

**The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh):** (a) Yes. Collections of wheat, barley, potato, fruits such as apples, apricots, grapes, etc. and vegetables such as peas, carrots, cabbages, cauliflower, tomatoes, etc., have been made from the snow-bound regions such as Europe and studies under comparable conditions in India. Some of them have been found suitable particularly among the fruit and vegetable crops.

(b) Information is being collected from the States and will be laid on the Table of the Sabha in due course.

(c) In respect of crops, the promising varieties mentioned under (a) above, have been introduced for extensive trials in the inaccessible areas of the Himalayas such as Kalimpong area of West Bengal, Cheeni area of Himachal Pradesh, NEFA of Assam and Protectorates such as Sikkim.

In regard to trees, information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the Sabha in due course.

11 12 hrs.

#### MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT SHIPPYARD AT COCHIN

**Mr. Speaker:** I have received notice of an adjournment motion from Sarvashri A. K. Gopalan, T. B. Vittal Rao, Vasudevan Nair, Hirendra Nath Mukerjee, P. K. Kodyan, M. Elias and Shrimati Renu Chakravarty on:

"The reported decision of the Government of India to drop the second shipyard project in violation of various commitments and promises made on the floor of the House regarding its setting up during the latter part of the Second Five Year Plan."

While answering a supplementary question today, the hon. Minister said that he came to know of this only

from the newspapers. I had half a mind, in view of this adjournment motion, to allow some questions there and then, but we passed over that question. Therefore, I did not come to it.

What is the position?

**Shri Raghunath Singh (Varanasi):** I have given notice of a short notice question and also a calling attention motion, both.

**Mr. Speaker:** Wherefrom does he get this information?

**Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod):** The information I got from the papers, as well as from an editorial in the Malayalam newspaper *Mathrubhoomi*, *The Mathrubhoomi* have written an editorial on the basis of the information that they have got, and there were also reports in the *Statesman Free Press Journal* and other papers.

On 26th November, 1959, the Minister of Transport and Communications made the following statement in the Lok Sabha:

"The U.K. Shipyard Mission which visited this country in November 1957, under the joint auspices of the Colombo Plan and the U.K. Shipbuilding Conference, to advise the Government on the site and lay-out of a new shipyard, submitted their report to Government in April, 1958, after inspecting nineteen sites. The mission recommended that the Ernakulam site at Cochin offered more than any site examined by them towards a successful development of a shipyard.

After a preliminary examination of the report, the Government of India appointed an inter-departmental committee in June, 1958. This Committee has since submitted its report to the Government, and has come to the conclusion that the shipyard should be located at Cochin at the site recommended by the Mission."

**Mr. Speaker:** I have no intention to prevent Shri Gopalan. He may feel that it is a very important matter. But, is there any truth in the report that the project is given up?

**The Minister of Transport and Communications (Dr. P. Subbarayan):** I do not think that is exactly correct, because no decision has been finally arrived at, and I am still trying to see that the second shipyard comes into being, and it is still under discussion.

With regard to the short notice question and the calling attention motion given by Shri Raghunath Singh, I have said that I will make a statement on the 18th, giving the facts as I know them. I have not had enough time to collect the details as yet. Therefore, I would request the hon. Member to be patient and know what is being undertaken by the authorities.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I would have been patient if it was said a decision had not been taken. In answer to a question of mine, it had been said that a decision had been taken, and that is why I want to know why it is now being said that a decision has not been taken.

The statement of the Minister continued:

"The Government of India, after careful consideration of the report, have decided that, subject to the results of the further investigations into the soil conditions being satisfactory, the second shipyard should be located at Cochin at the site recommended by the U.K. Shipyard Mission."

It is not that no decision was taken. According to the statement, the Government of India, after careful consideration of the report, decided that subject to the results of the further investigation into the soil conditions being satisfactory, the second shipyard

should be located at Cochin as recommended.

I understand that the soil testing is also over.

There was a question on December 21, 1959 about a ship repairing yard at Cochin Port, and in reply the Minister (Shri Raj Bahadur) said:

"There is no proposal under consideration for starting a Ship Repairing Yard in Cochin. However, as the hon. Member is aware, the Government have decided to establish a Shipbuilding Yard in Cochin, subject to the results of further investigation into the soil conditions being satisfactory. Steps are accordingly being taken to conduct the necessary investigations at the proposed site. Action has also been taken under the Cochin Land Acquisition Act to acquire about 73 acres of private land for the proposed Shipbuilding Yard.

So, action also had been taken.

A week back, there was news in the Kerala papers that a special officer had also been appointed to do this work.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** How does it become urgent?

**Mr. Speaker:** The hon. Member wants to arrogate to himself the powers of the Speaker. Why are hon. Members so impatient? I have to decide it.

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** On the 21st December, there was a supplementary question by Shri Panigrahi as under:

"Are we to understand that the decision of the Government to locate the second shipyard in Cochin is not final, but subject to certain conditions?"

And the answer was:

"As I said, an announcement was made the other day on the floor of the House. It has been decided to locate the shipyard at Cochin subject to the results of the investigation into the soil conditions."

