberate betrayal and cheating of the people. I will show by facts that it was a deliberate betrayal.

On the eve of every election all the Ministers who go to Kerala promise many things, and I can understand it. Shri A. M. Thomas, who comes from that area, promises not only during the elections but whenever he goes there.

Mr. Chairman: Luckily he is here now.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I am glad he is here. He is interested in that project but he is also duped by his own colleagues, I do not know why. Recently, the Prime Minister who visited Kerala—I do not know whether it is because a large number of people assembled to meet her in spite of my organising a black flag demonstration—also said that the work on the second shipyard would begin. Yesterday, some of the Malayalam papers reported that the Prime Minister has told the Planning Commission to see that it is included in the Plan. Shri Asoka Mehta has stated that the draft of the Five Year Plan is ready. What I want to know from the hon. Minister is whether in the draft Plan there is any provision for the Cochin shipyard. As far as foreign exchange is concerned, I want to know whether they are again trying to get it and whether priority is given to this project. From that it will be clear that what has been said till now is not what is going to happen hereafter.

I am not one who thinks that by the construction of the shipyard at Cochin the whole problem of unem-

ployment in Kerala will be solved. Then why is it that from 1957 till this day all the newspapers in Kerala, irrespective of their party affiliations, all the political parties and the people in general had been agitating for the shipyard at Cochin? It is because the establishment of the shipyard will result in the opening of so many subsidiary small industries and in a State like Kerala, where unemployment is acute, that will help. That the reason why there is so much of agitation for the second shipyard in Kerala.

We have the bitter experience of betrayal and discrimination, not once or twice but about twenty times. In this very House, Shri Kanungo, the then Minister, assured us about the establishment of phyto-chemical industries in Kerala. Shri A. M. Thomas knows the incident only too well. It was a conspiracy. We were assured that the phyto-chemical industry will be established in Kerala.

There was a half-an-hour discussion about it and the answer given after the discussion to the Members from Kerala and to me was, "Be sure, the phyto-chemicals plant will be in Kerala".

It is out of that experience that I am a little bit better when I criticize. It was said here that land was taken and purchased. A question was put and then land was purchased. Another question was put and then fences were put up. Another question was put and the land was taken away and the fences were removed and there is no phyto-chemicals plant. That is what happened.

As far as the fisheries training institution is concerned, experts went to examine and the experts said that Cochin is the best place. There was a discussion. The Minister, then Shri Krishnappa, said, "Yes, it is the best place". But in Ernakulam there are no houses where there are four rooms. So, it was transferred to Bombay, though this was the best place.

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

I do not want to give the list of betrayals—1, 2, 3, like that. One thing was continuously done. If the project is not there, the land has been taken and the peasants have been driven away. Even for the Cochin shipyard the land has been acquired and the Minister, Shri Raj Bahadur, went there and laid the foundation. That was a foundation of betrayal. It is not the foundation of the shipyard; it is the foundation of betrayal. All the people are driven away. Though we have no project at all, we have one thing. In the name of a project the poor peasants who are living in the place are driven away. The phytochemicals plant is also not there and the people also are not there; they are driven away.

Money was wasted. I have said about two things. The other things are there and I want to give a history of this. The UK Shipyard Mission visited this country in November 1957 under the joint auspices of the Colombo Plan and the UK Shipping Conference to advise the Government on the site and the lay-out of a new shipyard, submitted a report to Government in 1958 and after inspecting 19 sites the Mission recommended that Ernakulam site at Cochin was the best place. After the preliminary report Government of India appointed another inter-departmental committee in June 1958. This committee recommended that it must be in Cochin. Then there was a pull from some other State as usual that the shipyard must be in some other place. In answer to a question on February 23, 1965 the Minister said that Shri G. L. Mehta, the Chairman of the National Shipping Board, advised against this proposal. He doubted the advisability to have a shipyard. Even that advice is there. That advice is behind all these things.

My hon. friend, who is not present here—Shri Raghunath Singh, who is now the Chairman of the National Shipping Board opposed my adjourn-

ment motion then. Then I did not understand what was the real basis for his opposing that. Now I understand that the National Shipping Board at a meeting 15 days ago said that 75 ships can be purchased. That is the reason why the Government has decided to have no shipyard.

