Commissioning New Jetty at New Mangalore Port

4836. SHRI B. K. HARIPRASAD: Will the Minister of SURFACE TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

- (a) whether it is a fact that the Public Investment Board has cleared the project for the creation of an additional jetty at the New Mangalore Port;
- (b) whether there are any plans to renovate the existing jetty which has gone obsolete and requires upgradation to handle higher traffic; and
- (c) what is the time frame set to commission the new jetty facility and whether Government would ensure its completion in time to handle the input traffic of the Mangalore Refinery supposed to be functional from August, 1995?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANSPORT (SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER): (a) Yes, Sir.

- (b) The proposal envisages creation of na additional oil jetty and upgradation of the existing oil jetty to cater to the needs of the users.
- (c) The completion time for the entire project has been estimated at 30 months from the date of Government Sanctions However, the new oil jetty is expected to be completed earlier than 30 months to make it available for use tankers.

Assurance to Gujarat for Ahmedabad Project from National Renewal Fund

4837. SHRI AHMED MOHMEDBHAI PATEL: Will the Minister of SURFACE TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Government of Gujarat has been assured to be provided Rs. 250 crores in phases from the National Renewal Fund for implementing its Ahmedabad Project;
- (b) if so, what is the total amount to be provided during 1994-955
- (c) whether Government of Gujarat has submitted the detailed plans on which this amount will be spent; and
- (d) what is the time period fixed for provided total loan from National Renewal Fund?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANS-PORT (SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER): (a) to (d) The information is being collected and will be placed on the table of the House.

National Highway Projects

4838. SHRI S. R. BOMMAI: Will the Minister of SURFACE TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

- (a) what are the State-wise details of the lengths of the National Highways;
- (b) what is the criteria for according priority for taking up the national highway project in a State and what is the, Plan-wise and State-wise details of the allocation during the last three Five Year Plans stating the basis on which allocation was made;
- (c) what was the total length of National Highway projected to be completed during the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Plan period and what was the actual achievement stating the reasons for the shortfall in the target and
- (d) what are the reasons for the discrimination, if any, in the allocation of funds and in taking up the National Highway Projects in the less developed States in the country?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANS-PORT (SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER): (a) A Statement-I showing the statewise length of National Highway is attached. (See below).

(b) to (d) The development of National Highways is a continuous process. The improvement works are taken up keeping in view the condition of the road, traffic intensity, inter-se-priority of work and the overall availability of funds etc. The Plan-wise and State-wise details of allocation during the last three Five Year Plans is enclosed as a statement-II, (see below).

The allocation for National Highways to various states is made keeping in view the Bank of Sanction, status of work and the availability of funds. There is no discrimination in the allocation of funds to various States.

Sl. No.	Nam	Length of NH in Km. (Provisiona								
1	2								 	3
1.	Andhra Pradesi	h		•						2888
2.	Arunachal Prad	esh								330
3.	Assam									2296
4.	Bihar .									2117
5.	Chandigarh						•			24
6.	Delhi .						•			72
7.	Goa .									229
8.	Gujarat .									1631
9.	Haryana .				•	٠				698
10.	Himachal Prade	sh					•			854
11.	Jammu and Ka	shmi	r ·							648
12.	Karnataka					•		•		1996
13.	Kerala .									940
14.	Madhya Prades	sh								2946
15.	Maharashtra									2918
16.	Manipur .									431
17.	Meghalaya	•								472
18.	Mizoram									551
19.	Nagaland			•	٠					113
20.	Orissa .									1649
21.	Punjab .									892
22.	Rajasthan									2931
23.	Sikkim									62
24.	Tamil Nadu			•				•	•	1896
25.	Tripura .									200
26.	Uttar Pradesh									2613
27.	West Bengal									1638
28.	Pondicherry								٠	23
										34058

Statement-II

	-							
Sl. No.	State/U.T.					5 th Plan 1974-75	6 th Plan 1980-81	7 th Plan 1985-86
						to 1978-79	to 1984-85	to 1989-90
						1000.00	-	
1.	Andhra Pradesh		•	•	•	1929.00	4364.83	8231.82
2.	Arunachal Prades	sh	•	•	•		85.00	237.00
3.	Assam .	•	•	•	•	1357.72	2803.87	4760.20
4.	Bihar .			•	•	3059.90	4418.16	6392.59
5.	Chandigarh			•		-		68.00
6.	Delhi .				•	495.62	2068.56	1395.50
7.	Goa .		•		•	301.20	772.96	3130.36
8.	Gujarat .					1762.00	3409.31	12475.20
9.	Haryana .					600.67	2263.28	3741.92
10.	Himachal Prades	h				784.16	1500.80	3745.50
11.	Jammu & Kashm	rir	•			856.98	1412.00	2840.32
12.	Karnataka				-	1 816.9 5	4123.06	7337 .46
13.	Kerala .					1290.26	2543.56	5511 .43
14.	Madhya Pradesi	ı				2473.80	4232.32	8364.00
15.	Maharashtra				•	3592.00	4500.78	9984.00
16.	Manipur .					244.40	578.39	1442.00
17.	Meghalaya					168.00	862.00	2955.00
18.	Nagaland .					14.00	52.50	495.50
19.	Orissa .					1314.40	2331.72	5408.45
20.	Pondicherry					_	25.00	231.00
21.	Puniab .					716.80	2538.82	7949.08
22.	Rajasthan					1690.00	3005.75	7256.40
23.	Tamil Nadu					2149.85	3138.21	8347.40
24.	Uttar Pradesh	•	•			4291.88	6212.84	17445,40
25.	West Bengal	•				1954.60	3065.71	4688.00
20.	11 COL TACTION	•	•	•	•			

Container cargo handling in JNPT Bombay

4839. SHRI SURESH KALMADI : Will the Minister of SURFACE TRANS-PORT be pleased to state :

(a) whether the attention of Government had been drawn to the news item published in the Economic Times of 2nd April, 1994 under the caption 'Bombay Port, JNPT on warpath' over container cargo handling; and

(b) if so, what is Government's reaction in respect thereto?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SURFACE TRANS-PORT (SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER): (a) Yes Sir.

(b) The contention made in the newsitem is not correct. There is natural growth of container traffic at both the ports and the handling facilities at both these ports need to be augmented.