(ख) उपर्युक्त (क) को देखते हुए प्रश्न नहीं उठता । इसमें से किसी भी भवन को किराए पर नही दिया गया है।

(ग) दो पुराने अस्तदकों को जीण होने के कारण इस्तेमाल में नहीं लाया जा रहा । अन्य सभी भवनों पर कब्जा है भीर उनका उपयोग किया जा रहा है ।

## Inter-State Dacoit Gangs

5868. SHRI MADHAVRAO SCIN-DIA: Will the Minister of HOME AFFAIRS be pleased to state:

- (a) whether any well coordinated scheme for liquidating the inter-State gangs of dacoits operating in Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and Delhi had been evolved and enforced in recent months;
- (b) if so, the details of steps taken during the last three months in pursuance thereof; and
- (c) the datails of encounters between the dacoits and the police during these months and the number of dacoits apprehended/killed during the period?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS (SHRI YOGENDRA MAKWANA):

(a) to (c). The requisite information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

## Growth of Industrial Monopolies

5869. SHRIMATI GEETA MUKH-ERJEE: Will the Minister of INDUS-TRY be pleased to state:

(a) whether a study sponsored by the Institute of Economic Growth has come to the conclusion that the Government's industrial and licensing policies have failed to check the continuing disproportionality in the growth of industrial monopolies of India;

- (b) whether it is also true that only Birlas and Tatas have increased their share of total assets to 40 per cent and paid up capital to 41 per cent which is significant increase than those in the last Monopoly Commission;
- (c) whether it is also true that these very industrialists have been allowed the option of automatic growth upto further 25 per cent in 34 items; and
- (d) if so, what happened to the Government's earlier declarations pertaining to curbing monopoly and concentration of industrial power in Indian economy?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA): (a) to (d): The study referred to is by Shri N. S. Siddharthan, Reader in Institute of Economic Growth. Among the conclusions that he has come to is that despite the declared objectives of the industrial policy, viz., to prevant restrictive policies of monopolies and expansionist policies of oligopoly firms, the conglomerate monopoly firms grew at a slower rate while the conglomerate oligopoly policy grew at a faster rate since, according to his conclusion, the investment behaviour of these conglomerate firms was at variance with the declared objectives of the industrial and licensing policies Government. The author further gone on to admit that in fact, a uniform policy cannot tackle the restrictive policy of the conglomerate monopoly firms and the expansionist policy of the conglomerate oligopoly firms simultaneously. However, the industrial and price policies were more or less successful in regulating investment and output of the conglomerate firms belonging to the competitive market where investment decisions are influenced by profitability.

It has been stated by the author himself that his study suffers from