Then the question of soil came, whether the soil was fit. Somebody said that the soil of Keraia is red soil; so, it is not fit. It was tested also. The soil also was found to be good.

Then, on March 15, 1960 I moved an adjournment motion because papers like the *Mathrubhoomi*, *Statesman* and other papers reported that the shipyard was going, that they have already decided. Then there was an agitation in Kerala. The Minister said in answer to a question, which I have stated, once more:

“I hope, we shall be successful in our efforts and it will be possible to start construction of the yard in the Third Plan period itself.”

I do not know whether he used the word “itself” without knowing the meaning of it. He said “itself”.

The other day the Minister, Shri Poonacha, said that there was no record of an assurance. I am not blaming him because he does not know what happened. So many ministers have changed that they do not know what the other minister has said. So, usually there will be contradictions. I am not finding fault with him.

Mr. Chairman: But the record should be there.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: There must be. He said that now they are waiting for the feasibility of the shipyard. They want to know this after ten years! What has been done these ten years?

And what will be the report of the feasibility committee? It will be, "No foreign exchange now; nothing. So, no shipyard or a ship repairing yard." Or, as Shri Thomas wants now, a naval dockyard or something like that. There will be no shipyard.

Shri Poonacha's statement is an unconvincing exercise in word play. This is what the *Times of India* said; I am only quoting:

"It is now ten years since Government announced its decision to set up a second shipyard in Cochin."

only ten years!

I will show that there was definite commitment not only to begin the thing but to complete it also in the Third Plan. It is said there is no foreign exchange. Kerala gives about Rs. 100 crores of foreign exchange annually and for that Kerala State which is giving foreign exchange, it is difficult to find Rs. 10 crores of foreign exchange in the whole Plan, Rs. 2 crores of foreign exchange per year. It is very strange.

I will now, briefly, go to the records.

Mr. Chairman: He may try to conclude soon because there are a number of Members who want to put questions.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I will take some time. I will try to finish within a few minutes. I must give all these facts.

In answer to a question, on 20th November, 1957, the Minister said:

"It may be added that this project is scheduled to be taken up in the 3rd Plan."

In December, 1958, the Minister said:

"The Committee is still examining certain technical points."

Then, on March 12, 1959, he said:

"The Committee is still engaged in examining certain technical points which have to be investigated before a site can be finally settled."

Before the site can be settled, there were the technical points to be examined. And now also there are the technical points to be examined.

On March 18, 1960, the Minister said:

"It depends upon the availability of finance."

On March 18, 1960, the Minister said in a statement:

"It will be possible to start the construction of the yard in the Third Plan period."

In answer to a question he said:

"From 1960 onwards, technical Collaboration negotiations are going on with U.K., West Germany, Japan and Sweden for setting up second Shipyard."

On August 8, 1961, in answer to a question, the Minister said:

"An amount of Rs. 20.52 lakhs was spent during Second Plan. The project which is estimated to cost Rs. 20.5 crores has been included in the list of industrial and mineral projects included in the Third Five Year Plan.

Further, on February 16, 1961, the replies were given in the following manner to the questions put to the Minister:

Q. Has any amount been allotted in the Third Five Year Plan for second Shipyard?

A. It has been included in the draft plan and an amount has been allotted.

[Shri A. K. Gopalan]

Q. May I know whether it will be completed during the Third Five Year Plan period?

A. I cannot exactly say it will be completed. I think, we shall have made a beginning and we shall have made a fair advance. Maybe, if everything goes well, we may also complete it. Due priority is to be given to these projects."

They said that they would complete it and that due priority was to be given to this project.

Then, it was asked:

"The hon. Minister stated it will cost Rs. 20 crores but it has not been included in the Third Plan."

The reply was:

"It has been included in the Third Plan. Rs. 20 crores is the total sum. What amount is to be spent in the Third Plan is yet under consideration."

On March 24, 1962, this is what was stated:

"Negotiations with U.K., West Germany, Japan and Sweden are going on. The approximate cost is Rs. 19 crores."

... it is coming down; it was Rs. 20 crores and now it is Rs. 19 crores and it is further coming down.

"...and it will be from the resources available to the country as laid down in the Third Plan.

In fact, we would like to have it completed in the Third Plan."

Again, on March 26, 1963, in answer to a question, the Minister said:

"The question of foreign technical and financial collaboration

in the project is being actively pursued."

