

**GOVERNMENT OF INDIA  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
LOK SABHA**

UNSTARRED QUESTION NO:2341

ANSWERED ON:07.08.2001

IMPLEMENTATION OF POVERTY ALLEVIATION PROGRAMME

A.P. JITHENDER REDDY;ADHIR RANJAN CHOWDHURY;AJAY CHAKRABORTY;AKHILESH YADAV;GANGASANDRA  
SIDDAPPA BASAVARAJ;IQBAL AHMED SARADGI;MANSINH PATEL;NEDURUMALLI JANARDHANA REDDY;RAGHUNATH  
JHA

**Will the Minister of RURAL DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:**

- (a) whether attention of the Government has been drawn to the news-item captioned `anti- poverty schemes run down the drains with funds` appearing in the `Hindustan Times` (HT Business) dated June 18, 2001;
- (b) if so, the facts of the matter reported therein and the reaction of the Government thereto;
- (c) whether Poverty Alleviation Programmes have been found ineffective in so far as their formulation and implementation are concerned;
- (d) if so, the details thereof;
- (e) the factors responsible for the ineffective implementation of such Programmes; and
- (f) the concrete action plan envisaged to implement these programmes effectively?

**Answer**

MINISTER OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (SHRI M. VENKAI AH NAIDU)

(a); Yes, Sir.

(b); By quoting the Planning Commission as source, the important issues raised in the News item regarding Poverty Alleviation Programmes of the Ministry of Rural Development, include the following:

- (i) The Centre does not seem to have any Action Plan to revamp the poverty alleviation Programmes.
- (ii) Large chunk of funds under this scheme go-down the drain without reaching those Below Poverty Line.
- (iii) There is rampant misuse and diversion of funds and lack of monitoring by States as well as the Centre resulting in ineffectiveness of the anti-poverty Programmes.
- (iv) States` indifference to the schemes, Center`s limiting its role to releasing the funds and canvassing for higher allocation and dual control over the schemes are the hindrances for the scheme.

In this context, the views of the Ministry on the respective issues are as follows:

(i) The major poverty alleviation Programmes like the Swarnjayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY), the Jawahar Gram Samridhi Yojana (JGSY) and the Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) have been launched from April, 1999 after revamping their erstwhile corresponding Programmes. The SGSY has been launched in place of the erstwhile Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP), Training of Rural Youth for Self Employment (TRYSEM), Development of Women & Children in Rural Areas (DWCRA), Supp of Improved Toolkits to Rural Artisans (SITRA) & Ganga Kalyan Yojana (GKY), besides the Million Wells Scheme (MWST). The major shift of the SGSY from the earlier Programmes is in respect of its emphasis on integrated approach and social mobilization of the rural poor through Self Help Group (SHG). The JGSY has been launched in place of the erstwhile Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) and is implemented now exclusively by the Gram Panchayats for infrastructure development at the village level. Similarly, the EAS has been now made allocation based from demand driven.

The revamped Programmes are a little over two years old and at this stage it would be too early to consider any revamping of these Programmes.

(ii) & (iii) The existing system in the Ministry of Rural Development to ensure the funds to reach the people below poverty line and to prevent possibility of misuse and diversion of funds, includes periodical progress reports submitted by the Districts to the

States/Center, regular field visits of the area officers of the Ministry and the State, submission of audited statements of accounts by the Districts at the time of claiming the 2nd installment, restoration of funds to the Programme concerned in case diversion is noticed in the Audit Report before release of the next installment under the Programme, regular review of the Programmes in the Annual Workshops of the Project Directors of the District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs) and the Performance Review Committee comprising the State Secretaries. The implementation of the Programmes are also subjected to regular evaluation through independent agencies and remedial measures on the basis of the findings of the evaluation.

(iv) The implementation of the Programmes is a joint responsibility of the Centre and the States. The Programmes were formulated after extensive consultation with the States, besides experts in the field. Both are equally accountable for the poverty alleviation agenda of the country. The States also share the responsibility of the funds for all the Programmes i.e. in the ratio of 75% by the Centre and 25% by the States. The States are, therefore equally concerned about the quality of implementation of these Programmes and not indifferent as mentioned in the news item. Neither it would be correct to say that the Programmes suffer due to dual control. In view of the above and because of the federal set up of the country, the dual control over the Programmes is unavoidable.

(c) to (f): As has been mentioned in reply to parts (a) & (b) above, the main poverty alleviation Programmes under implementation in rural areas are there for a little over two years. At this stage, therefore, it would be too early to make any observation about their success or failure.