

SHORT DURATION DISCUSSION**Tardy implementation of National rural employment guarantee scheme**

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY (Pondicherry): Hon. Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I draw the attention of the hon. Minister to an issue relating to the tardy implementation of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme in some of the States of the country. Sir, the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, 2005 was passed in the Lok Sabha and also in the Rajya Sabha. The hon. Rural Development Minister piloted the Bill. It is a historic Act, which gives employment opportunities to the rural people especially the agricultural labour, artisans who do not have any work, and the people who are living below poverty line. Millions of people in the country will be benefited by this Act. Sir, in this august House I would like to express my gratitude to the hon. Congress President, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi. *...(Interruptions)...*

श्री एम. वेंकैया नायडु (कर्णाटक) : कांग्रेस मैडम कहां से आ गई बीच में ।

श्री वी० नारायणसामी : मैं बोल रहा हूँ भई । जब आपका भाषण हो आप बोलिए ।

श्री एम. वेंकैया नायडु : आप मेरे दोस्त है, इसलिए बोल रहा हूँ । आप बुरा मान गए हैं ।

श्री वी० नारायणसामी : मैं आपका दुश्मन नहीं हूँ। You kindly hear me and then you speak. The hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Minister for Rural Development and also the UPA Chairman were responsible for getting this historic Act passed. When monsoon fails, a lot of people, especially the people belonging to the Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, Backward Classes and minorities also, who are living in the rural areas, are not getting employment. When monsoon is not there, the agricultural activity is not carried out in the rural areas and people migrate to cities for employment. Sir, we find that in the urban areas they get employment in the construction industry and also in the households. Therefore, a lot of migration is taking place. The Government thought it fit that in order to arrest this kind of migration and also empower the people in the rural areas, they should be given employment opportunity in the rural areas itself. Therefore, this scheme was launched. Sir, this scheme was launched on 2nd February, 2006 in Andhra Pradesh. The hon. Prime Minister, the hon. Congress President, and also the hon. Minister for Rural Development launched the

[12 December, 2006]

RAJYASABHA

scheme. Initially, 200 districts have been covered. For the year 2006-07, an amount of Rs. 16419 crores has been allocated by the Rural Development Ministry for implementing the scheme in various States. Therefore, Sir, I would like to congratulate the UPA Government for launching this very important scheme in 200 districts of this country. You know pretty well that in Koraput, Kalahandi and Bolangir districts of Orissa the farm labourers were eating roots of the plants if they did not get any employment. That was their livelihood. Now under the new component plan that has been brought out under the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, these people are getting assured employment. Not only these people, but also people in other backward districts of other States are also getting assured employment under this Scheme. It is a welcome step. The Government of India has brought out guidelines for implementation of this Act. Sir, money is given by the Central Government to the States. 90 per cent of the money goes from the Central Government and the remaining 10 per cent is the contribution of the States. And, the State Government is the implementing authority. States have to identify the beneficiaries. After identifying the beneficiaries, they would be given a Job Card and, on the basis of this, employment is assured for any man or woman holding this Card for 100 days in a year. This is assured to them. Sir, in some States, for seven-hour or eight-hour work they are paid Rs. 23. In some States, they are paying Rs. 56. in Andhra Pradesh, they are being paid Rs. 80 per day. So, it varies from State to State. But, Sir, while identifying the beneficiaries, there is a lot of discrimination. Politics is being played in that. Sir, it is a Central Government Scheme Money is sent by the Central Government. And, only 10 percent is the contribution of the States. Some States, I don't want to name them, are discriminating. There are big hoardings in the States. They are giving a different name to this Scheme--the State Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme. The Central Government is forgotten. Sir, the Central Government, which is sending the money, is forgotten. The State Governments, being the implementing agency, are giving a wide publicity with the money received from the Central Government! I don't quarrel with that. I want that let the States also say that 90 per cent funds are coming from the Central Government. Let them say this truth to the people of States. I am not telling X, Y or Z. I am telling about all the States. Sir, they are spending 15 per cent of money on publicity alone Hon. Minister, Sir, 15 per cent of money earmarked for the purpose of advertisement in various areas under the guise of telling the people that

his Scheme is being implemented by the State Government for the poorer sections of the society. According to the establishment cost, it is only 2 per cent. Sir, only 2 per cent is the establishment cost for implementing the Scheme. But, unfortunately, more money is being spent on advertisements. And, Sir, there is a pick-and-choose in identifying the beneficiaries. Sir, Gram Panchayats have to be empowered for this. The powers have been given to Gram Panchayats. They have to identify the beneficiaries. But, to my utter surprise, I wish to share some facts with the august House. Sir, I went to some States. I met tribal people in those States. I had also an interaction with them. I am told that States are collecting Rs. 40 for issuing a Job Card, which otherwise has to be given free of cost. The State Government is collecting Rs. 20 from them for photograph and for issuing a Job Card. The poor people are not in a position to pay even this amount. I also found, in some Job Cards, there is no photograph of the beneficiary. How a beneficiary is identified? If this is the case, anybody can take the Job Card of other person and get employment. Sir, with utter surprise, I have even brought it to the notice of the hon. Minister that even Joint Secretary in a State has got a Job Card. His family members have got Job Cards. As per the norm, only one member in a family has to be issued Job Card. But, there are four Job Cards issued to a family. I found in a particular State--I will name the State later; otherwise, Mr. Venkaiah Naidu will quarrel with me--when I went there and talked to the people, four members in a family having Job Cards! Was any employment given to them? No Employment was not given to them. They worked for five days. After three months, they have got job for another four days. It has been going on like this. But, 100 days job was not given to them.

Another surprising factor is that machines should not be used for the purpose of doing any work under this Scheme. What they are doing is this. They are, in connivance with the officials, using machines for the purpose of doing the work and, ultimately, the money is collected as if the work is done manually. This is going on in some States. So, the main object of bringing forward this Act for giving employment to the rural poor is defeated. If a person or a lady works for hundred days in a year, they get eight thousand rupees. And, as far as a rural household is concerned, rupees eight thousand in a year is a big money for them for their subsistence, for their livelihood, keeping in view the number of starvation deaths that are taking place and the poverty this is prevailing there, if you

go to the rural areas, you will find that a drought situation is prevailing in the northern and the southern part of the country. The poor people, especially the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, take only one meal a day. They don't have livelihood. They can't educate their children. They are suffering. They don't have foodgrains to celebrate their family functions. So, at least, for their subsistence this scheme was brought. But, I would like to inform the hon. Minister that with the active connivance with the officials, there is an attempt to throttle the scheme in some of the States. These activities are being done to deprive the Central Government, which has brought the scheme, of their credit.

From my personal experience, I found that the State Government took the voters' list, picked up some names, and submitted them to the Central Government for getting ninety per cent funds. In one family, three-four members are getting the job cards. This is a clear violation of the guidelines issued by the Government of India. These guidelines are very clear. It is very clearly mentioned that no machines should be used, it should be manual work; the gram panchayats should identify the beneficiaries; job cards are to be given to the people after due verification; a person who gets a job cards should compulsorily get 100 day's employment, if he is not given employment within fifteen days he should get unemployment allowance. All these things are mentioned in the guidelines. But none of these guidelines are followed. These are being flouted. And, ultimately, the scheme is not implemented in an effective manner. It is a very important scheme because there are millions of poor people in this country. They will be getting advantage of this scheme. When we talked to the poor people, who get sixty-seventy rupees a day, these poor people, mostly the tribal and the scheduled caste people, are very happy. They told us that they were getting some employment in their leave period, when they did not have any work. It is helping them to sustain their families. It is a very laudable and important scheme. But, unfortunately, the funds are being siphoned off. It is being filtered. Officers are misusing it. *Sarpanchas* are also misusing the funds. Whichever political party is in power, that party selects only those people as beneficiaries who belong to that political party, and not the other people. There should be any party politics in that. It is a poor peoples' problem. I met the hon. Minister several times. I complained him. There were agitations in the States by the political parties also in this regard. The hon. Minister also visited some of the districts to

verify the things. When I went to Orissa, where nineteen districts are covered under this scheme, and Madhya Pradesh, where eighteen districts are covered under this scheme, mostly tribal areas, when we met the tribal people they told us that this was a very important scheme through which they were getting their livelihood. The people are acknowledging its. But unfortunately, the implementation of this scheme is not proper in some States. It has been found that in Madhya Pradesh, the implementation of this scheme is only 59 per cent; In Orissa, it is only 33.71 per cent. In some other States it is far less. In Uttar Pradesh, it is 29.78 per cent. Sir, the officers required for the purpose of implementing the Scheme are also not appointed. There are a lot of lacunae. There are a lot of flaws in that. Therefore, we request the hon. Minister that the Scheme which has been brought by you ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि (उड़ीसा) : सर, गुजरात में क्या पोजीशन है, बताइए ?

श्री उपसभापति : आप बैठिए।

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : गुजरात में क्या पोजीशन है और कांग्रेस शासित राज्यों में आप का क्या अनुभव है बताइए?

श्री उपसभापति : उनको बोलने दीजिए ।

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : 15 मिनट का समय ले लिया, same point repeat कर रहे हैं।

श्री उपसभापति : उन को बोलने दीजिए । ...*(Interruptions)*... Nothing will go on record. ...*(Interruptions)*...

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : *

श्री उपसभापति : पाणि जी, मत बोलिए आप बैठिए ।

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : *

उपसभापति : पाणि जी, बैठिए । नारायणसामी जी, आप बोलिए ।

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I mentioned about the percentages. Now, I would like to mention about the lacunae in implementing this Act. Number one, there should be transparency. The people of districts and Gram Panchayats should know what is the amount allocated for their Gram

*Not recorded.

Panchayats and districts; what is the total number of beneficiaries; how many people have been given job cards and what are the schemes that have been sanctioned. All these things are not known to the people. It is not published except the Employment Guarantee Scheme where the Chief Minister's photo is there. Whether it is Uttar Pradesh, or Madhya Pradesh, or Orissa, or Karnataka, they just say, the Karnataka State Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, whichever Chief Minister's photo is there. So, number one, there should be transparency in implementing the Scheme and the people should know which scheme is being implemented, how many beneficiaries are there and how employment is being given to those people. I want to know whether the hon. Minister has fixed the minimum wages. In some areas, I found that the people who are working for eight hours on hard soil, could not complete the work. We are fixing the average. But they could not earn Rs. 23-24 for an eight-hour job. But in other areas they are doing the work and earning Rs. 120 within a time or eight hours where loose soil is there. They are doing the job of desilting the pond, clearing the canal, laying the roads; *kuccha* roads or even providing drainage facilities. I request the hon. Minister that the guideline issued by the Government of India has to be very clear. It should vary from State to State. Apart from that, the minimum wages should be fixed for eight hours in all the States equally. In one State, people are getting employment; they are getting a salary of Rs. 54-55, but in another State, it is Rs. 62. In Andhra Pradesh, it is Rs. 80. It varies from State to State. There should be uniformity in fixing the minimum wages for them. The first point was about transparency. The second point is regarding the violation that is taking place. The muster roll has to be maintained. It is not being maintained. In Gram Panchayats, we have to maintain muster rolls. It is not being done. There was a survey done by an Organisation called the Centre for Study of Developing Societies (CSDS) for the purpose of implementation of this Act, that is the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act, at the district level. There is another Organisation called the Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability. They did survey in four States, including Andhra Pradesh. In Andhra Pradesh, they found that 98 per cent success rate was there. In other States like Jharkhand, it is only 29 per cent. They also found that there were various lacunae in the implementation of the Scheme. The State Governments are not properly implementing the schemes and the money going there is being diverted to other purposes. Especially, at the level of the officers, at the level of the coordinators, at the level of the

Gram Panchayats, the money is being taken away. It is not being given to the deserving people. Sir, it is happening under the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act. The hon. Minister knows it. He went to various States. He talked to the officers. He took action against some officers also. I would like to know when you are implementing the Scheme through *panchayats*, why the District Collectors are doing the entire job. Let the *Panchayats* do the job. *Panchayats* do not know what is the quantum of money coming to *Panchayats*. The decision for implementing the Scheme is taken at the Collector's level but is imposed on the *Gram Panchayats*. This is being done. When we talk to the *Sarpanch*, they say, "Sir, we have no knowledge. They are sending it. We are only identifying the beneficiaries, and we are giving them." The Scheme is being sent there. Sir, this is a very novel Scheme. In this Scheme, there is one advantage. It can be used for productive purposes, for example, desilting ponds, clearing *naliahs*, and also helping the agriculturists for just caving a pond, storing water, and also for laying roads. It can also be used for productive purposes. It is not going to be there just because they are removing the sand and filling the other areas, therefore, Sir, this novel Scheme of providing employment to the rural people, the rural poor which has been envisaged in the Act—from my experience, I could find—has not been properly implemented in various States. Then, there is a Review Committee. What are the findings of the Review Committee, I want to know from the hon. Minister. How many States have had a review? What are the findings of the Review Committee? What corrective measures have you taken after identifying, after seeing that the implementation of the Act is not being properly done under the Scheme? What action have you taken? What corrective measures have you taken? The job of the Ministry of Rural Development is not only to allocate funds to the States, but there should also be a monitoring mechanism in your Department. When you are giving money, you should also see that the State is accountable for implementing the Scheme. But, unfortunately, after the damage is done, your Ministry people go there and find that the money is being siphoned off by the officers and by the lower-level people. Therefore, Sir, I would like to know about the regular monitoring mechanism in the Ministry of Rural Development for implementing the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme. As regards the Review Committee, what are the findings of the Review Committee? I would like to know how many complaints you have received from various States for tardy implementation of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme.

What action have you taken on the basis of those complaints? Sir, it is a National Scheme. When it is implemented by various States, it is the duty of the Ministry of Rural Development to see that the target is achieved, and that the people who are poor, who need employment, are given employment and there should be no politics in it. Sir, I find that in most of the States—I do not know whether ruled by this party or that party,—I do not want to go into the details, I have a lot of details about various States—implementation has been totally shelved by various State Government. If I say that then there will be a quarrel from the other side. Sir, I gave it, in writing, to the hon. Minister from where we had got the complaints. Can you imagine, Sir, when we go to tribal areas, we find that the people are not getting 100 days job as assured. The deserving people are not getting 100 days' job in a year. Then, what is the purpose of implementing this Act? Kindly tell us, when the States are not implementing it properly, why you are giving the money again. When they are implementing the scheme properly, why do you release more funds to them? Sir, I would like to tell you about the amount which has been given by the Central Government to the various States. I don't want to read the whole thing. For 2006-07, an amount of Rs. 16,000-odd crores has been provided. When the hon. Prime Minister spoke in this august House, he had made it very clear that as far as giving money for implementing the scheme is concerned, the Government is prepared to give any amount which is required by the States. For Heaven's sake, let them implement it properly because this Scheme is meant for the poorest sections of the society. The hon. Minister knows what type of complaints are there from the various States. Though the Minister is very active, he is, unfortunately, not acting in this matter. In this matter, is very passive. I do not know why. The hon. Minister should take action against the erring officers. Why are you not taking action against them? The money is given by you. There is tardy implementation of this scheme in various States. Why don't you pull them up? ...*(Interruptions)*... Either you pull them up or pull them down; you can do anything.

श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह (उत्तर प्रदेश) : सभापति जी, पक्ष और विपक्ष दोनों भूमिकाएं से ही निभा रहे हैं :

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH (Andhra Pradesh): Today, we are appreciating it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No; no; you carry on. They are appreciating it ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Yes; Sir, this is not a party matter. ...*(Interruptions)*... This subject is related to the poorest sections of society. Therefore, Sir, I would request the hon. Minister to kindly take corrective measures from today onwards. Otherwise, whatever amount, whether it is twenty thousand crores or forty thousand crores or even one lakh crores of rupees, the Government Of India gives for implementing the Scheme will go into the drain. The deserving people, the poorer people will not get the advantage of it. Therefore, Sir, I want the hon. Minister to act on that.

Sir, now, two hundred districts have been covered. An assurance was given by the hon. Minister, and also by the hon. Prime Minister, in this august House that they will increase the number of districts under this scheme, which deserve it, from the next year onwards, 2007-08. How many districts are you going to include in it? Why I am saying this is because some States have sent their requests to you in this regard. How many districts are you going to include now? In 2007-08, what is the amount that you are going to earmark for this purpose? I want the hon. Minister to answer this. And for Heaven's sake, for this Scheme, kindly see that your Ministry is active. The Ministry should be active. Please see to it that the Scheme is implemented properly and the deserving people should get the advantage. I would like to inform the hon. Minister that there are some forces working in this country to make this scheme a failure. Kindly be aware of it. Identify those forces and see that the implementation of the scheme is successfully done and the credit of it goes to your Government, the UPA Government and the hon. Prime Minister and also to yourself. Thank you, Sir.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, for a change, my friend, Mr. Narayanasamy, spoke from this heart. Though he tried to bring in politics in-between, he could not succeed because the facts were overriding his mind than politics.

Sir, I was Minister for Rural Development for some time. The idea was conceptualised, and we planned a programme on the similar lines of the Maharashtra Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme of Seventies during the *Janata* period there and, subsequently, this Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme was implemented in the State of Maharashtra. As compared to the other schemes, it was better. I can't say that the people were completely satisfied because when I, as a Minister, summoned the

officials of the Maharashtra Government to my chamber to hear about the implementation of the Scheme and I made enquiries as to how many people were paid in cash when the employment was not available, the answer was not even one per cent. So, you could understand that figures were organized in such a way, and work was shown to be there at a distance of more than ten or fifteen kilometers so as to take the plea, "we have shown the work but the people have not gone there, what can we do, hence, no compensation." When this Government came into power, hopes were raised, and rightly so. The National Common Minimum Programme of the Government in May, 2004 reads, "The UPA Government will immediately enact a National Employment Guarantee Act. This will provide legal guarantee of, at least, one hundred days of employment, to begin with, on asset creation, etc. In the interregnum, a massive Food for Work Programme will be started."

Now, there was already a programme that was being implemented by the NDA Government. What this Government did when they came to power was that they abolished practically the entire scheme. This was the promise made in May 2004 in their Common Minimum Programme. Sir, it naturally takes some time for any Government to settle, understand the problems and then, initiate new schemes or introduce new Bills. But it took more than one-and-a-half years for this Government to implement the proposed National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme. The words used then were, "This Government will immediately enact..." Now, what is meant by "immediate"? The Minister should enlighten the House. Does it require that much time?

Now, coming to the second point, they did not talk about 150 districts. First, it has been reduced to 150 districts. Then, they said it will be increased to 200 districts. Then, slowly, by the end of the tenure of this Government, all the districts will be covered. That is the promise that they made subsequently. But the original promise was to have a National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme for the entire country. The very first act of this Government was to dilute it, limit it to the selected 150 districts. Secondly, they have also put the burden on the State Governments. The States don't have the money; they don't have the resources to match the grant of the Government of India, to join any of the programmes. That was the biggest challenge that has come up before the Government and the people who are interested in implementing the scheme. The third thing

was about the action for redressing the grievances. When there is a grievance and there is no compliance, then what is the remedy available? You have not suggested anything specific, concrete, initially, to take action against the people who don't implement the Act as per the spirit. That is lacking in the Bill. It has been highlighted by many people, including the people who are there in your National Advisory Council also. They also came out and gave statements, and even wrote articles also. That should have been taken care of by the Government. Then, Sir, for proper implementation, transparency is what is required. People said that Gram Sabha will decide the works. I can assure you, Raghuvansh babu—you are also from a rural area—that in a majority of the areas of the country, Gram Sabhas are not functioning effectively. It is the Gram Pradhan, the Sarpanch, who is active and who is making a plan. But otherwise, the entire work is done by the District Collectors. This is a big flaw in the entire scheme; the District Collectors are holding the key. I can understand the District Collector overseeing the performance, the Zilla Panchayat overseeing the performance, but the basic responsibilities should be given to the Panchayats. This is lacking now. Panchayat does not mean the Pradhan alone, but the Panchayat Boards as such and, secondly, the Zilla Panchayat, the second tier, But, unfortunately, what is happening is, it is the bureaucracy that has taken over the control of this entire scheme. The hon Minister should apply his mind, consult others, take the advice and views of Members of Parliament and evolve a system wherein the system of Gram Sabha meetings, the system of preparing plans, suggesting works, and then, of executing the plans is scrupulously followed. Also, Panchayat should be in the forefront. I wished to make this one point.