On June 2, 1964, it was said:

"The total estimated cost as per the latest scheme is Rs. 8.67 crores and the foreign exchange content is Rs. 2.67 crores."

Here, I want to say that the cost was Rs. 20 crores and it came down to Rs. 8.67 crores because the shipyard became a repairing yard. It was in 1964 that the Government decided that. They did not want to say that. They knew the people of Kerala are intelligent enough to understand that. So, they wanted to say that slowly. I stress this point that from Rs. 20 crores, it came to Rs. 8.67 crores.

Further, the question was:

"Whether any foreign collaboration will be approached."

The answer was:

"The negotiations with the group has reached such a stage where this question hardly arises."

On September 4, 1964, the Minister said:

"It is hoped that an agreement will be concluded soon."

On December 1, 1964, it was said:

"We were trying for collaboration from 1960 to 1962 with other countries. After 1962, our negotiation with Japanese is going on and we have reached an advanced stage."

On November 30, 1965, this is what was said by the Minister:

"The report is to be submitted by 30th April, 1966."

Then, on August 24, 1966, the Minister said:

"During the last 6 years that we have been negotiating for foreign collaboration relating to the second Shipyard, three delegations visited Japan in connection with the Shipyard, first visit in 1962, the second in 1964 and the third in 1965."

In answer to another question on February 23, 1965, the Minister said that they have not only made a firm commitment—I want to stress this point . . .

Mr. Chairman: He will try to conclude in two minutes.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I will finish it within two minutes. They have not only made a firm commitment, but they have already entered into an agreement as an advanced stage action for the construction of the project. **Sir,** it is not a question of concluding in two or three minutes. Here the Minister says that they have not only made a firm commitment but they have already entered into an agreement . . .

Mr. Chairman: We have to conduct the proceedings according to the rules of procedure. So far as half-an-hour discussion is concerned, I may say for the guidance of the members that the hon. Member who raises the discussion will make a short speech after which the questioners will ask their questions and then the Minister will reply. If the hon. Member wants to have a full discussion on this, there are other forms also where it could be discussed as a subject.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: First, it was a short-notice question and now it has come to half-an-hour discussion.

I shall put my points very briefly. The Minister has said that they have not only made a firm commitment—a commitment was made; negotiation was there—but they have already entered into an agreement as an advanced

stage action for the construction of the project. Now the 'feasibility' has come. What 'feasibility' is being thought of now? Here an answer has come saying that we have already entered into an agreement as an advanced stage action for the construction of the shipyard; something is being done.

I have only one thing to ask. I do not want to go into the details because you have said that there is no time.

I want to know from the hon. Minister whether at least now—the Planning Minister has said that the draft of the Fourth Five Year Plan is ready—in the draft of the Fourth Five Year Plan how much amount is set apart for the shipyard, whether it is Rs. 20 crores or as it was said by the Minister, Rs. 8 crores and whether, as far as the foreign exchange is concerned, the priority will be given. I want an answer for these. I would say that from 1957 to 1966 the answers given in the House are a betrayal; it is not ignorance; from Rs. 20 crores, it has come down to Rs. 8 crores.

There is a rumour and there are reports in the papers that there will be no Cochin shipyard, there may only be a repairing yard, a boat-yard. Now the draft of the Fourth Five Year Plan is ready. All that I want to say is that, as far as the Cochin shipyard is concerned, let the Government be frank; let them say, "we have no foreign exchange, we have no money because of devaluation" or something like that and then let them say what the position is. As far as Kerala is concerned, it is not a question of Party; it is a question of the whole people of Kerala because the construction of a shipyard at Cochin, where there are no industries at all, is very important. As I said the other day when the Prime Minister went there, nobody, not even the Prime Minister, should say anything without understanding the whole thing . . .

Mr. Chairman: The hon. Member should conclude now.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I hope the hon. Minister will give definite replies as far as the three questions are concerned, namely, whether any money has been set apart in the Fourth Five Year Plan; whether, as far as foreign exchange is concerned, priority will be given; and whether we are going to have a shipyard or a boatyard.

Shri Vasudevan Nair (Ambalapuzha): Last time the Hon. Minister, while answering the short-notice question, stated that he could speak only for his Ministry and that he could not speak for the Planning Commission and the entire Cabinet. I am now asking information only about his Ministry.

