

ed, difficulty may still be experienced as a result of traffic congestion in the telephone system involving the trunk automatic exchanges (TAXs) at Delhi, Hyderabad and Vijaywada handling the calls.

(b) Yes, Sir.

(c) The capacity of the SPC Electronic TAX at Delhi is planned to be increased by an additional 4000 lines and electronic digital TAX are planned for Hyderabad (10,000 lines), Vijaywada (4,000 lines) and Visakhapatnam (3,000 lines) during the 7th plan. In the meanwhile, service improvement is sought to be effected by augmentation of circuits and provision of direct and alternative routings as justified by traffic. In particular, it is proposed to connect Vijaywada TAX direct to Delhi.

Rejection of applications of 30 companies for recognition of installed capacity

1411. SHRI BHUBANESWAR KALITA:

DR. LOKESH CHANDRA:

Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that applications of 30 companies for recognition of installed capacity under the August, 1980 policy have been closed and rejected;

(b) if so, on what grounds, details of each application;

(c) whether it is a fact that applications for the same items received under 1982 and 1983 Policies from some of these companies were approved and in the process irregularities committed by these companies were ignored and if so, what are the reasons therefor;

(d) whether it is also a fact that out of 30 applications which were rejected or closed under 1980 policy, multinational companies were allowed re-endorsement under 1982 and 1983 policies, ignoring the major objectives of New Drug Policy; and

(e) why instead of rejecting or closing the applications under 1980 Policy, action for infringement and violations of the provisions of I(D&R) Act was not taken against the concerned companies?

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VASANT SATHE): (a) to (d) The requisite information in respect of 30 companies whose applications for recognition of installed capacities submitted under 1980 Policy had been rejected has already been furnished in reply to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question No. 989 answered on 7th May, 1984. These applications were mainly rejected because in many cases the companies were not found to be eligible for recognition of installed capacities on the basis of their production performance and also because in some cases higher capacities had already been granted under the scheme of re-endorsement of capacities. The Policy of Recognition of Installed Capacity of August 1980 and the Policies of Re-endorsement of Capacities of April 1982/April, 1983 are two independent Schemes. The 1980 Scheme does not envisage denial of regularisation on the ground of illegal installation of plant and machinery. In the case of Schemes of Re-endorsement of Capacities the same are to be given on the basis of production performance only for a specified period of five years.