Then, coming to the other issues about the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, there is lack of awareness. A number of studies have revealed that the awareness levels in the country are very low. Then, most of the rural labour who have job cards are not aware of the fact that they must apply for a job in order to get employment under the NREG Scheme, which is a demand-driven programme. Secondly, there is shortage of staff. There is no staff available exclusively for the purpose of running a scheme like the Food for Work Programme. There is shortage of staff at all levels of the NREG. The responsibilities of Programme Officers and Block Development Officers have been assigned to the BDO who is already

over-worked. This responsibility has been given to him. Third, there is inadequate provision for administrative expenditure. We know, Sir, in our system, in order to implement such a massive scheme, we need some money also for administrative expenditure, if you do not provide it, people will meet that expenditure from the scheme and draw the money and show it in some other account. So, it will be indirectly encouraging corruption. That particular aspect has to be taken care of. There is weak redressal procedure if somebody is not implementing it. As per the spirit, what is the procedure you have for redressal of grievances? Sir, recently, many of the Members of the National Advisory Council, which is not functional now, visited different parts of the country. They come out with scathing criticism about the implementation of the scheme. My friend, Mr. Narayanasamy, was telling that some of the States behaved like this, doing like this, and all. He has a point in what he said, but at the same time, he was only mentioning the States which are ruled by other parties. I would like to tell my friend, Mr. Narayanasamy, that the newspaper suggests that the non-Congress States take lead in employment schemes. I am not trying to highlight it further. What I am trying to say is that the States that you have mentioned— Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, even Rajasthan, even West Bengal—are doing better in the implementation of the scheme. We have to understand and acknowledge the fact that they are doing a better job और मैंने देखा रघुवंश बाबू मध्य प्रदेश गए और वहां जाकर उन्होंने मध्य प्रदेश सरकार के बारे में अच्छी तारीफ की और कहा कि प्रधान मंत्री ग्रामीण सड़क योजना और रूरल एम्प्लोयमेंट गारंटी स्कीम यह कोई एक पार्टी की नहीं है, नारायणसामी जी कह रहे हैं कि नहीं, वहां तो मुख्य मंत्री का फोटो था। मुख्य मंत्री तो जनप्रतिनिधि है आपके स्टेट में क्या कर रहे हैं। आपके स्टेट मायने मैं कह रहा हूँ। Congress-ruled and non-Congress ruled States में एक सिस्टम है, लोकल पंचायत है, जिला परिषद है, स्टेट गवर्नमेंट है, उसका एक मुखिया है – मुख्य मंत्री और मुख्य मंत्री की फोटो न छपे ठीक है और प्रधान मंत्री का भी फोटो न छपे और हम लोग देख रहे हैं इस देश में, नारायणसामी जी ने शुरूआत भी वहीं से की हर एक विषय में कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष का फोटो। आपको कांग्रेस अध्यक्ष के फोटो के बारे में कोई आपत्ति नहीं है मगर चुने हुए मुख्य मंत्री का फोटो लगाने में आपको आपत्ति है। यह क्या सही है, यह न्याय है क्या? इसके बारे में गंभीरता से सोचना चाहिए। न केन्द्र का हो, न प्रदेश का हो, पैसा किसका है – आम जनता का है। **The money belongs to the people. They are the masters and only people's representatives, elected representatives, should be given the credit or they should be given the lead, whether they belong to this side or that side, whether they are from**

the BJP or Congress Party or any other party, they are the elected representatives.

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Sir, hon. Member, Shri Venkaiah Naidu, has been referring to this because I have got a greater complaint on that. I know the problem with the State Chief Ministers' photographs is there and publicity is given. I have no problem with that. But, it is a Central Government scheme, totally put under the Central Government and funds are given by the Central Government.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA(Jharkhand): It is a contributory Scheme.

SHRI C. RAMACHANDRAIAH: Who has contributed? It is the people.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is his opinion and this is his opinion. Mr. Narayanasamy ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: It is a Central Government Scheme and publicity is given to the State Chief Ministers. That is my complaint ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No. ...*(Interruptions)*... Nothing will go on record.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Sir, we are having a debate, a lively debate, and I have no problem. But, for a change, I hope, at least, the media will pick up this issue. I don't do it, Sir. Forget about me. I really wanted to draw the attention of the House and I wanted the House to understand and also evolve some method. We quarrel on certain issues. Sometimes, we talk out; sometimes, we walk out; sometimes, there is break out. I agree. But, at the same time, when a constructive discussion takes place; a debate takes place on price rise, on agriculture, on rural development, on an employment guarantee scheme, the media are not at all focussing on it. I am not worried; I had enough publicity for my life. So, I do not seek any further publicity. But, the issue is : are Parliamentarians debating certain serious issues or not? This message should go to the people. But, unfortunately, it is not happening. I have the experience that last time, we discussed about agriculture, and farmer's suicides. Sir, many Members made constructive speeches, but there is no mention whatsoever. You cannot quarrel with the media. They have their own rights. But, at the same time, they have the responsibility also. It is the Indian Parliament

and we are the Council of States. We are representing the States. We are highlighting certain problems of the people. Education is one of the important issues, it is not the academic education; it is educating people about the schemes. But, unfortunately, it is not happening. So, some sort of intervention and some sort of comments and counter-comments are attached to the interests of our friends of the media. It don't mind it. Moreover, I have no problem with Mr. Narayanasamy who might have seem that the Madhya Pradesh Government, while he was *prabhari*, his photo was not there. Rules can be amended that way that photos of even *prabharis* of the parties can also be published. Very pretty face of Narayanasamy can also published. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: Hon. Chairman also said, that Narayanasamy was beautiful.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The entire House certifies it.

SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA: You cannot be beautiful, You have to change the sentence. You are a handsome person. ...(*Interruptions*)...

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: What is wrong in it? Men are also beautiful. Sir, Venkaiah Naidu giving a complaint or the Chair giving a compliment will not suffice. Whether madam at home gives a compliment that will suffice. If she is satisfied, then all of us are satisfied. Sir, coming back to the programme . (*Interruptions*). She has to be. What else can she do? ... (*Interruptions*)... I am sorry, Sir. My straight poser to the hon. Minister. ...(*Interruptions*)...What is the total amount envisaged, required by the Rural Development Ministry for the scheme, year-wise? What is the amount sanctioned by the Finance Minister? There is a big variation between them. Can the Minister take the House into confidence? This is number one. Number two is about the requirement of the entire scheme by 2009. If you have to cover all the 500 districts of the country, what is your action plan for the remaining portion? I don't blame the Minister. One year and three months of this Government have gone. Out of 16 months of your tenure, 15 months you have successfully avoided the scheme. ...(*Interruptions*)...No, it all depends on our friends. They are not there. Yechuryji, Mr. Madhu and others are not here. They will decide the fate of this Government. Not we. They are supporting them. If they are happy, we are happy, to the extent that they bear with this Government. My point is, out of 16 months. 15 months have gone. Remaining are 45 months. In

these 45 months also, you have confined it initially to 150 districts. That means in the first year, there would be only 150 districts. That much burden you have reduced. Then, in next year, 200 districts. By the end of 2009, there is a saying in Telugu. I do not know how to say it in English. Somebody wanted to describe Pancha Pandavas. Pancha Pandavas, he thought, means five. He thought of five; and then, thought of showing four; and then thought of writing three; and then, tried to write two; and at the end, he could not write even one and made it zero. This Government has passed 15 months right now without envisaging the scheme. Secondly, it was confined to only 150 districts, and thirdly, now they are trying to cover 200 districts. Should these poor people wait for the remaining four and a half years? I can understand, in a place where more deserving people are there, they can be given priority. But, how can you exclude if you feel that there is a need for such a scheme? If you call it a pilot project, I have no problem. You did not call it a pilot project. Certain areas in the country are more deserving. They have been left out. In the States of Andhra Pradesh and Karnataka, in Maharashtra, I have my personal experience, Sir, there are worst famine-affected districts, where migration takes place, you have not included those districts. You may say, "What can I do. It is the Planning Commission's feedback, which has decided about the criteria for the allocation of these districts." It is floods. I can tell you Raghuvanshababu, if you go through the list, you yourself can understand that the criteria they have selected for backward districts is flood. So something needs to be done in that direction also. You need to come out with a clear-cut policy. Our friend, Mr. Narayanasamy, was mentioning that the Prime Minister has given an assurance in this House that funds are no problem. Sir, funds are also a problem. You don't have adequate funds.

Sir, I have got some observations made by Prof. Jean Dreze, who is one of the architects of this Bill. Prof. Jean Dreze, Economist and former National Advisory Council member, says, "That the current level of employment under the Scheme is well below estimates. The programme has so far generated just 3,663 lakh mandays as against the target of 2,00,000 lakh mandays, which is just two per cent of the estimates. There is no lack of demand for employment. There is something lacking in the way the programme is being implemented."

Speaking to *The Indian Express*, Employment Guarantee Council member Annie Raja said; "The dismal performance of the NREG in various

parts of the country is a product of lack of willingness in the bureaucracy and the political heads." this is the observation made by the people who are involved in the drafting of the Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme.

Thirdly, coming to the implementation, reports emanating from the Indian Social Forum (ISF)—the conference-cum-jamboree of social activists and NGOs that took place in Delhi this past week — indicate a worrying audit for the National Rural Employment Guarantee Programme. Even the civil society groups that backed the NREGP are all disappointed and are dismayed by the leakages, corruption and general inefficacy that seem to be plaguing the flagship anti-poverty scheme of the Union Government. The amount is around Rs. 6,000 crore. Even a reasonable estimate, per year, is Rs. 20,000 crore for 150 districts. That has been studied officially by the Applied Economic Research Forum of the country. They came out with the figure that Rs. 20,000 crore is required. And what is the provision? Rs. 6,000 crore! And what is the expenditure? I am not going State-wise, because the Minister himself is having figures, and they are put on the website also.

Sir, I come from Andhra Pradesh. The question is that the most serious complaints are from Andhra Pradesh. There are stories in different newspapers. I am not trying to score a political point over the Andhra Pradesh Government there, because it simply happens to be a Congress Government. Why I am mentioning Andhra Pradesh is because the Scheme was launched by the hon. Prime Minister and the Congress President who took interest in it. I do give her credit—there is no, problem for me — in drafting this Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme. They launched the Scheme in Anantapur. If you have complaints galore, which are serious in nature, from that very State and district, you can imagine the fate of the Scheme in different parts of the country. This is the point I just wanted to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister.

Secondly, regarding the implementation part of it, there has to be transparency. People should know about it. Sir, as the Minister, I gave instructions that the amount of money that had to be given to each Scheme, district-wise and panchayat-wise, should be put not only on the website— because websites are not that much popular—but also be given to the regional newspapers, and thirdly, to be given to panchayats, to be displayed in the village *chaurahas*. whatever you call it, so that people know that this much amount of money is being spent in the village under this Scheme, whether it is the Awaas Yojana, or whether it is a Road Scheme, or whether

it is a Drinking Water Scheme, or a School Building Scheme, or whatever it is. You should display it in the village. The awareness levels are increasing in the villages. People will find faults with the executing agency, इतना पैसा आया, इतना ही खर्च हो रहा है, इतना खर्च करना है, इतना ही खर्च कर रहे हैं , क्या हो रहा है इसमें ? कम से कम सवाल पूछने में लोगों को कुछ जवाब तो देना पड़ेगा, इसलिए । I want to tell the Minister that think on these lines. Signboards should be displayed publicly in each place; otherwise, you know the bureaucracy. They will say, "We have done that; we have issued notices also. हमने यह पोस्ट किया, वह पोस्ट किया, पंचायत घर के ऊपर है ।" ऐसा कुछ कहेंगे" फिर finally कुछ होगा नहीं । This has to be understood also.

Sir, now I come to the complaints. You have to fix the responsibility. The agency, which is implementing this Scheme, has to be made accountable to the people; they have to be made accountable for their inefficiency and inaction also. Unless you put a penal provision for non-implementation or improper implementation, the Scheme will not be successful, because it is massive. One Minister from Delhi, or the Prime Minister from here, or the Chief Minister from a State, cannot oversee what is happening in a village, even in 150 districts. So, you need to have transparency; you need to have accountability; and you need to have a sense of fear and responsibility in the minds of the people who are the executing agency, so that they also feel that somebody is watching them.

Now, we have entered the computer age. Practically, there is a system now available almost in all the districts where you can have all these things, all your data on day-to-day basis, and they can be cross-checked. Can you evolve such a system that any day, if I just open the website, I can find and visit a particular district and then a village, and then find out what is happening, what is the reality so that well-meaning NGOs, enlightened civil society and well-intentioned media can focus on these and then expose those people who are misusing the scheme. Recently, lot of NGOs have visited across the country including Andhra Pradesh. They came out with startling revelation. It is a news item which says, names of teachers, members of the families of employees and even of the children of politicians and then, other important people are there in those lists that are prepared. How can this happen if so much scrutiny is there? If you are really monitoring the scheme, how can the names of such people be included in the list?

Then, Sir, with regard to the card, it is not given as per eligibility; card is given as per some other consideration and if a poor man has to pay Rs. 40 or Rs. 50 for procuring the card, how do you expect him to survive in such a system? You have to simplify it and you have to make it obligatory on the part of District Administration to see that every eligible person is provided a card. Then, with regard to enrolment, if they refuse to enrol as per the demand, what is the remedy? Whom do they have to approach? After all, a rural person, even today, is not that much educated, he does not have ways and means of communication to communicate to others and to complain also. For that also, there has to be some system.

Sir, the Act is very clear that the Gram Panchayat, not Pradhan, shall be responsible for the identification of projects; a Gram Panchayat may take up any project; every Gram Panchayat shall prepare a development plan; the Gram Panchayat shall allocate employment opportunities among the applicants; the Gram Panchayat shall make available all relevant documents including muster rolls, bills, vouchers, etc., applications for work may be submitted in writing either to the Gram Panchayat, not to the Pradhan; the Gram Panchayat and programme officer shall be bound to accept valid applications and to issue a dated receipt. Sir, this application itself is very cumbersome. How do you expect ordinary people in the villages to fill it up? Does it require a big application? One simple line that I am unemployed and I want work. (*Interruptions*) My friend, Shri Ahluwalia, is saying that in some places, it is 21 pages.

SHRI S.S. AHLUWALIA: Even more pages. Sir, it is not about some places. It is the application, a 21-page application, throughout the country for registration.

SHRI M. VENKAI AH NAIDU: So, the Minister should apply his mind. Everybody says this. *The Indian Express* says, "Job cut out-given its potential, the rural jobs programme deserves a thorough review". Sir, we do not have adequate time, otherwise, I would have given you the details. Sir, rational norms are also required because measurement of work for payment of wages had generated some controversies in some of the areas. "The work norms are too demanding. There are very few cases of any one earning the statutory minimum wage of Rs. 73 per day", Ms. Aruna Roy, Magsaysay Award winner, said in an interview to a newspaper. There has to be a rationalisation of work norms and measurement practices that

would make it possible for workers to earn minimum wages. She was a former Member of the NAC. There is scope for corruption also. Sir, there is need for a comprehensive social audit of the Act. Some of the private organisations have done the comprehensive audit, but the results of the audit are very disappointing because they do not stand the levels which we expected in the scheme. The most dangerous form of inaction on the NREGA relates to transparency of safeguards such as the mandatory availability of muster roll at the work sites. In many of the areas, at the work site, there is no muster roll. It is prepared subsequently. Field report suggests that these safeguards are often neglected. The CBGA study cited earlier found that muster rolls were rarely available at the work site except in one of the four sample States. They have taken samples of different States. In this context, recent efforts in Andhra Pradesh deserve to be closely observed. It is not just that the Government of Andhra Pradesh has taken pioneering steps, but there have been interesting public initiatives to mobilise for the NREGS. A lot of public is taking interest. Voluntary organizations are taking interest to see that the scheme becomes a success. In Anantapur, this experiment was made in the social audit inspired by Durgapur *pad yatra*. But, new dimensions to this exercise have been added. A lot of people have joined this *yatra* and they started inspecting the work sites in gram panchayats, verifying muster rolls and other records, and at the end of it, they have found that some of the interesting revelations that have come are, firstly, these cards are not given as per individuals. Secondly, muster rolls are not maintained. Thirdly, the advocated minimum wages are not paid. Fourthly, work standards and norms are demanding which cannot be met by innocent local people. Fifthly, payment is made after 15 days in some of these places. In 15 days, do you expect a farm labour or a landless poor or an ordinary agricultural worker to sustain without food? This also has to be kept in mind. It has to be a daily wage programme. The response, I can tell you, is very interesting. People want this scheme to be successful. Even from the Opposition, we can assure you that we want this scheme to become successful, पर पहले आपकी नीयत क्या है what is your commitment? Simple commitment will not suffice, without funds. If you want to function, you need funds. Without funds, you cannot achieve your objective. First of all, let us know from this Government what is the budgetary allocation you are proposing to make to meet your own targets of 150 villages, 200 villages, then adding 100 districts like that. At the end of it, you must come out with

figures of allocation. Mere jugglery of figures will not suffice. The main concern is, the lack of political will with regard to awareness, with regard to sufficient provisions for administrative experience, with regard to shortage of staff, with regard to lack of independent redressal mechanism. So, these things have not been addressed by this Government. I would like the Minister to throw some light on this issue, and also take note of the criticism that has come in various parts of the media. Simply don't be carried away by this plea that since somebody criticises your scheme, he is your enemy. Some people were saying something. They were telling around something. Who told them that some people what to see that this scheme is failed? I do not think any party in any part of this country is thinking on those lines. Sir, you need preparatory work. An amount of Rs. 305 crores has been released to undertake preparatory work and the Plan proposal for 2006-07 for implementation of the NREGA in 200 districts at the initial stage, your expenditure is supposed to be Rs. 16419 crores. What is the allocation that has been made so far? I do agree that it is a unique scheme, and the country needs such scheme. There is no second opinion about it. But, without adequate funding, once again I want to emphasise that this will not succeed.

Sir, according to the projections by a preliminary study, the report of the scheme prepared by New Delhi based Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability, CBGA, the Central Government will have to allot Rs. 9, 240 crores and Rs. 30,000 crores in 2005-06 and 2006-07 respectively to pay the beneficiaries alone. Administrative costs and other expenses have not been included in this estimation, the projection was based on the assumption that in the 200 districts where the scheme is being implemented, 92.4 crore mandays of employment would be generated in the 42 days remaining in the financial year 2005-06. Where is the money? You wanted to implement the scheme in all the 593 districts by the end of your term, that is, by 2009. It seems that the Government plans to carry out to give 100 days in 115 districts each year. That means the Central Government has to start making an allocation of Rs. 22,250 crores in the coming budget. I am sure the hon. Minister might have taken up the matter with the Finance Ministry. In this country, unfortunately, the rural people and the rural areas are not given adequate attention because they are not organised. They don't have the voice. I always used to say that in this country there are two countries-one is forward moving India and the other

3.00 P.M.

is backward looking Bharat. You have everything bright in the cities and urban areas and everything dull, i don't say nil, in the rural area. You have seen that, all the initiatives that are taken by the Government are concentrated more on urban areas. You take the Pradhan Mantri Gramin Sadak Yojana, a simple Scheme of providing roads to even/ village. How much time has it taken? After 52 years or 55 years of independence, there are more than 1,60,000 villages in the rural areas which don't have minimum a *pucca* road. Now, the Minister wants more funds for this novel Scheme, for the rural development. Every MP wants his constituency, his villages, to be connected with a *pucca* tar road. But the money is not forthcoming. What else is the priority than a rural road to any Government? I would only urge upon this Government which always goes on talking about आम आदमी उन्होंने आश्वासन दिया और उनका नारा भी था, "कांग्रेस के हाथ .." (व्यवधान) तो उन्होंने कहा – "कांग्रेस के हाथ, आम आदमी के साथ" । मुझे एक डाउट हो रहा है, हमारे मित्र श्री नारायण सामी जी बताएं, तो मैं अलर्ट हो जाऊंगा। इतने साल आपक लोगों को आम आदमी का साथ मिला, यानि 52 साल, फिर भी आपको ऐसा लग रहा है कि आम आदमी को आपका साथ देना चाहिए और आप लोग सोच रहे हैं दोबारा गरीबी हटाओं का नारा लाने के लिए और इसके लिए आपने इतना प्रयास किया है । आपने नारा दिया है, इसलिए मैं कह रहा हूँ कि "कांग्रेस के हाथ विश्वासघात किया बीच में".....इसको मान लीजिए, मानकर आगे बढ़ने के समय कम से कम मिनिस्टर को पर्याप्त पैसा दीजिए । मिनिस्टर को भी काम करने के लिए पैसा चाहिए बिना पैसे के केवल भाषण करने से कुछ नहीं होगा , हमारे रमेश बाबू जोर से बोलते हैं , आवाज भी बहुत बुलंद है , लेकिन उससे काम नहीं होगा । मैंने खुद अनुभव किया है कि इसके लिए जितना पैसा चाहिए, 2009 तक पर्याप्त पैसा आप दीजिए और इस प्रोग्राम के लिए आप पार्लियामेंट के द्वारा, वित्त मंत्री के द्वारा और प्रधान मंत्री के द्वारा clear-cut commitment दीजिए । हम भी आपकी प्रशंसा करेंगे, इसमें कोई दो राय नहीं हैं । दूसरी बात यह है कि स्टेट्स जो हैं, इन स्टेट्स को भी हमारे federal system में importance दी गई है । Without States, there is no Centre. So, the Centre and the States must work together. We should not try to score political points.

