

of companies and getting them sold through courts and adjusting the sale proceeds towards the defaulted amounts.

### Poor response to family planning in the States

1477. SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY WELFARE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that in spite of massive investment and sustained campaign family planning and small family norm is not being adopted on a large scale in States like U.P., M.P., Bihar and Rajasthan;

(b) whether it is a fact that the southern States, Maharashtra, Haryana and the Union Territory of Delhi are far ahead of other States in achieving the family planning targets;

(c) what plans are being chalked out by the Central Government for effective implementation of the small family norms, especially in a villages in the northern region so as to bring down the birth rate; and

(d) whether Government would also consider the feasibility of issuing appeals to some religious groups, who are not enthusiastic about family planning, so that family planning is acceptable to them?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY WELFARE (SHRI S. KRISHNA KUMAR):

(a) and (b) Acceptance of small family norm depends upon the status of women including literacy and educational level especially of the mothers, employment status, child survival rates, social security and other socio-economic factors embracing a wide spectrum of development. The acceptance of small family norm, therefore, varies from State to State. The couple protection rate in respect of different States/UTs is given in the enclosed Statement (See below).

(c) A well designed strategy for achieving population stabilisation has been developed. As part of the strategy, the small family norm is sought to be achieved through education and motivation and structured material and non-material incentives. In order to enhance acceptance of family planning in lagging States greater efforts will have to be made for all round improvement in the socio-economic developmental status including the position of women in the society backed by communication efforts directed at the eligible couples in the States.

(d) Family Welfare Programme is being promoted on a voluntary basis among all sections of the population. Efforts are made to enlist support to the Programme, of opinion leaders from various walks of life, including the religious leaders through the press, inter-personal communication, orientation training camps, involvement of voluntary Organisations.

### Statement

*Couples effectively protected as on 31-3-1986*

Sl. No.	State/U.T. Agency	% Protected*
<b>I. Major States (Population 1 crore or more)</b>		
1.	Andhra Pradesh . . . .	34.6
2.	Assam . . . . .	25.4
3.	Bihar . . . . .	18.9
4.	Gujarat . . . . .	48.2
5.	Haryana . . . . .	52.1
6.	Karnataka . . . . .	36.3
7.	Kerala . . . . .	41.1
8.	Madhya Pradesh . . . .	31.9
9.	Maharashtra . . . . .	53.0
10.	Orissa . . . . .	34.5
11.	Punjab . . . . .	53.5
12.	Rajasthan . . . . .	23.1
13.	Tamil Nadu . . . . .	41.0
14.	Uttar Pradesh . . . . .	29.5

\*Figure Provisional

Sl. No.	State/U.T./ Agency	% Protected*
15.	West Bengal . . . . .	28.3
<b>II. Smaller States/U.Ts.</b>		
1.	Himachal Pradesh . . . . .	39.6
2.	J&K . . . . .	18.2
3.	Manipur . . . . .	20.3
4.	Meghalaya . . . . .	5.9
5.	Nagaland . . . . .	3.4
6.	Sikkim . . . . .	12.6
7.	Tripura . . . . .	11.7
8.	A&N Islands . . . . .	25.9
9.	Arunachal Pra. . . . .	5.3
10.	Chandigarh . . . . .	36.9
11.	D&N Haveli . . . . .	36.3
12.	Delhi . . . . .	36.8
13.	Goa, D. & Diu . . . . .	24.2
14.	Lakshadweep . . . . .	12.5
15.	Mizoram . . . . .	26.9
16.	Pondicherry . . . . .	54.6
<b>III. Other Agencies</b>		
1.	M/o Defence . . . . .	—
2.	Deptt. of Railways . . . . .	—
ALL	INDIA . . . . .	35.5

\*Figures provisional.

#### Aircraft accidents

1478. SHRI BHAGATRAM MANHAR: Will the Minister of TRANSPORT be pleased to state:

(a) what are the details of aircraft accidents which occurred during the last year;

(b) the loss incurred by Government due to these accidents;

(c) whether it is a fact that there is loss of lives also in these accidents and if so what compensation has been paid to the relatives of the victims;

(d) whether it is a fact that there have been a number of accidents of Indian Airlines planes due to bird hits during the same period; and

(e) if so, what steps are being taken by Government in this regard to prevent accidents due to bird hits?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER): (a) In 1985, there had been 17 notifiable accident involving civil aircraft, details of which are given in the attached statement. (See below)

(b) Expenditure incurred so far by Air India are approximately Rs. 2.30 crores as a result of Kanishka crash. General Insurance Corporation who are insurers of Air India have reimbursed an interim amount of Rs. 68.34 lakhs. Another amount of Rs. 59.81 lakhs approximately has been spent by Air India on the recovery and salvage operations of the ill-fated Kanishka. The total cost of repairs of the two air-craft of Indian Airlines VT-EDS and VT-EGD is Rs. 9 and Rs. 3.5 crores respectively. The Corporation will obtain refund of a major portion of the repair cost as per its aircraft insurance policies.

(c) Yes, Sir. Approximately Rs. 3.75 crores has been paid as compensation to the relatives of the victims so far.

(d) No, Sir.

(e) Various measures such as cutting of grass around the run-way strips and spraying of insecticides, use of incinerators for burning garbage, shooting of birds at airports, installation of sodium vapour lights on the operational area and air-fields and clearance of slums around airports, creating public awareness regarding environment cleanliness around air-fields through various publicity media are also in hand.