

Ministry of Rural Development

JAWAHAR ROZGAR YOJANA

**ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
1992-93**

TENTH LOK SABHA

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

THIRTIETH REPORT
ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
(1992-93)

(TENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT
JAWAHAR ROZGAR YOJANA



Presented to Lok Sabha on 30 April 1993

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 1993/Vaisakha, 1915(S)

(JN)1000 (BK)la2058 21.06.93

E.C. No. 1304

Price: Rs. 12.00

@ 1993 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Seventh Edition) and printed by the Manager (P.L. Unit) Govt. of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER I JAWAHAR ROJGAR YOJANA.....	1
A. Introductory	1
B. Objectives and Salient Features.....	3
C. Objective of providing 100 days employment to a family member	6
CHAPTER II ALLOCATION, UTILISATION AND ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES.....	12
(a) Criteria for Allocation of Resources	12
(b) Financial Allocation and Physical Targets.....	12
(c) Diversion of Resources from poorly performing Mandal Panchayats Districts to better performing ones under JRY	16
(d) Unutilised Resources of NREP/RLEGP	17
(e) Delay in release of Central Assistance/States' share	17
(f) Non opening of Savings Bank Accounts	18
CHAPTER III PLANNING AND EXECUTION OF WORKS	23
(a) Organisational setup.....	23
(b) Target Group under the Yojana	24
(c) Preparation of Annual Plans	27
(d) Implementing Agencies.....	28
(e) Technical Inputs and Training (Preparatory stage)	30
(f) Execution of Works	32
(g) Technical support for execution of works	34
(h) Wage and Non wage components to the works under JRY	36
(i) Ban on Contractors.....	37
(j) Maintenance of assets.....	38
(k) Misappropriation/Leakages of Funds and means of redressal of grievances/complaints	39
(l) Administrative/contingent expenditure	43
(m) Social Forestry Works	43

	PAGE
CHAPTER IV: PAYMENT OF WAGES UNDER JRY	51
(a) Payment of minimum wages	51
(b) Equal wages both for men and women	52
(c) Wages on piece rate/time rate basis	53
(d) Supply of foodgrains as part of wages	54
(e) Proper maintenance of muster rolls	56
CHAPTER V MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMME	60
(a) Monitoring arrangements	60
(b) Evaluation Studies of the Programme	61
(c) Social Audit of JRY	62
CHAPTER VI	
(a) Indira Awas Yojana	65
(b) Million Wells Scheme	69
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX I* Allocation of Resources under JRY during 1989-90 to 1992-93	73
APPENDIX II Employment generated under JRY during 1991-92	75
APPENDIX III Number of Percentage of Rural Population below poverty line	76
APPENDIX IV Statement of Observations/Recommendations	77

PART II*

Minutes of the Sittings of the Estimates Committee held on 8.9.1992 (FN & AN) 9.9.1992 (FN & AN) and 28.4.1993.

15

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ESTIMATES
(1992-93)

CHAIRMAN

Shri Manoranjan Bhakta

MEMBERS

2. Shri A. Charles
3. Shri Rajendra Agnihotri
4. Shri Mumtaz Ansari
5. Shri Ayub Khan
6. Shri Sartaj Singh Chhatwal
7. Shri Somjibhai Damor
8. Shri Pandurang Pundlik Fundkar
9. Shri Santosh Kumar Gangwar
10. Smt. Girija Devi
11. Shri Nurul Islam
12. Shri R. Jeevarathinam
13. Shri Viswanatham Kanithi
14. Shri C.K. Kuppuswamy
15. Shri Dharampal Singh Malik
16. Shri Manjay Lal
17. Shri Hannan Mollah
18. Shri G. Devaraya Naik
19. Shri Rupchand Pal
20. Shri Sribhatta Prigrahi
21. Shri Harin Pathak
22. Shri Harish Narayan Prabhu Zantye
23. Shri Amar Roy Pradhan
24. Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman Sait
25. Shri Moreshwar Save
26. Shri Manabendra Shah
27. Shri Mahadeepak Singh Shakya
28. Shri Rajnath Sonkar Shastri
29. Shri Manku Ram Sodhi
30. Shri Braja Kishore Tripathi