Now, I come to a point which was said in the Congress Parliamentary Party meeting or the Congress Party meeting, "We devise the schemes and others are taking advantage of them. So, something should be done". What something can be done, Sir? I have experience. I have envisaged many schemes, Narayanasamyji. Did your Governments in different States

mention the Central Government's name at that time? They had their own Schemes, even in Madhya Pradesh also. In Madhya Pradesh, they have got a drinking water scheme. The schemes are named after Congress leaders only, and not after the Central Government or not even after other names. So, let us not quarrel over the names. It is really unfortunate that the former Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee's name and photo were removed from the hoardings which were there on the National Highway, on the Golden Quadrilateral projects. By doing such things we are not adding anything to our honor. यह कोई सौभाग्यता नहीं है, यह देश को यश नहीं देता है।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude because the time is less. There are other Members also.

श्री एम. वेंकैया नायडु : देश की political parties को एक दूसरे की मदद करनी चाहिए, अगर किसी ने अच्छा काम किया है, तो उसकी प्रशंसा करनी चाहिए, अगर उसमें कुछ deficiencies हैं, shortcomings हैं तो उनको highlight करना चाहिए। जो highlight करेगा, जो आलोचना करेगा, उनके बारे में सोचना कि इन्होंने आलोचना की है, इसलिए इनको पैसा नहीं देना चाहिए ऐसा भाव किसी के मन में नहीं आने देना चाहिए और इसके लिए पूरा प्रयास करना चाहिए। Without taking much time of the House, I would like to thank you for giving me this opportunity.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken the entire time of your party.

SHRI M. VENKAI AH NAIDU: There is no problem on that account. I might have taken an equal amount of time that my friend, Mr. Narayanasamy, has taken. My only plea to the Minister is, please see to it that the issues raised are clarified or understood by him in a proper manner; and a meaningful and constructive approach is adopted with regard to the implementation of the Scheme. इतनी ही मेरी प्रार्थना है। मेरे मन में एक और भी पीड़ा है कि मुझे बाहर भी जाना है, if I am not there by the time he starts responding, if that time passes, you should really excuse me. Thank you very much for giving me time.

श्री नन्द किशोर यादव (उत्तर प्रदेश) : धन्यवाद उपसभापति महोदय। ग्रामीण रोजगार गारंटी योजना पर माननीय नारायणसामी जी ने चर्चा शुरू की और उन्होंने अपने भाषण में कहा कि यह जो योजना चल रही है, ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में जो ग्रामीण बेरोजगार हैं, उनकी बेरोजगारी दूर करने के लिए, इस पर कोई राजनीति नहीं होनी चाहिए। किसी दल को इसमें राजनीति नहीं करनी चाहिए।

[उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री प्रशांत चटर्जी) पीठासीन हुए]

प्रो० राम देव भंडारी (बिहार) : सर आज आप पहली बार इस आसन पर पीठासीन हुए हैं, इसके लिए आपको बधाई हो।

श्री एम. वैकैया नायडु : सर, हमारी तरफ से भी आपको बधाई हो।

श्री एस. एस. अहलुवालिया : सर, हमारी तरफ से भी आपको बधाई हो।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Thank you.

श्री नन्द किशोर यादव : उपसभाध्यक्ष महादेव, चाहे ग्रामीण क्षेत्र की बेरोजगारी हो, चाहे शहरी क्षेत्र की बेरोजगारी हो, भारत जैसे विशाल देश के लिए अभिशाप है क्योंकि जब तक हम देश की बेरोजगारी, चाहे ग्रामीण क्षेत्र को ही, चाहे शहरों की हो, अगर हम उसको दूर नहीं कर पाएंगे, तो भारत आर्थिक रूप से मजबूत नहीं हो पाएगा। नारायणसामी जी यहां से चले गए हैं, लेकिन मैं अपने कांग्रेस के साथियों से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आजादी के बाद से लगातार लम्बे समय तक आपको केन्द्र में शासन करने का अवसर मिला। एक जमाना था, जब इस देश के अधिकांश प्रांतों में आपकी सरकार थी। आपने इस अवसर का लाभ नहीं उठाया। जहां तक देश की समस्याओं का सवाल था, ग्रामीण क्षेत्र की बेरोजगारी दूर करने का सवाल था, शहरी क्षेत्र की बेरोजगारी दूर करने का सवाल था, आपने कभी इस पर गंभीरता से काम नहीं किया। आपके अंदर इच्छा शक्ति का अभाव रहा। आप दृढ़ शक्ति नहीं दिखा सके। आपकी योजनाओं, नीतियों और आपने जो कार्यक्रम बनाए आज उसी का परिणाम है कि पूरे देश में खासकर ग्रामीण भारत में ग्रामीण बेरोजगारी बहुत तेजी के साथ बढ़ी है। ग्रामीण रोजगार गारंटी योजना, जिसका वर्तमान सरकार बड़ा ढिंढोरा पीट रही है कि इसके लागू होने से देश के ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों की बेरोजगारी दूर हो जाएगी, महोदय, मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि आज से तीन दशक पहले सन् 1971 में भी "गरीबी हटाओ" का नारा दिया गया था, उस समय "बीस सूत्री कार्यक्रम" की एक योजना बनी थी, उसका महत्वपूर्ण बिन्दू यह था कि ग्रामीण क्षेत्र की जो बेरोजगारी है, हम इसके माध्यम से दूर करने का प्रयास करेंगे। इसके बाद चाहे इधर के साथी हों, चाहे मेरे दाहिने तरफ के साथी हों, इनकी भी शासन करने का अवसर प्राप्त हुआ। इन लोगों ने अनेक योजनाएं चलाईं। जिस तरह की ग्रामीण गारंटी योजना है, ठीक उसी तरह की इस देश में तमाम योजनाएं चली-स्वर्ण जयंती ग्राम स्वरोजगार योजना, संपूर्ण ग्रामीण रोजगार योजना प्रधान मंत्री रोजगार योजना, काम के बदले अनाज—लेकिन सब भ्रष्टाचार की भेंट चढ़ गए और इसकी जो मंशा थी, वह पूरी नहीं हो पाई चाहें देश के ग्रामीण क्षेत्र हों, चाहे शहर हों, बेरोजगारी बढ़ती गई।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, जहां तक रोजगार गारंटी विधेयक का सवाल है, मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों के विकास के लिए देश में आज विभिन्न मंत्रालयों के द्वारा 450 अरब रूपए खर्च किए जा रहे हैं, लेकिन उसका जिस तरह से अनुपालन होना चाहिए, अभी

नारायणसामी जो बोल रहे थे कि जितने कांग्रेस शासित क्षेत्र हैं, वहां अनुपालन सही हो रहा है और विपक्ष की जहां-जहां सरकारें हैं, वहां इसका अनुपालन सही नहीं हो पा रहा है। महोदय, आजादी के बाद से इनकी पार्टी का शासन लंबे समय तक रहा, इन्होंने डिढोरा भी पीटा कि हमें इस देश में शासन करना आता है, हमारे पास इस तरह की व्यवस्था है कि हम देश को तमाम समस्याओं से निजात दिला सकते हैं। लेकिन इनके शासन-काल में, चाहे ग्रामीण क्षेत्र हो या शहरी क्षेत्र हो, चाहे मजदूर हो या गरीब हो या किसान हो-सभी बेहाल रहे। आज जहां-जहां इनका शासन है, वहां ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में बेरोजगारी सबसे ज्यादा है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आप यह जो ग्रामीण क्षेत्र के लिए रोजगार गारंटी कार्यक्रम लाए है, उसके तहत आप गरीबी रेखा के नीचे रहने वाले परिवार के एक आदमी को रोजगार देने का काम करेंगे और वह भी एक सौ दिन, तो बाकी 265 दिन वह परिवार क्या करेगा? महोदय, साल में 365 दिन होते हैं? और आप एक सौ दिन रोजगार देने की बात कर रहे हैं, तो बाकी 265 दिन वह क्या करेगा? फिर सौ दिन आप रोजगार देंगे तो उसमें उसे कितनी मजदूरी मिलेगी—60 रूपए, 65 रूपए या 70 रूपए? आपकी गलत नीतियों के कारण आज महंगाई चरम सीमा पर पहुंच गयी है। आज सीमेंटका दाम बढ़ गया है, स्टील का दाम बढ़ गया है, आवश्यक खाद्य सामग्री व सब्जी आदि सभी का दाम बढ़ गया है। मैं माननीय मंत्री जी से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि आप परिवार में एक व्यक्ति को सौ दिन काम देने की बात करते हैं तो उस में उस परिवार का खर्चा कैसे चल पाएगा?

महोदय, जहां तक इस योजना का सवाल है, मुझे यह कहते हुए प्रसन्नता हो रही है कि उत्तर प्रदेश में इस योजना को ठीक ढंग से लागू करने में उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार सफल रही है। चाहे राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण योजना हो या इस तरह की जितनी और योजनाएं हो, आप भले ही इन्हें लागू कर लें, लेकिन इससे ग्रामीण भारत की बेरोजगारी दूर नहीं हो सकती है। ग्रामीण भारत की बेरोजगारी दूर करने के लिए आपको कृषि क्षेत्र में ज्यादा-से-ज्यादा काम करना होगा। इस देश में आज भी 71 प्रतिशत लोग खेती का काम करते हैं। भारतवर्ष गांवों का देश है, इसलिए हमें कृषि क्षेत्र पर ज्यादा-से-ज्यादा निवेश करना होगा। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछली सरकारों और वर्तमान सरकार ने लगातार कृषि क्षेत्र की उपेक्षा की है। आज कृषि का काम घाटे का काम हो गया है। आज जो लोग खेती करते थे, जो खेती पर निर्भर थे वे खेती का काम छोड़कर शहरों की तरफ पलायन कर रहे हैं जबकि आज भी कृषि के क्षेत्र में सबसे ज्यादा रोजगार के अवसर हैं, इसलिए हमको कृषि के क्षेत्र में काम करना होगा, लेकिन आज कृषि की हालत यह हो गयी है कि डीजल महंगा है, उर्वरक महंगा है, उर्वरक महंगा है, बीज महंगा है और बिजली हम उन्हें दे नहीं पा रहे हैं, तो किसान खेती कैसे करेगा? इसी कारण आज यह घाटे का काम हो गया है। आज पूरी खेती मानसून पर और भगवान भरोसे होती है। महोदय, आजादी के बाद से आज तक हम कृषि के क्षेत्र में 30 से 35 प्रतिशत तक ही सिंचाई के साधन उपलब्ध कर सके हैं। उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब कृषि के क्षेत्र में काम नहीं होगा, तब तक

इस देश की बेरोजगारी दूर नहीं हो पाएगी। इसलिए मैं आपके माध्यम से इस सरकार से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि कृषि के क्षेत्र में हमें काम करना होगा।

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, वर्ष 2003 में 638 गांवों में एक सर्वेक्षण किया गया था, जिसमें 51,770 घरों का सर्वेक्षण हुआ था और उसमें यह पाया गया था कि 40 प्रतिशत किसानों ने खेती का काम छोड़ दिया है। आज देश का करीब 48.7 प्रतिशत किसान कर्ज में डूबा हुआ है। निश्चित रूप से रोजगार गारंटी विधेयक पर चर्चा हो रही है, लेकिन मैं किसान की बात इसलिए कर रहा हूँ, क्योंकि रोजगार देने के तमाम अवसर कृषि के क्षेत्र में हैं।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Your time is over. Please conclude.

श्री राजीव शुक्ल (महाराष्ट्र): अभी खेती की चर्चा कर रहे हैं।

श्री नन्द किशोर यादव : धन्यवाद शुक्ल जी। इसलिए कृषि के क्षेत्र में ज्यादा से ज्यादा काम करने की जरूरत है। अर्थशास्त्री भी इस बात को मानते हैं कि हमारी जो सिंचित और अर्ध-सिंचित जोतें हैं, उनमें जब तक सिंचाई की व्यवस्था नहीं हो जाएगी, तब तक हम कृषि के क्षेत्र में रोजगार नहीं बढ़ा सकते हैं। हमें गांव-गांव में ऐसी सड़के बनानी होंगी, जो सीधे शहर और मंडियों को जोड़ सकें, जिससे किसान का जो उत्पादन है वह मंडियों तक जा सके, शहरों में जा सके। अगर इस तरफ हम ध्यान देंगे, तो हम कृषि के क्षेत्र में, ग्रामीण क्षेत्र में ज्यादा रोजगार देने का काम करेंगे। हमें रोजगार के अवसर बढ़ाने के लिए लघु उद्योगों, कुटीर उद्योगों की ओर भी काम करना होगा।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, ऐसे अनेक देश हैं, जिनकी प्रतिव्यक्ति औसत आय हमारे देश से ज्यादा है। वहां पर जो बेरोजगार है, उसे बेरोजगारी भत्ता देने का काम वहां की सरकारें करती हैं। मुझे इस सदन में यह बताते हुए प्रसन्नता है कि उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार जब पिछले विधान सभा चुनाव में गई थी, तो उसने जनता के सामने यह वायदा किया था कि अगर हमारी सरकार बन गई तो हम बेरोजगारों को काम देने का काम करेंगे और अगर काम नहीं दे सके तो बेरोजगारी भत्ता देने का काम करेंगे। हमारी उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने उत्तर प्रदेश में चार लाख से ज्यादा लोगों को रोजगार देने का काम किया है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Please conclude.

श्री नन्द किशोर यादव : सर, एक मिनट। तो वहां चार लाख से ज्यादा लोगों को काम देने का काम किया है और जिनको रोजगार नहीं दे सके, उन्हें 500/- रूपए महीने की दर से हम बेरोजगारी भत्ता देने का काम है। मैं आपके माध्यम से यह मांग करना चाहता हूँ कि केन्द्र सरकार भी, उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार ने जिस तरह से बेरोजगारी भत्ता देने का काम किया है, उसी तरह का यह भी काम करने का काम करें।

[12 December, 2006]

RAJYA SABHA

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, इनकी पूरी सरकार न तो बेरोजगारी दूर कर सकती है, न महंगाई दूर कर सकती है। इनकी पूरी की पूरी सरकार केवल जहां-जहां विपक्ष की सरकारें हैं उनको केवल गिराने का षड्यंत्र करने का काम कर रही हैं। एक साल तक तो लगातार इस सदन की माननीया सदस्या श्रीमती जया बच्चन जी की सदस्यता कैसे खत्म की जाए, उस ओर इनका सारा ध्यान केन्द्रित रहा। ये लगातार ऐसा प्रयास करते हैं, जनता की समस्याओं से इनका वास्ता, सरोकार नहीं है, ये लगातार प्रयास कर रहे हैं कि कैसे माननीय अमर सिंह जी को इनकम टैक्स के अंतर्गत घसीटा जाए। इनका लगातार यह प्रयास चल रहा है कि किस तरह से दादरी प्रोजेक्ट, जो हमारा सबसे बड़ा प्रोजेक्ट था, जिसके तहत हम पूरे उत्तर प्रदेश को बिजली देने का काम करना चाहते हैं...(व्यवधान)... शुक्ल जी, ध्यान से सुनिए।

श्री राजीव शुक्ल : आप रोजगार गारंटी स्कीम पर बोलिए।...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): You please conclude. You have taken fifteen minutes.

श्री नन्द किशोर यादव : बस एक मिनट, सर। दादरी प्रोजेक्ट शुरू हो जाता, तो उस क्षेत्र के ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों के जितने बेरोजगार हैं, उनको हम रोजगार देने का काम करते। हमारी सरकार यह करना चाहती है।

उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आपने मुझे बोलने का अवसर दिया, आपका बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

श्री उदय प्रताप सिंह : सर, मैं श्री रघुवंश प्रसाद जी को केवल दो पंक्तियां पढ़कर सुनाना चाहता हूँ कि :

आजादी का सूरज चमका शहरों के आकाश में,
गांव पड़े हैं, अभी गुलामी के पिछड़े इतिहास में।

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN (West Bengal): Respected Vice-Chairman, Sir, we are discussing about the National Rural Employment Guarantee Act. It has got immense significance in the context of widespread rural distress and growing unemployment in the country. Sir, the programme has generated much needed wage employment for the unemployed and the poor. But, there are a lot of shortcomings, so far as the Act and its implementation is concerned. I am not in a position to go into the details of it, but I would like to mention some of the shortcomings, so far as the Act and its implementation is concerned. Number one, there is low allocation of funds and even lower utilisation. Number two, non-payment of minimum wages. Number three, huge delay in wage payments. Number four, absence of facilities at work site. Number five, very little accountability

and transparency. Number six, insignificant participation of women in planning and implementation.

Sir, now I would like to go into the details of the performance of this Scheme. I will not go into State-wise performance of the Scheme. It has already been discussed by the hon. Members. I have seen that the funds released and the expenditure incurred is not more than 50 per cent so far. So, I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what type of corrective methods he has taken so that the performance of the Scheme is better. It is a well-talked programme throughout the country. So, its performance should also be good, I think, at present, it is not up to the mark and satisfactory. It is a welcome exercise, but its performance is not satisfactory. At present, 200 districts have been covered under this scheme. But, I would like to know from the hon. Minister as to when the entire country will be brought under this programme.

Sir, as the situation in our country differs from place to place, a flexible attitude should be taken in implementing the scheme. Now, I would like to say something about the Act. Sir, we have also discussed the Rural Employment Guarantee Act in this august House. But, I would like to say that there is a mention in the Act or in the guidelines issued by the Ministry of Rural Development about the term 'family'. 'A family' means those who have common ration card, those who have been living in a shared household. I would like to say that there may be an adult son and a daughter living under a common shed. There may be a single woman and there may be a micro family. But so far as the household as defined in the Act or given in the guidelines is concerned, there is no definition of 'micro family'; there is no provision for individual cards. So, what will happen to them?

Sir, my next point is about the condition prevailing at the worksite. It has been stated in the guidelines that there will be a creche; there will be a provision for safe drinking water; and there will be a first-aid-box at the work site. If there is any injury, then, they can help the labourers. There will be a provision for hospitalisation; there will be a muster-roll also available at the worksite. It has been stated in the Act or in the guidelines, but nothing is seen in the rural site where the work is going on.

Sir, the next point I would like to mention here is this. I have seen the Work list-details of works to be done in this Scheme. But, again, I would like to say that different type of situations prevail in different parts of the

[12 December, 2006]

RAJYA SABHA

country. You take the example of Tripura. So far as Tripura is concerned, only one district has been covered under this Scheme. Sir, Tripura is a small State. What type of work we will do because there is no rubber plantation and there is no bamboo plantation? There is a provision for drinking water. So, I would like to submit that we are not taking the entire North-East within its purview. At present, there is only one district of Tripura and six districts of West Bengal. I would like to say that we should expand the work, expand the districts, and expand the areas according to the different conditions of the country. It should be expanded in a big way. One very-important thing that we are facing in West Bengal, perhaps, in many parts of the country, is because of the climate. During rainy season, we are not able to provide job or work to the common man. So, the Ministry should advise or allow us to give them another job, which is related to the social sector work, particularly, during the rainy season. They should do some work either for a school building or some other such activity which comes under the social sector work. Another point, which we have been saying, is that we should make the official procedure easy. You have seen it. Mr. Narayanasamy was also saying that machines would not be allowed. Yes, it is in the guidelines that machines will not be allowed. For a small road, labour would require a roller to compress the land. Otherwise, it will not be possible to work. But without roller it is not at all possible. If I provide them roller, I have to seek permission from the District Magistrate,(Interruptions).....

