

Employment under the Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme

*112. SHRI NAND KISHORE BHATT:†
SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Central Government have sanctioned amounts for some projects to provide maximum employment under the Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme;

(b) the nature of work in each State on which amounts have been spent so far; and

(c) the details of the work to be completed in each State during the current year under this programme?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI CHANDU-LAL CHANDRAKAR): (a) to (c). A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

The Central Sanctioning Committee upto its meeting held on 11th December, 1984 have approved 288 projects involving an estimated cost of approximately Rs. 784.39 crores under the Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme. The State-wise position of the projects approved is given in Annexure-I.

The nature of projects sanctioned for each State and the details of the type of works to be completed will be evident from the sectorwise distribution of the projects approved as given in Annexure-II. The sanctioned projects are in various stages of implementation in different States/ Union Territories.

Annexure-I

Estimated cost of projects approved upto 11-12-1984 under the Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme:

Name of State/U.Ts.		No. of project approved	Cost of projects (Rs. in lakhs)
1	2	3	4
1.	Andhra Pradesh.	2	7192.58
2.	Assam	3	1516.00
3.	Bihar	63	11227.372
4.	Gujarat	15	2985.90
5.	Haryana	5	598.465
6.	Himachal Pradesh	4	449.46

†The question was actually asked on the floor of the House by Shri Nand Kishore Bnatt.

	2	3	4
7. J.&K		8	675·846
8. Karnataka		9	3115·82
9. Kerala		3	3478·58
10. Madhya Pradesh		16	7565·20
11. Madhya Pradesh		17	7131·16
12. Manipur		1	11·0
13. Meghalaya		1	46·32
14. Nagaland		1	10·00
15. Orissa		10	2994·005
16. Punjab		11	810·0
17. Rajasthan		16	1797·55
18. Sikkim		4	33·47
19. Tamil Nadu		7	6982·02
20. Tripura		7	206·755
21. Uttar Pradesh		67	13577·276
22. West Bengal		12	5830·389
<i>Union Territories :</i>			
23. A&N Islands
24. Arunachal Pradesh
25. Chandigarh		1	4·57
26. D&N Haveli
27. Delhi		1	17·27
28. Goa, Daman & Diu		1	64·36
29. Lakshadweep		1	10·00
30. Mizoram		1	55·60
31. Pondicherry		1	52·74
		TOTAL :	288 78439·708

ANNEXURE-II

Sector-wise percentage distribution of total estimated cost of projects approved under RLEGP up to 11.12.1984

Name of States U.Ts.	Road projects	Minor Irrigation projects including drainage etc.	Const. of School building Mahifa Mandal etc.	Soil & Water Conservation projects	Social forestry projects	Const. of house for SC/ST	Other i.e. village ponds, developments of waste land drinking water facilities	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Andhra Pradesh .	64.34	..	35.66	100
2. Assam . . .	72.89	2.46	23.88	..	0.78	100
3. Bihar . . .	41.63	24.63	16.62	6.95	9.81	..	0.36	100
4. Gujarat . . .	41.06	29.25	14.08	2.44	5.91	..	7.26	100
5. Harayana . . .	30.55	7.43	57.08	4.94	100
6. H.P.	77.87	3.76	..	11.07	7.30	100
7. J&K	62.87	31.65	..	15.48	100
8. Karnataka . . .	43.76	18.58	..	6.94	30.72	100
9. Kerala	69.13	2.13	28.74	..	100
10. Madhya Pradesh	50.73	9.45	13.23	4.05	9.66	..	12.88	100
11. Maharashtra . .	62.66	30.70	..	5.52	1.03	100
12. Manipur	100.00	100
13. Meghalaya	100	100
14. Nagaland . . .	100.00	100
15. Orissa	32.30	14.40	31.89	20.74	0.67	100
16. Punjab	9.56	14.96	..	62.57	..	12.91	100
17. Rajasthan . . .	54.91	10.14	..	3.69	31.26	100
18. Sikkim	38.42	61.58	100
19. Tamil Nadu . . .	34.63	22.94	..	20.54	..	21.91	..	100
20. Tripura	52.02	11.08	..	36.08	0.82	100
21. Uttar Pradesh . .	66.55	20.12	0.58	5.85	1.29	..	5.61	100
22. West Bengal . . .	87.96	7.59	3.38	..	0.11	..	0.96	100