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri G.L. Batra—*Additional Secretary*
2. Shri K.K. Sharma—*Joint Secretary*
3. Shri B.B. Pandit—*Director*
4. Shri R.C. Gupta—*Assistant Director*

INTRODUCTION

1. The Chairman of the Estimates Committee, as authorised by the Committee, do present on their behalf, this Thirtieth Report on the Ministry of Rural Development — Jawahar Rozgar Yojana.

2. Alleviation of rural poverty has been one of the primary objectives of the planned development in India. Since rural poverty is inextricably linked with low income level in the rural sector and therefore, with the problem of unemployment including under-employment in the rural areas, the objective of increasing employment opportunities has constantly been engaging the attention of planners and policy makers. The Committee undertook the examination of Jawahar Rozgar Yojana keeping in view the endemic problem of rural unemployment.

3. The Committee considered the replies given by the Ministry of Rural Development to a detailed questionnaire issued on Jawahar Rozgar Yojana whereafter they took evidence of the representatives of the Ministry on 9.9.1992. The Committee wished to express their thanks to the officers of the Ministry of Rural Development for placing before them the detailed written notes on the subject and for furnishing whatever information they desired in connection with the examination of the subject. The Committee also appreciated the frankness with which the officials/representatives shared their views, perception and constraints with the Committee.

4. The Committee were also benefited from the views of Dr. S. Acharya—Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Bombay; Ms. Aruna Roy and Mr. Nikhil Dey—Social workers from District Udaipur; Shri Chetan Ram—URMUL Trust, Bikaner; Dr. Indira Hirwa—Gandhi Labour Institute, Ahmedabad; AVM S. Sahani (Retd.)—Development Alternatives, New Delhi; Dr. (Mrs.) Rohini Nayyar; Dr. T.S. Papola—Consultants, Planning Commission, all of whom tendered evidence before the Committee. The Committee wish to place on record their gratitude to them.

The Committee also wish to express their thanks to the non-official organisations *viz.* Phulbani Rural Development and Technology Agency; Malanadu Development Society etc. for furnishing valuable information/memoranda which helped the Committee in their examination of the the subject.

During the course of their examination of the subject the Committee also undertook a study tour of various districts in a number of States where JRY scheme is being implemented. They were immensely benefited by their interaction with beneficiaries, implementing agencies and the officials of the State Governments.

5. The Report is divided into six Chapters. In the First Chapter the Committee have discussed about the objectives and salient features of the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana. In the Second Chapter, they have commented upon allocation, utilisation and adequacy of resources. Planning and execution of works have been discussed in Chapter III whereas payment of wages under the Yojana have been discussed in Chapter IV. In Chapter V the Committee have commented upon the monitoring and evaluation aspect of the Programme. Indira Awas Yojana and Million Wells Scheme have been examined in Chapter VI of the Report.

6. In this Report, the Committee have expressed their regrets about the fact that none of the series of schemes for alleviation of rural poverty implemented by Government of India with the help of State Governments have addressed the problem in a comprehensive manner. It is a matter of great concern to the Committee that even after years of planned development there are still 200 million unemployed poor people living in rural India.

7. The Committee are constrained to find that the necessary funds meant for various poverty alleviation programmes, as admitted by the Government, did not invariably go to the areas of concentration of landless and unemployed rural labour. In 1989-90, there were 120 backward districts with acute poverty. The Committee have desired that the Government should accord preference in allocation of funds to these 120 districts suffering from acute poverty.

