

to open Krishi Vigyan Kendras at district headquarters. Madhya Pradesh is a backward state but Krishi Vigyan Kendras have been opened there even at divisional headquarter level. Whether the commissioner headquarters will be placed on top in the priority list whether provisions will be made to open a Kendra at Chambal headquarter of my constituency which is also a commissioner headquarter? Whether these kendras will be opened in Bhind and Murena on priority basis?

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: It would not be possible for me to tell right now whether a Krishi Vigyan Kendra can be opened in a particular area or not. But as I have already stated priority is given to the backward areas. If the previous Government has lacked somewhere, it will be taken care of and as I have just now mentioned that during the eighth five year plan these centers will be opened at maximum number of places.

SHRI TEJ NARAYAN SINGH: How many Krishi Vigyan Kendras have been opened in Bihar so far and what is their position?

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: In Bihar 8 Krishi Vigyan Kendras have been opened so far.

SHRI TEJ NARAYAN SINGH: Please furnish state-wise breakup.

MR. SPEAKER: Don't ask for state-wise figures as hon. Minister has already stated that state-wise break up will be laid on the Table of the House.

SHRI YAMUNA PRASAD SHASTRI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, Krishi Vigyan Kendras have been opened so far only in 103 districts. It means that there are no Krishi Vigyan Kendras in three-fourth districts of the country. In view of the fact that Madhya Pradesh is the most backward State in the country and its per acres production as well as per acre productively is very low. May I know the number of Krishi Vigyan Kendras which have

been opened in Madhya Pradesh? It has been decided that by the year 2000 Krishi Vigyan Kendras will be opened in each district of the country, it means that all districts will not be covered by the next Five Year Plan. I want to know the names of the districts in which Krishi Vigyan Kendras will be opened during eighth Five Year Plan and the norms to be adopted for opening them and the number of districts where Krishi Vigyan Kendras will be set up by the final year of Eighth Five Year Plan?

SHRI NITISH KUMAR: Mr. Speaker, Sir, answer to these questions have already been given.

[English]

Traffic Handled at Major Ports

+

*965. SHRIMATI BASAVA RAJESWARI:

SHRI G.S. BASAVARAJ:

Will the Minister of SURFACE TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) the traffic handled at the 12 major ports during 1989-90 and the corresponding figures for 1988-89 and 1987-88, portwise;

(b) whether traffic handled by these ports has come down during year 1989-90 as compared to that of the previous two years; and

(c) if so, the reasons therefore, portwise?

THE MINISTER OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN): (a) to (c). A statement is laid on the table of the House.

(a) and (b). There are 11 major ports. Traffic handled at these major ports during the year 1987-88, 1988-89 and 1989-90 is given below:

Traffic Handled at Major Ports during 1987-88, 88-89 and 89-90

(in million tonnes)

Sl. No.	Name of the port	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90 (Provisional)
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Calcutta (including Haldia Dock Complex)	13.071	14.223	14.689
2.	Paradip	5.187	6.032	6.183
3.	Visakhapatnam	15.371	20.371	21.117
4.	Madras	22.82	23.86	23.94
5.	Cochin	6.802	7.824	7.111
6.	New Mangalore	6.107	7.085	7.661
7.	Mormugao	13.332	15.389	14.171
8.	Bombay	29.6	29.3	27.5
9.	Kandla	18.083	17.807	18.925

Sl. No.	Name of the port	1987-88	1988-89	1989-90 (Provisional)
1	2	3	4	5
10.	Tuticorin	4.26	5.14	5.324
11.	Jawaharlal Nehru Port	—	—	0.697
		134.633	147.031	147.318

As the above table shows, there has been an over all increase in the traffic handled in the 11 powers in 1989-90 as compared to 1988-89 and 1987-88. There has, however, been a marginal decline in the traffic handled in 1989-90 at Bombay as compared to 1987-88 and 1988-89 and at Cochin and Mormugao as compared to 1988-89.

Even as such the volume of traffic handled in 1989-90 at Bombay and Cochin ports represented 100% of the installed capacity at these ports.

(c) The reasons for decline in traffic are given below in respect of ports referred to in part (a) and (b) of the reply:—

1. Bombay :— i) Substantial fall in castal Exports of Bombay High crude, leading to decrease in traffic in the petroleum, oil and lubricant group.
 - ii) Fall in import of edible oil, iron and steel and food grains (including pulses).
 - iii) Diversion of traffic from Bombay Port to Jawaharlal Nehru Port since it was commissioned in May, 1989, has contributed marginally to the decline in total traffic.
- 2) Mormugao :— i) Less export of iron ore by 9.57 lakhs tonnes compared to the previous year, due to strike in Iron Ore Mines, Romania's internal problems and hold up of seven chartered vessels at Karachi Port during February, 1990 due to disturbances at that port.
 - ii) Less transhipment of imported POL products, by 2.55 lakhs tonnes.
- 3) Cochin :— Fall in traffic during 1989-90 compared to that of the previous year was mainly caused

by reduced traffic in oil which constitutes the major portion (79% during 1989-90) of the Port's traffic.

SHRIMATIBASAVARAJESWARI: May I know from the hon. Minister whether the Union Government has proposed a major plan for overhauling and improvement of the ports in Karnataka, Gujarat and Bombay during the 8th Plan? If so, how much money has been allotted? What is the total money spent on these ports?

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN: From time to time, on an annual basis, we do review the working of the ports, and also on a Plan-basis. It is not based on States. As the hon. Member is aware, there are eleven major ports in India; and the requirements of all ports for expansion as well as for facilities are taken into consideration when these reviews are undertaken. As far as the 8th Plan is concerned, we are already at the level of discussions; and since 1990-91, as the hon. Member is aware, is the first year of the Plan, we have allotted various sums of money for outlay for 1990-91. Since she wanted to know about Karnataka, Karnataka is serviced by the New Mangalore port; and Rs. 5.48 crores have been allotted for Karnataka; for Kandla Rs. 31.4 crores and for Bombay Rs. 43.18 crores.