I understand that there is an offer of yen credit from Japan. I should like to know whether his Department or Ministry has recommended that priority should be given for this second ship-building yard as far as this yen credit from Japan is concerned. I should also like him to enlighten the House whether his Ministry has recommended to the Planning Commission and perhaps to the Technical Committee that only the repairing yard need be taken up during the Fourth Plan and the shipyard can be postponed for the Fifth or Sixth or Seventh Plan, whatever it is.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair (Quilon): In view of the fact that during the first two Plan periods the total expenditure in public sector in the State of Kerala had been only Rs. 0.79 crore out of Rs. 1328 crores and in view of the fact that even during the Third Plan, there had been complete neglect of Kerala by the Central Government, may I know whether the Mitsubishi report has specifically laid down two aspects as conditions precedent to the setting up of the ship-building yard in Cochin, namely that

firstly the naval jetty which is projecting into the sea should be altered at the expense of the Defence Ministry, and secondly that the explosives dock should not be set up anywhere near it and, therefore, it should not be set in Cochin? May I also know from the hon. Minister whether he has instructed the technical committee to go into the question of the overall cost including the removal or alteration of the naval jetty and to suggest that the cost in Cochin will be inordinately excessive as compared to that in any other area, and thereby deny the ship-building yard in Cochin on the ground that it is more costly? At the same time, may I also know whether Government are trying surreptitiously to bring in the explosives yard, which is being opposed by all sections of the people into the port of Cochin in order firstly to deny us the shipbuilding yard and secondly in order to establish it somewhere else because no other major port would take it?

Shri P. Kunhan (Palghat): What has happened to the Rs. 20 crores provided in the Third Plan? May I know whether Government could give us an assurance that this amount will be earmarked over and above the allocation that would be made in the Fourth Plan, if that scheme is taken up?

Mr. Chairman: Shri Umanath.

Shri Umanath (Pudukkottai): I do not want to ask any questions.

Shri Warrior (Trichur): May I know whether Government have taken any definite decision regarding the policy question of producing ships rather than building ships here? That idea was already in the air even from the beginning. As my hon. friend Shri A. K. Gopalan had pointed out, Shri G. L. Mehta had suggested that in order to reach the targeted tonnage, it would be easier to purchase the ships rather than to have some ship-

yard somewhere in India, either in Cochin or anywhere else. Have Government at least now come to a firm decision about this policy question?

Shri D. C. Sharma (Gurdaspur): In view of the fact that some Members from Kerala have urged or have emphasised an element of conspiracy against the State in not building this ship-building yard and in view also of the fact that when the Chinese were attacking our country, some of the Chinese boats were seen near that area, and in view also of the fact that Pakistan has tried to step up its programme of ship-building and building up its own shipyards, may I know why Government which promised to the people this ship-building yard in the Third Five Year Plan have delayed its construction for so long, when our internal situation, our external relations and considerations of our neighbourly relations with Pakistan are such as to necessitate its completion very, very early?

Shri Maniyangadan (Kottayam): Recent reports in the papers in Kerala have increased the anxiety of the people in this connection. I would like to refer to a report in the *Matrubhoomi* dated the 6th August. There it is stated that in a private talk, the Minister, Shri C. M. Poonacha, said to a Member of this House that he had his sympathies for Kerala; he is also reported to have said that if there is no shipyard in Kerala, he will try to get at least a ship-repairing yard and attempts are being made to satisfy Kerala by establishing a repairing yard which does not need any foreign exchange or other commitments, just to give some meaning for the assurances given by the Prime Minister. The paper further reports, but not as the Minister having said so, that the Planning Commission is against this second ship-building yard. I want to know whether these reports are correct.

श्री हुकम चन्द कछवाय (देवास) :
कोचीन में शिपयार्ड बनाने के सम्बन्ध

में सरकार पांच छः सालों से उदासीन दिखाई देती है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि वहाँ की आवश्यकताओं को ध्यान में रखते हुए क्या सरकार गैर-सरकारी क्षेत्र में किसी कम्पनी को या प्राइवेट आदमी को लाइसेंस इसको देने को तैयार है? यदि नहीं, तो विदेशों से इस सम्बन्ध में बातचीत करने की क्या आवश्यकता पड़ी है? क्या सरकार में इतनी सामर्थ्य नहीं है कि विदेशों से बिना बातचीत किए हुए अपने बल बूते पर सारा कार्यक्रम बनाये?