8. The Committee have also observed that the JRY has more or less operated in isolation without having any meaningful linkages with the other on-going developmental as well as poverty alleviation programmes. Obviously, this situation impairs the investment efficiency of Jawahar Rozgar Yojana. The Committee have lend full support to the recommendations made by the Public Accounts Committee in their 91st Report (Eighth Lok Sabha) on IRDP wherein that Committee had recommended to integrate all allied programmes and activities and the infrastructure required for effective implementation of all such programmes. The Committee have, therefore, desired that there must be single integrated development plan formulated by each Panchayat Samiti which must be made responsible and accountable for its successful implementation and at the same time a beneficiary should be assisted in a sustained manner over a certain period to enable him to cross the poverty line once for all. With this objective in view, the Committee have recommended that all poverty alleviation programmes should be merged.

9. In this Report, the Committee have also recommended for diversion of resources from poorly performing Mandal Panchyats/Districts to better performing ones, preparation of annual plans well in time, identification of families living below the poverty line, strengthening of technical support to Panchayat Samities, revision of wage and material cost ratio, maintenance of assets created, exemplary punishment to persons involved in misappropriation/misutilisation of funds, proper maintenance of muster rolls,

strengthening the monitoring arrangements. social/special audit of JRY works etc.

10. The Committee have also recommended that the prescribed unit cost of a house to be constructed under Indira Awas Yojana should be revised every year at the time of releasing funds to the States, on the basis of average increase in wages and material cost during the preceding year.

11. As the Million Wells Scheme has been very popular amongst the rural poor as much as the facility operates as a key to better agricultural productivity, the Committee have desired the Government to seriously consider the desirability of permitting digging of wells under Jawahar Rozgar Yojana itself.

12. For facility and reference the observations and recommendations have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report and have also been reproduced in a consolidated form in Appendix III to the Report.

NEW DELHI;
April 28, 1993

Vaisakha 8, 1915 (Saka)

MANORANJAN BHAKTA
Chairman,
Estimates Committee

CHAPTER I

JAWAHAR ROZGAR YOJANA

A. Introductory

1.1 The Government of India have from time to time launched a number of programmes for creating employment opportunities in the rural areas. The Rural Manpower Programme (RMP) taken up towards the end of 1960-61 continued till the end of 1968-69. However, owing to resource constraint, only a little over 20% of the originally envisaged outlay of Rs. 150 crores could be provided and about 137 million mandays were generated. Later a Crash Scheme for Rural Employment (CSRE) was launched for a period of 3 years from April, 1971 with an annual outlay of Rs. 50 crores. Although, the objective of providing employment opportunities by generating 315.9 million mandays against a target of 315 million mandays was achieved, the benefits in terms of direct employment and asset creation was found to be too widely scattered. A pilot Intensive Rural Employment Programme (PIRE) was also taken up in November, 1972 in 15 selected Community Development Blocks for 3 year period to provide additional employment and to create assets which were to have a multiplier effect on creation of new job opportunities and also to attempt manpower budgeting with a view to ultimately evolving a comprehensive programme for the rest of the country.

1.2 In April 1977, Food for Work Programme was launched with an objective of creating employment opportunities in the rural areas by utilising the surplus stocks of foodgrains and creating durable community assets. Under this programme a total employment of 799.32 million mandays was generated during the years 1977-78 to 1979-80 (September). Even though the programme was recognised as a major instrument of rural employment and development, a number of deficiencies were noticed in its implementation. The working of this programme was accordingly reviewed in 1980. After being revamped and restructured it was renamed as National Rural Employment Programme (NREP).

1.3 Launched in October 1980, this Programme became a regular part of the Sixth Five Year Plan from April 1981 onwards and continued to be implemented upto 31 March, 1988 as a Centrally Sponsored Programme. The allocation of resources was to be made both by the Centre and the States on a 50:50 sharing basis. The Programme aimed at providing supplementary employment opportunities to work seekers during the lean period of the year besides creating durable community assets and raising the nutritional standard of the rural poor.