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: I was saying that they are using excavator. ...(Interruptions)... Excavator should not be used. ...(Interruptions)... That is the point I was making.

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN: Machine use is already prohibited and it is clearly stated in the guidelines. It is already stated in the guidelines. ...(Interruptions)... It is within the rules. ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI V. NARAYANASAMY: That is violating the rules. ...(Interruptions)...

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN: But I suppose they require it. ...(Interruptions)... But it is required.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): The Minister will give the reply.... (Interruptions)...

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN: Now ! come to the earthwork. In different places the nature of the earth is different. Sometimes earth is hard and sometimes it is soft. But it is a common guideline that 117 cubic feet will be dug by one labour in seven or eight hours. It should not be applicable in all respects in all parts of the country. There should be some criterion. In hilly areas, it is difficult but it may be possible in soft areas. So, there should be a good insight into it. So far as women are concerned, there is no separate provision for the women. Same work in the same way is not applicable. Worksite may be improved and upgraded as far as women are concerned. Another point is regarding financial allocation. Already about financial allocation which has already been stated here and I would like to touch one para with your kind permission. It says, "The Government would be bound to pay unemployment allowance in the case the money for implementation of the Act did not reach the State Governments by the beginning of every quarter." Unfortunately, this categorical assurance has not been included in the proposal of rules circulated by the Ministry. This must be done in the rules. It can be linked to the clause 7/2 that mentions the 'economic capacity' of the State Governments to pay the unemployment allowance. The linkage is necessary so that this clause is not used as a loophole by the State Governments to escape paying unemployment allowance. Sir, another point I would like to mention is about the role of NGOs. *...(Interruptions)...* There is a provision to work through NGOs. The Government has proposed to include NGOs among its keeping agencies. This is a method to retrieve from its own responsibility. I am opposing it. I am submitting the example of Anganwadis work given to NGOs. I would like to say that the experience is not good. There is a provision in the Guidelines that contractors should not be allowed under this Scheme. I firmly believe, when you allow NGOs, contractors would come from the backdoor. If we allow NGOs, contractor will go there. My experience says that many contractors are working under this Scheme through NGOs.

Sir, now, I come to the status of the Programme Officer in relation to Panchayat. I think it is ambiguous. So, I would like the hon. Minister to clarify the position. What is the role of the Programme Officer under this Scheme?

Now, I come to monitoring. Sir, my friend, Mr. Narayanasamy also spoke about monitoring. And, Shri Venkaiah Naidu also spoke about the system of monitoring. There is a Guideline. According to this, 2 per cent work will

be inspected by the State-level officer, 10 per cent by the district-level officer and 100 per cent work will be inspected by the block level officer. But, it is not being done. It is not happening in every State. It is not happening throughout country. Sir, this 2 per cent, 10 per cent is only a story. No district-level or State-level or State-level officer is going to the ground level and inspecting what is happening there. So, monitoring system has to be accurate and it should be monitored strictly at different levels. Sir, it is a Central Government Contributory Scheme. But, what is the role of Members of Parliament? Is there any say for MPs? There is no say for the Members of Parliament in this Scheme. I have seen the Note that has been circulated by the Ministry of Rural Development through Internet. There is a sentence in that. It says, "Members of Parliament should inspect the situation of the work." How to inspect it? What is the mechanism? Sir. Members of Parliament go to villages and inspect, but with what authority? I request the hon. Minister to clarify this point.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Mr. Hassan, please try to conclude.

SHRI MOINUL HASSAN: Sir, another point raised here is about application. How a common man or woman apply? He or she has to apply by saying, 'I have a Job Card. So, please give me employment within 15 days of my application.' At the same time, there is also a provision for oral application. With your kind permission, I would say that ail the oral requests are not entertained. All the oral requests are refused. I have seen in the website which says what is not *to* be done, and there is a sentence, 'refusal of oral application in any circumstances not to be done: But, in every case, throughout the country, oral application is refused. Oral application is a *Very* good thing. Sir, *anpadh* women are coming and asking for work. There is also an inordinate delay in verification. I am submitting my application today and within fifteen days the authorities will have to tell me whether I am eligible. But, they are taking time. It is also not in favour of common people of our country.

Sir, 40 per cent material component will be there. What is the material component? At many places it is wheat and at many places it is rice. I would say that the FCI is supplying wheat or rice at many places. Many-a-time, we have raised this question before this august House that wheat and rice supplied by the FCI is not fit for human consumption. It is impossible

for human beings to consume them. I wish to ask and would like to know from the hon. Minister as to what is to be done in this regard.

Sir, awareness is a very important thing. We should do something on awareness. Everybody should know what it is. So, I would like to say — my time is very short — that it is a very important scheme; it should be properly implemented so that the common man is benefited from this scheme. With these words, I conclude, Sir.

SHRI P.G. NARAYANAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it gives me great pleasure that the House is discussing the implementation of the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, within a few years of its implementation. It is a scheme which, if properly implemented, would definitely wipe out poverty in rural areas. But, I would like to point out that this scheme is not being implemented properly. Despite the introduction of this scheme, we see that farmers are committing suicide on a large scale in Andhra Pradesh, Maharashtra, Kerala and Karnataka. The Government should intensify the implementation of the scheme in the distress-prone areas. The implementation of the scheme in Tamil Nadu has been tardy. The implementation has been ineffective because of the Assembly and the civic elections. Moreover, allotment of funds for Tamil Nadu is hardly a fraction of the amount spent in other States, like Uttar Pradesh and Bihar. The Centre is hitherto discriminating Tamil Nadu. We have certain districts in Tamil Nadu, like Dharmapuri and Ramanathapuram, where conditions of the people are worse than those in Bihar or Orissa. I would like to urge the hon. Minister to implement this • scheme in a big way in these two districts of Tamil Nadu. The Dharmapuri and Ramanathapuram districts have no industry. There is no agriculture because there is no irrigation facility. Poverty and unemployment in these two districts are rampant. So, I urge upon the Central Government to allot more funds to these two districts so that the problems of farmers are taken care of Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Now, Shri Arjun Kumar Sengupta. Your time is seven minutes.

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA(West Bengal): Mr. Vice Chairman, Sir, this is a very major subject, which has come up today, especially when our country is growing at the rate of 8 to 9 per cent, and, probably, it will reach 10 per cent, a growth which does not see much of increase in

jobs, much of reduction in poverty. In that particular scenario, this scheme is really a beacon light. It was introduced by this Government. The credit should go to a few leaders of this Government and the congress President. Of course, when it was adopted, there was a unanimous support. We should not forget that the Standing Committee, which looked into this, was chaired by Shri Kalyan Singh. So, there was a national consensus behind this. Unfortunately, the experience that we have of operation of the Scheme in the last few months shows that it is not working properly. There are plenty of newspaper items and reports. I do not have to tell it to the Minister, who is one of the most dynamic Ministers of this Government, that this Scheme is not working properly. There are areas where registration has not been done properly and the family has not been defined properly. Among the registered households, the number of job cards issued is very small. In Maharashtra, — Shri V. Narayanasamy was very keen to talk about the different States run by different Government—job cards issued as a proportion of registered households is only 12 per cent. Then, there are areas where there is dismal performance. Women families do not get registered. They do not get jobs. They do not get proper wages that have been announced. In fact, most of the examples of wages show that the wages that are given are far below the minimum wages. I am saying all these things because these are known to the Minister. I am not telling any new story to the Minister. These are all known stories. The question is: What should be done? i am one of those persons, Mr. Minister, like you, who would like to see that the job is done. It is true, -- Mr. Venkaiah Naidu pointed out what should be the budgetary allocation --I was one of the supporters from the very beginning and a protagonist that full budgetary support should be provided, which is about Rs. 30,000 crores, over a period of time. But only Rs. 6,000 crores have been provided this year. Whatever may be the reasons; let us see whether we have done the best job as we could do of these Rs.6,000/- crores. Unfortunately, the results show that we have not been able to do the job that we were expected to do. There are many reasons for that. One of the reasons that has been pointed out is -- again I must quote Shri Venkaiah Naiduji --that the Gram Sabhas are supposed to be the principal instruments to work out the programme. But in many areas, Gram Sabhas do not exist. They meet only once a year or once in six months. And the Gram Pradhans are supposed to work out the programme. They are not functioning independently. More often than not, and, as a matter of fact, mostly, these are left to the District Collectors. And the District Collectors mean that it is a top down kind of a job that goes on. Most of the problems that have been raised are known to these District Collectors. Now, what should we do? Can there be a method to check this? Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, let me point out that a model has been suggested by the Congress President in the

meeting of the World Forum. When people were talking about public-private partnership, she raised this issue of public civil society partnership in the case of social development programmes. This, I am afraid, has not been taken into account fully by our Government. I would like to tell Mr. Raghuvansh Prasadji — Because all NGOs are under him — that this is an initiative that can be taken by him. Now, I am mentioning this thing because this is a new way of, what we call, monitoring a programme, what we call a programme that has to be implemented at the grassroots, and we should get results of the implementation back to the Government. And, here, the NGO community, and the civil society organisations can play a very major role. I am saying it because, unlike the public-private partnership that we talk about in the World Bank and in other forums, here, we do not have to spend any money because the civil society organisations only want that their voice should be heard and that you should respond to what they are saying. They would go to different places, and tell that this is not working, that in Sabarkantha area women do not get registered, that in different districts of Orissa there are plenty of cases where people are completely denied jobs. In Jharkhand there are areas where tribals are ignored. These stories are coming back. Just listen to them. Take the opportunity of getting that information and do something immediately in that particular field. What can we do in that field? What we can do, again I would like to quote Shri Venkaiah Naiduji, is to establish a strict mechanism of penal provisions. If a person or an institution or a particular office is found to be responsible for not doing the job, not working out the Scheme properly, they should be thoroughly and strictly reprimanded. In other words, Sir, there has to be a mechanism now where people from the grass-root organisations should be able to report back to the Government, and the Government should be able to respond to that immediately in different areas so that the persons, the organisations and the institutions responsible for not following up a particular provision should be held up. I am suggesting this because only a dynamic personality can provide a mechanism like that. This would be a new way of establishing a different kind of partnership, which is absolutely essential in a social-development programme, because the social development programmes are grass-root programmes. These programmes cannot be, under any circumstances, implemented on a top-down approach. However much you try, however much you have the Budgetary provisions, unless at the grass-root levels, there are feedbacks, there are mechanisms of control, there are mechanisms of actual verification, you will not be able to get the results. We are getting this story from many people, they have mentioned the name of Mr. Jean Dreze who is one of the principal authors of this. The civil society organisations have been to different parts of the country, and have given absolutely pinpointed diagnosis that this is not working out. I want to know-what is this Government ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Please conclude.

SHRI ARJUN KUMAR SENGUPTA: There has to be a mechanism to do this thing. Why I am putting in this way, Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, is that let us not now bother about who is to be blamed, which Party is doing this thing, and which Government is taking credit; the people of India are not fools. They would know who is doing this thing; how this whole thing has come about. But please see that it is, actually, implemented. In order to do that, you have to have a mechanism of monitoring; you have to have a mechanism of reprimanding; and you have to have a mechanism of taking immediate action when you get the results not intended. Thank you very much.

प्रो. राम देव भंडारी : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं ग्रामीण विकास मंत्री जी को पुनः बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि जो देश के ग्रामीण क्षेत्र हैं और जो ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में रहने वाली 70 प्रतिशत आबादी हैं, उनके लिए उन्होंने सदन में राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण रोजगार गारंटी योजना कानून पास किया है।

महोदय, जिस समय यह कानून पास हुआ, तो पूरे देश ने इसका स्वागत किया। माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी को, UPA की Chairperson श्रीमती सोनिया गांधी जी को और माननीय मंत्री श्री रघुवंश प्रसादजी को बधाइयाँ मिली। ऐसा लगा कि जो ग्रामीण अर्थव्यवस्था है, वह धीरे-धीरे बहुत कमजोर होती जा रही है और ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों में रहने वाले लोग चाहे किसान है, मजदूर हैं छोटे-छोटे कामगार है, उनकी बेरोजगारी को दूर करने के लिए, उन्हें एक मजबूत सम्बल प्रदान करने के लिए UPA की सरकार ने एक बहुत अच्छा कानून बनाया। महोदय, अच्छे से अच्छा कानून बने, अच्छी से अच्छी योजनाएं बनें और इनका सफलतापूर्वक इम्प्लीमेंटेशन हो यह ज्यादा महत्वपूर्ण है। जो इम्प्लीमेंटेशन मशीनरी होती है, उसकी दृढ़ इच्छाशक्ति, जनता के प्रति जो जवाबदेही है, जो दायित्व है, जो निष्ठा और ईमानदारी होनी चाहिए। सेवा और समर्पण की भावना होनी चाहिए, यह इस बात पर निर्भर करता है कि कानून का लाभ जनता तक कैसे पहुंचेगा? कई राज्यों ने इसे सीरियसली लिया है, गंभीरतापूर्वक लिया है, मगर कई राज्यों ने इसे रूटीन वर्क जैसे लिया है। यही कारण है कि इतनी महत्वपूर्ण योजना का सही ढंग से इम्प्लीमेंटेशन नहीं हो रहा है। कई माननीय सदस्यों ने पारदर्शिता की बात की, करप्शन की बात की, रजिस्ट्रेशन नहीं हो रहे हैं, जॉब कार्ड नहीं बन रहे हैं, जॉब कार्ड्स, जो फ्री मिलने चाहिए, उसके लिए पैसे लिए जा रहे हैं तो राज्य सरकारें, चाहे किसी भी पार्टी की सरकार हो, उनकी जवाबदेही बनती है। नायडु साहब फंड की बात कर रहे थे। फंड की आवश्यकता है, मगर जो फंड केन्द्र सरकार की ओर से राज्य सरकारों को दिया जाता है, उसका भी पूरा उपयोग हो और सदुपयोग हो, यह जवाबदेही राज्य सरकारों की होती है। कई राज्य सरकारें इसका निर्वहन कर रही हैं। मगर कई ऐसी राज्य सरकारें भी हैं, जो इसका पालन नहीं कर रही हैं। मैं यह कोई आलोचना करने के उद्देश्य से नहीं बोल रहा हूँ। मैं बिहार सरकार के बारे में चर्चा करना चाहूंगा कि बिहार सरकार में जो फंड गया है, उसके यूटिलाइजेशन की क्या

स्थिति है। महोदय, बिहार में अड़तीस जिले हैं और अड़तीस जिलों में से तेईस जिलों को माननीय रघुवंश प्रसाद जी ने इस योजना के तहत लिया है। वहां 77,55,942 परिवार हैं। इसमें से 34,35,882 बी.पी.एल. परिवार हैं। महोदय, रजिस्ट्रेशन की स्थिति यह है कि पूरे बी.पी.एल. परिवारों का भी अभी तक रजिस्ट्रेशन नहीं हुआ है। सिर्फ 29,66,005 फैमिलीज का अभी तक रजिस्ट्रेशन हुआ है। इसमें से 20,37,604 फैमिली को जॉब कार्ड्स मिले हैं। बिहार में एक मठिनाई यह भी है कि जितने ब्लॉक्स हैं, सभी ब्लॉक्स में बी.डी.ओ. नहीं है। पंचायतों में जो जन सेवक होते हैं, ग्राम सेवक होते हैं, पंचायतों में उनकी भी बहुत कमी है। एक-एक बी.डी.ओ. दो-दो तीन-तीन ब्लॉक्स का इंचार्ज है। एक-एक जन सेवक दो-दो, तीन-तीन पंचायतों का इंचार्ज है। जिस उद्देश्य से ग्राम स्व-राज्य की कल्पना की गई है, उस उद्देश्य से पंचायतों को स्वतंत्र रूप से काम नहीं करने दिया जाता है। जो प्रखंड विकास अधिकारी है, एक प्रकार से उनका पंचायतों पर, पंचायतों में जो मुखिया होते हैं, उन पर दबदबा होता है और वे जिस तरह से चाहते हैं, उस तरह से काम करा लेते हैं। महोदय, बिहार में अभी तक जो पैसा गया है मैं आपको बता रहा हूँ कि कुल मिलाकर अभी तक 957,32,76,000 पैसा गया है। खर्च कितना हुआ है? खर्च 215,43,39,000 हुआ है, अर्थात् 22.50%। महोदय, जब बिहार में राष्ट्रीय जनता दल की सरकार थी, उस समय जो हमारी विरोधी पार्टी के लोग थे, वे चार-पांच नारा लगाया करते थे कि बिहार में "जंगल राज" है, एक यह बात थी कि कानून व्यवस्था ठीक नहीं है, विकास का काम नहीं हो रहा है, जो पैसा दे रहे हैं, वह पैसा सरकार खर्च नहीं कर रही है, पैसे का दुरुपयोग हो रहा है।

...(व्यवधान)...

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री प्रशांत चटर्जी) : टाइम भी कीमती है।

प्रो. राम देव भंडारी : सर, इतने कम समय में उनको तो बहुत समय मिला पैसा खर्च करने के लिए मुझे तो थोड़ा समय मिला है बोलने के लिए। ऐसी स्थिति में मैं अपने मित्रों से पछूना चाहता हूँ कि अब तो वहां आपकी सरकार है और ऐसी सरकार है कि रोज घोषणाएं होती हैं। श्री रघुवंश जी ने तो 23 जिलों को लिया है और बिहार सरकार कहती है कि 38 जिलों को लिया है, बाकी जो जिले हैं, उनमें वे अपनी योजनाएं लागू करेंगे।

महोदय, केन्द्र सरकार से जो पैसा गया है, उसका भी दुरुपयोग हो रहा है, सदुपयोग नहीं हो रहा है, फिर आप रोज ये जो ऐलानी घोषणाएं करते हों, उनको आप कहां से पूरा कर पाओगे? महोदय, घोषणाओं से सरकार नहीं चलती है, सरकार काम से चलती है और काम की जो स्थिति है, वह मैंने आपको बताई है और संक्षेप में इसकी जानकारी दी है।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Please try to conclude.

प्रो. राम देव भंडारी : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं conclude कर रहा हूँ। ग्रामीण अर्थव्यवस्था को मजबूत करने के लिए विभिन्न सरकारों के समय में कई योजनाएं चलती रही हैं, मगर फिर भी बड़े पैमाने पर ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों के लोग पलायन करके बड़े शहरों में जा रहे हैं। अभी जब बिहार में नीतीश जी की सरकार बनी थी, तो उन्होंने कहा था कि मैं निमंत्रण दे रहा हूँ पूरे देश में कि जहां-जहां बिहार के मजदूर पलायन करके चले गए हैं, वे वापस आएँ, मैं उनको रोजगार दूंगा। अब तो एक वर्ष से

ज्यादा हो गया है उस सरकार को और उनकी घोषणाएं भी अब पुरानी पड़ती जा रही हैं, लोग उनको भूलते चले जा रहे हैं, क्योंकि जो यहां है, उनको हम रोजगार नहीं दे पा रहे हैं। केन्द्रीय सरकार की तरफ से फंड की व्यवस्था है। मैं कहना चाहूंगा कि राज्य सरकारों को इस संबंध में गंभीर होना चाहिए। मॉनिटरिंग की व्यवस्था सेंट्रल लेवल पर भी होनी चाहिए। हमारे माननीय सांसद कह रहे थे कि एम.पी. लोगों को भी इसमें involve करना चाहिए। स्थिति यह है कि जहां विरोधी दल की सरकार है, वहां जो centrally sponsored schemes हैं, उनके कार्यक्रम में अपनी पार्टी के एम.पी.को एम.पी. लोगों को बुलाया जाता है। योजना का शिलान्यास होता है, उदघाटन होता है, मगर स्थिति यह है कि विरोधी दल के एम.पी. लोगों को सूचना भी नहीं होती है कि centrally sponsored schemes का शिलान्यास हो रहा है या कार्यान्वयन हो रहा है इसलिए कोई ऐसा mechanism निश्चित रूप से सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट को बनाना चाहिए कि सांसदों को कार्यान्वयन में involve किया जा सके। जो centrally sponsored schemes हैं..... अभी कमेटियां हैं, जिले में उन्होंने कमेटी बनाई गई है, लेकिन जो जिले का पदाधिकारी होता है, वह डिक्टेटर होता है। आप अगर जिले के पदाधिकारी से टेलीफोन पर बात करना चाहेंगे, मैं नहीं जनता हूँ कि दूसरी स्टेट्स में क्या हालत है, अगर हमारे यहां आप जिले के पदाधिकारी से टेलीफोन पर बात करना चाहेंगे और अपना नंबर छोड़ देंगे, तो कभी भी वह call back नहीं करता है। इसलिए जो भी योजनाएं ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों के विकास के लिए और प्रगति के लिए बनी हैं, उनके employment के लिए जो कानून बना है, यह बहुत ही अच्छा कानून है, सभी लोगों ने इसकी प्रशंसा की है, लेकिन जो implementing सरकारें हैं, उनको बुलाकर माननीय मंत्री जी, उनके बात करें और कुछ पूछें कि क्या कठिनाई हैं ...**(व्यवधान)**...

