

6609 Acquired AGRAHAYANA 29, 1882 (SAKA) Central Institute 6610
Territories (Merger) Bill of Fisheries Education
and Constitution (Ninth
Amendment) Bill

Tahir, Shri Mohammed
Tariq, Shri A. M.
Tewari, Shri Dwarikanath
Thomas, Shri A. M.
Tiwari, Pandit Babu Lal
Tiwari, Shri R. S.
Tiwari, Pandit D. N.
Tula Ram, Shri

Tyagi, Shri
Uike, Shri
Umrao Singh, Shri
Upadhyay, Pandit Munishwar Dutt
Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Datt
Varma, Shri B. B.
Varma, Shri M. L.

Varma, Shri Ramsingh Bhai
Vedakumari, Kumari M.
Vyas, Shri R. C.
Vyas, Shri Radhelal
Wadiwa, Shri
Wasnik, Shri Balkrishna
Wodeyar, Shri

NOES

Amjad Ali, Shri
Assar, Shri
Banerjee, Shri Pramathanath
Banerjee, Shri S. M.
Bhanja Deo, Shri
Chakravartty, Shrimati Renu
Chaturvedi, Shri
Das Gupta, Shti B.
Dasaratha Deb, Shri
Deo, Shri P.K.
Drohar, Shri
Elias, Shri Muhammed
Ghosal, Shri Aurobindo
Ghose, Shri Bimal
Ghose, Shri Subiman
Gopalan, Shri A. K.

Goray, Shri
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Gupta, Shri Sadhan
Jadhav, Shri Yadav Narayan
Kar, Shri Prabhat
Khushwaqt Rai, Shri
Kodiyan, Shri
Kumbhar, Shri
Kunhan, Shri
Mahagaonkar, Shri
Mahanty, Shri
Mchta, Shri Asoka
Mohan Swarup, Shri
Mukherjee, Shri H. N.
Mullick, Shri B. C.
Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani

Parmar, Shri K. U.
Parvathi Krishnan, Shrimati
Patil, Shri U. L.
Pillai, Shri Anthony
Punnoose, Shri
Rajendra Singh, Shri
Ram Garib, Shri
Ranga, Shri
Shastri, Shri Prakash Vir
Supakar, Shri
Tangamani, Shri ¶
Thakore, Shri M. B.
Vajpayee, Shri
Verma, Shri Ramji
Warior, Shri

Mr. Speaker: The 'Ayes' have it, the 'Ayes' have it.

The motion is carried by a majority of the total membership of the House and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the Members present and voting.

The motion was adopted.

Mr. Speaker: The Constitution (Ninth Amendment) Bill, 1960 is passed.

We will now take up the Acquired Territories (Merger) Bill. May I put all the clauses to the vote of the House together?

Some Hon. Members: Yes.

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That clauses 2 to 11 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 11 were added to the Bill.

The First Schedule and the Second Schedule were added to the Bill.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

Shri Jawaharlal Nehru: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

Mr. Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

17-20 hrs.

***CENTRAL INSTITUTE OF FISHERIES EDUCATION**

Mr. Speaker: The House will now take up the half-an-hour discussion on the Central Institute of Fisheries Education.

Shri Warior (Trichur): After a strenuous day, it is my painful duty to raise this subject for a half-an-hour discussion, but since we are at the fag end of this Session, I think this is the last opportunity which I may get to do so. The main point is about the report of the Committee

*Half-an-hour discussion.

[Shri Warior]

on Fisheries Education and the subsequent decision taken by Government, which, to my mind, has led to a measure of discrimination against the small State in the extreme south of this country.

17.21 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

This State had suffered from discrimination in so many other matters also in the past, but we thought that at least with this institution being established in Kerala, justice will be done to Kerala. In fact, there had been occasions when even Shri S. K. Patil had given almost an assurance that this institute at least will be located in Kerala, as, for instance, when he addressed the Economic Conference of the Kerala People held in Delhi, and also when he made certain other speeches. But, finally, unfortunately, we did not have it in Kerala. Now, a decision has been taken that the institute will be located in Bombay. There were two or three questions put in this House in the past, and we had got answers to all of them, and on the basis of all those answers, we had really some confidence that ultimately it would be established in Kerala and not in Bombay which is the only contestant in this respect.

