

- (iv) Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP)
- (v) Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas (DWCRA)
- (vi) Training of Rural Youth for self Employment (TRYSEM)
- (vii) Indira Awas Yojana (IAY)
- (viii) Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP)
- (ix) Westeland Development (WD)

The status of implementation of these schemes during 1998-99 is in the statement attached.

(c) and (d) One project proposal pertaining to Integrated Wastelands Development Project received from Raigarh district is pending awaiting clarification from the District Rural Development Agency (DRDA), Raigarh.

#### Statement

S.No.	Scheme	Central Release as on 15.2.99	Total Available Funds	Total Expenditure (Dec. 98)
1	2	3	4	5
1.	JRY	389.49	549.97	372.07
2.	IAY	181.72	266.14	99.46
3.	MWS	58.04	90.02	32.45
4.	EAS	141	322.43	142.87

1	2	3	4	5
5.	DWCRA	13.92	15.52	0
6.	TRYSEM	5.89	13.66	9.37
7.	IRDP	118.67	164.85	109.94
8.	TOOLKITS	6.12	6.12	0
9.	ARWSP	716	716	677.24
Total		1630.85	2144.71	1443.4

#### Fertiliser Factories Running in Loss

38. SHRI GANGA CHARAN RAJPUT :  
SHRI KRISHAN LAL SHARMA :

Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state :

(a) whether the fertilizer units in Public/Private sectors are running into losses;

(b) the details of profit making/incurring losses by such units during 1997-98 and as on date;

(c) the reasons for their losses; and

(d) the steps taken by the Government to make these units viable?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (DR. A.K. PATEL) :

(a) to (c) The profit/losses of the fertilizer public sector undertakings/cooperatives under the Department of Fertilizers (DOF) during 1997-98 and 1998-99 (upto Jan'99) have been as under :-

(Rs./Crore)

S.No.	Name of PSUs/Cooperative Sectors	1997-98	1998-99 (April 98 - Jan 99) Provisional
1.	National Fertilizers Limited (NFL)	189.01	52.14
2.	Fertiliser and Chemicals Travancore Limited (FACT)	53.94	(-) 47.00
3.	Rashtriya Chemicals & Fertilizers Limited (RCF)	189.37	171.00
4.	Paradeep Phosphate Limited (PPL)	(-) 105.53	(-) 14.91
5.	Madras Fertilizers Limited (MFL)	(-) 55.35	(-) 39.68
6.	Pyrites, Phosphates & Chemicals Limited (PPCL)	(-) 53.41	(-) 47.41
7.	Fertilizer Corporation of India (FCI)	(-) 724.93	(-) 712.50
8.	Hindustan Fertilizers Corporation Limited (HFC)	(-) 647.83	(-) 578.79
9.	Projects & Development India Limited (PDIL)	06.09	(-) 7.28
10.	Krishak Bharati Cooperative Limited (KRIBHCO)	299.61	206.82
11.	Indian Farmers Fertiliser Cooperative Limited (IFFCO)	438.85	265.45

The Department of Fertilizers does not monitor profit/loss information of private sector fertilizer companies.

In 1997-98, five PSUs namely HFC, FCI, PPCL, PPL & MFL incurred losses. During 1997-98, PDIL has also incurred loss. Aging equipment, power shortages and surplus manpower are among the important reasons for the losses being incurred by FCI and HFC; the case of PPCL, intrinsic cost disadvantage of pyrites based sulphuric acid production and rising costs of deep underground mining at Mussoorie are the important causes. Contract labour problems and high cost of production on account of lower capacity utilisation of phosphoric acid plant and fluctuations in the exchange rate are the important causes in so far as PPL is concerned. Delay in commissioning the revamp project and increased feedstock costs are among the important reasons for the losses being incurred by MFL. PDIL has incurred losses due to low level of orders for catalysts and lack of job orders due to no new/expansion of fertilizer projects.

(d) The Government proposes to take appropriate steps after taking into account the techno-economic viability of these units concomitant with the recommendations made by the Disinvestment Commission, as well as the rehabilitation package which would be approved by the BIFR as the case may be. Specifically, FCI and HFC have been referred to BIFR and comprehensive rehabilitation proposals have been circulated for inter-ministerial consultations. These shall be submitted for approval of the competent authority in the Government and final sanction of BIFR. The Disinvestment Commission has made recommendations for NFL, FACT, MFL and PPCL. In case of MFL, it has recommended sale of 50% of the shares to a strategic partner through a competitive bidding process. The Government have approved, in principle, its recommendation. In respect of FACT & NFL, Government has deferred the proposal of disinvestment. No decision has been taken as regards PPCL.

Substantial reliefs were given to PPL in the year 1994, which includes inter-alia restructuring of its capital base. The repayment of plan loans and payment of interest due during 1997-98 was deferred by one year. A scheme for overcoming the constraints in capacity utilisation of its sulphuric acid plant has also been drawn up.

*Food Corporation of India*

#### Misuse of FCI Godowns

39. SHRI HARIBHAI CHAUDHARY : Will the Minister of FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS be pleased to state :

(a) whether the various godowns of the Food Corporation of India are being misutilised in the country;

(b) if so, whether the Government have conducted any raids on the FCI godowns during the last three years;

(c) if so, the details thereof, year-wise; and

(d) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FOOD AND CONSUMER AFFAIRS (SHRI SATYA PAL SINGH YADAV) : (a) No, Sir.

(b) to (d) No, Sir. The then Hon'ble Minister for Food and Consumer Affairs, had visited Phulwarisharif and Dighaghat in Bihar on 30.10.97 and 1.11.97 respectively, for inspection. During the inspection, some old stocks of foodgrains and sugar were found not to have been disposed off during the stipulated period. It was investigated and necessary remedial action including administrative action has been taken by transferring the concerned officers/officials for such lapses, both from FSD, Phulwarisharif and Dighaghat.

#### Special Component Scheme and Tribal Sub-Plan

40. SHRIMATI SHEELA GAUTAM :  
SHRI RAMESHWAR PATIDAR :

Will the Minister of SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EMPOWERMENT be pleased to state :

(a) whether 22 per cent of fund is earmarked out of the planned budget allocation for the development of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes under the special component scheme and tribal sub-plan;

(b) if so, the allocation made by the Government in this regard during each of the last three years; and

(c) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SOCIAL JUSTICE AND EMPOWERMENT (SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI) : (a) No.

(b) Question does not arise.

(c) The Government of India have been impressing upon the State Government/UT Administrations from time to time to allocate resources in proportion to the population of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes while formulating their Special Component Plans and Tribal