

- (ii) Inadequate focus and specificity of the surveys and studies conducted for assessing the industrial potential in selected areas.
- (iii) Serious gaps in infrastructure in the selected areas.
- (iv) Serious gaps in the selections of beneficiary entrepreneurs.
- (v) Rudimentary technical advice and the consultancy services in the selected backward areas.
- (vi) The bulk of the disbursements under the Central Investment Subsidy Schemes was accounted for by fewer States. Moreover, this was availed of relatively substantially by the larger and medium industrial units.

**Evaluation Report on Concessional Finance and other Incentives to Industrially Backward Areas**

\*276. SHRI GHULAM MOHD KHAN :

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE :

Will the Minister of PLANNING be pleased to state :

(a) whether the Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission had released the evaluation report on concessional finance and other incentives in industrially backward areas ;

(b) whether it is also a fact that the bulk of the Central investment subsidy given in backward areas was cornered by large units ;

(c) whether Government propose to reformulate the entire Central scheme of concessional finance for the development of backward areas ; and

(d) if so, details thereof ?

**THE MINISTER OF PLANNING (SHRI S. B. CHAVAN) :** (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) According to the Report on Industrial Dispersal submitted by the National Committee on the Development of Backward Areas (NCDBA), 143 units having capital investment over Rs. 1 crore received a total subsidy of R. 18.3 crores out of the total of Rs. 62.4 crores disbursed till 1978-79 under the Central Scheme of Investment Subsidy in the identified industrially backward districts/areas.

(c) and (d). The entire question of development of industrially backward areas including Central incentives like the schemes of concessional finance is presently under examination in the Government pending a decision on the Report on Industrial Dispersal submitted by the National Committee on the Development of Backward Areas (NCDBA).

**DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY :** Sir, it is a very exhaustive answer.

**SHRI N. DENNIS :** Each State follows its own way for the development of backward areas and divergent views are expressed on the term 'industrial backwardness'. Some States adopt policies for the dispersal of industries from the developed areas to backward areas, some for all round development of all areas, some favour growth centre approach and so on. As per our Constitution, the responsibility for regulation and industrial development is shared between the Centre and the States. The Central Government is for the overall development of the nation and it has a crucial and overall responsibility in the regulation and development of industries so as to reduce regional imbalances and disparities and to achieve the national objectives.

So, may I know whether a comprehensive, general and uniform national policy would be evolved for application throughout the nation to tackle effectively the industrial backwardness by removing regional imbalances and disparities? Also I want to know the approximate time when the report of the NCDBA on industrial dispersal would be submitted and when a decision would be taken on it.

**SHRI S.B. CHAVAN :** Sir, the Central Government is definitely concerned about the development of industrially backward areas and, according to the present scheme also, there has been almost a uniform policy which has been made applicable in the case of industrially backward districts.

But, there has been some kind of a variation due to State Government's giving their own package of incentives for development of industrially backward districts.

We have been trying to point out as to whether it is going to be possible for the Central and state Governments to have coordinated package of incentives and, how far it is going to be possible, is a matter which is also being considered. I cannot, possibly, indicate any date as to when the final decision on the report of the N.C.D.B.A. would be taken.

**SHRI N. DENNIS :** Sir, though the intention of the Government is for overall development of the nation and to reduce the regional imbalance, some regions and states are forward in industrial development, whereas others are lagging behind. Within the States too, there are regional imbalance and disparities. Still, there is concentration of industries in metropolitan areas and cities and so, the step pursued by the Government for dispersal of industries from the developed places to backward areas is not fully success-

ful. There are still many districts and areas in the country which have not been taken up and identified for development thereby, they are not benefited adequately. Many backward areas continue to be backward and industrially underdeveloped. So, may I know from the Hon. Minister what concrete and practical steps would be taken by the Government for the speedy removal of regional imbalance? May I also know the time within which all backward areas in the country would be identified and taken up for development?

**MR. SPEAKER :** How many questions do you want to put? The questions are too long. You are allowed only one or two.

**SHRI N. DENNIS :** May I know whether there is any specific proposal to impose certain restrictions in the matter of giving licences and financial assistance to the new industrial units within certain limits that are already in developed areas.

**MR. SPEAKER :** You only reply to his first question.

**SHRI S. B. CHAVAN :** Sir, in the present scheme of incentives which has been offered by the Central Government a problem has been thrown out due to which Sivaraman Committee was set up to go into the entire question. We are committed to removal of disparities in regional development and, that is why, the Sivaraman Committee has gone into the details of the entire thing and they have submitted their report. This entire report is under the consideration of the Government.

Unless a final view is taken, it will be difficult for me to exactly say as to when it is going to be finally decided. I cannot also possibly indicate the entire timeframe within which it should be possible to remove all the imbalance in the country.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Goyal.