So, according to this, it was decided to have the shipyard at Cochin. There are two things. Firstly, it was decided to have a second shipyard; secondly, it was also decided to have it at Cochin. The only condition to drop it would be the unsuitability of the soil. But the Minister said today that a final decision has not been taken. That is why it is an urgent matter of public importance. There was a statement in Parliament that after careful consideration it had been decided to have the second shipyard at Cochin. Then, in answer to questions also it was said there was no question of dropping it. So, to say now that it has not been decided means that within two or three days it will be decided to drop it. That is why I bring this.

**Mr. Speaker:** How did he get to know this?

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I came to know this from the Malayalam paper. The editorial of the paper says that Government has already decided, and there are reports in other papers also.

**Dr. P. Sbbarayan:** It might shorten the discussion if the hon. Member will only bear with me a little. He seems to have been excited because of the newspaper reports that this is being dropped. I said to begin with, the newspaper report is not quite correct. The matter is still being investigated, is still under consideration, and no final decision has been arrived at, even though it is correct that every step has been taken as recounted by the hon. Member. We have begun to purchase the land, we have sent a

special officer to enquire whether this place is satisfactory. We have taken every step that is necessary, and we are also in negotiation with foreign firms for technical assistance.

**Mr. Speaker:** What has the expert said?

**Dr. P. Subbarayan:** The experts have said.....

**Shri Joachim Alva (Kanara):** They have said that Karwar is the best.

**Dr. P. Subbarayan:** The hon. Member presumes too much about Karwar, if I may point out. He seems to be interested in Karwar.

**Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun):** On a point of order, Sir. I may be pardoned for raising points of order on adjournment motions. My submission is that the matter has been under consideration for a pretty long time and therefore it is not a case of urgency.

Secondly, in the matter of permitting adjournment motions, it has also to be taken into account whether a subject cannot be agitated by other means, by cut motions etc. If Government takes up a certain programme and examines it, there must come a day which is crucial when the Government decides yes or no about the programme. It is ordinary routine. There is no urgency about the matter.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** It was four days before in the papers, not today.

**Shri Feroze Gandhi (Rae Bareli):** I want to draw your attention to the fact that Shrimati Parvathi Krishnan's name is missing from the adjournment motion!

**Mr. Speaker:** Such humorous remarks are all right, but it ought not to have been made.

I consider this matter important. I only want to know when and how he came to know that the statement that was made, and the assurance given

on the floor of the House in reply to a question that a decision had already been taken by the Government, are given up and they are now going behind that decision. How does he know, and when did he come to know?

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** I knew about this decision day before yesterday, when I saw a report in a newspaper. In *The Statesman*, also, there was a report to the effect that they were going to drop it. Yesterday, in another paper also, there was another report to that effect. Yesterday morning, I got *Mathrubhoomi* from Kerala, in which they have written an editorial, saying.....

**Mr. Speaker:** I want clarification on one other matter also. (*Interruptions*) What is this kind of remark? Even hissings are improper. I always find this kind of hissing on one side or the other, as I go on hearing. Some people may or may not like what is going on in the House; if they do not like, I would advise them to keep out of the House and not to cause disturbance by hissing and other things. It is improper. That takes away the decorum of the House.

I am seriously engaged in this matter. Hon. Members from the south feel that a decision that has been taken regarding the location of the second shipyard, for which there have been repeated demands in this House, and in respect of which an assurance was given on the floor of this House, is being changed. All those persons who are interested are coming up here. I do not know how I can shut them out. This is a Parliament of all persons where every hon. Member is entitled to discuss, deliberate, persuade and ultimately take a decision. Hon. Members are impatient with respect to this matter. I do not know why this impatience comes in. Shall we decide it by show of force, or shall we decide it here by discussion and persuasion? Hon. Members must set an example to the rest of the country. There are fourteen Legislatures here in our country. And Parliament

does not consist only of Members from the north; it consists also of Members from the south, the east and the west. And, therefore, let no impression be created that any hon. Member is standing in the way.

It is for me to decide what I should allow and what I should not allow. I shall presently answer the points that have been raised both by Shri Tyagi and by Shri Raghunath Singh in whom I find some impatience.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** No, no. Why should such a thing be said? We should be given a chance to speak.

**Shri A. K. Gopalar:** After knowing this, I went into the question further..

**Mr. Speaker:** I want clarification on one other point also. The hon. Member came to know of this from *Mathrubhoomi* or some other newspaper yesterday or the day before. The hon. Minister who gave an assurance said that Government had decided this, subject to the soil being found proper after testing. Has this been done?

**Shri A. K. Gopalan:** Yes, it has been done. There was a report in the press that the soil testing was over, and it has been found that it is suitable.

**Mr. Speaker:** Therefore, the hon. Member's contention in the adjournment motion is that the decision is there subject to the soil being found satisfactory on testing, the soil also has been tested and found to be proper, but for grounds other than this, this is being dropped, and the people there are interested in knowing why it is being dropped. What is the answer?