The Minister of State in the Ministry of Transport and Aviation (Shri C. M. Poonacha): The chronological details as given by Shri A. K. Gopalan will themselves show....

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: What is this? The Minister is here. But he is making a cat's-paw of the Minister of State.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: The details mentioned by Shri Gopalan amply demonstrate that the Government are very earnest in finalising their decision to start constructing a ship-building yard in Cochin. All the things which my hon. friend, Shri Gopalan, has narrated would go to show the Government's earnestness in this regard.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Very big earnestness!

Shri C. M. Poonacha: Of course, he can call it anyway he likes, that would serve his own purpose, but not the country's purpose. What is the country's purpose? It is to see that we develop our own capacity to build ships in this country. Shipbuilding is a highly technical matter and then it cannot be done by arguments, by adjournment motions or short notice questions. None of these things will bring or produce a ship-building yard in this country. It is hard work, it is concentrated thinking.... (*Interruptions*).

Shri A. K. Gopalan: Why did the Government lay the foundation stone and drive away the people from there?

Shri P. Kunhan: The Minister said that this is not going to bring the ship-yard. This is most improper. Can he make such a statement that our raising this matter will not bring about any such thing?

Shri D. C. Sharma: He is ridiculing the discussion here. He is bringing the discussion here into contempt.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: Please bear with me. I am trying to explain. If you are upset, what can I do?

Shri D. C. Sharma: I am not upset. But you must speak here with a sense of responsibility.

Mr. Chairman: Please address the Chair.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: It is the duty of every Member to move resolutions, ask questions, move adjournment motions, and we will continue to do these if the Government are behaving in the manner they are doing at present. What else are we here for?

Mr. Chairman: From what I heard the hon. Minister to say, I think he did not say anything that is wrong.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: He was pooh-poohing this discussion. He was making fun of us.

Mr. Chairman: What I understood him to say was that this is a thing which has to be done by very hard work, it is a very difficult job, it cannot be done in a day and it takes some time. Let us hear what he has to say. Let him complete his reply and then it will be open to ask a question or two.

Shri Warrior: We can understand what you have said, that this is a very highly technical job. But that is different from saying that this cannot be done by putting questions, moving adjournment motions and so on. That

means we should not do our duty in Parliament.

Mr. Chairman: Leave something to me also.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: Government have been continuously engaged in seeing how soon they could complete their examination of the ship-building yard project and take up the work of the construction of the shipyard. In this country we do not have enough technical knowhow, particularly in this line of industry which is highly technical, and therefore Government had to look round to get the necessary technical consultancy. I must confess there has been a long time taken to fix up proper consultancy agreements with a competent foreign firm. After that everything has been going on very expeditiously.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: May I have a clarification?

Mr. Chairman: Please wait.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: We had four or five parties, from USA, from UK, from West Germany and from Japan. All these people came here and this had to be done in two stages. The first was the preliminary investigation, the preliminary investigations to locate a site and to conduct certain preliminary investigations which were absolutely necessary to take a decision on this matter. The preliminary investigations themselves took about two years time, i.e., from 1957 to 1959 as my hon. friend Shri Gopalan himself mentioned. During 1959-60, Government considered and after comparing all the reports relating to the various sites, the location was finally decided to be in Cochin, and after that they had to look forward to an arrangement with a competent foreign consultancy firm for preparing the project report. We had four or five parties, each of them had their own terms to stipulate, and they were not quite acceptable to Government. Finally, the agreement with the Japanese firm

Mitsubishi was concluded in February, 1965. Within a year their detailed project report has come. It is only in April that we received the project report and the project report is under the consideration of the Government as was mentioned earlier, and we will have the technical committee's report. Immediately after that necessary steps will be taken to allocate the required sums of money and take up the work on hand.

This is the position which I have been explaining, but there are other matters also, the foreign exchange component for instance. Between 1953-60 and now we have developed certain capacity in the country for producing certain types of equipment relating to the shore equipment. This committee is also examining the availability of the indigenous equipment and the materials are required for constructing the shipyard and also building ships. We have developed certain capacity and all that will have to be assessed, and after that assessment only we can know what exactly is going to be the foreign exchange element. These are things which cannot be done quickly or in a cursory manner; these things require deep study, careful examination, and it has to be properly calculated and a programme will have to be laid down. Government are only awaiting that report, and the report is likely to be in the hands of the Government within a couple of weeks, and Government will not doubt take the earliest time to take a decision in consultation with the Planning Commission, and I am sure a decision will be taken as early as possible.