श्री कृष्ण कुमार गोयल : अध्यक्ष महोदय, प्रश्न संख्या 273 के उत्तर में जो स्टेटमेंट दिए गए हैं, मैं उनके आधार पर सवाल पूछना चाहता हूँ। स्टेटमेंट 3 में आइटम 6 में कहा गया है :—

“The bulk of the disbursements under the Central Investment Subsidy Scheme was accounted for by fewer States. Moreover, this was availed re-latively substantially by the larger and medium industrial units.”

इसी प्रकार स्टेटमेंट 2 से पता चलता है कि सेंटर से जो सब्सिडी रिलीज की गई है, उसमें से मणिपुर, मेघालय, नागालैंड, उड़ीसा, लक्षद्वीप, मिजोरम और पांडीचेरी को एक पैसा भी रिलीज नहीं किया गया है। क्या यह सही है कि जो बड़े यूनिट्स हैं, जिनको कनसेशनल फिनांस के द्वारा सब्सिडाइज किया गया है और जो 50 लाख रुपए या उससे अधिक की लागत के हैं, जिनकी कुल संख्या 3, 4 प्रतिशत है उनको सब्सिडी का शेयर 53.3 प्रतिशत मिला और दूसरी ओर जो मध्यम यूनिट्स हैं जिनका इन्वेस्टमेंट 10 लाख से 50 लाख तक का है और जिनकी संख्या कुल सब्सिडी पाने वालों में 5.4 प्रतिशत है उनको कुल सब्सिडी का 25.2 प्रतिशत मिला जब कि जो छोटी यूनिट्स हैं जिनमें दस लाख तक का इन्वेस्टमेंट है और जो कुल यूनिट्स के अन्दर जिनको आपने सब्सिडाइज किया है 91.2 प्रतिशत हैं उन्हें सब्सिडी का केवल 21.5 प्रतिशत मिला। तो क्या यह सही है कि बड़े यूनिट्स को औसतन 10.7 मिला, जो मध्यम हैं उनको 3.1 लाख मिला और छोटी यूनिट्स को केवल 20 हजार रुपया मिला? क्या यह सच है

कि जितना भी आप ने बैंकवर्ड एरियाज को डेवलप करने के लिए कनसेशनल फाइनेंस दिया, जो पहले से ही ऐडवांस्ड स्टेट्स हैं खास करके मद्रास, कर्नाटक, तामिलनाडु, अधिकतर शेयर केवल इन्हीं तीन स्टेट्स ने लिया? तो इस रीजनल इम्बैलेंस को दूर करने के लिए सरकार क्या करने जा रही है? जितनी भी सब्सिडी मिली जिसको कि केवल बिग हाउसेज ने कान्फर कर लिया एट दि कास्ट आफ स्माल हाउसेज उसको पूरा करने के लिए सरकार क्या करने जा रही है?

श्री एस० बी० चन्हाण : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह स्टेटमेंट जो दिया गया है उसमें 80-81 के अन्दर सेंट्रल सब्सिडी जो हर स्टेट को दी गई है उसकी पूरी जानकारी दी गई है। मुझे लगता है कि यह सब देखने के बाद आन्ध्र प्रदेश, गुजरात, कर्नाटक, केरल, महाराष्ट्र, राजस्थान, तामिलनाडु और गोवा, दमन और ड्यू इन्होंने यह सब्सिडी काफी तौर पर उठाई है। यह सब्सिडी हर एक को दी जाती है। मणिपुर, मेघालय, नागालैंड, इन जगहों पर सब्सिडी का आफर सबके लिए खुला है। जहां पर यूनिट सेंट अप होगी वहीं पर वह सब्सिडी क्लेम कर सकते हैं, अगर वहां यूनिट सेंट अप ही नहीं किया तो सब्सिडी उठाने का सवाल पैदा नहीं होता। इंडस्ट्रियली बैंकवर्ड एरियाज के अन्दर छोटे, मध्यम या बड़े का सवाल नहीं है, अगर इंडस्ट्रियली बैंकवर्ड एरिया हो या नो इंडस्ट्रीज डिस्ट्रिक्ट हो वहां पर अगर बड़ा यूनिट भी आता है तो मुझे नहीं लगता है कि माननीय सदस्य को उसके बारे में कोई आपत्ति हो सकती है।

श्री कृष्ण कुमार गोयल : अध्यक्ष महोदय, शिवरामन कमेटी ने इस बात को कडेम किया है। जितना पैसा रिलीज किया गया

