Fund allocation under POSHAN Abhiyan

2080. SHRI AHAMED HASSAN: Will the Minister of WOMEN AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

^{*}The scheme has been implemented for out of school adolescent girls in the age group of 11-14 years w.e.f. 01.12.2017 and extended to all the districts w.e.f. 01.04.2018.

- (a) whether it is a fact that fund allocation under POSHAN Abhiyan has been reduced during the last three years;
- (b) if so, the State-wise details of fund allocation under POSHAN Abhiyan during last three years;
- (c) whether Government has decided to provide nutritious food under POSHAN Abhiyan including eggs; and
 - (d) if so, the details thereof and if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF WOMEN AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI SMRITI ZUBIN IRANI): (a) Fund allocation under POSHAN Abhiyaan has increased in the last 3 years from ₹950.00 crore in 2017-18 to ₹3061.30 crore in 2018-19 and to ₹3400.00 crore in 2019-20.

- (b) State-wise details of fund released under POSHAN Abhiyaan during 2017-18, 2018-19 and the current year are given in the Statement (*See* below).
- (c) and (d) There is no provision under the POSHAN Abhiyaan to provide nutritious food. Providing Supplementary Nutrition is a part of Anganwadi Services scheme. POSHAN Abhiyaan ensures convergence of various nutrition related schemes/interventions of various line Ministries.

Statement

State-wise details of funds released under POSHAN Abhiyan during 2017-18, 2018-19 and the current year

(Amount ₹ lakhs)

Sl. No.	State/UT	Released in	Released in	Released in
		FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	FY 2019-20
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	1284.63	8604.68	5582.52
2.	Bihar	6724.06	15001.67	10000
3.	Chhattisgarh	965.45	9629.51	0
4.	Delhi	945.95	2206.88	0

Written Answers to		[5 December, 2019]	Unstarred Questions 40	
1	2	3	4	5
5.	Goa	238.07	197.78	0
6.	Gujarat	3036.66	11228.04	7531
7.	Haryana	400.97	5992.46	0
8.	Himachal Pradesh	1557.26	4153.15	2480
9.	Jammu and Kashmir	388.59	8343.52	0
10.	Jharkhand	1555.35	5110.45	0
11.	Karnataka	3351.05	9870.89	0
12.	Kerala	1273.37	6491.91	0
13.	Madhya Pradesh	3441.49	15894.17	17883
14.	Maharashtra	2572.31	20989.28	33061.47
15.	Odisha	4600.46	10571.65	0
16.	Puducherry	39.24	393.7	497
17.	Punjab	819.51	6090.33	0
18.	Rajasthan	2045.73	9680.99	0
19.	Tamil Nadu	1340.51	12210.93	0
20.	Telangana	1736.94	8595.7	7003
21.	Uttar Pradesh	8440.6	29582.87	0
22.	Uttarakhand	1866.25	4301.57	3696
23.	West Bengal	5545.27	19294.11	0
24.	Arunachal Pradesh	52.93	2663.35	0
25.	Assam	2298.27	15492.36	14171
26.	Manipur	340.46	3865.37	0
27.	Meghalaya	462.98	1713.27	1706.8
28.	Mizoram	119.38	957.65	902
29.	Nagaland	163.74	1251.97	1445.17

402	Regarding a Matter [RAJYA	SABHA]	the	e Other House
30.	Sikkim	98.59	328.47	544
31.	Tripura	277.91	3695.72	0
32.	Andaman and Nicobar Islands	100.22	416.89	307.62
33.	Chandigarh	158.88	306.82	526.97
34.	Dadra and Nagar Haveli	108.83	129.32	431.16
35.	Daman and Diu	42.06	197.66	446.98
36.	Laddakh	-	-	-
37.	Lakshadweep	60	138.9	126.75
	Total	58453.97	255593.98	108342.44

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI SUKHENDU SEKHAR RAY): Question Hour is over.

The House stands adjourned till 2.00 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock,

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

REGARDING A MATTER RELATED TO THE OTHER HOUSE

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Hon. Members, I have to make one Observation. Shri Bhupender Yadav raised a point of order on 2nd December, 2019 under Rule 258 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha. Shri Yadav, while raising his point of order, mentioned that a leader of the other House had called the Prime Minister an infiltrator. Shri Yadav further said that use of such words against the Prime Minister was an insult to democracy. I gave my ruling on the issue that day itself stating that the point of order raised by any Member should be connected with the matters before the House, and since the raised issue by Shri Yadav was not pertaining to the Business of the House, I disallowed his point of order. However, on his insistence that this House on many occasions has condemned the Members who have violated the established Parliamentary norms and decorum and there are precedents of this nature, I had stated that I would get the precedent examined. I have got the record examined. There is no such precedent in which the House