

[*Translation*]**Anti-Pollution Measures in Gaya, Bihar**

1482. SHRI ISHWAR CHAUDHARY: Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether Gaya (Bihar) is a big attraction for tourists from within the country and abroad because of its historical importance from the religious point of view;

(b) whether life in the city is seriously affected because of the high rate of pollution;

(c) whether the Government propose to take any anti-pollution measures like cleaning of the river Phalgu and its attached ponds and undertaking afforestation on the surrounding hills etc.

(d) if so, the details thereof; and

(e) if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRIMATI MANEKA GANDHI): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) No such report has been received by the Central Government.

(c) and (d). There is no such proposal with the Central Government. However, the Bihar Government has initiated action from afforestation of the surrounding hills and plantation of trees on both the banks of the Phalgu River.

(e) No complaints have been received on the pollution of river Phalgu by the Central Government.

[*English*]**Management of India Cements, Madras**

1483. SHRI R. MUTTHIAH: Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Management of India cements, Madras which has been taken over the financial institutions from the promoters for their mismanagement and misappropriation has been given back to the same persons by the financial institutions;

(b) if so, the reasons therefor; and

(c) the present share holding position of the financial institutions and the management in the above unit?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE AND DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI DIGVIJAY SINGH): (a) to (c). It has been reported by Industrial Development Bank of India (IDBI) that the management of India Cements, Madras, was in the hands of private promoters for 33 years from 1946 to 1979. However, as a result of serious dissensions between two promoter groups, one of the promoters was removed from the post of Jt. Managing Director, on the recommendation of the Board. The other promoter did not seek re-appointment when his term as Managing Director expired on 31.12.79. The institutions then increased their representation on the Board for one year and the company was managed by the Management Committee appointed by the institutions. Thereafter the company was professionally managed. When the term of the last Managing Director was about to expire, the institutions received a request signed jointly by the two promoter groups indicating that they had resolved their differences and that they would like to be brought back into the management. The two groups