There were three institutes mentioned by the committee, but when the committee was formed, and the terms of reference were given to the committee, the committee, after analysing the terms of reference and the procedure that they should adopt finally came to this conclusion, and they state at page 4 of their report:

"The Committee has been impressed by the fact that the Government's responsibilities under the development plans call for high level officials of considerable competence, and, therefore, reached the conclusion that first priority should be given to the establishment of an institute of higher training in fisheries."

Although there are three institutes envisaged in the recommendations of this committee, the primary and the most important one is the institute to train district fisheries officers. The others are ancillary, as the committee itself has said. Primary importance is attached only to this institute, and in their recommendation itself, the committee have said that it is of prime importance. I would not like to quote at length, but it has been mentioned in the report that the State Governments, especially those which have a coast-line of fisheries are actually taking some measures to get the personnel trained for actual operative work on fisheries, such as catching the fish, getting them into the land, curing them, processing them and so on. But the main emphasis which Government had placed, and the committee had also placed was on the fact that the training of the district fisheries officers should be immediately taken up, and the committee even went to the extent of recommending that if it were not possible to locate it immediately or to establish it immediately, at least as a temporary and provisional measure, an institute be started in Bombay.

The committee had taken great care in going round the whole of the coast-line and thus finding out the best possible place. The committee had gone to Bombay also. And this is what the committee had to say about Bombay:

"The Committee has also deeply gone into the possibility of locating the Institute in some suburb of Bombay. . .":

Danda, Versova, Worli and one or two other places were inspected by the committee, and they said:

"Of all the sites visited, only one at Versova deserves serious consideration".

That was the only place in respect of which the committee had some hesitation as to whether it will be ideal

or not. All other places were found by the Committee not suitable for this. As regards Versova, the Committee say in page 71 of their Report:

"Apart from its distance from the educational, research, processing and other industrial establishments in Bombay, the most glaring disadvantage of Versova as a possible choice for the location of the Institute is the inadequacy of its port. It is extremely unlikely that even after further development, the Versova port will be suitable for vessels with a draught exceeding 8 ft."—

a draught of 8 ft. is just a bit more than what an ordinary canoe requires, not a ship. That is what is meant by that. So that port cannot be developed for this fishing industry and hence this Institute cannot be located there. As regards Cochin, in the same Report, they say:

"In contrast"—

that is, in contrast to Bombay and other ports—

"Cochin not only shares with Bombay many of the special advantages that the latter has but is also a favourable place with regard to the availability of land and the berthing facilities right in the midst of a flourishing fishing and a fast expanding off-shore fishing and fishery industry. The proximity of the Indo-Norwegian project which has established repair on the slipway at Cochin is another feature in favour of this place."

The final conclusion the Committee arrive at is:

"Allowing for such disabilities that Cochin undoubtedly has, the Committee is convinced that on purely technical and practical considerations, the suitability of Cochin for the location of the Central Institute of Fisheries Education far exceeds that of Bombay"—

I underscore that—'far exceeds that of Bombay'—

"It accordingly recommends that the Institute be located at Cochin".

This is quite unambiguous. The suitability of Cochin far exceeds that of Bombay. That means, both places are not on par.

Now the final conclusions of the Committee are also to be recorded. There are three Institutes envisaged. One is the District Officers' Training Institute. All these are enumerated in the summary of recommendations. There is another Institute envisaged and it is called the Operatives Training Institute. This is contained only in four sentences in a small paragraph. The third one is about the training of junior fisheries officers which, they suggest, may be started in Kausalyaganga somewhere in Orissa or some other place.

Shri Punnoose (Ambalapuzha): Where is Kausalya and where is Ganga?

Shri Warrior: I have mentioned this only for record. I will not quote anything more from the Report.

Now I come to the history of the question. On 6th April 1960, there was a Starred Question No. 1321.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already taken about 10 minutes. Now he is going to go into the history of it.

Shri Warrior: It is only reading the answer which Shri M. V. Krishnappa and Shri S. K. Patil gave, without comments. In reply to that question, Shri M. V. Krishnappa was pleased to say:

"In the meantime, this Institute may be located on a temporary basis in Bombay where there are institutional facilities available."

This is according to the recommendation that the provisional or temporary Institute may be located in Bombay; it is not about the permanent one. In the same answer, he was pleased to say:

"We have not yet taken a decision because the Committee itself felt that till the new facilities are

[Shri Warior]

available at Cochin, we can start a temporary centre in Bombay”.

A temporary centre, not a permanent centre—both words are different.

