

**Wasteland for afforestation**

\*278. SHRI S. S. AHLUWALIA:  
Will the Minister of ENVIRONMENT  
AND FORESTS be pleased to state:

(a) whether according to the agro-scientists, we have nearly 175 million hectares of wasteland which can gainfully be used for afforestation;

(b) if so, what is the State-wise break-up of this figure;

(c) what is the area which is treated as alkaline land and the State-wise break-up of such land;

(d) what steps Government have taken to use the wasteland as also the salt-affected lands for the purpose of afforestation; and

(e) whether any time-bound programme has been drawn up in this regard; if so what are the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF ENVIRONMENT AND FORESTS (SHRI BHAJAN LAL): (a) The National

Commission of Agriculture (1976) estimated an area of about 175 million ha. as being degraded, of which 150 million ha. are subject to water and wind erosion and about 25 million ha. are degraded through special problems. Some of these would be suitable for afforestation.

(b) Statement-I is placed on the Table of the House. (See below)

(c) Statement-II is placed on the Table of the House. (See below)

(d) and (e) The National Wastelands Development Board was set up in May, 1985, to formulate policies and programmes for stepping up the rate of afforestation in the country. An Action Plan in this regard has been circulated to all the State Governments and the same is placed on the table of the House as Statements III, IV and V show the progress of afforestation during 1985-86 and 1986-87.

**Statement-I**

(Area in lakh ha.)

Sl. States/UTs No.	Total Problem Area			
	Due to Soil erosion	Land Degrada- tion	Total	
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1 Andhra Pradesh		115.02	7.29	122.31
2 Assam		22.17	7.82	29.99
3 Bihar		42.60	22.92	65.52
4 Gujarat		99.46	26.40	125.86
5 Haryana		15.91	25.71	41.62
6 Himachal Pradesh		19.14	..	19.14
7 J & K		8.83	0.10	8.23
8 Karnataka		109.89	4.14	114.03
9 Kerala		17.57	1.78	19.35

1	2	3	4	5
10	Madhya Pradesh . . . . .	196.10	11.07	207.17
11	Maharashtra . . . . .	191.81	6.65	198.46
12	Manipur . . . . .	3.74	3.60	7.34
13	Meghalaya . . . . .	8.37	2.65	11.02
14	Nagaland . . . . .	4.05	0.77	4.82
15	Orissa . . . . .	45.78	32.25	78.03
16	Punjab . . . . .	10.07	22.23	32.30
17	Rajasthan . . . . .	119.02	174.92	373.94
18	Sikkim . . . . .	3.03	..	3.03
19	Tamil Nadu . . . . .	36.40	1.82	38.22
20	Tripura . . . . .	1.67	1.12	2.79
21	Uttar Pradesh . . . . .	71.10	60.05	131.15
22	West Bengal . . . . .	10.33	32.70	43.03
23	A & N Islands . . . . .	2.59	..	2.54
24	Arunachal Pradesh . . . . .	24.44	2.10	26.5
25	Chandigarh . . . . .	0.01	..	0.0
26	Dadra & Nagar Haveli . . . . .	0.12	..	0.12
27	Delhi . . . . .	0.74	0.01	0.75
28	Goa, Daman & Diu . . . . .	2.00	..	2.00
29	Lakshadweep . . . . .	..	..	..
30	Mizoram . . . . .	4.21	1.89	6.10
31	Pondicherry . . . . .	0.03	..	0.03
		1,266.20	449.99	1,716.19
			14.65	14.65
		1,266.20	464.16	1,730.84

SOURCE.—Developing India's Wasted Lands A Briefing Paper, Centre for Science and Environment, 1986.

