

you have excluded Himachal Pradesh from having the Task Force. When did you receive the first proposal and when did the other one?

**SHRI KAMAL NATH:** When the scheme was approved, the plan allocation was Rs. 750 lakh. It was meant to be invested in Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan and Himachal Pradesh. But the whole amount of allocation had been utilized in Uttar Pradesh and Rajasthan from 1983 to 1988.

**SHRI MADAN LAL KHURANA :** During that period your Government was in power in all these three States.

**SHRI KAMAL NATH:** Are you asking me or do you want to reply yourself. In 1988, due to the special circumstances prevailing in Jammu and Kashmir Rs. 33 lakh only were to be paid by the State while fifty-two lakh rupees were to be paid by the centre. For Jammu and Kashmir it was a very nominal amount because it was a small scheme. I have already stated in my reply that I assure that the priority will be given to Himachal Pradesh in the Eighth Plan as the

State has fulfilled their promise of growing nurseries. There is a scheme costing Rs. 416 lakhs to be implemented in Kangra district. Therefore, priority will be given to Kangra district.

[English]

#### DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

\*30. **SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI:** Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS be pleased to state :

(a) whether the progress of a large number of developmental projects is held up due to delayed 'forests clearance' by the Union Government; and

(b) the number of proposals received from the States for such clearance till 15th June 1991 and the action taken thereon?

**THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI KAMAL NATH):** (a) No, Sir.

(b) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

#### STATEMENT

Status of receipt and disposal of proposals received from the States/UT Governments seeking forestry clearance for various development projects is as under :—

(i) Proposals received . . . . .	4482
(ii) Proposals approved . . . . .	2291
(iii) Proposals rejected on merit . . . . .	655
(iv) Proposals rejected for non-furnishing of essential details by the States/UTs.	1213
(v) Proposals withdrawn by respective States/UTs . . . . .	110
(vi) Proposals pending in the Ministry . . . . .	213

**SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, although the Minister has replied to my question in the negative and said that the progress of a large number of developmental projects is not held up due to delayed forest clearance, it is our common knowledge that in respect of a large number of developmental projects in the States, the progress of the work is held up due to delay in clearance by the Government of India.

So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to whether there is any deadline fixed or there is any time-schedule for the clearance of such projects which are received from the States. If so, what is the time-schedule? Out of the total number of 213 proposals which are stated to be pending in the Ministry as on 15th June, which is the oldest case; how many cases are pending for more than three years; and how many cases are pending

for more than one year? Let the Minister enlighten the House on this aspect.

**SHRI KAMAL NATH :** Sir, first I would like to allay the fear that there is delay in forest clearance. The delay arises because of non-supply of proper information. There is a proper procedure laid out for the information which is required. Since this information does not come, as my statement says, there are very large number of cases which have been returned. This is because of non-availability of proper information. Those cases, where there is no proper information available, cannot possibly be processed.

There are only two cases which are pending for more than six months; there are 53 cases which are pending for three to six months; there are 50 cases which are pending for two to three months; there are 33 cases which are pending for one to two months; and there are 75 cases which are pending for less than one month. There are cases for which proper information is available.

Out of two cases which are pending for over six months, one relates to the diversion of 177.47 hectare of forest land in Kurnool District; and the other relates to the erection of Lower Sillem to Bommeru 220 KV Transmission Line using 100.26 hectare of forest land.

**SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI :**

Sir, out of the total 4482 proposals received, as many as 1213—more than 25 per cent cases proposals are rejected for non-furnishing of essential details. Sir, this is a serious matter. From our experience we know that it is very difficult to comply with the procedure, with the information or material that is sought from the State within the time-frame. So, some States find it difficult to comply with this. It is not possible also. So, the relationship between this Ministry and the States is getting strained in respect of many cases.

Therefore what special steps the Government of India and the Ministry are taking to improve the situation? I would like to know as to whether they are thinking in terms of sending teams from Centre to different State Headquarters to discuss

with them by sitting across the table and finalise the things. Whatever might be the reply—the Minister is here—the progress is held up in the field to set up several developmental projects.