The Prime Minister, at the time she was in Kerala recently, also said that an earliest possible decision will be taken on this matter. It was not indicated when we will start construction, because without a project report, without a carefully studied project, how can anybody take up a project, that is the point.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: What is the position today?

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: The position is explosive now.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: My hon. friends were referring to other matters, that Kerala has been neglected. Very recently the HMT ...

Mr. Chairman: Please restrict your speech to your subject, do not go into other things.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: He wanted to generalise, I thought I would also reply to them.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: He can take up that issue later, we want an answer for the three or four points raised.

Shri C. M. Poonacha: Coming to the point, after the examination by the technical committee, and the technical committee's report will be in our hands very soon, Government will take a very early decision.

Mr. Chairman: Excuse me. Actually, I have myself put a question once about the Cochin shipyard. The point is, the people are very much agitated, not only the people of Kerala but people from all over India, from both sides of the House. Hon. Members feel rather agitated as to why a final decision is not coming. I am glad that you have given certain details, but even now, you are not in a position to say exactly when you will be in a position to start it. That is the first thing.

The second thing is, if I may make it very clear, when we are all functioning here in a parliamentary democracy, this is the only way of finding out things, namely, putting a question, or a short notice question or a calling attention notice or a half-hour discussion. Otherwise, Shri Gopalan or any hon. Member here is not in a position to know what is in your file. Of course, I quite understand with what motive you have said all that you

[Mr. Chairman]

wanted to say, but our friends are agitated for the reason that I mentioned. I hope you also feel the same thing as I feel about it.

The Minister of Transport, Aviation, Shipping and Tourism (Shri Sanjiva Reddy): A specific question was asked by my hon. friend, Shri Vasudevan Nair, whether we will be able to announce it soon and whether the Planning Commission has included it in this Plan.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: Yen credit.

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: We have not ourselves seen the final draft till now. It is going to be discussed perhaps in these coming two or three weeks, on the 20th or the 21st or so. It will be discussed at the National Development Council. I may assure my Kerala friends on both sides of the House..

Mr. Chairman: Others also.

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: Yes, Sir. But naturally the local people are more anxious and much more anxious now because the elections are coming; that is our difficulty.

Shri Vasudevan Nair: You know that; you know about the Visakhapatnam steel plant. (*Interruption*).

Shri D. C. Sharma: Why? What have I to gain by the shipyard in my election? The point is, it is an all-India question.

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: Yes; The Transport Department is anxious, and a stage has been reached now where we have come to the final stages of making a start. Shri Gopalan was narrating what happened since the last eight to 10 years. It is true that some projects are delayed, but now the project report is there. The Fourth Plan is coming in two weeks' time. I am sure that my hon. friends will be very glad to know that something has been

done. Dr. Subbarayan has promised and we are only following up.

Mr. Chairman: The fears that our friends were having have not come true. Our friends' fears were that perhaps the shipyard was being taken away from there.

Shri Sanjiva Reddy: No, Sir. It is not correct. I am only saying that it is not a delay of years. It is on the 20th or the 21st that the National Development Council is going to discuss it. It is a matter of 10 days more, and while the House is continuing its sittings, the Fourth Plan report will be there and it will become public property. Then, the Transport Department will be very happy to find a provision made for foreign exchange and all that; the Yen credit—Mitsubishi—is also tied up with that. But not much foreign exchange is needed now, because we have been able to produce much more with what we have and what we can from 1958. In the last seven to eight years, our country has progressed fast. Much foreign exchange is not needed now, and perhaps with a little foreign exchange we will be able to do it. The consultants have given the project report; our technicians are examining it. In a matter of days, perhaps before you disperse, we will be able to see something much more clearer than what it is now.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: We shall wait, but if it is a question of election, as mentioned by the Minister, we are also ready to decide it in the election.

Shri N. Sreekantan Nair: Explosive dock.

17.39 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, August 10, 1966/Sharavana 19, 1888 (Saka).