Experience of implementation of National Rural Employment Programme (NREP)/Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP) over the years showed that whereas the Government of India's objective in starting these programmes' was to tackle the problem of unemployment of unskilled rural labourers, the distribution of funds by the States in different regions and districts did not follow this logic. The funds did not invariably go to the areas where there was concentration of unemployed landless labour. After almost seven/eight years of the implementation of the wage-employment programmes, the evaluation showed that;

- (i) there were at least 53% village which had not ever got the benefit of any works programme at all;
- (ii) the wage-employment resources were being used by the States as a substitute for Plan and Non-Plan resources;
- (iii) the type of assets being created were not economically productive;
- (iv) the system of approval of the projects/schemes was such that is left much to be desired; and
- (v) in spite of the clear guidelines to the effect that the felt needs of the village people should reflect in the works programme, there was not much involvement of the people at the grassroot level in identifying the items of work and implementation of the programmes.

1.4 In his Budget Speech for the year 1989-90, the then Finance Minister announced a new scheme named as 'Jawaharlal Nehru Rozgar Yojana' for intensive employment in backward districts with acute poverty and unemployment to be implemented in 120 districts for which a provision of Rs. 500 crores was made. The intention behind it was that the funds allotted under the new scheme would be in addition to the existing NREP/RLEGP funds for providing more employment opportunities in view of the backwardness of these districts. A announcement was also made by him, in the Budget Speech that NREP and RLEGP would be merged into one programme and implemented as Centrally Sponsored Scheme on 75:25 sharing between the Centre and the States.

1.5 However, after reconsidering the whole matter it was decided that NREP/RLEGP and the new programme announced by the Finance Minister should be merged into one single rural employment programme to be known as 'Jawahar Rozgar Yojana' (JRY). This programme was launched by Government on 1st April, 1989. The expenditure under the programme is to be shared between the Centre and the State on 80:20 basis.

1.6 To a question whether all those 53 percent villages which did not get the benefit of any works programme under NREP/RLEGP

have been covered under JRY, the Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development stated during evidence:

“.....In the earlier programme of NREP and RLEGP there was no system by which every village was benefited with some money. The money was being distributed on the basis of certain formula and various methods. Here, under the JRY we made it as a part of the system by which every Panchayat in the country should get some amount. There are 2,20,000 panchayats in the country. All of them will get some amount under the JRY as matter of right.”

Asked whether all villages or all the panchayats are covered, the witness clarified:

“.....All panchayats are covered. There are 5,83,000 villages in the country and 2.20 lakh panchayats. Some panchayats have more than one village. All panchayats are covered under JRY. I wanted to highlight that in JRY the coverage is much more than other programmes. We tried to cover every Panchayat in the country.”

1.7 A non-official expert in her memorandum submitted to the Committee, has also stated that JRY is different from the earlier programmes in several ways:

- (i) It has a major objective of ensuring 100 days of employment to atleast one member of each family of rural landless labourers in the country.
- (ii) Secondly, it covers each and every village of the country.
- (iii) It is planned and implemented largely through village panchayats (after deducting 6% funds for IAY and 20% for MWS, 80% of the rest of the funds are passed on to village panchayats), and in that sense it gives real powers to village panchayats;
- (iv) It has also given powers to villagers who, through Gram Sabhas, can select works to be undertaken under JRY and can also control the overall working of the programme at the village level; and
- (iv) There is a quantum jump in the funds for the programme (JRY funds in the first year were roughly one and a half times of the total NREP-RLEGP funds in the earlier year).

B. Objectives and Salient Features

1.8 The objectives of the JRY programme are as under:

(a) Primary Objective

Generation of additional gainful employment for the unemployed and underemployed persons both men and women in the rural areas.

(b) Secondary Objectives

(i) Creation of sustained employment by strengthening rural economic infrastructure and also assets in favour of rural poor for their direct and continuing benefits.

(ii) Improvement in the overall quality of life in the rural areas.