In reply to Starred Question 1921 dated August 31, 1960, when this question was raised, Shri S. K. Patil was pleased to say this when Shri Tyagi interjected:

“The Committee’s recommendation was that although Bombay was the most ideal place suited for it.”

“... they recommended Cochin on the assumption that in Bombay land would not be available in time.”

If we picked up certain words from here and there in this report, you can find this also there. Then, finally Shri Patil himself was pleased to say:

“It is no use appointing a Committee of experts and getting their recommendations and then going on to a thing which is not recommended by them.”

It is a very good thing that we have an expert committee. There was the FAO expert, the Norwegian expert, and the Ministry’s Fisheries expert, Shri Panikkar was also there. Shri Patil has paid a compliment to them. Now, Sir, in the last question, on 1st December, 1960, we have the answer:

“The experts had said that Bombay is ideal, and equally Cochin also is ideal.”

I went through this report four or five times and I do not know that they have said that both places are ideal anywhere.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us hear the hon. Minister now.

Shri Warior: We will hear him. He will clarify certain doubts. Then again he says that the report said that the ideal place is Bombay but

they were afraid that there would be no land available there and that is why they came to Cochin. That is what we get in the final answer. Now we understand that it has been decided that this will be in Bombay. The operative training institute will be set up in Cochin sometime afterwards. That is what has been said. But the immediate necessity is for the training institute. This institute is the preliminary thing which should be given priority. We hope still that the Food Ministry and Shri Patil will reconsider whatever decision has been taken. It is no question of prestige. Wherever it is, it is only in Mother India. Let Kerala have it because the institute will gain, Kerala will gain and the Food Ministry and Shri Patil also will gain.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The other Members can only put questions and not make speeches—one question each.

Shri Punnoose: May I know whether the hon. Minister agrees with me that the committee has recommended in very clear terms that the institution may be established in Cochin and it used the very words ‘it is a very ideal place’? I would like to know how the hon. Minister misunderstood the thing and made a statement in the House that was likely to mislead the House. I should also like to know whether a place becomes ideal if that place has got a strong Minister to back it up and I would also like to know whether a place becomes unsuitable....

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Let us hear him; then perhaps he may give his opinion.

Shri Punnoose: These doubts are raised in our minds. As it is, Sir, the State of Kerala cannot claim several natural advantages with regard to several industries; after all there are only one or two things and this is one of the very rare things that we can get. How is it that the Cabinet and the Ministry took a decision that this should be at Bombay when all

the recommendations were in Kerala's favour? I would like to know what the Ministry will do to clarify the position and to convince the people in Kerala that that State will still survive in spite of the fact that it has in the Cabinet only one or two weaklings who cannot pull their weight. May I know whether it is a fact that as reported in the vernacular papers.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has been lecturing all through... (*Interruptions*).

Shri Punnoose: One minute and I will stop, Sir. Is it a fact that this decision was taken at the very top level and that even the Deputy Minister, my hon. friend, Shri Thomas never knew that a decision had been taken?

The Deputy Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri A. M. Thomas): I can take care of myself.

Shri Punnoose: He can take care of himself but he cannot take care of Kerala. That is the point.

Shri Chintamani Panigrahi (Puri): One of the institutes is going to be located at Kausalyagang in Orissa. May I know what is the provision that has been made for this institute and when the institute is going to be established?

Shri A. K. Gopalan (Kasergod): In answer to a question put by us Shri Krishnappa said that because there were no buildings available at Cochin this had to be taken to Bombay. I want to know whether when Shri Kamble went to Cochin some two weeks back the Chamber of Commerce, Ernakulam told him that they would provide the buildings?

Dr. Melkote (Raichur): Is it a fact that one of these institutes will be established in the Mysore State?

Shri Maniyanganadan (Kottayam): It is very unfortunate that the Government has taken a decision to establish the institute at Bombay in spite of the report. I do not know whether it is now possible for the Govern-

ment to change its decision. But there is the operatives institute. The people of Kerala are very much anxious about this institute. I want a categorical answer from the hon. Minister whether this institute of operatives could be established in Cochin and whether it would be done as early as possible.

Shri V. Eacharan (Palghat): When the location of this institute was decided upon previously the facilities required for the establishment of the institute was not available and the Government of Kerala were not in a position to give the required facilities. May I know whether the present Government of Kerala has promised all assistance and help for the establishment of this institute at Cochin and whether the Government will consider the question of establishing at least one of these institutes at Cochin?

