

- (3) Bausi—25 to 50 line MAX-HI expansion.
- (4) Mathurapur—25 to 50 line MAX-IH expansion.
- (5) TELCO—600 to 800 MAX-H expansion.

Low per capita Central investment in Bihar

2282. SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) what is the per capita investment of Central Government in different States;

(b) what are the reasons for very low per capita investment in Bihar, in comparison to other States; and

(c) what action Government propose to take to bring Bihar at par with other States?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI SUKRAM): (a) The figures of Statewise Central investment are not maintained in the Planning Commission, as Plan investment by the Centre covers a wide range of both infrastructural and social welfare services. However, Planning Commission has worked out, in consultation with the Ministries, rough estimates of Statewise expenditure of the Central Plan for the Sixth Five Year Plan (1980-85). A statement giving these figures, together with Statewise Per Capita Central Plan expenditure in the Sixth Five Year Plan is attached. (See below).

(b) It will be noted from this Statement (Annexure) that the share of Bihar in the Central Sixth Plan expenditure comes to 7.2 percent. There are only 4 States (Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Andhra Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh) above it in this distribution of expenditure. The per capita Central Sixth Plan expenditure, in Bihar was Rs. 595.5 while there are at least seven States in which

it was still lower than Bihar, viz. Haryana (Rs. 479.6), Karnataka (Rs. 538.9), Kerala (Rs. 527.9), Meghalaya (Rs. 546.2), Punjab (Rs. 390.9), Rajasthan (Rs. 488.4), and Uttar Pradesh (Rs. 388.0). Accordingly, Bihar's Per Capita Expenditure (Central Plan) cannot be termed as very low. In this connection, it may be mentioned that as Central Plan investment is not planned or accounted for Statewise, this compilation is based on certain assumptions, as indicated in the 'Foot notes' in the attached statement (Annexure). Further, in view of large number of sources from which the data have been collected, the Statement can at best help in a dimensional appreciation of the Central Sixth Plan investment in different States and cannot be used for inter-State comparison due to various limitations.

(c) The problem of regional imbalances/disparities is sought to be tackled in the Seventh Plan through various measures. At the Central level the following policies and Programmes have been adopted:—

(i) Transfer of resources from the Central Government to the State Governments for meeting their Plan expenditure according to Revised Gadgil formula under which in the allocation of Central assistance to the States, a weightage of 60 per cent for population and 20 per cent for per capita income for States below National average has been assigned.

(ii) Devolution on non-Plan resources in accordance with the award of the Eighth Finance Commission which favours the backward States and seeks to reduce disparity between the States in addition to covering the revenue gap.

(iii) Providing Special Central Assistances for the development of backward areas in the States such

as, hill areas desert areas drought prone areas and also area having concentration of tribal population.

(iv) Providing special incentives in the form of investment subsidy and concessional finance for accelerating the industrial development of the industrially backward regions in the States; and

(v) While making State-wise allocation of resources under the poverty alleviation programme, more emphasis is given to the incidence of poverty during the Seventh Plan as compared to that in Sixth Plan. Naturally, the States with higher poverty ratio will get higher allocations of funds for these programmes.

Statement

States/U.T.'s	Central Plan Expenditure		Per Capita Expenditure (Rupees)
	Amount (Rs. crores)	Percentage	
1 Andhra Pradesh . . . . .	5404.57	9.37	1010.2
2 Assam . . . . .	2190.07	3.80	1100.5
3 Bihar . . . . .	4162.40	7.22	595.5
4 Gujarat . . . . .	3130.33	5.43	918.0
5 Haryana . . . . .	618.63	1.07	479.6
6 Himachal Pradesh . . . . .	368.46	0.64	856.9
7 Jammu & Kashmir . . . . .	501.58	0.87	836.0
8 Karnataka . . . . .	1999.47	3.47	538.9
9 Kerala . . . . .	1346.22	2.33	527.9
10 Madhya Pradesh . . . . .	4710.56	8.17	902.4
11 Maharashtra . . . . .	4901.16	8.50	780.4
12 Manipur . . . . .	125.20	0.22	894.3
13 Meghalaya . . . . .	71.01	0.12	546.2
14 Nagaland . . . . .	87.92	0.15	1099.0
15 Orissa . . . . .	2855.08	4.95	1081.5
16 Punjab . . . . .	656.67	1.14	390.9
17 Rajasthan . . . . .	1675.35	2.91	488.4
18 Sikkim . . . . .	34.47	0.06	1149.0
19 Tamil Nadu . . . . .	3167.09	5.49	654.4
20 Tripura . . . . .	135.93	0.23	647.3
21 Uttar Pradesh . . . . .	4302.20	7.46	388.0
22 West Bengal . . . . .	3480.04	6.04	637.4
TOTAL STATES . . . . .	45924.41	79.4	680.0

States/U.T.s	Central Plan Expenditure		Per Capita Expenditure (Rupees)
	Amount (Rs. crores)	Percentage	
1 Andaman & Nicobar . . . . .	30.21	0.05	1610.5
2 Arunachal Pradesh . . . . .	50.69	0.09	844.8
3 Chandigarh . . . . .	52.86	0.09	1321.5
4 Dadra & Nagarhaveli . . . . .	3.65	0.01	365.0
5 Delhi . . . . .	1170.95	2.03	1888.6
6 Goa, Daman & Diu . . . . .	162.04	0.28	1473.1
7 Lakshadweep . . . . .	4.04	0.01	1010.0
8 Mizoram . . . . .	30.13	0.05	602.6
9 Pondicherry . . . . .	30.63	0.05	510.5
<b>TOTAL U.T.s,</b> . . . . .	<b>1535.20</b>	<b>2.66</b>	<b>1582.7</b>
<b>Unallocated</b> . . . . .	<b>10204.26</b>	<b>17.70</b>	
<b>TOTAL STATES &amp; U.T.s,</b> . . . . .	<b>57663.87</b>	<b>100.00</b>	<b>841.6</b>

NOTE: (i) The unallocated amount (Rs. 10204 crores) includes offshore and other investment of Rs. 5500 crores in the Petroleum Sector.

(ii) The total Central Plan Expenditure during the Sixth Plan was Rs. 57800 crores. The break-up available in the statement is (including the unallocated portion) for Rs. 57664 crores.

(iii) As Central Plan investment is not planned or accounted State-wise, some assumptions have been made in attempting such a break-up. While they seem to be the best possible assumption to base such an exercise, as their validity is certainly of a limited nature. Some examples are given below:

(a) Railway investments on newlines, gauge conversions and electrification have been broken up Statewise based on approximate length completed in each state.

(b) The remaining 80 per cent of Railways Plan has been allocated to different States on the basis of route kilometers falling in each State.

(c) Expenditure on purchase of aircraft (Civil Aviation Plan) has been allocated on the basis of the number of landings in each State.

(d) Expenditure of Air India on acquisition of aircraft has been allocated to four international air-ports on the basis of traffic handled by these Airports.

(e) Regarding Shipping, the State-wise allocations have been done on the basis of traffic earned by the major ports in each of the maritime States.

(iv) Housing & Urban Development includes provision for six schemes only. For HUDCO the total Plan outlay was Rs. 50 crores. The actual release amount to Rs. 675.87 crores. This is due to market borrowings of the HUDCO.