

**Crop Insurance Scheme**

1687. SHRIMATI SUSHILA SHANKAR  
ADIVAREKAR :

SHRIMATI PRATIBHA  
SINGH:

SHRIMATI SUMITRA G.  
KULKARNI:

SHRI B. S. SHEKHAWAT :

DR. RAMKRIPAL SINHA :

SHRI V. K. SAKHLECHA :

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION be pleased to refer to the reply to Starred Question 409 given in the Rajya Sabha on 13th March 1974 and state:

(a) whether any assessment has since been made about the results derived from the partial crop insurance scheme enforced in some States;

(b) if so, what are the details thereof, State-wise; and

(c) whether any decision has been taken to provide the insurance cover to all types of crops in the light of the experience gained by the partial insurance scheme ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION (SHRI ANNASAHEB P. SHINDE): (a) and (b) During the current year, four pilot scheme for cotton (one in Gujarat, one in Maharashtra and two in Tamil Nadu) and two schemes for groundnut (one each in Andhra Pradesh and Gujarat) were introduced. The results of these schemes would be available only after harvest early next year.

The Gujarat Cotton Scheme in Baroda District was in operation in the previous two years, the results of which are as under:—

Period	Net Premium recd.	Claims paid
	Rs.	Rs.
1st year . . .	16,859	18,189
2nd Year . . .	16,216	5,32,411

Due to severe drought in Gujarat and drought and long dry spell in Andhra Pradesh this year, insured groundnut crop was adversely affected. Against the net premium income of Rs. 1,37,400, estimated loss under the two groundnut schemes may be over Rs. 23 lakhs.

In view of the limited experience and the exceptionally adverse climate conditions, it is difficult to come to any definite conclusion about the viability or otherwise of the pilot Crop Insurance Schemes.

(c) General Insurance Corporation is considering the introduction of pilot schemes for selected crops in selected areas only. The Corporation does not contemplate covering all crops in any area.

**Setting up of a University at Rohtak**

1688. SHRIMATI SUSHILA SHAN-  
KAR ADIVAREKAR :

SHRIMATI PRATIBHA  
SINGH :

SHRIMATI SUMITRA G.  
KULKARNI:

Will the Minister of EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE be pleased to state :

(a) whether University Grants Commission have decided to set up a University at Rohtak in Haryana;

(b) if so, what are the details thereof ?

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION, SOCIAL WELFARE AND CULTURE (PROF. S. NURUL HASAN): (a) and , (b) The Universities in India are established under an Act of a State Legislature or that of the Parliament and not by the University Grants Commission However, a proposal of the Government of Haryana to establish a University at Rohtak has not been approved by the-Commission.

**Cauvery Valley Authority**

1689. SHRI S. KUMARAN: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION be pleased to state :

(a) whether there is any proposal under Government's consideration to set up a Cauvery Valley Authority;

- (b) if so, what are the details thereof;
- (c) by when it will be set up; and
- (d) what is the amount of expenditure involved in it ?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND IRRIGATION (SHRI KEDAR NATH SINGH) : (a) to (d) A meeting of the Union Minister of Agriculture and Irrigation with the Chief Ministers of Tamil Nadu, Karnataka and Kerala to discuss the various issues relating to Cauvery waters was held at New Delhi on 28th and 29th November, 1974. A broad consensus emerged during negotiations regarding the quantum of water which can be saved and the manner in which it may be apportioned. Consensus was also reached to set up Cauvery Valley Authority to regulate supplies of the Cauvery with a view to ensuring the most equitable distribution of waters. The Authority would also monitor the schemes for effecting savings and allocating waters so saved amongst the various States on an agreed basis. It is proposed to convene another meeting with the Chief Ministers shortly for further discussion.

#### **Use of Lime Plastic etc. in Building Construction**

1690. SHRI AWADHESHWAR PRASAD SINHA: Will the Minister of WORKS AND HOUSING be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawn to the report which appeared in the 'Times of India' of 5th December, 1974 to the effect that Government do not encourage construction of buildings even on an experimental basis with new materials like lime plastics brick wood, bamboo and in the absence of adequate supply of cement, steel, as is being done in some foreign countries;

- (b) if so, what are the details thereof;
- (c) whether Government have received requests in this regard; and
- (d) if so, what action Government have taken thereon and what steps Gov-

ernment are taking to encourage the use of such materials in building construction?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF WORKS AND HOUSING (SHRI MOHAN DHARIA). (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) to (d) It is not correct to say that the Government do not encourage construction of building with new materials. On the other hand, in the context of shortage of cement and steel, Government have been trying to project the use of alternative materials in buildings in order to save cement and steel. Already the State Governments and Union Territory Administrations have been advised to use lime, surkhi and other materials as far as possible. A Technical Committee was also set up to recommend the use of economic specifications and local materials. This Committee has just submitted its report and this is being examined. Government have already advised the State Governments to direct the local bodies to revise their specifications to be in line with the new trend of thinking.

Projects for experimental construction are also undertaken after scrutiny by a Committee and new materials/techniques successfully tried, on these projects are widely publicised for large scale adoption.

#### **C.G.H.S. Benefits for Pensioners**

1691. SHRI GANESH LAL MALI: Will the Minister of HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING be pleased to state :

(a) whether it is a fact that pensioners getting Rs. 250/- per month or above are not entitled to CGHS benefits;

(b) whether it is a fact that persons drawing more than Rs. 250/- per month as family pension are not entitled to CGHS benefits;

(c) whether it is also a fact that persons getting family pension draw less than Rs. 250/- per month after some period;