**SHRI KAMAL NATH :** Sir, I share his concern with regard to the delay. As I said, there has been a major problem in getting proper information in the first instance. I am in regular touch with the Chief Minister and I am in the process of starting a dialogue with more State Chief Ministers requesting them that all proposals, which are sent to the Ministry, should be supplied with all information, all the guidelines which have been laid down, so that the Ministry can look at it.

I completely share his concern because development projects are held up. There are many cases where the hon Member may think that this delay is at the Centre but it has not moved from the State Government to the Central Government itself. There are many such cases which are lying with the State Forest Department and have not arrived in Delhi. So, one has also to distinguish what is pending between the Forest Department in the State capital and the Ministry at Delhi.

**SHRI SRIBALLAV PANIGRAHI :** How many cases have been appealed against? They have rejected a large number of cases. About 1213 cases have been rejected because of non-furnishing of information. It is a serious matter.

Against this decision of Government of India, how many appeals have come from the concerned State Governments? What is the attitude of Government of India towards those cases?

**SHRI KAMAL NATH :** There is no question of appeal because they have been rejected for non-furnishing of information. As soon as we have the information, we will look at it. They are not being rejected *per se*.

**SHRI RAM KAPSE :** In the Vidharba region of Maharashtra, there are two or three districts where the problem of Jhuddi jungle has come up. It was a policy decision. When Shri Bhajan Lal was the Minister, he had favourably decided.

He cleared the position about the Jhudpi jungle. But after Shri Bhajan Lal, it was reversed. What is the attitude of the new Government about the Jhudpi jungle?

**SHRI KAMAL NATH :** I am not aware of the details he is asking. But I shall furnish them later.

*Translation*

**SHRI DATTA MEGHA :** Mr. Speaker, Sir, the problem of Jhudpi jungle prevails in some districts of Vidharba region. The Government of Madhya Pradesh lent no ears to what the Central Government proposed. Development proposals of others were cleared but this was not cleared. You know it well that this problem persists in several districts near Nagpur in Maharashtra. The matter was discussed time and again; decisions were also taken but not implemented. Will the Government clear the proposal within one or one and a half months to solve the problem of Jhudpi jungle in Vidharba region

[English]

**SHRI KAMAL NATH :** As I said, about Jhudpi jungle, I do not have the information. But I would like to assure the Member that between Maharashtra and Madhya Pradesh, especially his region, I would not have any disparity.

**SHRI UMMAREDDY VENKATESWARLU :** One project that the hon. Minister has referred to in his reply is the Telugu Ganga project. It is pending with the Union Government for its clearance. To my knowledge, all the information has been supplied by the Andhra Pradesh Government. It is pending with the Union Government for its clearance for more than six months.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister what exactly is the reason? Why is it still pending even if it is more than six months?

**MR. SPEAKER :** The question has already been answered in detail.

**SHRI UMMAREDDY VENKATESWARLU :** No, Sir. About the Telugu Ganga, it has not been answered.

**SHRI KAMAL NATH :** He has referred to a very specific project. Several cases are pending. I am not aware of this particular case. But I shall give him the information.

**SAFETY MEASURES IN HAZARDOUS PLANTS**

\*31. **PROF. K. V. THOMAS :** Will the Minister of LABOUR be pleased to state :

(a) the steps taken by the Government for the strict implementation of safety measures for workers in chemical plants, mines and other hazardous plants; and

(b) the details of the system adopted to monitor the safety measures in major public and private sectors ?

**THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF LABOUR (SHRI K. RAMAMURTHY) :** (a) and (b) : A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

*Statement*

The safety measures for workers in chemical plants and other hazardous plants (except mines) are covered under the Factories Act (as amended in 1987) and the rules made thereunder. This Act is enforced by the State Governments through the Chief Inspectors of Factories. The compliance with the safety measures laid down under this statute and the rules made thereunder is monitored through :—

- (i) periodical inspections carried out by the Inspectors;
- (ii) scrutiny of applications received from the management for licensing, approval and registration of factories and for their periodical renewal;
- (iii) scrutiny of documents such as on-site emergency plans and other information etc., which are required to be submitted by the management to the Chief Inspector;
- (iv) investigation of complaints or representations received from workers; and
- (v) investigation of serious/fatal accidents.