

LOK SABHA DEBATES

LOK SABHA

Wednesday, May 6, 1992/Vaisakha 16,
1914 (Saka)

*The Lok Sabha met at
Eleven of the Clock*

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

[*Translation*]

Central Investment in Industries

*882. SHRIMATI SHEELA GAUTAM:
Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government have conducted any review of the Central investment made for setting up of small/large scale industries in the country through

various agencies of the States during the last three years;

(b) if so, the details of such industries which have started the production and generated employment during the above period, State-wise; and

(c) the approach of the Government in this regard for the Eighth Five Year plan?

[*English*]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INDUSTRY (SHRI P.K. THUNGON): (a) and (b). No, Sir. However, the Government reviews the Central investments made in different States every year and bring out the Public Enterprises Survey annually. The latest Survey 1990-91 was placed before the Parliament on 5th March, 1992. A statement showing the figures on employment generated and the investment made in different States is laid on the Table of the House.

(c) Eighth Five Year Plan is under finalisation.

STATEMENT

State-wise Distribution of Gross Block and Employment

(Gross Block Rs. in crores)

(Employment No. in Lakhs)

Sl. No.	State/Union Territory	As on 31-3-1989		As on 31-3-1990	
		Gross Block	Employment	Gross Block	Employment
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Andhra Pradesh	9906.32	0.99	11411.82	1.01
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	41.57	0.01	60.00	0.01
3.	Assam	4733.28	0.56	5049.84	0.58
4.	Bihar	8440.32	4.40	9637.74	4.33
5.	Goa	51.72	0.03	57.64	0.03
6.	Gujarat	5071.10	0.51	5660.26	0.54
7.	Haryana	813.67	0.16	898	0.18
8.	Himachal Pradesh	951.71	0.05	1297.75	0.05

Sl. No.	State/Union Territory	As on 31-3-1989		As on 31-3-1990	
		Gross Block	Employment	Gross Block	Employment
		3	4	5	6
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	866.88	0.09	1315.25	0.09
10.	Karnataka	2180.79	1.17	2588.95	1.21
11.	Kerala	1523.81	0.33	1701.24	0.34
12.	Madhya Pradesh	11502.29	2.84	12580.48	2.89
13.	Maharashtra	16179.67	2.26	19933.36	2.27
14.	Manipur	148.78	0.02	158.57	0.02
15.	Meghalaya	2.72	0.01	4.01	0.01
16.	Mizoram	21.63	0.01	23.50	0.01
17.	Nagaland	93.91	0.02	113.97	0.02

(Gross Block Rs. in crores)

(Employment No. in Lakhs)

Sl. No.	State/Union Territory	As on 31-3-1989			As on 31-3-1990		
		Gross Block	Employment		Gross Block	Employment	
1	2	3	4	5	6		
18.	Orissa	5719.29	0.76	5966.27	0.76		
19.	Punjab	802	0.23	836.51	0.23		
20.	Rajasthan	1399.03	0.39	1716.73	0.40		
21.	Sikkim	4.21	-	10.82	-		
22.	Tamil Nadu	4897.71	0.88	5902.01	0.89		
23.	Tripura	294.56	0.02	352.97	0.02		
24.	Uttar Pradesh	8295.17	1.32	8794.35	1.43		
25.	West Bengal	5730.43	4.13	7084.18	4.06		
26.	Andman & Nicobar Islands	11.39	0.02	12.51	0.02		

(Gross Block Rs. in crores)

(Employment No. in Lakhs)

Sl. No.	State/Union Territory	As on 31-3-1989		As on 31-3-1990	
		Gross Block	Employment	Gross Block	Employment
1	2	3	4	5	6
27.	Chandigarh	8.35	0.01	31.06	0.01
28.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	-	-	-	-
29.	Daman Diu	-	-	-	-
30.	Delhi	2965.87	1.34	4561.48	1.37
31.	Lakshdweep	-	-	-	-
32.	Pondicherry	12.81	0.04	15.50	0.03
33.	Others and Unallocated	4209.33	0.31	5617.16	0.36
	Total	96880.67	22.93	113430.90	23.17