**Dr. P. Subbarayan:** The answer is that it is not being dropped. I have made it clear that it is not being dropped but is still under consideration and negotiation etc.

**Mr. Speaker:** I want to know whether there can be any consideration



[Mr. Speaker ]

after an assurance in this House that it has been decided to locate it here.

**Dr. P. Subbarayan:** The consideration is as to the amount of money that will be available for this purpose and the provision in the Third Five Year Plan for that purpose.

**Mr. Speaker:** I have heard sufficiently over this matter. I am going to allow this adjournment motion.

Two points have been raised by Shri Tyagi. One is that this is not an urgent matter, and there are opportunities to discuss this matter. I would say that this is an urgent matter, because an assurance has been given on the floor of the House not once but several times that it has been decided. I do not know if a decision of the Government is irrespective of the finances being available.

The second 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. That has not been contradicted. Shri A. K. Gopalan has said that the expert has discovered that there is absolutely no weakness in the soil, and the shipyard can be established there.

✱ Thus, all the circumstances which have been laid before the House repeatedly by the hon. Minister have been subject only to one condition, and 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 to be taken notice of. This matter will be taken up today at four o' clock.

I would like to know how many Members are in favour of leave being granted. They may kindly rise in their seats.

(Some hon. Members rose in their seats)

**Mr. Speaker:** So, leave is granted.

**Shri Tyagi:** What about the requisite number?

**श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (वाराणसी) :** आपने नार्थ और साउथ का सवाल उठाया। पहले मैं ने ही इस सवाल को शार्ट नोटिस क्वेश्चन द्वारा उठाया था। इसलिये आपको यह बात नहीं कहनी चाहिये थी कि नार्थ वाले इस बात के अगेन्स्ट हैं। नार्थ में तो शिपयार्ड होगा नहीं, वह तो साउथ में ही होगा।

**Mr. Speaker:** I am sorry. I only wanted to say that the whole House should work as a team. When I was hearing Shri A. K. Gopalan on this side, the hon. Member Shri Raghunath Singh rose three times in his seat and said that there was no urgency about this matter, and, therefore, he ought to leave it off; if he has any grounds to submit that it is not an urgent matter, it is for him to do so after having his own turn.

I am anxious to see that great harmony prevails in this House. All of us here are interested in every part of the country. If my remarks have led to any other impression, I am sorry for it.

This matter will be taken up at four o' clock today.

**Shri Tyagi:** But the requisite number did not stand in their seats.

**Mr. Speaker:** I found that the requisite number stood.

**Shri Tyagi:** I submit that you count the numbers again.

**Mr. Speaker:** How many should be there? I think there should be 25 in favour.

**Shri Tyagi:** No, it is 50. The number that stood up was not 50. Therefore, I submit that you may count again.

**Mr. Speaker:** Those in favour of granting leave to this adjournment motion may stand in their seats.

(Some hon. Members rose in their seats)

I find that the number is forty.

**Shri Tyagi:** So, it is ten short. I hope that there cannot be two countings in this matter; one counting is final.

**Mr. Speaker:** If one counting is final then my first counting must stand! Shri Tyagi has scored the point on a technical objection that fifty Members have not risen in their seats. It is unfortunate. Hon. Members who table adjournment motions must have fifty Members always with them.

I am really sorry that notwithstanding my stretching a point in their favour, I am not able to support them. Leave is refused. 11

12.17 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

##### REPORT OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ANCILLARY INDUSTRIES RELATED TO SHIP-BUILDING AND SHIP-REPAIRS

**Dr. P. Subbarayan:** On behalf of Shri Raj Bahadur, I beg to lay on the Table a copy of the First Report of the Advisory Committee on Ancillary Industries related to ship-building and ship-repairs. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1993/60.]

##### NOTIFICATIONS UNDER ESSENTIAL COMMODITIES ACT

**The Deputy Minister of Food (Shri A. M. Thomas):** I beg to lay on the Table, under sub-section (6) of section 3 of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, a copy of each of the following Notifications:—

- (i) G.S.R. 290, dated the 5th March, 1960 making certain amendment to the Wheat

(Uttar Pradesh) Second Price Control Order, 1959; and

- (ii) G.S.R. 315, dated the 9th March, 1960 making certain amendment to the Uttar Pradesh Paddy and Rice (Restriction on Movement) Order, 1958. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1994/60.]

#### MESSAGE FROM RAJYA SABHA

**Secretary:** Sir, I have to report the following message received from the Secretary of Rajya Sabha:—

"In accordance with the provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 162 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 1960, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 10th March, 1960, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendations to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill."

#### CALLING ATTENTION TO A MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

##### OMISSION IN COMMUNIQUE ISSUED BY WORLD BANK OF INDIA'S CONTRIBUTION TO INDUS DEVELOPMENT FUND

**Shri S. M. Banerjee (Kanpur):** Under rule 197, I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Irrigation and Power to the following matter of urgent public importance, and I request that he may make a statement thereon:—

"The omission in the communique issued by the World Bank, of India's large contribution to the Indus Development Fund."