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Please, conclude.

श्री राम देव भंडारी : मंत्री जी उनसे कुछ कि क्यों नहीं implementation हो रहा है, क्यों नहीं आपके यहां job card बन रहा है। क्यों आपके यहां corruption हैं, आपके यहां पारदर्शिता क्यों नहीं हैं? इनको राज्य सरकारों पर थोड़ा सा दबाव बनाना पड़ेगा और यह जो केन्द्रीय सरकार की बहुत ऐतिहासिक और महत्वपूर्ण योजना है, उसका सफलतापूर्वक पालन होगा। बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN(SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Thank you. Shri Rajeev Shukla.

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, भंडारी जी राष्ट्रीय जनता दल के हैं लेकिन बोले बिहार जनता दल जैसे।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN(SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): The Minister would reply to that.

श्री राजीव शुक्ल : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि इस स्कीम को लेकर किसी किस्म की राजनीति होनी चाहिए, क्योंकि यह नेकनीयती से लागू की गई स्कीम है, जिससे गांवों के

4.00 P.M.

उन गरीब लोगों को रोजगार देने की बात है, जो न केवल गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे हैं, बल्कि जो सालों-साल रोजगार के लिए भटकते रहते हैं। आज किसी संसद सदस्य से पूछिए कि उसके पास सबसे ज्यादा कौन लोग आते हैं, तो वे बताएंगे कि उनके पास लोग नौकरी के लिए आते हैं, वे नौकरी वालों से तंग रहते हैं। खास तौर से हमारे ऐसे ससंद सदस्य, जो रूरल इलाकों से आते हैं, उनको सबसे ज्यादा दिक्कत का सामना करना पड़ता है। अगर हम कहें कि उस दिशा में छोटा-मोटा भी प्रयास किया गया है, तो इसकी सराहना करनी चाहिए, बजाए इसके कि हम इसको आलोचना का केन्द्र बिन्दु बनाएं...(व्यवधान)... अपने वैकैया नायडु जी को समझाइए, वहीं तो इस चीज को शुरू कर रहे हैं कि सिर्फ 150 जिलों में लागू किया जाए, यह 200 जिलों में लागू हुआ है...(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE) : Let him speak.
You can reply when your turn comes ... (Interruptions)...

श्री राजीव शुक्ल : इतने बड़े देश के लिए, जहां इतने बेरोजगार हैं, जो भी प्रयास किया जाए, मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि हम यह समझे कि यह पर्याप्त है। मान्यवर, इस दृष्टि से मैं मंत्री जी को इस मामले में सीधे-साधे पांच-छः सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ।

सबसे पहले यह कि इसमें **transparency** कायम करनी चाहिए, इसमें पारदर्शिता लानी चाहिए, ताकि जितनी शिकायतें, जहां से जिन राज्यों से आ रही हैं, उनमें यही आ रही हैं कि एक तो सही व्यक्तियों का चयन नहीं होता, समय पर स्कीम लागू नहीं होती है और ब्यूरोक्रेसी और नीचे के सरकारी अधिकारी और ग्राम प्रधान मिल कर गड़बड़ियां कर रहे हैं। इसलिए **transparency** कायम करने के लिए उन्हें एक व्यवस्था करने चाहिए। मेरा उनको सुझाव है कि वे कोई ऐसी **monitoring agency** लगाएं, जो **district level** पर काम करे और वह **monitoring agency** उनको **follow-up report** देती रहे। उस हिसाब से वे लगातार राज्य सरकारों को अवगत कराते रहें और राज्य सरकारों को वे कार्रवाई के लिए कहते रहे, क्योंकि मान्यवर, **rural development** के लिए हर जिले में एक कमेटी बनाई गई थी, जिसमें एमपीज अध्यक्ष होते थे और डिस्ट्रिक्ट मैजिस्ट्रेट होते थे। मेरा अपना अनुभव है कि 6 साल में मुझे एक बार भी इस मीटिंग में नहीं बुलाया गया। उसकी बैठक ही कभी नहीं होती, क्योंकि कलेक्टर **rural development** का हिसाब-किताब देने से घबराते हैं, वे नहीं होते हैं। इसलिए यह बात सही है कि इसमें ब्यूरोक्रेसी बहुत गड़बड़ियां करती है। इसलिए एक ऐसी कोई कमेटी बने किसी की भी कमेटी बनाएं, जिससे हर महीने, दो महीने, तीन महीने पर इसकी **accountability** लेकर वे इसे लागू कराएं।

दूसरी शिकायत जॉब कार्ड के बारे में है कि तीस-तीस दिन तक जॉब कार्ड नहीं बनते हैं। उस जॉब कार्ड को कम से कम 15 दिन में इश्यू करने की बात थी। उसको 15 दिन में जॉब कार्ड इश्यू कर देने चाहिए, वरना गरीब आदमी कलेक्टर या तहसील स्तर पर बार-बार भटकता रहता है। उसके भटकने की स्थिति नहीं आनी चाहिए।

तीसरी एक important चीज हैं। मैं मंत्री जी को एक सुझाव देना चाहता हूँ कि इस Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme के जरिए हमें गांवों में permanent assets create करने की कोशिश करनी चाहिए। अभी ऐसा हो रहा है कि कुछ इस तरह के काम होते हैं कि एक बारिश आई और वे बह जाएंगे या वे स्थाई नहीं रह पाएंगे। इसमें permanent assets का भी काम शुरू होना चाहिए। स्कूल बनाना, पंचायत घर बनाना और भी तमाम तरह के बारात घर बनाना, सामूहिक घर बनाना या वृद्धाश्रम बनाना, इस तरह के काम, जिनसे permanent assets, स्थाई सम्पत्तियां बन सकें, यह काम भी मंत्री जी को करना चाहिए।

Awareness level की बात आई थी। मैं वेंकैया नायडु जी से बिल्कुल सहमत हूँ कि हमें लोगों को awareness के लिए थोड़ा सा और बताना पड़ेगा। इसके लिए बहुत जरूरी होगा, वे सच कह रहे थे कि एक बोर्ड लगवा दिया जाए कि इतना पैसा इस काम के लिए इस गांव को दिया गया, तो फिर ग्राम पंचायत और ग्राम प्रधान दोनों उत्तरदायी होंगे कि उस पैसे को क्यों नहीं खर्च किया जा रहा है। वह सुझाव अच्छा है, मेरे ख्याल से मंत्री जी को उसे लेना चाहिए।

इसमें एक बात यह है कि डीएम और बीडीओ, ये दोनों इसे directly execute, implement करने के लिए जिम्मेदार होते हैं। कई जगह इन लोगों के बारे में सबसे ज्यादा शिकायतें हैं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि ये सब चीफ मिनिस्टर के हाथ में होते हैं, राज्य सरकारों के हाथ में होते हैं। उनको यह करना चाहिए कि डीएम और बीडीओ से सीधे-सीधे रिपोर्ट मंगाए, हर गांव की रिपोर्ट लें, क्योंकि अभी तो यह 200 जिलों में है, अगर यह स्कीम आगे बढ़ेगी तो यह सारी जगह जाएगी। अगर हमने इसके लिए पहले से कोई सिस्टम नहीं बनाया, तो हमें बहुत मुश्किल आ जाएगी।

एक बात यह आई कि इसमें पैसा कम दिया जा रहा है। मेरे ख्याल से भारत सरकार के पास जितना पैसा है, वह देने की कोशिश कर रही है, भारत सरकार इसमें 90 प्रतिशत पैसा देती है। राज्य सरकारों को सिर्फ 10 प्रतिशत देना होता है। बाकी यह जो पैसे का गुणा-भाग है, वह मान्यवर रघुवंश बाबू से ज्यादा कोई नहीं जानता, वे तो mathematics के प्रोफेसर हैं और by his joining politics, I think we have lost of the finest professors of mathematics in the country वे अंकगणित का ज्यादा हिसाब-किताब लगा सकते हैं। कहां कितने पैसे की जरूरत है ... (व्यवधान) ... Rural-development is more important than the Finance Ministry.

मान्यवर, अब इसमें एक बात आई कि इस बहस की जरूरत क्यों पड़ी। इस बहस की जरूरत इसलिए पड़ी कि शिकायतें बहुत आ रही हैं। मैं कोई राजनीति में नहीं पड़ना चाहता हूँ कि उन-उन राज्यों से आ रही हैं, जहां पर कांग्रेस की सरकार नहीं है और दूसरे राज्यों से आ रही है, जहां पर कांग्रेस की सरकार नहीं है। जो रिपोर्ट आई है, भारत सरकार को भी मिली है, उसमें सभी राज्यों के

नाम हैं। लेकिन ज्यादातर शिकायतें, मैं अलग-अलग नहीं पढ़ना चाहता हूँ, क्योंकि सब कागजों पर है, मध्य प्रदेश से बहुत ज्यादा शिकायतें हैं, झारखंड से हैं, राजस्थान से हैं, छत्तीसगढ़ से कम हैं, छत्तीसगढ़ से दो हैं, बिहार व उत्तरांचल से भी शिकायतें हैं, उड़ीसा से शिकायत हैं, महाराष्ट्र से हैं, मध्य प्रदेश की टक्कर में उत्तर प्रदेश से बहुत ज्यादा शिकायतें हैं। त्रिपुरा से सिर्फ एक शिकायत हैं। इसलिए ऐसा नहीं है, सभी राज्य हैं और वहां अलग-अलग सरकारें हैं। मुझे लगता है कि मध्य प्रदेश और राजस्थान को इस स्कीम पर विशेष रूप से ध्यान देना होगा। श्री वेकेंया नायडु जी ने आंध्र प्रदेश की आलोचना की और जीन ड्रेज को कोट किया। महोदय, जीन ड्रेज ने खुद लिखा है, मैं उसे कोट कर रहा हूँ। In this context, recent efforts in Andhra Pradesh deserve to be closely observed. It is not just that the Government of Andhra Pradesh has taken pioneering steps to prevent corruption under the NREGS, such as the payment of wages through post offices and designing of sophisticated online reporting system. There have also been interesting public initiatives to mobilise NREGS workers and involve them in the monitoring process. पता नहीं, उन्होंने कैसे पढ़ लिया। जीन ड्रेज की रिपोर्ट हमारे पास भी है। उस में लिखा है कि आंध्र प्रदेश में 98 परसेंट awareness है। महोदय, वह चले गए हैं, मैं उन्हें correct करना चाहता था, उन्होंने एक चीज और कही थी कि इस स्कीम को लागू करने में डेढ़ साल लगा दिया। मेरा उन से विनम्र निवेदन है कि जब उन के पास महाराष्ट्र का वर्ष 77 साल का मॉडल था, 6 साल तक सत्ता में थे और खुद रुरल डेवलपमेंट मिनिस्टर थे, चलो हम से डेढ़ साल लग गए, आप तो 6 साल तक लागू नहीं कर पाए। हमें आप डेढ़ साल का उलाहना दें रहे हैं। आप कम-से-कम अपना तो introspection करें। आप ने 6 साल तक क्यों नहीं लागू किया और हमें डेढ़ साल का उलाहना क्यों दे रहे हैं?

दूसरी बात, उन्होंने फोटो पर एतराज किया। मैं कहता हूँ कि इस पर किसी को एतराज नहीं है। चीफ मिनिस्टर्स अपनी फोटो लगाए, उस में कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता, लेकिन अगर सी.एम. अपना फोटो लगा रहा है तो पी.एम. की भी फोटो लगा दें। अकेले सी.एम. अपनी फोटो क्यों लगाते हैं या किसी की न लगाएं। फोटो के ऊपर आप का इतना जोर क्यों है, आप स्कीम पर फोकस करो ताकि स्कीम लागू हो जाए। मान्यवर, मुझे उड़ीसा की एक माननीय सदस्या बता रही थी कि वहां इस स्कीम को स्टेट की स्कीम बता दिया है और सब जगह प्रचार कर रहे हैं कि यह स्टेट की स्कीम है। मध्य प्रदेश में भी यही कर रहे हैं। यह तो लगत है। आप अपनी फोटो लगाओं, लेकिन पी.एम. की भी लगाओं। चलो दोनों की लगे, लेकिन स्कीम तो ईमानदारी से बताओं कि वह किस की है? मान्यवर, यह नियम बताते हैं कि स्कीम ईमानदारी से लागू की जा रही है। वहां स्कीम ईमानदारी से लागू की जा रही है, लेकिन पैसा कहां से आ रहा है, कहां से नहीं आ रहा है और यह कहते हैं कि फोटो कांग्रेस के नेताओं की लगाते हैं। मान्यवर, जब एन.डी.ए. की गवर्नमेंट थी तो क्या

श्यामा प्रसाद मुखर्जी के नाम से स्कीम लागू नहीं की थी, दीनदयाल उपाध्याय जी के नाम पर स्कीम लागू नहीं हुई थी? मुझे उस पर कोई आपत्ति नहीं है, लेकिन आप यह नहीं कह सकते कि "तुम्हारे बुरे और हमारे अच्छे"। सीधी बात है कि सब अच्छे हैं, सब के नाम पर होनी चाहिए। मैं इस पर कहां एतराज करता हूं।

श्री रुद्रनारायण पाणि : हमारे कम और आप के ज्यादा।

श्री राजीव शुक्ल : हम ने काम ज्यादा किया और योजनाएं ज्यादा लागू की। आप ने कम काम किया, इसलिए आप की कम हैं। साथ ही, आप आजादी के आन्दोलन में नहीं रहे, इसलिए आप के पास कुछ मान्यताओं की भी कमी है, आप के पास महानुभावों की कमी है। इस में हम क्या कर सकते हैं?

मान्यवर, एक इन्होंने मजाक बनाया। "कांग्रेस का हाथ, आम आदमी के साथ" के बजाए "कांग्रेस का हाथ विश्वासघात"। ऐसी बात नहीं है। अगर आम आदमी के लिए इस तरह की योजनाएं लागू की गयी, आम आदमी के लिए अगर यह रूरल एम्प्लायमेंट गारंटी स्कीम है, तो यह गांव के आदमी को रोजगार देने के लिए है। इस तरह की तमाम योजनाएं हैं। फिर हम भी कह सकते हैं "बी.जे.पी. का हाथ, पैसे वालों के साथ" क्योंकि उन्होंने सारे होटल्स मुफ्त में बेच दिए, **disinvestment** कर दिया। ये सारे पैसे वाले लोग हैं। तो अगर आप नारे बनाओगे तो हम भी नारे बनाएंगे। आप कहोगे, "विश्वासघात" तो हम कहेंगे "पैसे वालों के साथ, आप का हाथ।" तो वह नारे बनाने का **slanging match** हमारे व आप के बीच में नहीं होना चाहिए, खासकर जब कि इस तरह की आम आदमी और गरीब आदमी के लिए इस रोजगार गारंटी योजना पर बहस होती हो।

मान्यवर, हमारे मित्र यादव जी ने विषयांतर कर दिया था। उन्होंने भी कांग्रेस पार्टी पर आरोप लगाए। उत्तर प्रदेश में बेरोजगारी भत्ता सरकार देती है, कांग्रेस ने कुछ नहीं किया। उन्होंने आम लोगों के लिए किया, अच्छी बात है, हम स्वागत करते हैं। इस से आम लोगों का फायदा हो, बेरोजगार युवकों को भत्ता देना चाहिए। लेकिन ऐसी बात नहीं है, कांग्रेस सरकारें लगातार पूरी कोशिश करती रही हैं। अगर आप यह आरोप लगाते हैं कि आपने भत्ता नहीं दिया, तो भत्ता लेने का भी काम आप लोग करते हैं, वसूलने का काम भी आप लोग करते हैं, और फिर कुछ भत्ता देने का काम भी आप करते हैं। हम लोग भत्ता नहीं रोजगार देने का काम करते हैं, बेरोजगारी भत्ता देने में विश्वास नहीं करते हैं, हम रोजगार देने में विश्वास करते हैं, हम रोजगार देने में विश्वास करते हैं, बेरोजगारी भत्ता देने-लेने में विश्वास नहीं करते हैं।...(व्यवधान)... जी, क्या कह रही हैं आप?

डा.फारुक अब्दुल्ला (जम्मू और कश्मीर) : जया जी साफ कह रही हैं कि 40 साल अपने हुकूमत की है, लेकिन अनएंप्लायमेंट आज भी वैसी है।...(व्यवधान)...

SHRIMATI JAYA BACHCHAN (Uttar Pradesh): You are still discussing unemployment. *(Interruptions)*

श्री राजीव शुक्ल : अमरीका मे आज भी unemployment discuss हो रहा है। ...*(व्यवधान)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Mr. Shukla, you please talk about your point. *(Interruptions)* Mr. Shukla, you talk about your point. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRIMATI JAYA BACHCHAN: Forget America, talk about India. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAJEEV SHUKLA. Unemployment is a perpetual problem. Even you could not solve it in Uttar Pradesh. *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): You talk about your point.

SHRI RAJEEV SHUKLA: Unemployment is a permanent problem.

SHRIMATI JAYA BHACHCHAN: Sir, he is a permanent person who is always commenting on everybody, on every Government, etc. Please stick to your subject. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI RAJEEV SHUKLA: Why don't you ...*(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Mr. Shukla, you talk about your point.

SHRI RAJEEV SHUKLA. Madam, you are prodding me. I am not *(Interruptions)*... You are commenting on me. If somebody accuses my Government or somebody accuses my party, I have to reply. You .can't deprive... *(Interruptions)*...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE). You put your point. *(Interruptions)* You have only three minutes' time left. *(Interruptions)* You place your point. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI V NARAYANASAMY; Why are they interfering, Sir? *(Interruptions)*

प्रो. राम देव भंडारी : भाषण में तो नॉक-झोंक होती ही है, इसको सीरियसली नहीं लेना चाहिए।

श्री राजीव शुक्ल : मैं तो सीरियसली नहीं ले रहा, मैं तो मजाक करता हूँ । जया जी सीरियसली ले रही हैं ।

श्रीमती जया बच्चन : क्या सिर्फ मजाक करने का अख्तियार है।

SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE: He is addressing the Chair. (*Interruptions*)
You please continue. You have only three minutes left.