Shri Kuttikrishnan Nair (Kozhikode): What would be the financial commitment for establishing a centre at Cochin and what is the financial commitment which they are going to have for establishing the centre at Bombay?

Shri Kodiyan (Quilon—Reserved—Sch. Tribes): Will the hon. Minister be pleased to explain the special advantages in having this institute at Bombay in comparison to Cochin and which he thinks are not available at Cochin?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: That is the only thing which he is going to do now. The hon. Minister.

The Minister of Food and Agriculture (Shri S. K. Patil): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am very glad that this question of the committee for fisheries education has been raised. I would like to explain as to why Government have taken this decision, and I am quite sure that the hon. Members will bear with me that there is neither injustice nor partiality in my mind. Even if the recommendation was not there and really Cochin or Kerala wanted something which the Government was in a position to give I would have very, very gladly done

[Shri S. K. Patil]

so at any time. Therefore, please banish from your mind that there was any partiality or injustice. I can explain in what state of mind I actually was and I shall convince you that the hon. Members who have raised this issue could also have taken the same decision under the circumstances in which I have been able to take it.

Therefore, no injustice at all has been done. The plan has been accepted by us and I am sure it will go through and there will be no difficulty at all. The hon. House will remember that on one occasion during the question time I did tell the House that the feeling both in Cochin and Bombay is so great, the qualifications both for Cochin and Bombay are so great for an institution that I myself thought that we must have something by which instead of one there will be two institutions. That decision I had taken in my mind before even the Ministry had time really to consider this question. Afterwards we came to the conclusion that although there may not be two similar institutions, there should be two institutions which will cost us almost the same amount of Rs. 80 lakhs to Rs. 1 crore. There is absolutely no difference between the two. The question is which is the place and where. That was the question. If we had really wanted one, they would naturally ask, "Why not have the institute here and the operative institute there?" I would then have to wait for many months together, before facilities are provided in Kerala to start the institute, because the educational institute and other facilities are immediately wanted and the Committee also have said the same thing and have recommended Bombay. Therefore, rather than waiting, I thought that if both the things are of the same value—and perhaps, I honestly think that, the operative institute is of greater importance and greater significance than the other institute—then, ultimately, when it develops, it will cost much more than the institute. Therefore, I thought

that I was doing no injustice to Kerala at all.

Some hon. Members have quoted the report. I shall, with your permission, give some extracts from the report. Hon. Members should realise that the report is also of a type that it is really very difficult to see what exactly the Committee has recommended. The words used are so complimentary to both Bombay and Cochin. After examining the advantages and disadvantages of locating the institute at Calcutta, Cuttack, Waltair, Kakinada, Madras, Porto Novo, Mandapam, Cochin, Kozhikode, Mangalore and Bombay, the Committee had examined in detail the advantages and disadvantages of Bombay and Cochin. A reading of the report makes it clear that both Bombay and Cochin were well balanced in their advantages though both had a few disadvantages also.

Cochin as well as Bombay are centres of considerable fishing activity. On page 71 of the report, the Committee observes:

"An examination of the relative merits of the various sites which the Committee has considered shows that, in view of the importance it attaches to a fishery atmosphere, well-developed fishing and fishery industries and adequate port facilities, the choice will have to be between Cochin and Bombay. The advantages specially in favour of Bombay are its per-eminent position in fishing industry in the field of mechanisation, its association with university centres, its recognised status in the fisheries co-operative movement and marketing and its geographical location."

The report goes on to list the disadvantages and observes on page 71 thus—I am putting the case fairly on both sides, as they have it—:

"The disadvantages are the congested nature of the city, the

extreme unlikelihood of a suitable site being available in the proximity of a well-established fishery area like the Sassoon Docks, the difficulty of finding berthing and other facilities for vessels of the institute, when even facilities now operating are so inadequate and the very high capital and recurring cost likely to be involved."

Listing the disadvantages in regard to Cochin, the Committee observes on page 69 of the report thus:

"Cochin is not an important educational centre, although there are two degree colleges at Ernakulam."

To every statement they make, there is also an opposite statement along with that. Though they say that Cochin is not an important educational centre, they proceed to say, "although there are two degree colleges at Ernakulam." Then they go on to say:

"Access to Cochin through feeder air routes is easy though train connections with a large part of the country, especially in the north, are far from convenient."