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>Union territories :</i>									
23. A&N Islands Islands
24. Arunachal Pr.
25. Chandigarh	100	100
26. D&NHaveli	100
27. Dilli	91.78	..	8.22	100
28. G.D. & Diu	100	100
29. Lakshadweep	100	100
30. Mizoram	100	100
31. Pondicherry	100	100
TOTAL:	55.41	16.59	10.16	6.27	5.47	3.22	2.88		100

SHRI NAND KISHORE BHATT: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the statement which is made available to us gives the relevant information and shows how great importance is attached to these two schemes. Sir, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether he has got any comparative information as to the benefit which has been derived as a result of these schemes. It is all right that a provision has been made but we would like to know how much has been utilized. I would also like to know if he can enlighten the House as to whether any specific guidelines have been given. When we are abolishing the contract system, when we do not want to give work to the contractors, has the Government given any guidelines that the labour class should be organised and for that purpose, has any arrangement been made for the training of rural and landless workers, to form labour cooperatives?

SHRI CHANDULAL CHANDRAKAR: In terms of work done, here again it is mandays. So far as the question of assets created is concerned, there are many like minor irrigation projects, school buildings, mahila mandal buildings, soil and water

conservation and soil forestry. Sir, this is a long list.

SHRI NAND KISHORE BHATT: I want to know, when you are discouraging the giving of work to the contractors, whether you have issued any guidelines to the State Governments to involve the landless labour and other agricultural workers, to form labour cooperatives through which these works can be executed so that the benefit could go to move number of people for whom the scheme is meant.

SHRI CHANDULAL CHANDRAKAR: It is the objective of the Government not to give contracts to contractors to do this work. But wherever it is essential, the same is being done.

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: You have already imposed the condition that contractors can never be employed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don't answer that. Yes, Mr. Bhatt.

SHRI NAND KISHORE BHATT: I would like to know from the hon.

Minister if he could give specific information about the amount utilized by the Madhya Pradesh Government and whether they have come forward with any further demand.

SHRI CHANDULAL CHANDRAKAR: The number of projects approved for Madhya Pradesh was 16 and the cost of projects was 75 crores and 65 lakhs of rupees.

SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: In 1984 the Centre sanctioned project costing Rs. 784.39 crores for the various employment guarantee programmes for rural landless people. It is a fact that due to unemployment the rural people are coming to cities for employment. They do not get employment in the cities and day by day they are creating slums in urban areas. I want to know what type of job guarantee they are having for the rural landless so that the rural people will not come seeking job in the cities but will get jobs in the rural areas. What steps is the Government taking in that direction? In this connection I want to know whether they are going to form a monitoring cell for this purpose to see that rural people are getting proper jobs and other facilities in the rural areas.

SHRI BUTA SINGH: The criteria laid down for this particular scheme is, towns with a population of less than 10 lakhs will be entitled and mostly the rural people, the landless people will be encouraged by this scheme. It will not be applicable in bigger towns like the metropolitan cities. Therefore the total benefit of this scheme is meant to be given to landless rural people and not to people in the urban areas.

SHRIMATI MONIKA DAS: I want to know how many persons have been given employment so far. You have spent Rs. 784.39 crores on this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is all right. Yes, Mr. Ray you wanted to ask something.

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: No, I wanted to impress upon the hon. Minister . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, you cannot impress upon the Minister. It is not the time to do that.

SHRI DEBA PRASAD RAY: But the question is not properly answered.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, please sit down.