1.9 Elucidating the objectives further, the Secretary, Rural Development, stated during evidence:

“Basically it is an employment programme. The intention and the objective is to create employment opportunities for the rural folk, particularly those who are below the poverty line, who constitute the target group for this Yojana. At the same time, the programme also creates rural assets and rural infrastructure.”

1.10 Asked to elaborate the term ‘gainful employment’, the witness deposed:

“The term ‘gainful employment’ is used because it should not be as giving doles. The worker does some work and some asset is created and he is able to get the purchasing power.”

In this regard, the Ministry of Rural Development have, in a written reply, stated:

“The employment offered has to result in a reasonable gain to the labour and should not be nominal. Payment of wages under the JRY is governed by the provisions of Minimum wages Act of the concerned state. As the wages paid under the Yojana can not be less than the minimum wages fixed under the relevant Act, it is termed as ‘gainful employment’.”

1.11 The Committee asked as to how far the secondary objective of JRY viz., creation of sustained employment by strengthening rural economic infrastructure as also creation of assets in favour of rural poor for the direct and continuing benefits have been achieved. The Ministry in their written reply stated:

“Indira Awas Yojana (IAY) and million Wells Scheme (MWS) components of the JRY have resulted in the creation of substantial assets in favour of the rural poor, SC/ST and released bonded labour. In addition, important economic assets have been created under Jawahar Rozgar Yojana for strengthening the rural economic infrastructure.”

1.12 However, during evidence before the Committee, the Secretary, Rural Development admitted that only ‘one-third of the requirements of supplemental employment are fulfilled’.

In this regard, Dr. Indira Hirway, a non-official expert, in her memorandum submitted to the Committee stated:

“It is now well accepted that though the primary objective of public works programmes is to generate employment for the un/underemployed, the programmes also have an important role to play in the development process of an economy like ours. In the long run the programmes are expected (a) to generate such durable assets that expand the labour absorbing capacity of the mainstream and create sustained employment opportunities in the economy (these assets could be productive assets like minor irrigation works or infrastructural facilities like roads), (b) to prevent environmental degradation and to promote ecological regeneration so as to strengthen the basis of the rural economy and (c) to improve the quality of life of the poor by constructing amenities and facilities for the poor life of the poor (such as, school rooms, residential housing, drinking water facilities etc.). It is expected that by fulfilling this long term role, the public works programmes will contribute to the overall development of the economy and expand the mainstream employment—as a result of which the need for such programmes will decline gradually.”

1.13 Reacting to the objectives of JRY, the witness stated during evidence:

“.....the objectives of the JRY are definitely appropriate in the sense that asset building for sustainable quality of life, improvement of infrastructural development are desirable at the village level. Whatever is to be done should be done through the JRY. But this is to be done at different levels also.....For this purpose we should have overall planning at the regional level. From that point of view, intervention at the village level itself will have a very limited objective. It has to be linked up in a meaningful way with the planning at higher levels.....

Secondly, as an economist I would like to divide the public works which can be taken up under JRY kind of programmes into three categories. First priority should be given to the directly productive investments like irrigation, water shed development, afforestation etc.

These assets are labour intensive in the construction as well as post construction stages. Second priority should be given to those which are not directly productive but which promote development in a region such as roads. These are necessary for economic development. If you do not have roads, you cannot have development. Third priority should be given to construction of buildings for housing, schools, dispensaries etc.”

1.14 However, she admitted that there is no explicit focus of this kind in the designing of the programmes—especially at the village level where the bulk of the JRY funds are spent. In her opinion of clear prioritisation of the

types of assets depending on the long run impact of the assets on employment and environment should have been incorporated in the programme. Also, strengthening the village ecological system or micro watershed development should have been incorporated for village level programmes. Moreover JRY is an isolated programme—isolated from general development planning as well as from other poverty alleviation programmes. Consequently, it operates in isolation without having any meaningful linkages with the ongoing development process; at the village and district levels. Planning for JRY under this background is likely to result in some wastages.