It will be seen that one of the main disadvantages in regard to Bombay was "the extreme unlikelihood of a suitable site being available." That was the main disadvantage. This difficulty has been got over by the Government of Maharashtra, making available three sites—one at Varsova, the other at Nariman Point and the third, the Queen's Barracks, free of cost.

Another important point brought out by the Committee is that Bombay is an important university centre whereas Cochin is not. The institute of science in Bombay has been engaged in marine biological researches for many years. Certain very well organised fisheries departments of the Maharashtra State Government, like the famous Taraporevala Aquarium, the research laboratories and the technical laboratory which specialises in the manufacture of shark liver oil, are also located in Bombay. Engi-

neering and workshop facilities at Bombay are better than anywhere else in the country. Its geographical position is also a distinct advantage. It is on the main international air routes and is connected with most parts of India by air and train services, a point which is against Cochin.

It is true that the Bombay harbour is congested but the Sassoon Docks which are used by the fishing boats are likely to be improved by the Port Trust and facilities for berthing of the fishing vessels would greatly improve. The committee has made a mention of the Port charges of various kinds being heavy at Bombay but on closer examination it has been shown that there is not much difference in this. The capital cost of setting up this institute at Bombay will not be prohibitive in view of the fact that the land which we required and which really forms a major part of the expenditure is offered free. The geographical location of Bombay has been another important factor in Government's conclusion that the institute should be located at Bombay. This institute is being financed by the United Nations Special Project Fund and is likely to attract students and distinguished visitors from abroad. The location of the institute at Bombay will make it more easily accessible.

The point has been raised that along with this, there will be other institutions. If it is decided ultimately that this institution should be in Bombay, then the other institution that has been suggested—the operative institute—will be at Cochin. The operative institute in my opinion is more important and is better suited for Cochin for those type of activities, which I will read out now. This Fisheries Operative Institute consists of the following categories: fishery engineers, marine engineers, engine drivers, naval architects, boat builders, fishing boat personnel, which would include skippers for large and medium vessels, master fishermen, mates, gear technicians, master mechanics and food processing technicians. These are the various things listed there.

ABOUT BOMBAY'S inability to provide a place, some quotation was given saying that Varsova was not suited. But the site given by the Maharashtra Government is really the best site—one at Varsova, the other at Nariman Point and the third at Queen's Barracks. The costliest site of Bombay has been given. I am not pleading for Bombay, because I would consider myself very small if I really pleaded the cause of this or that State. After all, both are Indian States. I take into cognizance these two facts which are very important and basic according to me. Both Maharashtra and Kerala are leading States in fisheries. So far as exports are concerned, Cochin has done very well. There are some institutions already in Cochin like the Norwegian Project and other things that have cost us crores of rupees. I am not suggesting any favour has been done to Cochin by locating them there; Cochin deserves them, because Cochin has developed fisheries. But Bombay has equally developed fisheries, because of this mechanisation that has gone on there on a large scale. Almost cent per cent of the boats have been mechanised and there are co-operatives of fisheries, working there. Along with that, there is the facility of this institute of science and the studies can start today. They have not to wait. Such a facility would take a very long time before it is got in Cochin.

Then there is this aquarium, which always goes with the fisheries education. It is not an easy thing to establish an aquarium. It cost us lakhs of rupees. The Bombay aquarium which the donor had given, and now the Government have added to it, must have cost them not less than Rs. 25 lakhs. From the practical viewpoint, Cochin must have also some kind of an institute, whatever you may call it and Bombay also must have one. When I have got two types of institutions—both costing us Rs. 80 lakhs to Rs. 1 crore to begin with; their cost will be more as they develop—which to locate where? That is the question. If this institution of

the district officers is located at Cochin, it will take a long time even to make the beginning. That is why the committee unanimously recommended that if ultimately the institute is to start in Cochin, a beginning should be made in Bombay, because the educational facilities are easily available. May I ask, in all humility and my friends will bear with me, could I start something as a temporary measure in Bombay and then bring it to Cochin, while there is a possibility of establishing a more important institute in Cochin? I have got two institutes of the same magnitude, costing us the same thing. I do not understand what is sacrosanct in the institute of district officers and that is regarded as something better. I thought as a practical man, I am doing no harm whatsoever.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: May I know the meaning of the answer given by the hon. Minister? The answer was that in Bombay it will be located temporarily and then it will be shifted to Cochin.

Shri S. K. Patil: That is true. That is the expert Committee's recommendation.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: It is your answer.

