

cation No. G.S.R. 666 in Gazette of India dated the 21st June, 1980, under sub-section (3) of section 48 of the Coffee Act, 1942. [Placed in Library. See No. Lt-1093/80].

(2) A copy each of the following Notifications (Hindi and English versions) under sub-section (3) of section 17 of the Export (Quality Control and Inspection) Act, 1953:—

(i) The Export of Cashew Kernels (Quality Control and Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980, published in Notification No. S.O. 1785 in Gazette of India dated the 5th July, 1980.

(ii) The Export of Enamelware (Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980, published in Notification No S.O. 1786 in Gazette of India dated the 5th July, 1980.

(iii) The Export of Bache-demer (Inspection) Amendment Rules, 1980, published in Notification No. S.O. 1787 in Gazette of India dated the 5th July, 1980. [Placed in Library See No. LT-1100/80].

I beg to lay on the Table a copy of Notification No. S.O. 483(E) (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 1st July, 1980 making certain amendment to Notification S.O. 211(E) dated the 18th April, 1979, issued under section 13 of the Rubber Act, 1947. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1101/80].

A COPIES OF GENERAL INSURANCE (TERMINATION, SUPERANNUATION AND RETIREMENT OF OFFICERS AND DEVELOPMENT STAFF) SECOND AMENDMENT SCHEME, 1980 AND A COPY OF NOTIFICATION UNDER CUSTOMS ACT, 1962.

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT): I beg to lay on the Table:—

(1) A copy of the General Insurance (Termination, Superannuation and Retirement of Officers and

Development Staff) Second Amendment Scheme 1980 (Hindi and English versions) published in Notification No S.O. 496(E) in Gazette of India dated the 4th July, 1980, under section 17 of the General Insurance Business (Notification) Act, 1972 [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1102/80].

(2) A copy of Notification No. G.S.R. 406(E) (Hindi and English versions) published in Gazette of India dated the 11th July, 1980 together with an explanatory note regarding fixation of basic customs duty on Colour negative cinematograph films, not exposed, under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-1103/80].

12.09 hrs.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377

(i) FIXATION OF PRESUMPTIVE SENIORITY OF PROMOTED I.A.S. AND I.P.S. OFFICERS IN UTTAR PRADESH.

SHRI RAJESH KUMAR SINGH (Firozabad): Sir, the Home Department of U.P. Government is following the practice of fixing presumptive seniority of the promoted I.P.S. and I.A.S. officers and, on the basis of the presumptive seniority, appointments to the selection grade and super-time scale of such officers are being made.

The seniority of the promoted IAS and IPS Officers is governed and regulated by the IPS and IAS Regulation of seniority Rules 1954. These rules neither recognise presumptive seniority nor allow the benefit of *ad hoc* period of officiation in determining seniority.

In December 1979 the Ministry of Home Affairs had asked the Home Department of UP to discontinue the practice of fixing presumptive seniority of promoted IPS Officers and had

[Shri Rajesh Kumar Singh]

asked for comments of the State Government in respect of certain promoted IPS Officers.

The question of allowing or disallowing the benefit of ad hoc period of officiation to promoted IPS Officers has to be decided in accordance with the rules and in consultation with the Ministry of Home Affairs.

Since a number of IPS Officers are adversely affected, the matter requires immediate attention of the Central Government.

(ii) NEED TO EMPLOY LOCAL PEASANTRY IN THE RAYCHAK' FISH HARBOUR OF 24 PARGANAS DISTRICT, WEST BENGAL

SHRI MUKUNDA MANDAL (Mathurapur): Sir, Raychak Fish Harbour and its township in the District of 24 Parganas, controlled and cooperate with the authorities concerned has been constructed on the tears of the poor cultivators. Yet, the cultivators in Raychak are came forward to cooperate with the authorities concerned for the construction of the Harbour and township, sacrificing their only source of livelihood, i.e., the agricultural land, in exchange of a pretty amount of compensation.

Surprisingly, a good number of cultivators have not yet received the full compensation money.

The poor peasantry, by losing land, would have thought that at least one from each family would get employment opportunity in the Harbour on compassionate grounds. But the authorities concerned gave appointment, both unskilled and skilled, to persons from outside ignoring the demand of the said people.

On the other hand M/s. Gannon Dunkerly & Co., Ltd., a building construction company gave appointment, for a number of skilled and unskilled jobs, to labour from Raychak area,

including labour from outside. Though more than one-third of the contracted work in the Fish Harbour is still undone, the company has retrenched 32 labourers (both skilled and unskilled) on 29th April, 1980, incidentally belonging to the Raychak area.

I would urge upon the Government to look into the matters and ensure justice to the peasantry and labourers concerned.

(iii) NEED FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION ON THE NHAVA SHEVA PORT PROJECT

SHRI R. K. MHALGI (Thane): Sir, under Rule 377, I would like to raise the following matter of urgent public importance:—

In June, 1979, the Planning Commission set up a Working Group on the Nhava Sheva Port Project. This Group finalised its report in November, 1979. The Group came to the conclusion that the capacity of the Bombay Port Trust which is at present reckoned at about 7.1 million tonnes may be capable of being augmented to the extent of 7.84 million tonnes as against which the traffic projections have been made at 9.22 million tonnes for 1982-83, 11.90 million tonnes for 1987-88 and 13.43 million tonnes for 1992-93. The Working Group felt that it may be necessary to create additional port capacity by 1987-88 for catering to the anticipated increase in traffic.

Separately, the Ministry of Shipping and Transport made a survey some time ago of the entire west coast which had shown that locating a new port at Nhava Sheva may provide the least cost solution.

The Planning Commission has recommended that a detailed project report may be prepared for the proposed Nhava Sheva, examining *inter alia* the technical and economic implications of locating the new Port at other alternative places on the west coast. The Planning Commission is of the view that the construction of