## Statement-II

(Hectares in Lakhs)

States/UTs	Saline & Alkaline Lands
Andhra Pradesh . . . . .	2.40
Assam . . . . .	..
Bihar . . . . .	0.04
Gujarat . . . . .	12.14
Haryana . . . . .	5.26
Himachal Pradesh . . . . .	....
Jammu & Kashmir . . . . .	....
Karnataka . . . . .	4.04
Kerala . . . . .	0.16
Madhya Pradesh . . . . .	2.42
Maharashtra . . . . .	5.34
Manipur . . . . .	..
Meghalaya . . . . .	..
Nagaland . . . . .	..
Orissa . . . . .	4.04
Punjab . . . . .	6.88
Rajasthan . . . . .	7.28
Sikkim . . . . .	..
Tamil Nadu . . . . .	0.04
Tripura . . . . .	..
Uttar Pradesh . . . . .	12.95
West Bengal . . . . .	8.50
UTs . . . . .	0.16
	71.65

**Statement-III****ACTION PLAN**

The Action Plan drawn up by the National Wastelands Development Board and accepted by the State/UT Governments for implementation has the following key elements:—

**1. Identification of Wastelands:**

Each State/U.T. Government has been requested to identify wastelands in their territory whether they be in forest area, revenue/common lands or degraded farm lands.

**2. People's Involvement:**

This will be ensured by the following measures:—

**(a) Decentralised Nurseries:**

People's nurseries i.e. kisan, schools, women, youth groups, voluntary agencies, etc., will be motivated to meet the increase demand of seedlings.

**(b) Farm Forestry:** Farmers will be motivated to take up tree farming on their marginal lands and planting on their field bunds. A rational policy in regard to distribution of seedlings should be evolved.

**(c) Tree Growers' Cooperatives:** Tree Growers Cooperatives should be organised with the involvement of farmers in raising and distribution of seedlings and in tree plantations.

**(d) Voluntary Agencies:** The grass-roots agencies Mahila Mandals, Youth groups would also be motivated in nursery raising and tree plantations.

**(e) Tree Pattas:** Strips of land along roads, rails, canals, etc., and other degraded land should be given to the rural poor, with usufruct rights on

the trees planted by them on each lands.

**3. Nodal Agency:**

The State/UT Governments have been requested to identify a single nodal agency for ensuring an integrated approach for the implementation of the programme which is being executed by different agencies, official and otherwise.

**4. Seed:**

The States/UTs have been requested to extend the scope of operation of the existing State Seed Corporations to include the production and supply of fodder, grass and legume seeds to farmers on commercial basis.

**5. Leasing of Lands:**

The States/UT Governments have been requested to prepare guidelines for leasing of forest and non-forest wastelands for afforestation to the rural poor.

**6. Forest based industries** must be encouraged to afforest wastelands to produce the raw material needed by them. Industries must also be enthused to raise tree cover on wastelands with a view to provide employment to the rural poor as well as to enable them to grow trees on a remunerative basis. The State Governments have been requested to draw up guidelines for the lease of wastelands to industries in this behalf.

**7. Urban Fuelwood and Green Belts:**

The States/UTs have been requested to ensure that town and cities have green belts of fuelwood and fodder plantations to cater to the urban fuelwood and fodder needs.

## 8. Degraded Forest Areas:

States have been requested to identify degraded forest lands and to reforest them with fuelwood and fodder species.

## 9. Forest Development Corporations:

The Forest Development Corporations should obtain wastelands on lease from the Government for raising fuelwood and fodder plantations.

## 10. Government Departments:

Government Departments, public sector undertakings and other

bodies/institutions having substantial area of unutilised lands must bring such land under tree cover.

## 11. Media and Communication:

A massive publicity campaign through the traditional media of folk art and culture, radio, television and other audio-visual aids should be undertaken to create awareness among the masses.

## 12. Monitoring and Evaluation:

The States/U.T. Governments should evolve appropriate monitoring and evaluation mechanisms to ensure qualitative implementation of the programme.