Sl. No.	State/Union Territory	As on 31-3-1989		% age as on 31.3.92		Share Ranking as on 31-3-1991	
		Gross Block	Employment	Gross Block	Employment	Gross Block	Employment
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Andhra Pradesh	12969.09	1.13	10.00	4.90	2	7
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	85.54	0.02	0.07	0.09	24	25
3.	Assam	5460.49	0.58	4.21	2.52	11	11
4.	Bihar	1069.99	4.20	8.24	18.22	4	1
5.	Goa	234.81	0.16	0.18	0.69	20	17
6.	Gujarat	6161.02	0.52	4.75	2.26	10	12
7.	Haryana	1070.88	0.19	0.82	0.82	17	16
8.	Himachal Pradesh	1385.361	0.05	1.07	0.22	15	19
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	1270.83	0.09	0.98	0.39	16	18

(Gross Block Rs. in crores)

(Employment No. in Lakhs)

Sl. No.	State/Union Territory	As on 31-3-1989		% age as on 31.3.92		Share Ranking as on 31-3-1991	
		Gross Block	Employment	Gross Block	Employment	Gross Block	Employment
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
10.	Karnataka	2693.24	1.09	2.08	4.73	12	8
11.	Kerala	1852.69	0.36	143	1.56	14	14
12.	Madhya Pradesh	12900.47	2.88	9.95	12.49	3	3
13.	Maharashtra	22012.36	2.35	16.97	10.20	1	4
14.	Manipur	159.94	0.02	0.12	0.09	22	22
15.	Meghalaya	5.75	0.01	-	0.04	30	28
16.	Mizoram	24.04	0.01	0.02	0.04	25	29
17.	Nagaland	130.60	0.02	0.10	0.09	23	21
18.	Orissa	6898.72	0.77	5.32	3.34	8	10

(Gross Block Rs. in crores)

(Employment No. in Lakhs)

(Gross Block Rs. in crores)
(Employment No. in Lakhs)

Sl. No.	State/Union Territory	As on 31-3-1989			% age as on 31.3.92			Share Ranking as on 31-3-1991		
		Gross Block	Employment		Gross Block	Employment		Gross Block	Employment	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
19.	Punjab	889.55	0.23	0.68	1.00	18	15			
20.	Rajasthan	2218.91	0.40	1.71	1.74	13	13			
21.	Sikkim	16.52	—	0.01	0.00	27	30			
22.	Tamil Nadu	7139.04	0.95	5.50	4.12	7	9			
23.	Tripura	360.67	0.02	0.28	0.09	19	24			
24.	Uttar Pradesh	10229.26	1.36	7.89	5.90	5	6			
25.	West Bengal	8784.23	3.94	6.77	17.09	6	2			
26.	Andman & Nicobar Islands	14.15	0.02	0.01	0.09	28	23			
27.	Chandigarh	163.70	0.01	0.13	0.04	21	26			

Sl. No.	State/Union Territory	As on 31-3-1989			% age as on 31.3.92			Share Ranking as on 31-3-1991		
		Gross Block	Employment		Gross Block	Employment		Gross Block	Employment	
1*	2	3	4	5	6	7	8			
28.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
29.	Daman Diu	10.19	0.01	0.01	0.04	29	27			
30.	Delhi	6706.57	1.37	5.17	5.94	9	5			
31.	Lakshadweep	-	-	-	-	-	-			
32.	Pondicherry	17.95	0.03	0.01	0.13	26	20			
33.	Others and Unallocated	7154.13	0.03	0.01	0.13	26	20			
	Total	129713.09	23.05	100.00	100.00					

[Translation]

SHRIMATI SHEELA GAUTAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to submit to the hon. Minister that no judge has been appointed so far in the BIFR which was established to improve the health of the sick units, though three judges were to be appointed to it. BIFR has neither any employee nor has any place for their office, has it also become sick? I would like to know from the hon. Minister the steps proposed to be taken by Government to strengthen BIFR and to rehabilitate the sick units.