उस का अधिकांश भाग बड़ी यूनिट्स ने और मध्यम यूनिट्स ने ले लिया जब कि छोटी यूनिट्स को किसी तरह का कोई एन्करेजमेंट नहीं मिला है। उन को बिलकुल निल के बराबर ही मिला है। मैं जानना चाहता हूँ कि जो उन्होंने खास तौर से इस ओर ध्यान आकर्षित किया है कि छोटी यूनिट्स को एन्करेज किया जाना चाहिए, यंग एन्टर-प्रेन्योस को एन्करेज किया जाना चाहिए, अनएम्पलायड यूथ्स को एन्करेज किया जाना चाहिए जो इस सारी स्कीम की भावना थी, और जिस की ओर शिवरामन कमेटी ने आप का ध्यान आकर्षित किया क्या सरकार उस को नहीं मानती है? क्या सरकार समझती है कि जो कुछ हुआ यह ठीक हुआ?

श्री एस० बी० चव्हाण : जो छोटी यूनिट्स अलग अलग एरियाज के अन्दर सेट अप की गई हैं, एजूकेटेड अनएम्पलायड लोगों की तरफ से की गई हैं, अगर उन लोगों को सब्सिडी नहीं मिली है, अगर एलिजिबल होते हुए भी सब्सिडी नहीं मिली है, ऐसी कोई बात हो तो मैं माननीय सदस्य से प्रार्थना करूंगा (व्यवधान) आप की बात को मैं खामोशी से सुन रहा था और मैं आप से भी यह उम्मीद करता हूँ कि जब मैं जवाब दे रहा हूँ तो मेरी बात को सुनें। अगर कोई सप्लीमेंट्री पूछना है तो जरूर पूछें लेकिन बीच में आवाज करेंगे तो मैं ठीक तरह से जवाब नहीं दे सकूंगा।

छोटी यूनिट्स जो सेट अप की गई हैं और जो एलिजिबल हैं, ऐसा होते हुए भी अगर किसी को सब्सिडी नहीं दी गई है तो जरूर एडमिनिस्ट्रेटिव मिनिस्ट्री के पास उसकी जानकारी दीजिए, वे इसकी जानकारी पूरे ढंग से दे सकेंगे।

जहां तक बड़ी यूनिट्स का सवाल है, उसके अन्दर सब्सिडी पर सीलिंग लगाई गई है,

उस सीलिंग से ऊपर किसी को सब्सिडी नहीं दी जा सकती है। पंद्रह परसेंट या 15 लाख, इसमें जो भी कम होगा वह मिल सकता है। 15 लाख से ज्यादा सब्सिडी किसी को भी सेन्ट्रल सब्सिडी स्कीम में मिलने का अधिकार नहीं है।

तीसरी बात यह है कि शिवरामन कमेटी ने, इसमें जो डिस्टार्शन्स आ गए हैं उनको प्वाइन्ट आउट किया है और उनको रिमूव करने के लिए क्या किया जाए—इसके लिए कुछ रेकमेंडेशन्स की हैं जो कि गवर्नमेन्ट के अण्डर कंसिड्रेशन हैं।

श्री कृष्ण कुमार गोयल : लेकिन जो एजूकेटेड यूथ है उसको गाइड-लाइन्स ही मालूम नहीं है।

MR. SPEAKER : Ignorance of law is no excuse. They should know.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Firstly, I would like to know from the Hon. Minister whether it is not true that mere financial and fiscal incentives are not enough to convert the backward areas into developed areas. Provision of infra-structural facilities are also necessary in order to bring about this development. If his answer is 'yes'—I presume it will be 'yes'—then in that case I would like to know, is it not a fact that the present difficulty in building up the infra-structural facilities like the Railways or any other mode of communication is on account of the norm laid by the Planning Commission which is coming in the way of providing infra-structural facilities in the backward areas? If the railway lines are to be set-up in the backward areas the Planning Commission's question is where are the industries in these areas so that we can permit you to have the railways? If we ask for the industries then their question is where are the infra-structural facilities? So, you have to tell

whether hen comes first or egg comes first. This dilemma has to be resolved. My specific question is whether you will make all possible efforts to see that out-dated traditional norms of infra-structural facilities being cleared in the backward areas will be radically revised.

MR. SPEAKER : You have also to decide whether the hen comes first or the egg comes first.