## Statement-IV

## Targets and Achievements under Afforestation for 1985-86

State/UT	Targets (Seedlings in Lakhs)	Achievements	
		Seedlings in Lakhs	Area in Ha.
1	2	3	4
1. Andhra Pradesh	2600	3156	157800
2. Assam	400	396	19800
3. Bihar	1500	1523	76150
4. Gujarat	2550	2497	124850
5. Haryana	950	937	46850
6. Himachal Pradesh	550	672	33600
7. Jammu & Kashmir	350	467	23350
8. Karnataka	2500	2546	127300
9. Kerala	600	1166	58300
10. Madhya Pradesh	3500	3501	175050
11. Maharashtra	2000	2165	108250
12. Manipur	120	125	6250
13. Meghalaya	130	111	6550
14. Nagaland	180	269	1345
15. Orissa	2142	1930	9650

1	2	3	4
16. Punjab . . . . .	527	590	29500
17. Rajasthan . . . . .	820	958	47900
18. Sikkim . . . . .	82	82	4100
19. Tamilnadu . . . . .	1100	1215	60750
20. Tripura . . . . .	150	200	10000
21. Uttar Pradesh . . . . .	3250	3548	177400
22. West Bengal . . . . .	1100	1115	55750
23. A & N Islands . . . . .	95	95	47500
24. Arunachal Pradesh . . . . .	100	103	51500
25. Chandigarh . . . . .	2.9	1.52	76
26. Dadra & Nagar Haveli . . . . .	30	91	1550
27. Delhi . . . . .	25	25	1250
28. Goa, Daman Diu . . . . .	32	45	2250
29. Lakshadweep . . . . .	0.04	0.25	12.5
30. Mizoram . . . . .	700	700	35000
31. Pondicherry . . . . .	10	11	550

TOTAL . 28095.94 30200.77 1514538.5

— 1.51 — 1.51  
Million Million  
— Hectares — Hectare

NOTE—Achievements have been reported by the Ministry of Programme Implementation.

Statement—V

Targets and Achievements—1986-87

State	Seedlings in Lakhs	Achievements	
	Targets	Achievements Upto Jan., 1987	Achievements
I	2	3	4
1. Andhra Pradesh . . . . .	3000	2747	13735
2. Assam . . . . .	400	625	31250
3. Bihar . . . . .	2600	2711	135550
4. Gujarat . . . . .	1631	2271	113550
5. Haryana . . . . .	725	644	32200
6. Himachal Pradesh . . . . .	625	567	28350

1	2	3	4
7. Jammu & Kashmir	522	244	12200
8. Karnataka	2500	2279	113950
9. Kerala	1200	1519	75950
10. Madhya Pradesh	3700	3920	196000
11. Maharashtra	2400	2352	117600
12. Manipur	160	144	7200
13. Meghalaya	150	158	7900
14. Nagaland	350	403	20150
15. Orissa	2400	2161	108050
16. Punjab	550	502	25100
17. Rajasthan	1100	1315	67750
18. Sikkim	110	114	5700
19. Tamil Nadu	2400	1711	85550
20. Tripura	320	268	13400
21. Uttar Pradesh	4500	4865	243250
22. West Bengal	1400	1365	68250
23. A & N Islands	120	116	5800
24. Arunachal Pradesh	125	26	1300
25. Chandigarh	3.40	3.6	180
26. Delhi	50	44	2200
27. Dadra & Nagar Haveli	30	31	1550
28. Goa, Daman, Diu	75	68	3400
29. Lakshadweep	0.12	0.27	13.5
30. Mizoram	1128	1284	64200
31. Pondicherry	10	8.93	446.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>34284.52</b>	<b>34460.80</b>	<b>17230.40</b>

### Grain Glut

\*279. SHRI KAPIL VERMA: Will the Minister of COMMERCE be pleased to state in what manner the world grain glut, which is likely to accentuate further during 1986-87, is likely to affect developing countries like India which have recently acquired grain export capabilities and what measures are being taken

to ensure that India does not fail to get a foot-hold in the competitive international market?

THE MINISTER OF COMMERCE (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER): The grain glut in the international market does continue. However, it has been possible to export wheat in limited quantities.