

*The Criteria Adopted for Selecting the Groups under the Scheme "Financial Assistance to Dance, Drama and Theatre Ensembles"*

(i) The ensembles are chosen from all parts of the country for their competence and achievements and for their national importance. It is ensured that different forms of classical and contemporary dance styles and theatre forms are represented. The groups should be in existence for a number of years, preferably not less than ten, and should have been recognised for their standard of performances.

(ii) The ensemble should have a repertoire of an appreciable number of ballets, programme of music, plays, and short numbers, not less than four in any case.

(iii) A repertoire should be based on themes which have universal appeal.

(iv) The ensemble should have performed on an All India basis and given an average of 25 to 40 shows a year during the last five years.

(v) The ensemble should be a registered body.

*Details of Machinery for Selection*

An Advisory Committee consisting of representatives from the Ministry of Finance, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting, Planning Commission, Sangeet Natak Akademi and the Department of Culture has been set up for selecting the Group for financial assistance under the scheme "Financial Assistance to Dance, Drama and Theatre Ensembles". On the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, the groups so selected are given financial assistance for payment of salaries of artistes and for cost of productions, subject to their fulfilling the prescribed terms and conditions.

**SMALL AND MARGINAL FARMERS**

\*88 SARDAR AMJAD ALI ·  
DR R K CHAKRAVARTI :  
SHRI K B CHETTRI :  
SHRI K P SUBRAMANIA ME-  
NON ·  
SHRI VENIGALLA SATYANA-  
RAYANA

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state :

(a) the progress so far made in the implementation of schemes for small and marginal farmers,

(b) what difficulties have been encountered in the implementation of the schemes,

(c) the financial allocation to each State made on this account, and

(d) the basis of such allocation ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (PROF SHER SINGH) : (a) to (d) A statement is laid on the table of the Sabha

**STATEMENT**

(a) The majority of the 87 SFDA/MFAL Agencies came into existence in 1970-71 when they were registered under the Societies Registration Act and they started their activities in full swing only in 1971-72. The progress achieved by them since inception till 30.9.1972 is indicated in the statement appended (Annexure-I)

(b) The main difficulties in the implementation of the two schemes as they emerged in the course of a review at the National Seminar held in April, 1972 are set out in the statement appended (Annexure-II). The findings of the Seminar have been duly conveyed to all State Governments/Union Territories and others for appropriate action.

(c) and (d) Financial allocations under the two schemes are made Agency-wise and not State-wise depending on the programmes undertaken/to be undertaken by them as also the progress of actual expenditure. Grants-in aid are released to the Agencies direct by the Government of India and not through the State Governments. Upto 31st October, 1972, grants-in-aid amounting to Rs 21.41 crores, have been released to the Agencies as per details given in Annexure-III.

**Annexure I**

*Progress of Implementation of SFDA/MFAL Programmes*

	Progress upto	
	30-9-1972	
	SFDA	MFAL
1. No. of Projects	46	41

2. No. of participants indentified (in lakhs)	20.55*	9.44†
3. No. enrolled as members of coops. (in lakhs).	9.13	2.43
4. No. of dugwells/tubewells,	38378	2358
5. No. of pumpsets.	7789	1040
6. No. of other MI Units.	5351	266
7. Units of milch cattle.	13820	9545
8. Poultry Units.	1868	3236
9. No. assisted under Rural Artisans Scheme.	789	843
10. No. assisted under Rural Works Programme.	8496	28112
11. Loans disbursed (through Co-operatives) :		
	(Rs. in lakhs)	
	<i>Cumulative</i>	
(a) short-term loans.	2014.86	165.57
(b) Medium-term loans.	455.01	93.55
(c) Long-term loans.	1318.59	74.25

## Annexure II

*Main Difficulties in implementation of schemes as Revealed at the National Seminar Held in April, 1972*

### I. Project Staff

1. Full complement of sanctioned staff was not in position in many projects.

\*Including 4.62 lakh Marginal Farmers.

†Including Agricultural Labours.

2. Frequent transfer of Chairman/Project Officer, etc. of the Agencies was disrupting the continuity in programme implementation in some projects.

### II. Supporting Development Staff

3. The Technical Departments in the Project area, such as at the Block level, at institution level etc. are to be adequately manned by experienced staff. This was lacking in some project areas. Strengthening of extension staff for agriculture and animal husbandry was expected to be made on the IAAP pattern.

4. Full involvement of the Block Development Agency in the programmes was not forthcoming in some project areas.

### III. Co-ordination :

5. The project Officer did not have adequate control over the field staff in the project area.

6. The State Level Coordination Committee remains to be set up in some States/Union Territories.

### IV. State Plan support

7. The need for preparation of a district plan for the project areas taking into account all the available resources, has been stressed.

8. Under certain programmes, State Governments were expected to provide matching support from the Plan resources. Such a matching provision was not forthcoming in many States.

9. Under the projects, it was envisaged that the State Governments would provide infrastructural facilities for development of marketing, processing, animal husbandry, soil testing etc. These facilities were not made available, as anticipated in some project areas. This is also true of groundwater surveys, rural electrification and allotment of scarce material. Strengthening of the cooperative structure with plan resources did not also match upto original expectations.

10. In some project areas, there was need for making the Land Records upto date and locate specific programmes for benefiting programme participants.

#### V. Identification

11. It took time for many of the functionaries at the field level to properly understand implications of the definition brought out in the project reports.

#### VI. Programmes

12. In many agencies, for want of

adequate technical staff etc, the programmes for development of minor irrigation, soil survey, dairy, farming poultry farming etc. were not prepared for benefiting the individual farms. The economics of such programmes in the project area, suited to local conditions were not worked out to fit in with the requirements of the programme participants.