SHRIS. B. CHAVAN : I quite appreciate the point of view put forth by the Hon. Member but it is not a fact that infra structural facilities do not exist in the industrially backward areas. Besides subsidies and the fiscal incentives which the Central Government offers the State Governments on their own have been creating the infra-structural facilities in the shape of roads, water supply, electricity and the rest of things which are required for the development of industries in the industrially backward areas. While railways can be one of the modes of transport there are other modes of transport available. Wherever railway mode is available I am not quite sure whether industrialists have been only concentrating on transporting their finished goods by railways. I am aware of the fact that most of the industrialists have been taking advantage of the road transport facilities which are available and somehow railways come rather low in their priority. But I fully appreciate that railways is also one of the very important mode of transport and a cheaper mode of transport and in industrially backward areas if Railways gives a proposal to Planning Commission the Planning Commission does not take into account merely the industries located in that area but the industrial potential available is also one of the factors which is taken into account. But ultimately it is the non-availability of resources which comes in the way of taking decisions about having new railway lines.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : My second question is this: I would like to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, how, when a Member becomes a Minister his entire outlook changes. Because, the very Hon. Minister had come to me as a Member and pleaded exactly the opposite point of view and saying that the Planning Commission must change its attitude because the area and the constituency which he represents, Marathwada region, is backward. But he is saying today, there are infra-structural facilities. But he is on record in a letter having said that there are no infra-structural facilities and therefore something should be done.

MR. SPEAKER : Are you not satisfied with the transformation ?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : Anyway, Sir, he has assured that the norms will be considered. There is another question that I would like to ask. That is in relation to his written reply to my Starred Question No. 276. Here he has said, in reply to part (b) as follows :—

“According to the Report on Industrial Dispersal submitted by the National Committee on the Development of Backward Areas (NCDDBA) 143 units having capital investment over Rs. 1 crore, received a total subsidy of Rs. 18.3 crores, out of the total of Rs. 62.4 crores disbursed till 1978-79.”

Now, Sir, this reply gives an impression as if those who have capital investment greater than Rs. 1 crore, are given only a subsidy of the order of Rs. 18.30 crores and numerically the rest of the industries which are having less investment are given Rs. 44.10 crores. The inference that he is drawing is this: Large industries with larger capital investment are given less subsidy whereas the other ones are given more. Just as you have given the number of units as 143, for which the subsidy given is

Rs. 18.30 crores, can you also mention the information regarding the rest, that is, Rs. 14.10 crores, and say how many units received the subsidy? Because, the moment he gives this number it will be clear whether the subsidy is disbursed over large number of small units. Therefore, the per-unit subsidy that is given is extremely low. Will he not increase the subsidy per unit that is very low today? Sir, it has to be increased.

**SHRI S. B. CHAVAN :** Sir, the information which the Hon. Member is asking is given in my reply. From zero to 10 lakhs the number of units is 10,064. The total amount of subsidy disbursed is Rs. 16.3 crores. From 10 lakhs to 100 lakhs you have 601 units; total subsidy given is Rs. 27.8 crores. Regarding 100 lakhs and above total units are 143; total subsidy is Rs. 18.3 crores. It is very obvious that large units, 100 lakhs and above, got subsidy of Rs. 18.3 crores. Those from 10 lakhs to 100 lakhs got Rs. 27.8 crores and below 10 lakhs, this is Rs. 16.3 crores.

So, it is very obvious that small and medium industries got the major chunk of the subsidy.

**SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV :** Is there any scheme for the development of backward areas? We are also backward, Sir.

**MR. SPEAKER :** Next question. Mr. Ananda Pathak.

**Absorption of 1400 Employees of Bhilai Unit of HSCL**

+

\*265. **SHRI ANANDA PATHAK :**

**SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE :**

Will the Minister of STEEL AND MINES be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that the Hindustan Steelworks Construction

Ltd. authorities are paying as much as Rs. 15 lakhs per month to about 1400 employees in its Bhilai Plant as the State Government is not allowing the HSCL authorities to give work to those employees, who were transferred from Bokaro Plant;

(b) if so, whether Government have taken up the matter with the State Government;

(c) if so, the response of the State Government; and

(d) if not, the reasons for the same?

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRIES OF INDUSTRY AND STEEL AND MINES (SHRI CHARANJIT CHANANA) :**

(a) Hindustan Steelworks Construction Ltd. (HSCL) had been incurring a liability of about Rs. 13.5 lakhs per month upto June, 1982, on account of 1,389 workers transferred from its Bokaro Unit to its Bhilai Unit who could not join duties there.

(b) to (d). The matter had been taken up by the Government of India and HSCL with the State Government who have suggested that some of these workers should be shifted to other works so as to create a congenial atmosphere for inducting remaining of these workers in small batches on HSCL's work in Bhilai Steel Plant. This process has started and 128 workers have already joined their duties.

**SHRI ANANDA PATHAK :** Sir, I have raised a very serious question. First of all, the reply given by the Hon. Minister is not at all clear. He has not at all replied to my question. I would repeat my question. It is not clear why the Hindustan Steel Works Construction Ltd. had been incurring a liability of about Rs. 13.5 lakh per month upto June, 1982. It is not clear for what purpose they were incurring liability upto that period. Why could the workers transferred