Shri S. K. Patil: Yes, the answer was also given. But was it not the same answer by the same Minister for the same question? I am thinking of having two institutions in two places and I gave it more than once on the floor of the House. Therefore, you can judge me. That is not the question. If for the sake of argument they say "No, let the institute be here and the personal institute be at Bombay" that is also a solution. I do not say that is not a solution. I do not disagree with you. I was thinking that it should be in Bombay for a year or two until the facilities are available in Cochin for the educational institute. Now the question is that the money is ready, the help has come from the foreign countries, the technicians and experts have come and they have suggested that it should be started in Bombay as a temporary measure.

Having started it there and knowing the keenness of both Maharashtra and Cochin, I have come to the right decision to which my hon. friend, Shri Warior, would also have come to if he were in my shoes. There is no difference at all about the setting up of the institutions. Two States are equally anxious that they should be located in the two States which are known for fisheries. Because some other questions have come . . .

Shri A. K. Gopalan: There is some misunderstanding. We have been made to understand from the very beginning that the committee's report is in favour of Cochin but because there are not enough facilities there, for the time being, it will be established in Bombay and then it will be shifted back to Cochin.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Was an assurance given that there will be two institutions and both will be at Cochin?

Shri A. K. Gopalan: No. It was stated that this will be located at Cochin. Then we put the question "Why was it established at Bombay?" It was stated in answer on the floor of the House that it will be located at Cochin. Now he says "I did not say that; we will establish one institution in Cochin and the other elsewhere". Till then we were given to understand that the best place is Cochin but since there are certain initial difficulties it will temporarily be located in Bombay and then shifted to Cochin. That is what we have been told till now.

Shri S. K. Patil: That is not an assurance. That is exactly what the report says. Therefore, it is not an assurance.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: I am not referring to the report. I am referring to the reply in Parliament to Question No. 84.

Shri S. K. Patil: That is true. I am not denying it. And if you want to know something more of it, because I can take the House into confidence, that created some anxiety in Cochin

because their demand was not satisfied. It would be wrong on my part to do anything which will be going against the wishes of Cochin. It was located in Bombay as a temporary measure. Then, because it would be a good thing, the Government of Maharashtra came into the picture. The difficulty is that just like the Cochin or Kerala Government have read the report, in the same way the Maharashtra Government have also read the report. They said "if there is no place available at present, please locate it in our place". Now they are also equally anxious for this institute.

The point before us is this: should we wait for a year or two years until the educational facilities are created in Cochin in order that the institute should be set up there and ask those who have given us funds etc. to wait for some time or should we go ahead with the programme, at least temporarily locating it at some other place? So knowing the keenness of the Kerala Government for this, I thought that I should accept the assistance from the foreign country and locate it temporarily in Bombay and then shift it to Cochin when Cochin has got enough facilities for that.

Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi): May I put . . .

Shri S. K. Patil: I am not yielding, because Delhi has no fisheries.

Shri C. K. Nair: The point is that a more developed city could develop things quickly whereas a backward area takes a long time. Bombay is already very much developed.

Shri S. K. Patil: That is an argument.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Now he is going to make a speech.

Shri C. K. Nair: Then the next question is . . .

Shri S. K. Patil: There is no question at all. If Bombay for that reason is disqualified, Cochin is also equally disqualified.

Shri A. K. Gopalan: How?

Shri S. K. Patil: Because, there are smaller places than Cochin where these things could be established.

What I am saying is that it is creating a controversy out of something which really does not call for a controversy. As I have said, both institutes are there. We are prepared to do that and spend the same amount of money. It is not that we are doing so specially. It is a coincidence that they will cost the same amount of money. I categorised as to what the activities of that operatives training institute are, like what Cochin is doing today. That institute is more suitable for that place because the one at Bombay is only for higher education for which Bombay has got the facilities.

I can assure the House and hon. friends from Kerala that I would not

make myself responsible for any injustice at all. I have had no hand in it. These things had been done long before I took over charge and so on and so forth. So far as the second institution and expediting it are concerned, so that Kerala should have the advantage of that institute, it is a thing which, as I said, is in the larger interests of Kerala and in the national interest and for which I am responsible

Shri Warior rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House stands adjourned to meet again at 11 o'clock on Wednesday, the 21st December, 1960.

17.56 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, the 21st December, 1960|Agrahayana 30, 1882 (Saka).