SHRI P.K. THUNGO: Sir BIFR is not sick.

[English]

We are trying to strengthen the BIFR. Some more members are required to be included and the Government is considering it seriously and very actively.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon. lady member has stated that BIFR was sick and the hon. Minister says that it is not. If it is not sick, does it have some minor problems? We agree that it is not completely sick, then it must be having some minor problem (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Perhaps BIFR is weak, it is going to be strengthened.

SHRIMATI SHEELA GAUTAM: Mr. Speaker, Sir, my supplementary question is 'what special facilities are proposed to be provided to women too enable them to set up SSI units?' How many seats have been reserved for women in Industrial Management Training. The hon. Minister may also kindly state the number of seats reserved for women in Industrial Management Training and the number of women provided employment in the industries in each State mentioned in the Statement placed on the Table of the House.

[English]

SHRI P.K. THUNGO: No doubt, we

give importance and priority to our women and in Indian society, women occupy a very high place. So far as the statistics that the hon. Member has asked are concerned, we do not conduct the survey in that particular way, wherein men and women are specified. This statistics that I have with me, is on the basis of number of employees and on the basis of the amount invested by the Centre in various States on large scale sector, medium scale sector and small scale sector. And, if the hon. Member specifically wants to have the break up of men and women, I will supply her the information later as I do not have the exact figure because we do not prepare the data in that manner.

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKTA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether there is any guideline in respect of Central investment in the States and Union Territories. I am asking this question particularly because in the past there used to be a Capital Subsidy Scheme under which the Government used to provide capital subsidy for investment in the backward and remote areas. Since that scheme has been withdrawn by the Government, it is necessary for the Government to evolve on the same line a scheme which will promote investment in the remote and backward areas.

As he has already said, the Eighth Five Year Plan is under finalisation. I would like to know specifically whether all these matters will be considered in that or not. Secondly, the Minister has given a statement showing the figures of employment generated. I would like to know whether as per the figures actually the employment has been provided to the persons or it is just their estimation.

SHRI P.K. THUNGO: Sir, let me reply the second part first. The number of employees which is shown here is actually the number of persons who have been employed.

Regarding the guidelines I would like to say that the Planning Commission lays down certain priorities and on the basis of these priorities allocation is made. The PIB goes into the details before any investment is

made. It is only after this, setting up of new units or expansion of the old units is decided. In respect of small scale industries, it is decided by the State Governments. The State Governments formulate the schemes to assist the small scale industries. So, in this regard the State Governments adopt their own policy.

SHRI MANORANJAN BHAKTA: What about the Union Territories?

SHRI P.K. THUNGO: So far as Union Territory is concerned, no doubt the Central Government formulates scheme for it.

[*Translation*]

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I object to this reply. Because the hon. Minister has submitted that employment has been generated. But the reply shows that in spite of the investment of Rs. 16283 crores in the public enterprises last year, the employment opportunities were reduced by 12000. Employment did not register any increase during the last one year even after investing Rs. 16283 crores. Therefore, the reply which states that employment has been generated is not correct. In Bihar, during the last two years, investment was raised by Rs. 1700 crores while the employment registered an overall decrease of 20,000. Similarly in Gujarat the investment of Rs. 500 crores was made in one year while employments were declined by 2000; in Karnataka capital of about Rs. 100 crores was invested while 12000 employments were reduced; similarly in West Bengal capital of about Rs. 3000 crores was invested and the decrease in the employment was 19000 and in Uttar Pradesh about Rs. 15000 crores were invested to a decrease of 17000 employments was registered. Will the Government correct the reply?