श्री बुद्धदेव नारायण यादव : सभापति महोदय, मैं सरकार से यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो ग्रामीण भूमिहीन लोगों के रोजगार के लिए केन्द्रीय सरकार के जरिये योजना चलाई जाती है और सरकार इसके तहत राज्य सरकारों को धनराशि देता है और खर्च राज्य सरकार करती है, तो राज्य सरकार के द्वारा इस पैसे का सदुपयोग सही ढंग से हो पाता है या नहीं। राज्य सरकार के द्वारा जो योजना चलाई जाती है उसका लाभ इन भूमिहीन ग्रामीणों को मिल पाता है या नहीं, जिनमें पिछड़े और हरिजनों की तादाद सबसे ज्यादा है और जो सबसे ज्यादा गरीब हैं, उनके हिस्से का पैसा उनको न मिल कर बीच में जो इधर-उधर गोलमाल हो जाता है या जो भ्रष्टाचार के जरिये खर्चा होता है उसकी जांच कराने के लिए सरकार के पास कोई एजेंसी है या नहीं, केन्द्रीय सरकार इसका कोई मुआइना करती है या नहीं कि इसका पैसा ठीक से खर्च होता है या नहीं ?

श्री चन्द्रलाल चन्द्राकर : जो लैंडलेस एम्प्लायमेंट गारन्टी स्कीम शुरू की गई थी 1983 में उसके अन्तर्गत केन्द्रीय सरकार की तरफ से शत-प्रतिशत पैसा दिया जाता है। राज्य सरकार से योजना मंगा ली जाती है कहां-कहां पैसा किस तरह से खर्च होगा। योजना में अधिकांश इसी

बात पर जोर दिया जाता है कि इससे ज्यादा से ज्यादा लोगों को रोजगार मिले जैसे सड़क बनाने का काम है, सिंचाई के काम हैं, मकान या अस्पताल बनाने का काम है वह किये जायें। जहां तक मानिट्रिंग का सवाल है वह सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से भी होती है और इस में कोई शक नहीं कि चाहे एन० आर० ए० में हो या इस में मानिट्रिंग को और सबल बनाने की आवश्यकता है। वैसे इस में पैसे का उपयोग अच्छा हो रहा है।

MR. CHAIRMAN: Question is over.

WRITEN ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Concern over the indiscriminate use of pesticides in orchards and vegetable farms

*102. SHRI KAILASH PATI
MISHRA;

SHRI SHANKER SINH
VAGHELA;

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Agricultural scientists have expressed serious concern over the indiscriminate use of pesticides in orchards and vegetable farms;

(b) whether it is a fact that the farmers, are often prone to spray their vegetable and fruit crops with pesticides in excessive quantities in initial and final stages.

(c) whether it is also a fact that toxicity continues in a higher degree and for a longer duration in fruit and vegetables;

(d) whether it is also a fact that the toxic effects of some pesticides are prone to lead to blood cancer or diseases of nervous system; and

(e) what steps Government propose to take to ensure that the fruit and vegetables are scientifically test-

ed and also to properly guide the farmers in the scientific use of pesticides?

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI BUTA SINGH): (a) Reports have appeared about the concern of scientists and others over the indiscriminate use of pesticides from time to time.

(b) The authorities under the Insecticides Act, 1968 have laid down the approved usage of the insecticides wherein the exact dosage is indicated and so also the waiting period. These are also statutorily required to be incorporated on the leaflets along with any insecticide container by the manufacturers of the insecticides. The extension functionaries of the Central and State Governments also provide necessary guidance to the farmers about its proper use. Besides, these insecticides are high value items which further inhibit any such indiscriminate or excessive use.

(c) No, Sir. The toxicity of pesticides residues reduces with passage of time and crop growth including on fruits and vegetables.

(d) The Registration Committee which includes an Expert in Medical Toxicology, registers an insecticide for import or manufacture in the country only after satisfying itself that the insecticide is safe to human beings and animals. If the insecticides are used in the recommended dosage, for the recommended purpose by following the recommended procedure, these chemicals remain safe in human beings and animals.

(e) Based upon the scientific testing of fruits and vegetables, the details of pesticides application are prescribed and those are statutorily incorporated on the leaflets accompanying pesticides containers. Further scientific investigations have been initiated under the 'All India Coordinated Research Project on Pesticides Residues'.