#### VII. Training & Publicity

13. There was paucity of special programmes of training and publicity to support the SFDA/MFAL schemes.

### Annexure III

Agency-wise amount released upto 31.10.1972 since inception

(Rs. in lakhs)

State/UT	SFDA	Amount released	MFAL	Amount released
<i>Andhra Pradesh</i>	1. Cuddapah	32.50	1. Nalgonda	20.70
	2. Nalgonda	30.00	2. Visakhapatnam	19.00
	3. Srikakulam	28.00		
<i>Assam</i>	4. Goalpara	26.00	3. Kamrup	22.50
	5. Newgong	19.50	4. Mikir Hills	12.32
<i>Bihar</i>	6. Champaran	23.60	5. Ranchi	30.00
	7. Patna	21.00	6. Shahabad	26.16
	8. Purnea	39.37		
<i>Gujarat</i>	9. Junagadh	22.50	7. Baroda	14.62
	10. Sabarkantha	27.52	8. Bulsar	16.00
	11. Surat	38.96		
<i>Haryana</i>	12. Ambala	26.76	9. Ambala	16.00
	13. Gurgaon	37.56	10. Hissar	27.00
<i>Himachal Pr.</i>	14. Sirmur	21.00	11. Solan	15.14
	15. Anantnag	32.05	12. Baramula	20.79
<i>J &amp; K.</i>	16. Jammu-Kathua.	31.65	13. Poonch-Rajauri	15.00
	17. Cannanore	25.00	14. Cannanore	11.74
<i>Kerala</i>	18. Quilon	28.00	15. Quilon	10.50
	19. Bilaspur	29.95	16. Durg	19.71
<i>Madhya Pr.</i>	20. Chhindwara	24.59	17. Raisen-Schore	22.28
	21. Railam-Ujjain	19.55		
	22. Bhandara	16.20	18. Prabhani	5.00
<i>Maharashtra</i>	23. Ratnagiri-Satara	23.34	19. Ratnagiri-Satara	15.76
	24. Thana-Nasik	12.87		
<i>Manipur</i>	...	...	20. Manipur	27.00
<i>Meghalaya</i>	...	...	21. Garo Hills	13.00
			22. J & K Hills	12.50
<i>Mysore</i>	25. Bidar	25.20	23. Bijapur	20.66
	26. Mysore	40.38	24. Tumkur	24.50
	27. Noth-Kanara.	27.50		
<i>Nagaland</i>	28. Kohima-Mokekchung-Tuonsung	18.00	25. Kohima-Mokekchung	12.00

State/UT	SFDA	Amount released	MFAL	Amount released
<i>Orissa</i>	29 Bolangir	32.00	26. Cuttack	38 75
	30. Dhenkanal	28.50	27. Kaonjhar	26 00
	31. Ganjam	41.75		
<i>Punjab</i>	32. Amritsar- Ferozepur	23 15	28. Jullundur Kapurthala	13 00
	33. Sangrur Patiala	17.00	29. (a) Hoshiarpur (b) Ropar	20 00 16 50
<i>Rajasthan</i>	34. Alwar	27.75	30. Ajmer	34 40
	35. Bharatpur	30.00	31. Bhilwara	30 77
	36. Udaipur	31.12		
<i>Tamilnadu</i>	37. Madurai	24.00	32. North Arcot	13.58
	38. South Arcot	25 90	33 Salem	18.96
	39. Tirunelvels	16.00		
<i>Tripura</i> <i>U. P.</i>	...		34. Tripura	13 00
	40. Badaun	35 03	35 Ballia	24 50
	41. Fatehpur	45 00	36. Mathura	31.20
	42. Pratap garh	48 00		
	43. Rae Bareli	46.00		
<i>West Bengal</i>	44. Dar- jeeling	42.85	37. Bankura	18.15
	45. Hooghly	19.63	38 Purulia	30.55
	46. west Dinajpur	24.00		
<i>Delhi</i>	...	...	39. Delhi	6.00
<i>Goa Daman &amp; Diu</i>	...	...	40. Goa	16 75
<i>Pondicherry</i>	...	...	41 Pondicherry	29 85
TOTAL		1306 23		834.75

#### DISTRIBUTION OF SURPLUS LAND AFTER LAND REFORM LAWS

\*89. SHRI BHOLA PRASAD :  
SHRI YOGENDRA SHARMA :  
DR Z A. AHMAD :

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE  
be pleased to state :

(a) whether estimates have been made  
as to how much surplus land would be avail-  
able for distribution after the new land  
reform laws are passed, statewide; and

(b) if so, the details thereof ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE  
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI  
ANNASAHEB SHINDE) : (a) and (b)  
No estimates of the surplus area likely to  
be available could be made as yet. The  
State Governments and the Union Territor-  
ies have been requested to give us such  
estimates.

#### SLUM CLEARANCE IN MAHARASHTRA

\*90. SHRI A G. KULKARNI :  
SHRI S B. BOBDEY :  
SHRI V.R. PARASHAR :

Will the MINISTER OF WORKS AND  
HOUSING AND HEALTH AND FAMILY  
PLANNING be pleased to state :

(a) whether Government of India have  
received any proposal from the Govern-  
ment of Maharashtra for slum clearance in  
Bombay and other big cities in Maharash-  
tra; and if so, what financial assistance was  
given to the State Government for the  
purpose and how much was utilised; and

(b) what is the progress of the two  
slum clearance projects undertaken by the  
State Government which were inaugurated  
by the Prime Minister ?

THE MINISTER OF WORKS AND  
HOUSING (SHRI UMA SHANKAR  
DIKSHIT) . (a) Government of India