SHRIMATI BASAVA RAJESWARI: I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether it has come to his notice—I come from an area where a lot of iron ore and manganese ore are being exported through various ports—that because of the non-clearance of the goods, a lot of inconvenience is caused for the mine-owners and also in respect of scrap which is being imported from other countries. In view of this inconvenience, will the hon. Minister assure me that at least during the 8th Plan he would try to see that the improvement of the ports in Karnataka is strengthened?

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN: As I said, Karnataka is well serviced by the New Mangalore port. As the hon. Member is aware,

there was a prolonged strike in the New Mangalore port earlier this year. I intervened, and the strike was settled. Since then, it has exceeded all targets of productivity. There is at this moment no hindrance whatsoever as far as New Mangalore port is concerned, regarding iron ore. Certainly we will look into the hon. Member's valuable suggestions.

SHRI AJIT PANJA: The Calcutta port is one of the oldest ports in the country. Haldia came thereafter. The hon. Minister may kindly look at his answer, at (a) and (b). There, the performance of the Calcutta port and also the Haldia Dock have been clubbed together, and these figures are given accordingly. Very recently, we have got the Jawaharlal Nehru port which is at Nhava Sheva near Bombay. Information about the Bombay port and the Jawaharlal Nehru port are given separately. I say this because, while ascertaining the need for development of a particular port, all these inputs are required. Haldia is required to be developed very quickly. The other day the Minister answered a question about a request from West Bengal Government for ship repairing at Haldia.

Therefore, I want answers to two parts of a supplementary. (a) what is the division of the traffic handled at Calcutta, excluding Haldia Dock complex, and what is the position at Haldia complex? and (b) will these administratively separate ports, in future, be assessed separately, so that we can ask for details regarding the inputs they get, and look into the question of whether proper funds have been given by the Centre, or not.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN: The hon. Member has been a distinguished Minister and he is well aware that the Haldia Dock system has been administratively a part of the Calcutta port complex. Therefore, there is nothing that we have done new. As far as inputs are concerned, we have always provided statistics in terms of the Calcutta ports as a whole. If he is interested in separate statistics for the Haldia port, we will certainly provide them.

We are keenly interested in developing

the Haldia Port complex because of the genuine need felt. It has also been accepted. We are also very much interested in servicing the hinterland as per the new industrial projects which are likely to be located in Haldia and serviced by Haldia. Therefore, there is no question of any kind of negligence towards Haldia. We shall certainly see that Haldia is given every kind of assistance. But, as far as its administrative structure is concerned, it has been treated as part of the Calcutta Port-complex with the Deputy Chairman in charge.

SHRI AJIT PANJA: I am sorry, the hon. Minister is not correct probably. I am not saying that you are saying incorrectly. But please look into it. Previously, it was together administratively. Now it is separate.

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Yes.

[Translation]

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT: Hon. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know through you whether any special plan and special provision have been made for the development of Kendra port in the Eighth Five Year Plan? Whether Government have declared a few major cities as dry ports besides the 12 major ports, which are those dry ports.

[English]

SHRI K.P. UNNIKRISHNAN: I have already explained about the 11 major ports. At the moment, we are not considering adding any port to this list, although these have been demands from different States for improving certain minor ports, which are entirely under the existing constituent schemes under the charge of the different States. As far as the Kandla Port is concerned, we have given the figures in the Statement.

MR. SPEAKER: He has given the figures.

MR. SPEAKER: Next question—Shri Advani.

SHRI YADVENDRA DATT: Since Mr. Advani is not here, I would request you to allow this question under your discretion.

MR. SPEAKER: No. He will not be there.

SHRI YADVENDRA DATT: Last time, you allowed a question like this. He will be coming.

MR. SPEAKER: No. Next question.

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKATA: Why did you not allow me to put a question?

[Translation]

MR. SPEAKER: Please don't short, take your seat.

(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: You please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKATA: I have been watching that you are depriving me to put a question all the time. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You cannot browbeat me like this. I will permit you only when you catch the eyes of the Speaker. Please take your seat.

(Interruptions)

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKATA: It is unfortunate that you are depriving a member from the Union Territory to put a question all the time. (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER: You should not enter into an argument with the Speaker. Please take your seat.

Next question. Mr. Ramanna Rai.

Implementation of Wage Hike Award to Workers of Aralam Farm in Kerala

1967. SHRI M. RAMANNA RAI: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether government are aware that the management of Aralam Farm in Kerala is not implementing the decision of the Supreme Court about wage hike award to workers; and

(b) if so, what remedial measures Government intend to take?

[Translation]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND COOPERATION IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI NITISH KUMAR): (a) and (b). A Statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT

The workers of the Aralam Farm in Cannanore district of Kerala were in dispute with the Management over wages. The matter was referred to the Industrial Tribunal at Calicut, which made an award in June, 1978. Aggrieved by the award, the Management approached the Honourable High Court of Kerala by a Writ Petition in December, 1978. The High Court rejected the Writ Petition and the Management then approached the Hon'ble Supreme Court through a Special Leave Petition filed in February, 1984. This Special Leave Petition was not admitted by the Supreme Court vide its Order dated 5.5.1986. Since the issue of fixation of pay in terms of the award was disputed between the Management and the workers, clarification was sought from the Industrial Tribunal which gave its clarification in November, 1989.

In view of the financial implications of the Tribunal Award, and the Aralam Farm's precarious financial condition, the Management and all the Unions, representing differ-