श्री राजीव शुक्ल : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, मेरे सिर्फ चार पाइंट है। लास्ट पाइंट मेरा यह है कि गवर्नमेंट को एनस्योर करना पड़ेगा कि ग्राम-पंचायतों में 50 प्रतिशत काम दिया गया या नहीं दिया गया ? जो कांट्रेक्टर्स को रोकने के प्रोविजन है, वे उन्होंने, डिस्ट्रिक्ट कलेक्टर ने लिए या नहीं लिए ? टेक्नीकल स्टाफ ने 15 दिन के अंदर जो कार्ड बनाने होते हैं, वे कार्ड उन्होंने बनाये या नहीं बनाये और 15 दिन के अंदर पेमेंट किया गया या नहीं किया गया? इन चार बातों की गारंटी रूरल डेवलमेंट मिनिस्टर को एनस्योर करनी चाहिए।

इसी के साथ, मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

THE VICE CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Now, Mr. Lalit Kishore Chaturvedi, you have six minutes. Please conclude within ten minutes. Please stick to the time

श्री ललित किशोर चतुर्वेदी (राजस्थान) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण रोजगार गारंटी योजना यू.पी.ए. सरकार की महत्वाकांक्षी योजना है। बहुत डिम-डिम बजाया था, जिस समय इसको प्रस्तुत किया गया था, किन्तु मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय को इसमें केवल दो-चार बिन्दु बताना चाहता हूँ जिनकी ओर आप ध्यान देंगे, तो आपको इस बात की जानकारी हो जाएगी। इस योजना की नींव वर्ष 1974 में ही स्वर्गीय मोहन धारिया जी ने रखी थी। जब वे थे, तो पहले उन्होंने महाराष्ट्र में और फिर सारे देश में न्यूनतम रोजगार गारंटी योजना के नाम से यह योजना प्रारंभ की थी, जिसमें 60 प्रतिशत मजदूरी और 40 प्रतिशत सामग्री, यही विषय रखा था। सभी सम्मानित सदस्य जानते हैं कि उसके अंदर अंतर्निहित विराधाभास थे, जो इसमें भी हैं। उसका हस्र क्या हुआ? यही हस्र इसका होगा, अगर आपने अंतर्निहित विरोधी बातों को समाप्त नहीं किया। यह बिन्दु नंबर एक है, जो आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ।

माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, जॉब-कार्ड मिल गए, ले लिए, लेकिन क्या उनको जांब, रोजगार भी मिले ? यह एक सवाल मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से जानना चाहता हूँ। यहां एक सवाल किया गया था तारांकित प्रश्न संख्या 157, जो 2 अगस्त, 2006 को किया गया था। उसके जवाब में बताया गया था कि 2,19,77,553 जॉब-कार्ड जारी किए गए और 68,86,729 रोजगार दिए गए। थोड़े दिन में उसमें और बढ़ोतरी हुई, जिसके अनुसार 2,54,73,820 जॉब-कार्ड जारी हुए। उसमें रोजगार दिया गया 83,05,930 को। एक तिहाई लोगों को जॉब कार्ड के आधार पर एम्प्लायमेंट दिया गया। कहा गया कि इसमें ऐप्लिकेशन दो। चर्चा की गई है प्रार्थना पत्र की। ओरली और

लिखित। आप जानते हैं कि ग्रामीण जनता कैसी है, यहां चर्चा हो गई। मंत्री महोदय, किसका डिढोरा पीट रहे हैं? एक तिहाई जॉब कार्ड मिलने वाले लोगों को रोजगार उपलब्ध करा रहे हैं, यह आपके द्वारा राज्य सभा के पटल पर 2 अगस्त को दिया गया उत्तर है। क्यों नहीं देना चाहिए रोजगार जिसको जॉबकार्ड मिल गया? 15 दिन में देने का आपने तय किया है। मैं तो कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस योजना की परिकल्पना ही दोषपूर्ण है, वह एक छलावा है। मैं आपका ध्यान आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूँ कि योजना किनको ऐड्रेस की जा रही है, जो या तो पूर्ण बेरोजगार हैं या अर्ध बेरोजगार है या **under-unemployed** हैं। यह पूर्ण रोजगार वालों को ऐड्रेस नहीं की जा रही है। आप 365 दिनों में 100 दिन रोजगार दे रहे हैं, ऐसे में वह व्यक्ति 265 दिन क्या खाएगा? आप उसको गरीबी से स्थायी रूप से बांध रहे हैं। इस पर विचार करिये। मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि इसका प्रत्युत्तर आप देंगे। गरीबी की रेखा के नीचे उन लोगों को रखा गया है जिनकी आय 12,500 रूपए प्रति वर्ष से कम है। एक दिन में 60,70 रूपए मिलते हैं तो एक साल में मिलेंगे 6,000 या 7,000 रूपए। ये क्या बातें कर रहे हैं आप? कितना रोजगार दे रहे हैं? एक ओर तो आप कह रहे हैं कि 12,500 रूपए की वार्षिक आय में, जो वार्षिक आय है गरीबी से नीचे वालों की, पेट नहीं भरता और दूसरी ओर आप एक व्यक्ति को 6,000 या 7,000 रूपए एक वर्ष में दे रहे हैं। आप चाहते हैं कि वह परिवार कभी गरीबी की रेखा से ऊपर नहीं आए, वहीं रहे, वे भूखें मरें, दो जून वे खाना नहीं खाएं। मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सर्वेक्षण किया गया है कि देश में सात से आठ करोड़ लोग बेरोजगार हैं, जिनमें से 75 प्रतिशत गांव में रहते हैं। आंशिक बेरोजगार भी 6 करोड़ लोग हैं। इसके अनुसार अगर आप कल्कुलेट करेंगे तो 200 जिलों 4 करोड़ से ज्यादा लोग होंगे। जॉब कार्ड कितने बने हैं? 3 करोड़। मैं तो स्पेसिफिक आंकड़े दे रहा हूँ। मैं माननीय मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहता हूँ कि 4 करोड़ से ऊपर लोग हैं, लेकिन जॉब कार्ड 3 करोड़ के बने हैं और एक तिहाई लोगों को आप रोजगार दे रहे हैं तो क्या बनेगा? यह क्या योजना है, कौन सी गरीबी आप दूर कर रहे हैं?

अभी-अभी यहां कहा गया कि गांवों में जानकारी का अभाव है। उत्तर प्रदेश के जिलों में 60 फीसदी लोगों की गांरटी स्कीम की जानकारी है, हरियाणा के महेन्द्रगढ़ जिले में केवल 52 फीसदी को जानकारी है, मध्य प्रदेश के सीधी जिले में 30 प्रतिशत लोगों को इस योजना की जानकारी है। अगर जानकारी की स्थिति यह होगी, तो इसका परिणाम देख लिया है आपने-जॉब कार्ड कितने बने, एम्प्लॉयमेंट कितने लोगों को मिला? आप प्रार्थना पत्र की चर्चा कर रहे हैं, जो बिल्कुल नहीं होनी चाहिए। पैसे वसूल किए जा रहे हैं, घूस ली जा रही है, दलित संगठनों की राष्ट्रीय कॉन्फ्रेंस उत्तर प्रदेश में हुई थी, उन्होंने कहा कि उनमें अफवाहें फैलाई जा रही हैं। ललितपुर जिले में सहरिया आदिवासी गांव में अफवाह फैला दी गई कि इस गांरटी स्कीम में तुमको इराक भेज दिया जाएगा। महिलाओं के आवेदन नहीं लिए जा रहे। एक जाति विशेष के लिए नहीं लिए जा रहे। माननीय मंत्री

महोदय मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इसकी पूरी जानकारी आप दीजिए और अफवाहें जो फैल रही है, उनको बंद करवाइए। भारतीय जनता युवा मोर्चा ने एक सर्वेक्षण किया था, रिपोर्ट मेरे पास है, मैं आपके पास भिजवा दूंगा। उस सर्वेक्षण में 200 जिलों में से 124 जिलों में घूसखोरी और भ्रष्टाचार की बात उभर कर आई है। माननीय मंत्री महोदय इस बात को देखने की कृपा करें।

जिन लोगों को काम मिल गया, वह तो सही है, किन्तु आपकी रोजगार गारंटी स्कीम में लिखा हुआ है कि बाकियों को रोजगार भत्ता दिया जाएगा, लेकिन आपने इसका भार भी राज्य सरकारों पर डाल दिया। जब राज्य सरकार पैसा मांगती है, तो आप पैसा नहीं देते हैं। जॉब कार्ड और रोजगार लेने वालों में जितना अधिक अंतर होगा यदि उतना भत्ता देना पड़ेगा, ऐसे में राज्य सरकार क्या देगी? यह योजना रियलिस्टिक नहीं है।

अभी माननीय शुक्ल जी ने ठीक कहा और हमारे इधर के सदस्य महोदय जी ने भी ठीक कहा। निर्माण कार्य के लिए 60% मजदूरी की बात कही गई है, अर्थात् 60% मजदूरी के लिए और 40% उसके लिए आवश्यक सामान के लिए। इससे क्या होगा? मुझे निर्माण मंत्री रहने का मौका मिला है, सिंचाई मंत्री रहने का भी मौका मिला है, अभी शुक्ल जी ने ठीक ही कहा कि केवल खड्डे खोदे जाएंगे और फिर भरे जाएंगे और जब बरसात आएगी, सारी मिट्टी बह जाएगी। आप इस बात पर विचार करिए। अगर आप योजना को सफल बनाना चाहते हैं और उसके अच्छे रिजल्ट चाहते हैं, तो परमानेंट कामों की दृष्टि से इस रेश्यों का हटाना होगा, इसे और बढ़ाना होगा। इस स्वयंसेवी संगठन ने(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Mr. Chaturvedi, please conclude. Your time is over.

श्री ललित किशोर चतुर्वेदी : महोदय, मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ और निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ, इन्होंने ठीक कहा। मैं यहाँ पर राज्य सरकार का नाम ही लेना चाहता हूँ लेकिन जब लोगों ने और राज्य सरकारों ने देखा कि इसमें इतना अधिक गैप हो गया है और उनको बेरोगजारी भत्ता भी देना पड़ता है, उन्होंने योजना के नाम के आगे से राष्ट्र का नाम हटा दिया, उसकी जगह राज्य का नाम लगा दिया। यहाँ पर मैं उनका नाम नहीं लेना चाहता हूँ जिससे कि उनकी क्रिटिसिज्म हो, किन्तु अगर आप बैलेंस नहीं रखेंगे, उन्हें इतना पैसा नहीं देंगे तो क्या होगा?

शायद आपको ध्यान होगा कि एक प्रमुख अर्थशास्त्र श्री विवेक देवराय हो गए हैं, उन्होंने कहा है कि आपने यह जो योजना बनाई है, इसके लिए 2,08,000 करोड़ रुपये की आवश्यकता है। एक तरफ प्रधान मंत्री कहते हैं कि पैसे की कमी नहीं आने दी जाएगी, दूसरी तरफ माननीय सदस्यों ने इस बात का निवेदन किया है कि फंड पूरा नहीं दिया जा रहा है (समय की घंटी) इसलिए मैं आपसे यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप इसका बैलेंस करिए और निश्चत रूप से व्यवस्था करिये

(समय की घंटी)... महोदय, मैं एक दो बिंदू और लूंगा(व्यवधान)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): You have already taken more time.

SHRI LALIT KISHORE CHATURVEDI: even then, I am giving separate points only. मुझे भी निर्माण कार्य करवाने का मौका मिला है, मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि जब निर्माण कार्य प्रारम्भ होता है, एक काम के लिए कम से कम 50 लोग होते हैं। एक निर्माण कार्य के लिए आवेदकों की संख्या 50 होनी चाहिए, 50 की संख्या का कारण यह होता है कि काम नहीं मिल पाता है, उतने लोग उस निर्माण कार्य के लिए नहीं होते। न तो उन लोगों के लिए काम चलाया जाता है और न ही उन लोगों को काम दिया जाता है, फलस्वरूप गैप हो जाता है और फिर वह भी आपने 2 प्रतिशत रखा है। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि आप उसे कैल्कुलेट करिए, क्या आपने 6 प्रतिशत से कम प्रशासनिक खर्च करने की कोशिश की? श्री शुक्ल जी ठीक कर रहे थे कि वहां पर बीडीओ नहीं हैं, ग्राम-सेवक नहीं है, नगर सेवक नहीं है, पोस्टिंग नहीं है, पोस्टिंग होगी कहां से, 20% प्रशासनिक व्यय में यह किसी भी तरह से नहीं हो सकती है।

मैं अंतिम दो बातें कह कर अपनी बात समाप्त करूंगा। आपने ग्राम पंचायतों को काम दिया, अभी शुक्ल जी ने शिकायतों का जिक्र किया, आपने शिकायतों को रफा-दफा करने का काम भी पंचायतों को दे दिया है। जो काम करवा रही है, वह अपील एथॉरिटी भी हो गई। इस बात को माननीय मंत्री महोदय देखने की कृपा करें। अपील अगर कहीं और जाए तो उसका निष्पादन हो। यह ब्यूरोक्रेसी के द्वारा नहीं होना चाहिए, चुनी हुई संस्थाओं के द्वारा इसे करवाएं जाने की आवश्यकता है।

अंत में आपसे यही निवेदन करते हुए मैं अपनी बात को समाप्त करूंगा कि योजना बहुत अच्छी है, केवल योजना को ठीक से चलाने की आवश्यकता है। इसे आप ठीक करिए, इम्प्लिमेंटेशन करवाइए, इसकी मॉनेटरिंग करिए, लोगों को लगाइए और जिस प्रकार की योजना बनी है, 100 दिन से काम मत चलाइए, कम से कम 200 दिन रखिए आप इस बात की चिंता करने की कृपा करें। मेरी बातों पर माननीय मंत्री महोदय, अवश्य ध्यान करेंगे, विचार करेंगे और अपने भाषण में उसका प्रतिउत्तर देने की कृपा करेंगे और जो यह ढोल पीटा गया था, वह ठीक रूप से कार्यान्वित हो। यही निवेदन करते हुए मैं अपनी बात को समाप्त करता हूँ।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Shri Gandhi Azad. You have three minutes. You can take five minutes. You complete within five minutes.

श्री गांधी आजाद (उत्तर प्रदेश) : धन्यवाद उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण गारंटी योजना

देश के दो सौ जिलों में फरवरी, 2006 से जब लागू की गई तो देश के गरीबों में एक खुशी की लहर दौड़ गई थी कि कम से कम साल के 365 दिनों में सरकार ने 100 दिन के रोजगार की गारंटी तो ली है और न्यूनतम मजदूरी 60 रूपए पाने की मजदूरों में काफी खुशी हुई थी। लेकिन खेद के साथ कहना पड़ा रहा है कि यह खुशी, यह आशा लोगों को निराशा के रूप में मिली, क्योंकि चयनित सभी जिलों में 100 दिन का रोजगार नहीं मिल पाया न्यूनतम 60 रूपए मजदूरी भी नहीं मिल करके कई प्रदेशों में केवल 30-35 रूपया ही मिला और शोषण के शिकार मजदूर होते रहे। दूसरे शब्दों में कहें कि भ्रष्टाचारी लोगों ने मजदूरों के मुंह का निवाला छीनने का काम किया पंचायत जॉब कार्ड भी सही-ढंग से नहीं बनने के कारण वहां भी रिश्तखोरी जारी है। समय पर मजदूरी का भुगतान नहीं किया गया है इसलिए यह मजदूरों की सारी आशा निराशा में बदल गई है। इसी कारण रोजगार गारंटी योजना का लाभ यदि गरीबों को पहुंचाना है तो हमें अमलीकरण की प्रक्रिया को पूरी ईमानदारी से लागू करने की जरूरत है। इसके लिए माननीय मंत्री महोदय, आपको सशक्त कदम उठाने की जरूरत है। इसके लिए माननीय मंत्री महोदय, आपको सशक्त कदम उठाने की जरूरत है। सरकार ने जब राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण रोजगार गारंटी योजना लागू की तो गरीबों को एक आस बंधी थी कि अब वे छले नहीं जाएंगे और उनके श्रम की उचित कीमत मिलेगी। लेकिन सरकार के नेक इरादों पर दलाल और सरकारी कारिन्दे पानी फेरने में लगे हुए हैं। मंत्री जी, इस कारण जरूरतमंद लोगों को रोजगार का लाभ नहीं मिल पा रहा है। इसलिए मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि सरकार को इस पर निगाह रखने की जरूरत है ताकि उनको लाभ मिल सके।

माननीय मंत्री जी, मैं आपसे जानना चाहता हूं कि इस योजना के क्रियान्वयन से ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों से शहरी पलायन रोकने की आशा की गई थी। इस योजना के लागू होने से शहरी पलायन में कितने प्रतिशत कमी आई है, कृपया यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे? साथ ही साथ देश में सामन्ती व्यवस्था के शिकार ज्यादातर भूमिहीन अनुसूचित जाति और अनुसूचित जनजाति के लोग होते हैं और इस योजना के लागू होने के बाद कितने प्रतिशत अनुसूचित जाति और अनुसूचित जनजाति के लोगों को रोजगार की बढ़ोतरी हुई है, कृपा करके यह भी बताने का कष्ट करें? क्या मंत्री जी, यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि न्यूनतम निर्धारित मजदूरी 60 रूपए सभी प्रदेशों में मिल रही है? यदि नहीं मिल रही है तो सरकार इसके लिए क्या कारगर उपाय कर रही है? अतः आशा ही नहीं मंत्री जी, आपसे भरोसा है, कि सिद्धांत अच्छा होते हुए भी यदि उसके अमल का कारगर उपाय नहीं है तो अच्छे से अच्छा सिद्धांत भी फेल जाता है, बेकार हो जाता है। माननीय मंत्री जी, आप जिस प्रदेश से आते हैं, ग्रामीण क्षेत्र से आते हैं, इसलिए आपसे आशा ही नहीं, भरोसा भी करते हैं कि आप इस अच्छे को सही रूप से अमली-जामा पहनाने का कोई कारगर उपाय जरूर करेंगे। इसी आशा और विश्वास के साथ, मैं अपनी बात को विराम देता हूं। धन्यवाद।

SHRIRAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, during

1980, I was a *Sarpanch* of a village. I was working as a *Sarpanch*. In those days, we used to have a programme called National Rural Employment Programme, NREER. The Gram Panchayats used to select the work and it was approved at the block level and we used to get the activity done in the village. Thereafter, a programme called Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme, RLEGP was taken up. The entire programme was funded by the Central Government. Subsequently, the programme was converted into Employment Assurance Scheme, EAS and later on into Jawahar Rozgar Yojana, JRY. During the regime of NDA, there was the National Food-for-Work Programme. The money involved is the same but the name of the programme was changed. There is nothing new. The only underlining factor is, they wanted to give a legal status to the programme. I would like to read the assurance given to the people. Of course, it was a post-poll alliance. The National Common Minimum Programme of the UPA Government says, "The UPA Government will immediately enact a National Employment Guarantee Act. This will provide a legal guarantee for, at least, 100 days of employment to begin with on asset-creating public works programme every year..." I don't know whether you are allowing people to create assets in villages. The hon. Minister has to explain it. It further says, "At minimum wages for at least one able-bodied person in every rural, urban poor and lower middleclass household." This is the promise made to the people after coming to office. What exactly is happening now? Nearly half of your tenure is over. You initially confined to 150 districts. Now the number is increased to 200 districts, I will straightaway come to my own State, Andhra Pradesh, wherein you had initially selected 9 districts and thereafter increased to 13 districts. I would like to cite the example of one district, that is the Chief Minister's own district, Cuddapah. Here the money sanctioned was Rs. 13 crores and the money spent was Rs. 2 crores. The total number of job cards issued to the people is 42,40,713. The work created on paper is for 7,55,000 people. There is a saying in my area that these job cards are in the hands of the middlemen. They are using them as ATM cards. Whenever money is required, they go to the Post Offices and draw the money. There is total mismanagement. There are a number of complaints. False muster rolls are being created. This was raised in the meeting of the District Planning Board. Then some inquiry was ordered. But no report has come out so far. We would like to request the hon. Minister to see that, at least, there is some mechanism to oversee the programme and there is redressal of

complaints. I am thankful to Shri Narayanasamy for mentioning this. For a moment, I thought that he was speaking from this side. According to him, Rs. 20/- are being charged, but according to me, Rs. 40/- are being charged. They were asked to open accounts in Post Offices. But there is no photograph on that. Anybody can go there and draw the money. Is it practically possible for a person who is illiterate to go to a Post Office after one week or ten days to draw the money? For doing that, he has to forego one full day. Please simplify the programme and see to it that it reaches the targeted people.

Coming to the local bodies,—I am thankful to my party that I could also serve in the Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly—in those days, when we were Sarpanchs in villages, we used to execute the work through the Gram Panchayats; no middlemen were there. Nowadays it has become a role model that only people, who are close to the ruling party or who work for the ruling party, would get work in the villages. This is the order of the day. There should be a check on this. I would like to know from the hon. Minister regarding complaints that have received. He should take some pains of explaining the details of the complaints received State-wise, the redressal of it and the action taken on them. Is there any provision to recover the money?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): The time is very short. Please come to the point.

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY: I am only touching upon the points. I am not making speeches.