[*English*]

Where they have mentioned, 'A statement showing figures of employment generated?'

[*Translation*]

Will the Government correct the heading of the statement by adding employment reduced to the heading employment generated? Will the Government improve the policy under which capital is invested but employment reduced?

[*English*]

SHRI P.K. THUNGO: Sir, we admit that in some cases, there have been some reduction so far as the number of employment is concerned.

In some States, if the hon. Member goes through it, there has been a marked increase. Overall, there has been a slight decrease. That is because of the modernisation and because, in some cases, redundant workers were there; some of them have retired and we have not filled up those posts.

But, then I would request the hon. Member to go through it. It is not only the employment, if the hon. Member goes through the other records, the turnover has been increasing from year to year. If the hon. Member wants I would like to mention that the gross turnover in 1990-91 was Rs. 1,18,165 crores.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES: I am concerned about employment and not about the gross turnover. It is because you are putting in so much money and you are reducing the employment.

SHRI P.K. THUNGO: Sir, it has a direct relevance to the improvement and progress of the industry concerned. That is why I would request the hon. Member to go through the turnover also and not to see only the darker part. Let him see the brighter part also.

[*Translation*]

SHRI DATTA MEGHE: Mr. Speaker, Sir, when a new industry—whether small or

big - is set up, capital is invested in it; and it should generate employment. But the statement given by the hon. Minister indicates that there has been decrease in employment, why is it so; because when investment takes place, then employment is generated.....(Interruptions) Shri George Fernandes has asked this. In Maharashtra there are a number of industries - since Bombay, Pune and Thane have an industrial belt. Will the Central Government ask the State Government to encourage setting up of new industries in Vidharba, Marathwada and Konkan and to invest more and more capital in Thane? Does the Government propose to issue guidelines to State Govt. to set up industries in Vidharba, Marathwada and Konkan area because more and more investment generates more and more employment? Will the Government set up new big projects, in these areas, particularly those of Defence and will inform the Maharashtra Govt. about it?

[English]

SHRI P.K. THUNGO: Sir, I would like to make it clear that the figures that I have provided here are only of the Central Government public sector undertakings.

So far as the total generation of employment is concerned, there are private sector and small scale industries also. If all these are combined together, there is certainly an increase. But because of our efforts to revive and to revitalise it and also because of the reason that we are trying to modernise public sector, there has been a slight decrease.

This is what I would like to explain to the hon. Member. This is done with good intention by the Government so as to make the public sector enterprises really enterprising.

So far as the policy for setting up industries in backward areas and in those regions where industries are most essential, while setting up new units, it is always kept in mind that techno-economic viability should be there. As Mr. Bhakta has said, certainly,

it is kept in mind in backward areas like the Andamans, the North-Eastern areas and Vidharba areas. These are all taken into account. But the techno-economic feasibility is one of the most essential aspects and that is the basis on which the decisions are taken.

Regularisation of Colonies in Delhi

*883. SHRI CHANDULAL CHANDRAKAR: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the number of colonies in Delhi and New Delhi upto December 1990;

(b) the number of colonies approved by the Government so far;

(c) whether the Government have provided water and electricity to these approved colonies;

(d) if not, the reasons therefor; and

(e) the time by which such facilities are likely to be provided?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. ARUNACHALAM): (a) to (e). A Statement is laid on the Table of the Sabha.

STATEMENT

(a) On the basis of estimates prepared by Delhi Administration, as in August 1990, there were 1207 unauthorised as well as regularized colonies in Delhi.

(b) The Government had issued orders in 1977 for the regularisation of unauthorised colonies which had come before 30.6.77 subject to prescribed conditions and recovery of development charge. It is reported by Delhi Administration that out of such colonies, 553 colonies have been regularised.

(c) to (e). It is reported by the Municipal Corporation of Delhi that in regard to the 553 regularised colonies, the position is as follows:-