Sir, there are written answers in this august House. My good friend, Shri M.V. Mysura Reddy, had put a question and the Government came out with figures and facts regarding the non-spending of money, and that too, the monies released to the States. Sir, to tell you about the job cards, in all, 3.19,79,000 job cards were issued in the country. But how much employment has been provided! Only one-third of the people have been provided with employment. If this is the status, then, there should be an evaluation of the programme. We should not use it just for publicity purpose, or, for the matter, just to get votes from the people, but it should be practically implemented. It should be useful to the nation. After all we are pooling money with contributions made by every individual of our country. So, looking at all the promises they have made in their NCMP—due to paucity

of time. I am not reading it out—and all that they have listed out as their one-year's achievement, they have only gone back on their promises and they have not kept their word. So, the programme needs a total evaluation. The programme needs a detailed fresh look. And, while simplifying the procedure, there should be mechanism for addressing the complaints. Thank you, Sir.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI PRASANTA CHATTERJEE): Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilania. You have been allotted six minutes.

DR. GYAN PRAKASH PILANIA (Rajasthan): Sir, I am grateful to you for your kind indulgence. I rise neither to criticise nor to censure, but to commend and compliment this very important and a historic and unique legislation, the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme which, for the first time, in some way, recognises the Right to Employment of the common man, the poorest of the poor, the villager, the farmer and the unemployed man, sitting in *Asli Bharat*. It was a great step forward, and we can call it a beacon light. It was a national consensus which prompted the Government to bring this legislation. This is a matter which should be discussed, rising above party lines, and everybody should make a very sincere effort that this scheme must succeed. If this does not succeed, it will be a dark day for the nation. There are many lapses, many shortcomings, which have been pointed out, which I am very sure would deserve the utmost kind consideration and attention of the hon. Minister. I come from a very backward State, a poor State, the biggest desert State of the country, having the largest land area of 10.4 per cent; I am speaking of Rajasthan. The population is 5.6 per cent of the nation, and the cattle population is the largest, but the surface water share, which Rajasthan has got, is only 1.16 per cent of the country. We have 12 desert districts out of a total of 32, covering 61.11 per cent of the total area of the State. Sir, I am putting before you my plight in a straightforward manner because I have here a very generous and kind Minister in the form of Shri Raghuvansh Prasad Singh who has had on many occasions lauded the effort of the State Government in implementing this very important piece of legislation in right earnest.

[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

I would like to put Shri Shukla also on the right lines by saying that Rajasthan is not one of those States which, yob can say, has been tardy in the implementation of this scheme. The hon. Minister will bear witness to what I am saying.

I would like to seize this occasion, my dear Sir, to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister that some kind of injustice has been done to the Rajasthan State in the coverage of districts. Out of 32 districts of Rajasthan, only six have been undertaken in this scheme, while according to the rationale or the guidelines laid down, counting the SC population, the ST population, per capita income, average wage of an agricultural labourer and the total productivity of agriculture in Rajasthan, we should have been given more districts. As the hon. Minister is a doyen of mathematics, I would like to put certain statistics for his kind consideration.

The total population of SCs and STs in Rajasthan is 29.8 per cent, while Andhra Pradesh has 22.8 and Maharashtra has 19.1. I am just illustrating the injustice which has been done. In Rajasthan, the per capita income is Rs. 15,485, while, in Andhra Pradesh, it is Rs. 20,757 and, in Maharashtra, it is Rs. 29,204. In spite of all this, in Rajasthan only six districts have been covered out of 32, while Andhra Pradesh, 13 out of 23; Maharashtra 12 out of 35; Bihar, 28 out of 38 districts. As far as the average employment demand is concerned, the hon. Minister will like to know that, in Rajasthan, for six districts, the demand was 12.47 lakhs, which, per district, comes to 2.08 lakhs as compared to Andhra Pradesh where the average for a district was 1.63 lakhs only, Maharashtra, where it was 0.33 lakhs only; and, Bihar, where it was 0.31 lakhs only. Looking to the generosity of the hon. Minister and his inclination to be just and fair, I will put forward a request again that now when a new dispensation is done, Rajasthan should get its due share in the total cake.

As far as the total scheme is concerned, I would not repeat the points, but I would like to point out one thing very specifically that until and unless regular monitoring machinery is laid down and a social audit is done, an audit by the people, and until and unless this scheme is made a people's movement, a kind of *lok jumbish*, a kind of *salaab*, we would not succeed. This is very, very important. And there is need for evaluation...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please conclude.

SHRI GYAN PRAKASH PILANIA: I will just stop, Sir. There is need for provision of facilities at worksites. There is need for removing the lack of awareness. There is need for adequate provision of administrative cost, as was pointed out by Shri Lalit Kishore Chaturvedi; instead of two per cent which is so meagre, it must, at least, be six per cent. Otherwise, there won't be people to look after this scheme.

As far as the Gram Sabha is concerned, it must be strengthened; it must be made a kingpin in the whole scheme. Otherwise, the scheme would not go down to the people. It won't have roots in the soil. And, as far as women are concerned, they need a place under the Sun. I know, Shri Raghuvansh Prasad Singhji has always been generous to womankind, and he will take care of it.

One point is very important, Sir. Uniform minimum wages for 8-hour work should be enforced throughout the country on a uniform scale. There may be more, it is all right. But, uniformity, at least, must be there. And last not least, there should be transparency, and there should be accountability. I know, these things are in the mind of the hon. Minister, but I just wanted to pinpoint them. Sir, I think that if all this is done, then, this Scheme will be a real scheme for *daridranarain*, for *aam admi* and for *asli Bharat*. And, that is what is the dream of all of us, that is the dream of all the parties and that is the dream of this august House. Thank you very much, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, now the time allocated to all the political parties and others is completely over. The hon. Minister has to go for a meeting of the Members of Parliament, which he has called. The hon. Minister has to complete his reply before that. Then, there is a statement by the Minister of External Affairs also. There are another six hon. Members who want to speak on this. I would request them not to take more than three minutes, so that we can conclude the discussion, and also have the reply of the hon. Minister today. Now, Shri K.P.K. Kumaran.

SHRI K.P.K. KUMARAN (Tamil Nadu): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, the National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme is one of the most compassionate poverty alleviation schemes introduced in free India. The most salient feature of this Scheme is that it couples compassion with productivity. The aim of the Scheme is to provide for the enhancement of livelihood security of the householders in rural areas. True to this, the Scheme provides, at least, 100 days of guaranteed wage employment, in every financial year, to every household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work. Thus, this Act aims at achieving social justice and economic justice as well as creating durable assets and strengthening the livelihood resource base of the rural poor. To do justice to the word 'rural', the authority for planning the schemes and implementing them has

been vested in the Panchayati Raj Institutions. All the three tiers are made equally responsible, and the Gram Sabhas have been given a lot of authority and responsibility. It depicts the importance of mass base of this Scheme. Sir, what we have to see now is whether this Scheme has yielded the desired results so far. Let us look at some of the complaints that are heaped on this Scheme. Firstly, the registration responsibility is now being entrusted with the Panchayat Union. The Union officials register only one individual's name per household which is against the provisions of the Act. Schedule II of the Act, in sections 1 and 2, ordains the registering authorities in unequivocal terms that all the adult members of every household who are willing to do unskilled manual work should be registered. So, the public should insist that the names of more than one person, per household, should be listed, which is a legally approved process. If the public are not aware of such a provision, they should be enlightened. Not only the public, even the Panchayati Raj officials need such an enlightenment.

Sir, not only the above-mentioned single provision of the Act, but also the whole of the Act is being kept beyond the knowledge of the public. So, an intensive publicity campaign is needed.

Sir, another complaint is about the choice of the season by the implementing authorities to undertake the works. They only want to choose the reason in which there is a heavy demand for daily wage labourers due to agricultural operations. At this time, even those who have registered for the Scheme would prefer to do their traditional work. Then, in this case, it is alleged that the officials record remarks to the effect that the registered persons are not prepared to join the workforce and forward to the higher authorities proposals for scrapping the scheme. This is against the spirit of the legislation. So, this allegation needs further investigation and rectification.

Sir, another common complaint is about the mode of payment of wages. It is alleged, again, that the officials insist on effecting the payment through banks, which is not possible for the rural unemployed poor. This is against the provision of the Act. It needs further investigation and rectification. Sir, a more serious allegation is that machines are creeping in their way into the works through contractors. Both of these culprits, *i.e.* machines and contractors are forbidden by the Act. In Schedule I, para 11, it is stated, "The Scheme shall not permit engaging any contractor for implementation of the projects under it."

Sir, para 12 reads, 'as far as practicable, the task funded under the scheme shall be performed by using manual labour and not machines.' All the works that are listed under the scheme are capable of being executed wholly by manual labour or partly by manual labour and partly by bringing into service machines. If the former method is used it may involve a few hundred man days whereas the latter method will finish off the entire matter in a single day. In short, mechanised operation of such manual labour oriented schemes will subvert the spirit of the scheme itself. Hence this hidden enemy should be rooted out at the earliest. The present rate of wage is fixed as Rs. 80/- per day. This may look very meagre when compared to the wages fixed for organised labour. But to be fair this rate is not utterly bad for the unskilled, unorganised sector that too in rural areas. But the real problem is that there is a ceiling in the matter of number of days per year per household irrespective of the number of persons registered in a family. This has been fixed at 100 days per year. This should be greatly increased. *(Time be!)* Before concluding, I have to mention that in Tamil Nadu only six districts have been chosen for Phase-I. I request that more districts in Tamil Nadu may be selected in the Phase-II so that the rural poor in our State may also benefit from this excellent scheme. Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Keshava Rao. You have only five minutes. ...*(Interruptions)*... Five minutes, not more than five minutes. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI K. KESHA RAO (Andhra Pradesh): Sir, I was wondering my maiden speech should pinch my conscience so much that I should speak for five minutes. ...*(Interruptions)*... Nonetheless if Chair wants it ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Is this your maiden speech?

SHRI K. KESHA RAO: Although I have spoken my words in wilderness during busy hours. Nonetheless Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, with all regard and respect to the Chair let me confess that I am not rising here with some kind of a prepared note ignoring reaction to the dogmatic approach that my friends have taken, more so, my friend who has been a former Rural Development Minister. He has been my colleague and so is my other very learned colleague who is from the TDP. They are witnessing a great revolution that is taking place, the interest that has started generating. First of all, let us understand that the scheme that we are talking about,

as one of the friends here said, is not one man scheme, it is people's scheme. It is not first time that we are trying to take up a scheme like this. We had not more than one, we had eight schemes which were of public schemes. Maharashtra you talked about, you talked about Rajiv Gandhi Yojana. All these schemes had come. What exactly new? Let not my advocate friend from TDP say that it has just brought in a new element of legality into it, a statutory backing. A statutory backing is what the society today wants. It is a crime to be born poor in this country and curse to be born. What exactly a poor man wants is, some kind of mechanism, a back up mechanism, which can guarantee him, which can monitor and tell him that this particular machinery is in place that will help him. That is exactly what has been tried in this Act. My friend say about the figures and photos being used. I would have used even, if he were a photogenic face I would have used Mr. Venkaiah Naidu's photo as was used during BJP and NDA time. But one who is pious does get a photo. In the rural India area from where my friend from TDP comes, that is one of the most backward districts of the country and one of the backward district in my State, he knows that 30 lakh people used to leave the places during a particular season for jobs. Today, it has come down geometrically down, although my friend would dispute it for the simple reason because he belongs to the other party and I belong to the ruling party. Now the question is not that. He has tried to quote from the figures. I do not want to quote figures because they may take time. I have certain figures about Andhra Pradesh where Kadapa has spend only two crores, it has been seven crores. I am not disputing at it at this particular stage but nonetheless whether we spend two crores or seven crore is not the matter. Let us first understand what exactly that what we are trying to talk. This, first of all, let us understand, is our right to life guaranteed under the Constitution and that guarantee has been supported by the Directive Principles where the right to life comes from right to work. What exactly is the work? Sixty per cent of our rural population lives in rural areas and sixty per cent of them are unemployed. Sir, 30 per cent are with unsustainable living conditions. I agree with Mr. Sen Gupta when he says this. When Mrs. Gandhi told, at a global forum, there need to be not only a public and private partnership, but also there is a need for public and State partnership. What exactly does it mean? this means, the public partnership that we are seeking is the partnership of all political parties. Public and civil society's partnership does involve the political functionaries to come up. Today, a new revolution

is taking place in my rural areas. I have a question here, Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir. The BJP, the Communist Parties, the Congress Party and the SP sent out a questionnaire to every household to find out whether they have availed of this Scheme. Can you show me one example after Independence, can you show my one example in this independent India, where the political system as such has come in so greatly into the field to sensitise the civil society? this time we are trying to take it up and trying to bring rural themes into that. I submit that today, in spite of the fact that 60 per cent of the people belong to the rural areas and 30 per cent being absolutely unemployed there and 60 per cent does not have a sustainable wage-level, yet, our Budgetary allocation for the agriculture has come down to 2 per cent. This is a sad plight. What exactly does it mean? Again, Sir, I submit to you that it is not any kind of alternative to the sustainable economic growth rate. It is not an alternative to that. It is only a supportive scheme, a supportive scheme that is trying to cover all those people about whom we have been talking about. We have been romanticising about them; no deal about it. Sir, I do agree that there might be lacunae. I know what Mr. Sen Gupta has said about the coverage of family. We all know that we have Ration Card in which a person living in a particular house also lives somewhere else. But, since the Ration Card he has is only one, he is not allowed elsewhere. Let me tell you that I am intervening spontaneously since I am an NREG activist. I am a social activist. I think my friend will bear me out. I think, I have gone not less than 100 villages where the Scheme is in place. I am not saying that all is good. But, a beginning has been made where the people really start thinking that they have a right to get the work, not because they are getting a right. We have all the schemes. I am not trying to blame them. But, this is a Scheme which has come out with a foolproof methodology to see that they stem out what was really bad earlier days. We did not have awareness earlier. We did not have any guarantee earlier. We did not have any estimate being done earlier. We did not have the right assets being supervised by Gram Panchayats earlier. Sir, 10 to 12 point have been raised by the Expert Committee. And, all these have been taken note of by the Bill which tried to answer. Now, it is for us, people in the civil society and the political system as such or the NGOs who are working, to take interest, as they are today taking interest, this would be a success. Let us say that this Scheme, as it goes, see some kind of a change, a perceptible change, which will match our requirements. Sir, one of my friends, today, also said

5.00 P.M.

that for forty we have ruled but we have not been able to solve the unemployment problem. This reminds one great saying. I don't know whether it is 8,000 years old or 4,000 years old, because I am not that much of a Hindu, where the first Stanza of Rig-Veda says, 'Oh God give me strength to ward of the evil.' that means, evil was in existence even 4,000 or 8,000 years back. In spite of ritualistically repeating the same for 4,000 years, we still have the same kind of sin haunting us. This is not the kind of a thing that this particular piece of legislation requires. This particular piece of legislation requires a positive backing, where every one of us must know if there is some kind of lacunae somewhere. It can be changed. I tell you the wages that we are trying to give is Rs. 100 per day in Andhra Pradesh at a few places. But, they differ from region-to-region and village-to-village. For example, Rs. 80 is given in the entire Andhra Pradesh. But, the States are given the freedom to give more. So, at a few places in Andhra Pradesh, we are giving Rs. 47. For example, in Pondicherry it is only nineteen rupees. So, here is a legislation that given you a leeway, which give you a kind of freedom, where you meet the needs of the people.

And, lastly, Sir, more than all that, let us understand that this is a true experiment for a rural democratic process, where we have brought the panchayats to the centre stage of our employment schemes. The former Rural Development Minister says that gram sabhas don't exist. Perhaps, he does not know what a *gram sabha* is. Shri Chandra Sekhar Reddy would have told him what a *gram sabha* is. Even Mr. Sengupta was saying that there is a bureaucratic influence. There could be a bureaucratic influence, not Collector's influence. There is a difference between this. I don't think if a Collector had been able to go things would have been different in this country. They don't go at all. They don't go out of their houses, or, out of their Mercedes cars. I know the bureaucratic influence does exist. But don't take a PR functionary or the elected representative to be that small. He knows how to assert. Days are gone where he used to go to serve petitions. Today, gram sabha need not necessarily be a regular gram sabha, called under some kind of a statutory rule. A gram sabha has an office where a man goes and asks what is happening to the schemes. He find out what schemes are being mooted. Next, it is quite possible that the gram sabha does not display on the board the schemes that are introduced. Sir, through you, let me submit to my friend, right in this own district, every person is going right to the MRO'S office and find out as to what works are

being taken up. As far as Andhra Pradesh is concerned, I don't want to make it an, as one of the friends said, "Everybody is making it a Bihar issue or the other issue", issue. Let me tell you not because 98 per cent of the people, who are there, have benefited out of it, the scheme that we are talking about is ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No; no. Please don't interrupt. It is his maiden speech. ...*(Interruptions)*... No interference please. ...*(Interruptions)*... It is a convention. ...*(Interruptions)*... Please respect the convention. ...*(Interruptions)*... Whatever may be your differences, but please respect the convention. ...*(Interruptions)*... He has claimed that it is his maiden speech, and I have accepted it. ...*(Interruptions)*... No, you need not interfere, when he has said so, let us not dispute it.

SHRI K. KESHAVA RAO: All right, Sir, I would exchange my notes with the TDP Members. ...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is this? ...*(Interruptions)*... He has claimed that it is his maiden speech. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI K. KESHAVA RAO: If somebody is feeling jealous of my speech that under the guise of maiden speech I am taking more time, they have a right to again contradict me, I have no objection, and, if they don't get time here, they can go back to my place and join the issue with me. There is no doubt about it. But the question is, today, is not that. The question today, is that a democratic revolution is taking place in the rural areas. Where is the right which we have been talking about, which has been denied all through? That has come through a statutory backing; that has come through a legislative backing, and not through an Executive order that can be taken away any time you want. So, when these kinds of things, when they are trying to be in their place—even if, according to you, they are not in their place—we need your support because you have never said that this is done by this Ministry or that Ministry. The law is so made, the law is so made that there is a space for everyone to intervene. So, why don't you look into a right perspective? There is no need for a fragmented perspective in this, nor there is any need of a politics to be played in this because every poor man, of whom you are talking, belong to you or belong to me, about whom you have been talking for sixty years, but doing nothing at all. When there is a legislation, which is in your hands, please try to use it, whether it is your Government or my Government. .
.*(Interruptions)*...

Mr. Venkaiah Naidu said, "The non-Congress Governments have done well" Very good! All of us are feeling proud of it. I wish all the Governments, in the country, to do the same thing. And, if there is a need to add more, add more to that. Another important thing is, the TDP Member would know that in Andhra Pradesh, in his own district, 59 per cent of the people, who are taking advantage of it, are women. What more do you want? *(Interruptions)* This is what, they can't say. Sir, I am sure in the Chandra Sekhar Reddy's village, it is...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI RAVULA CHANDRA SEKAR REDDY Sir, he has never visited any village...*(Interruptions)*...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He will come ...*(Interruptions)*... Either you go or he will come. ...*(Interruptions)*...

SHRI K. KESHAVA RAO: All right. I am sorry if I tried to hurt anybody. No; I did not try to hurt anybody. As a matter of fact, let me tell you, he was with me in his village and they are doing a wonderful work. Actually, the first question came from their Party, the TDP, which has been welcomed. That is why I started the first sentence by saying that it is nobody's movement. It is a people's legislation, perhaps, brought in by somebody who thought about the people for the first time. After 56 years, we thought of the people who were forgotten. As Shuklaji said, for six years we were sitting down and talking about the Maharashtra legislation. It is the same kind of a thing that Smt. Sonia Gandhiji has brought in. She had concern for the people. She understood what exactly is needed. If Dr. Manmohan Singhji has brought this thing, he understands what exactly is the economic growth rate that is to be integrated into the rural scenario, rural scene, and rural milieu. This is what exactly has been done. That is what I am trying to tell you. Please look into this from the social, cultural and economic angles. This is some kind of a total revolution that is taking place because people who are familiar, and about whom we are talking are now today empowered, whether fully or not, but they are on their path of empowerment. Thank you very much, Sir.

श्री अजय मारू (झारखंड) : उपसभापति महोदय, राष्ट्रीय ग्रामीण रोजगार गारंटी अधिनियम यू. पी.ए. सरकार की उन योजनाओं में से एक हैं, जो सुनने में और कागज पर बहुत अच्छी ओर आकर्षक लगती है, लेकिन जब संपूर्ण भारत में इस योजना की जमीनी हंकीकत की ओर ध्यान दें , तो कई राज्यों में इसकी तस्वीर निराशाजनक है। इस योजना का मकसद है कि अगर किसी ग्रामीण

परिवार का कोई वयस्क सदस्य अकुशल शारीरिक श्रम करने को तैयार है, तो एक वित्त वर्ष में उस परिवार को कम से कम सौ दिन का रोजगार उपलब्ध कराया जाए। आरंभ में इस व्यवस्था को देश के 593 जिलों में से 200 जिलों में लागू किया गया है और लक्ष्य है कि पांच साल के भीतर इसे पूरे देश में लागू कर दिया जाएगा।

महोदय, वास्तव में यह एक नारा बनकर रह गया है और सच्चाई यह है कि यह कानून भ्रष्टाचार और अनियमितता का एक नया माध्यम बनकर रह गया है। अब तक इसे कहीं भी सही ढंग से लागू नहीं किया जा सकता है। जिन क्षेत्रों में इस योजना को लागू किया गया है, वहां दलालों और बिचौलियों की एक नई जमात खड़ी हो गई है, जो ग्रामीणों को बरगला कर खुद पैसा हजम कर जाते हैं। यह बात सिर्फ मैं नहीं कह रहा, स्वयं ग्रामीण विकास मंत्री डा. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह जी ने सांसदों को लिखे गए अपने पत्र दिनांक 18 अप्रैल, 2006 में कही हैं कि कुछ स्थानों पर जॉब-कार्ड जारी करने में विलंब या जॉब-कार्ड जारी करने के बावजूद समुदाय द्वारा काम की मांग न किए जाने का रिपोर्ट मिली है। कुछ स्थानों में अधिनियम और दिशा-निर्देश का उल्लंघन किए जाने की जानकारी मिली है, जैसे कि पंजीकरण, जॉब-कार्ड आदि के आवेदन-पत्रों के लिए पैसा मांगना।

महोदय, इस संदर्भ में मैं अपने राज्य झारखंड का उदाहरण देना चाहता हूँ। झारखंड राज्य उन सौभाग्यशाली राज्यों में है, यहां 20 जिलों में यह योजना लागू की गई है। अभी वहां कांग्रेस के समर्थन में सरकार चल रही है और सरकारी मशीनरी में कांग्रेस का दबदबा है। कांग्रेस के ही एक विधायक श्री निराल तिरकी, जा सिमडेगा विधानसभा क्षेत्र से आते हैं, उन्होंने अपने ही ग्रामीण विकास मंत्री एनोस एवका के खिलाफ अपने क्षेत्र में मोर्चा खोल रखा है, और उन पर भ्रष्टाचार के आरोप लगाए हैं। हाल में केन्द्रीय ग्रामीण विकास मंत्रालय के संयुक्त सचिव झारखंड के सिमडेगा जिले में वहां की रोजगार गारंटी योजना का हालचाल लेने गए थे। वहां इस योजना का जो हस्त उन्होंने देखा, उससे वह हतप्रभ रह गए। वहां उन्होंने सैकड़ों ग्रामीणों को रोजगार जॉब-कार्ड लेकर घूमते हुए देखा और उन्हें नौ महीने बीत जाने के बावजूद अब तक एक भी दिन काम नहीं मिला है। जिले में सारी केन्द्रीय योजनाएं, जिनमें रोजगार गारंटी योजना भी शामिल है पूरी तरह से नाकाम हो गयी है। कांग्रेस का जो नारा है उसी में कांग्रेस के एक विधायक अपनी ही सरकार के एक मंत्री के खिलाफ मोर्चा खोले हुए हैं और मंत्री पर खुद भ्रष्टाचार का आरोप लगा रहे हैं। मैंने इस योजना की वेब साइट में जब झारखंड के सिमडेगा जिले का परफॉर्मेंस चार्ट निकाला तो मैंने देखा कि पूरे प्रदेश में सबसे ज्यादा कार्य अगर उस वेब साइट में कहीं दिखाया है तो वह सिमडेगा जिले में ही दिखाया गया है, जिसमें **financial performance and physical performance**, दोनों में 99% कार्य की संतुष्टि उस जिले की दिखाई गई है, लेकिन उसी सिमडेगा जिले के विधायक झारखंड के ग्रामीण विकास मंत्री पर आरोप लगा रहे हैं।

महोदय , हाल ही में झारखंड के मुख्य मंत्री, श्री मधु कौड़ा ने राज्य के पांच जिलों के DC और DDC को कारण बताओं नोटिस जारी करने का निर्देश दिया, क्योंकि उन्होंने समीक्षा बैठक के दौरान पाया कि इन जिलों में रोजगार गारंटी योजना की 20 प्रतिशत से भी कम राशि खर्च हुई है। बोकारो में 20 प्रतिशत, धनबाद में 6 प्रतिशत, गिरिडीह में 3 प्रतिशत, हजारीबांग में 5 प्रतिशत और कोडरमा में 10 प्रतिशत काम हुआ है। अगर पूरे प्रदेश का औसत देखा जाए तो वह 42 प्रतिशत है। मैं इसके लिए सिर्फ केन्द्र सरकार को ही जिम्मेदार नहीं बता रहा हूँ राज्य सरकारों की भी जिम्मेदारी है।

मैं सिर्फ यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि रोजगार गारंटी योजना जैसे कार्यक्रम को राजनीतिक फायदे के लिए इस्तेमाल नहीं किया जाना चाहिए और न ही यह वोट बैंक का माध्यम बनना चाहिए। रोजगार गारंटी योजना कानून अभी तक सिर्फ कागजों पर है और वास्तविकता में कई राज्यों में बहुत कम कार्य हुआ है। मैं और हमारी पार्टी अनावश्यक आलोचना में विश्वास नहीं रखते। यदि इस योजना से वास्तव में ग्रामीण का भला होता है, तो यह बहुत खुशी की बात है, लेकिन ऐसा कुछ नहीं हो रहा है।

महोदय, सैद्धांतिक तौर पर यह योजना अच्छी है, लेकिन व्यवहार में इसे अच्छा बनाने के लिए हम सभी सांसदों ने भी जो सुझाव दिए हैं, मेरा विश्वास है कि मंत्री महोदय उन पर ध्यान देगे। धन्यवाद।

श्री उपसभापति : डा. एम.एस. गिल। गिल साहब, आपके लिए पांच मिनट का समय है।

डा. एम.एस.गिल : यह बड़ी खुशी की बात है कि जैसा इस हाऊस में होना चाहिए और जिन चीजों पर यहां बहस होनी चाहिए, वह हो रही है। मैं बड़े ध्यान से दोपहर से अब तक सबको सुनता रहा हूँ। मामला भी यह ऐसा है, क्योंकि इस देश में बेअंत गरीब इलाके हैं बड़े-बड़े जिले हैं, जिनमें कोई साधन नहीं है – पानी नहीं है, नहर नहीं है बारिश नहीं है, तो उनका कैसे गुजारा हो। तो उनको 100 दिन रोजगार देने के लिए जो कुछ इस सरकार ने किया है और यह जो स्कीम है, उस पर यहां चर्चा हो रही है। मैं तो चाह रहा था कि सारा हाऊस यहां बैठा होता, क्योंकि यह तो मामला ही ऐसा है जिस पर आप वो लेने जाते हैं। खैर, बहुत से भाई और बहनें बैठी हैं।

आप सब यह जानते हैं कि बहुत सालों से इस प्रकार की स्कीमें बनती रहती हैं, कभी कोई बनाता है, कभी कोई बनाता है कि रोजगार, **employment, earning** कैसे गरीब को दी जाए। तो इस प्रकार की स्कीमें बनती रहती हैं, इस प्रकार की कोशिश होती है, फिर उनमें नुक्स होते हैं, बाद में वे **fade** हो जाती है, उन पर टिप्पणी होती है और इसकी भी टिप्पणी हो रही है, जो डटकर होनी चाहिए। जब यह बिल बन रहा था तो मैंने देखा था कि सारी जिम्मेदारी कलैक्टर पर, मैं भी रहा हूँ, BDO पर, बड़े देखे हैं, जब से बने थे, एस.के. डे के समय से और आगे पंचायत और सरपंच पर होती है, क्योंकि यही एक सिलसिला हमारे यहां चला हुआ है और इससे बाहर हमको कोई सोच

अभी तक आई नहीं है। अब उसमें ताकत भी है, कमजोरियां भी हैं। ये स्कीम या ऐसी कोई भी स्कीम चलानी हो तो उसमें चिंताएं तो तीन-चार ही रहती हैं। एक तो यह है कि जिन लोगों के लिए आपने स्कीम बनाई है, जो eligible हैं, उनकी लिस्ट कैसे बने, उनका registration कैसे हो, ताकि जिसका हक है, उसको आराम से उसमें डाल लिया जाए। मैंने सुना है कि कई भाइयों ने उसकी टिप्पणी करी है कि वह नहीं हो रही या गलत तरीके से हो रही हैं।

दूसरा प्वाइंट है कि काम तो मिले, लेकिन काम के लिए प्रतिदिन जो 100 रुपये तनखाह देनी है, यह न हो कि अगूठा 100 रुपये पर लगवाया जाए और उसमें से 70 रुपये या 80 रुपये मिले। हमारे देश के सिस्टम की यह एक परम्परा है, कोई भी सरपंच कहेगा कि मैं तो गांव का आदमी हूँ और आज भी मैं इसे देखता हूँ, फिर कहेगा कि भाई तुझे तो मैंने सिर्फ अगूठा लगाने के ही पैसे देने हैं, तुम यह मिट्टी इधर डालो या न डालो। उसे कौन पूछता है, इसलिए तुम्हारे लिए 70 रुपये ही बहुत हैं या 80 रुपये ही बहुत है, बीड़ी पीओ या कुछ भी पीओ, मौज करो। इस चीज को कैसे रोका जाए? जो भी वर्क्स बने, वे सार्थक हों, किसी मायने के हो, वेस्टेज ऑफ मनी न हो। उसके लिए कुछ ऑडिट भी हो या फिर हिसाब-किताब इस तरीके से हो, जिसके ऊपर आप सभी को और देश को भी तसल्ली हो। इसमें आने वाली मुश्किल के संबंध में तो मैंने कह दिया है, लेकिन मेरे पास उसका कोई इलाज नहीं है, मंत्री जी मैथमेटिक्स के विद्वान भी हैं और साथ ही गांव के व्यक्ति भी है, वह इसके संबंध में कुछ न कुछ तो सोचते भी रहे होंगे और इसका कोई न कोई उपाय अवश्य निकालेंगे।

जो कलैक्टर होते हैं वे इतने अधिक व्यस्त होते हैं, उनकी प्रतिदिन इतनी अधिक फिजूल की ड्यूटीज रहती हैं कि इस कार्य के लिए वे ध्यान ही कितना दे सकते हैं frankly speaking कुछ नहीं, चाहे आप उनको जितनी चाहे चिट्ठियां लिखते हैं।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जो बीडीओ इंस्टीट्यूशन है, वह इतनी अधिक घिस गई है कि अगर एक प्रांत से दूसरे प्रांत का मुकाबला कर लें तो कौन सबसे ऊपर होगा और कौन सबसे नीचे होगा, यह तो भगवान ही जानते हैं फिर उसमें पोस्टस भी नहीं है, सीनिकली वह भी एक बहुत ही अजीब चीज हो रही है।

तीसरा, सरपंच के नीचे भी एक पावर स्ट्रक्चर होता है, इसमें ऐसा क्या किया जाए कि जिन लोगों को उनका हक दिया जाना है, चाहे पूरे परिवार का हक है या फिर एक का ही है, वह पूरा हो। मुख्य बात यह है कि जो भी काम हुआ और जो चीज बन कर सामने आई, वह किसी मायने की होनी चाहिए। वैसे तो आजकल मशीनों से भी कार्य होने लगे हैं, लेकिन मैं यहां मशीनों की बात नहीं करना चाहता हूँ। अगर उन लोगों को वैसे ही कह दिया जाए कि दस आदमी पहले यहां पर मिट्टी डाल लें और फिर अगले हफ्ते वहां पर डलवा देंगे, इसलिए अगर कोई ऐसैट नहीं होगा, तब भी पैसा व्यर्थ ही जाएगा, फिर चाहे आपने उस पैसे को किसी लेबर को दिया या बेरोजगार को उसका कोई अर्थ नहीं होगा। आप इस बात के बारे में सोचिए।

जब मैं यह सोच रहा था कि इस पर किस तरह से नियंत्रण किया जाए तो मेरे दिमाग में एक विचार आया। मैं ऐसा नहीं कहता कि इसके माध्यम से मैंने कोई हल निकाल लिया है, लेकिन मैं मंत्री जी के सामने अपनी बात अवश्य रखूंगा। ये डिस्ट्रिक्ट स्कीम्स है, हर डिस्ट्रिक्ट में चार, पांच या छः कॉलेज तो होते ही हैं, **even in the most backward areas, there are colleges.** कॉलेजिज में इकोनॉमिक्स और सोशल साइंस पढाने वाले प्रोफेसर्स भी होते हैं, महिलाएं होती हैं, पुरुष होते हैं। मेरे दिमाग में यह विचार आया कि अगर हम इसे "जनता ऑडिट" या "जन ऑडिट" कह दें, चूंकि माननीय मंत्रीजी बिहार से आते हैं, इसलिए अगर मैं हिन्दी में बोलूँ और कोई अच्छा क्रेज दूँ तो शायद इन्हें पसंद आ जाए। आप एक "जन ऑडिट" की टीम बना दें, हर डिस्ट्रिक्ट में पांच लोगों की एक कमेटी बना दें तो कि सरकार के बाहर होगी। उन कॉलेजिज में आपको सोशल साइंटिस्ट और इकोनॉमिस्ट मिल जाएंगे। जो साइंटिफिक तरीके से चेंकिंग भी कर सकते हैं, सैम्पल सर्वे भी कर सकते हैं और वह पांच व्यक्तियों का यह ग्रुप बना दें, उन्हें कुछ सिम्पल ऑनरैरियम भी दें दें और उनसे कहें कि हर तीन महीनों में आप अपने डिस्ट्रिक्ट की एक छोटी सी, दस पेज की रिपोर्ट भेज दें। जब आप हजारों करोड़ रुपये इस कार्य के लिए लगा रहे हैं, 50,000 या 30,000 करोड़ रुपये लगाने जा रहे हैं ऐसे में यह स्कीम शायद काम आ जाए। अगर आप उन्हीं अफसरों को यह काम देंगे, तो वह पूरा नहीं होगा, अगर आप कहते हैं कि इसकी शिकायत सरपंच को जाती है, उससे भी बात नहीं बनती है, इसलिए हर जिले में आपको ऐसे पांच-पांच लोग मिल जाने चाहिए, जिनको आप कह सकते हैं कि **every quarterly** आप यह रिपोर्ट बनाइए और इसके खर्च के लिए हम आपको इतना ऑनरैरियम देंगे। वह आस-पास के एरियाज में घूमें सैम्पल्स ले, गांव देखें, साथ ही यह भी देखें कि इस गांव में कितने लोगों का मस्टर रोल दिखाया गया है, ये सब चीजें देखें तो शायद कुछ बन जाए। धन्यवाद।

डा० नारायण सिंह मानकलाव (नाम-निर्देशिक) : उपसभापति महोदय, धन्यवाद
....(व्यवधान)...

श्री उपसभापति : आपके पास पांच मिनट हैं।

डा० नारायण सिंह मानकलाव : सर, मैं तीन मिनट में ही अपनी बात समाप्त कर दूंगा। सबसे आखिर में, इतने विद्वज्जनों के भाषण के पश्चात् पांच मिनट बोलना बहुत बड़ी बात है। मैं पांच मिनट से पहले ही अपनी बात समाप्त करके दिखा दूंगा। सुबह से ही इस योजना पर चर्चा चल रही है और यह योजना निश्चित तौर से बहुत ही अच्छी योजना है। वैसे तो हर योजना अच्छी होती है क्योंकि बुद्धिजीवी और जानकार लोग उसका निर्माण करते हैं। उस योजना के क्रियान्वयन में, उसे अमली जामा पहनाने में और उसे बनाते समय कुछ ऐसी त्रुटियों निश्चित तौर पर रह जाती है जिनका समय-समय पर मूल्यांकन होना चाहिए और ईवैल्यूएशन करने के बाद, उन त्रुटियों का निराकरण भी हो जाता है। इस योजना के सिलसिले में जो कुछ भी खामियां हमारे पूर्व वक्ताओं ने

बताई है, उनको मैं रिपीट नहीं करना चाहता, वे सभी लोगों के जहन में है और मंत्री जी ने उनको ध्यानपूर्वक सुना है। इसमें जो सबसे इम्पोर्टेंट चीज है वह यह है कि स्टेट का जो शेयर बताया है, स्टेटस में इतनी ताकत नहीं है, इतनी क्षमता नहीं है कि वे इतना शेयर वहन कर सकें, क्योंकि यह सेट्रली स्पॉन्सर्ड स्कीम है, इसलिए स्टेट को कम से कम बार देना चाहिए और इसके चलते जो आज रिपोर्ट पढ़ी गई, कई लोगों ने पढ़ी कि इसमें कुछ स्टेटस पिछड़ी हुई है, कुछ स्टेटस इसका उपयोग नहीं कर पा रही है। कोई स्टेट ऐसी नहीं है, जो सैंटर के पैसे का उपयोग नहीं करती हो, परन्तु जब उनका शेयर उनको देने के लिए न हो तो वह स्टेट पिछड़ती है और उसके पिछड़ेपन का कारण हम सब को विदित है। इस स्कीम के अन्तर्गत अनएम्प्लोयमेंट भत्ता भी देने की जिम्मेदारी स्टेट पर रखी है। जब स्टेट अपना मूल शेयर भी नहीं दे पा रही हैं तो अनएम्प्लोयमेंट भत्ता देने की बात बेमानी लगती है। यह अच्छा नहीं लगता और ऐसा लगता है कि इसको सिरे से ही नकारने के लिए स्टेट के जिम्मे डाला गया है। इसमें स्टेट एम्प्लोयमेंट गारंटी कॉन्सिल के निर्माण की भी बात कही गई है। जबकि बहुत कम स्टेट होगी जिन्होंने कौंसिल का निर्माण किया होगा जो स्टेट लेवल पर इसकी मॉन्टरिंग के लिए जिम्मेदार है। स्थाई और गुणवत्ता वाला उपयोगी निर्माण कार्यक्रम हो, इसकी मांग भी की जा चुकी है। श्रीमन्, इस कार्यक्रम में मनुष्यों को, उन लोगों को, जो बेरोजगार है, उनको रोजगार देने के लिए निर्माण कार्य का प्रावधान है। परन्तु इसमें देखा गया है कि मशीनों का उपयोग बहुतायत रूप से होता है और इससे जो मैन पावर है उसका स्थान मशीनें ले लेती है जिसके कारण स्कीम की जो मूल भावना है, इस पर आघात होता है, इसमें यह भी प्रोविजन किया गया है कि कार्यस्थलों पर महिलाओं के लिए कुछ सुविधाएं उनके बच्चों के लिए तथा अन्य सुविधाओं की भी व्यवस्था की गई हैं ऐसा भी इसमें कोई दृष्टिगत नहीं होता। हमारे एक सीनियर मेंबर ने राजस्थान के लिए बहुत ही विनयपूर्वक और आग्रहपूर्वक मंत्री जी से निवेदन किया था कि राजस्थान की जो सारी स्थिति समझाने के बाद, उन्होंने अपना विश्लेषण करने के बाद में यह निवेदन किया था कि राजस्थान जैसी स्टेट, जो आंकड़ों के हिसाब से काफी नीचे आती है, उसमें केवल 6 जिले ही दिए गए हैं, मंत्री महोदय से हमारा आग्रह रहेगा कि अब की बार, जब जिले बढ़ने की बात आए तो राजस्थान को उसका उचित हिस्सा मिलना चाहिए। मंत्री जी का इस स्कीम के प्रति पूरा ध्यान है, इसको अच्छी तरह से समझते हैं, क्योंकि वे गांव से आते हैं तथा हाउस में यहां समय-समय पर जो उनका वक्तव्य आता है उससे लगता है कि वे एक दर्द और पीड़ा रखते हैं। मैं इनसे निवेदन करूंगा कि इस स्कीम को सार्थक करने के लिए जितने भी सुझाव इस सदन में आए हैं, उन पर कार्रवाई करें और इस स्कीम को सफल बनाने का प्रयास करें। धन्यवाद।

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, the Short Duration Discussion on National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme is over. The reply would be given by the Minister later. Now, the External Affairs Minister will make a statement.