1.15 She further stated that whereas she had appreciated the need for giving some powers to village panchayats to plan under JRY as per their own requirements, it was felt necessary to see that (a) they understand the logic of the programme and select works accordingly (b) they have an access to the required expertise to guide them in undertaking works (for example, for ecological regeneration and micro watershed development), and (c) the decision making is not dominated by the vested interests of the rich.

C. Objective of providing 100 days employment to a family member

1.16 As per guidelines, employment of 100 days was to be ensured to at least one member of each family of rural landless labourers in the country. However, during their study tour of various villages across the country and after inspection of actual sites of JRY works as also interaction with the beneficiaries, the feed back received by them in village after village was that the resources provided to individual panchayats were too meagre to create any dent in the problem of rural unemployment.

1.17 In this regard, Comptroller & Auditor-General has also in his report, pointed out that:

“The Department fixed a target of generation of 91.17 crore man-days for 1989-90, with a total outlay of Rs. 2623.08 crores (including share of States). According to the National Sample Survey (1983-84), the estimated rural population below poverty line was 22.15 crores as on 1st March, 1984. Taking the average size of a family as five, the number of rural families below the poverty line works out to 4.43 crores. On this basis, the total provision of funds would provide, on an average, employment to one member of every rural family living below poverty line for 21 days in a year. Thus the availability of funds for the programme is too inadequate to achieve the objective of providing full employment opportunities to one member of each family living below the poverty line.”

1.18 An unofficial expert has also complained about the inadequacy of funds in the following words:

“The objective of covering all the villages under JRY and ensuring 100 days of employment to one member of each landless labour

family do not match with the size of the funds allotted to the programme. It seems that the funds are spread too thinly vast rural areas (for example, in Gujarat 7500 village panchayats out of the total of 13412 — about 56% got less than Rs. 25000/- in 1991-92 under the programme). Many village panchayats therefore can take up very small works that generate limited employment. The objectives of providing 100 days of work to landless families is completely out of question.”

1.19 In this connection, a voluntary organisation from, Rajasthan has, in a memorandum submitted to the Committee, stated:

“The JRY allocations to the panchayats in the area where the sangathan works, has resulted in far less than the desired quantum of work, i.e. 100 days of work in a year. If all those on IRDP lists of families below the poverty line are given employment, that the number of days, that each family could get would be 6-10 days per annum. The reasons are as follows:—

(a) *Insufficient allocations*

The money provided is far less than the amount required to give viable and sufficient employment to those below the poverty line.

(b) *Material - Labour ratio*

Most panchayats complain that the provision of the 60:40 ratio for labour and material is unrealistic and in practice end up spending much more than the allocated amount on materials. The rising prices of materials have further eroded funds available for employment.

(c) *Use of Contractors*

Although use of contractors is banned under the programme, the practice is still widely prevalent. This obviously cuts into the insufficient allocations for employment.”

1.20 Ministry of Rural Development have also admitted, in a written reply that:

“With the existing level of resources available under Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY), it is not possible to provide 100 days of employment to one member of each rural family living below the poverty line in any State/UT.”

During evidence the Secretary, Rural Development also stated:

“JRY is one of the many schemes of poverty alleviation and it ends up really as a transitional employment and given the reasources they are able to generate for 30 days of employment on an average taking the country as a whole. The general planned

development itself should take care of the employment needs to a large extent. So, the planned development itself takes care of the employment needs. In due course the JRY will disappear. The success of JRY will be when it disappears."

1.21 The Additional Secretary of the Ministry informed the Committee during evidence:

"The only difficulty which we faced was the cut imposed on our budgetary allotment in 1990-91. Our allocation was cut by 15 per cent and in 1991-92 our total allocation for the Ministry as a whole was cut by Rs. 500 crores."

1.22 The Planning Commission is of the view that the employment guarantee under wage employment programmes like Jawahar Rozgar Yojana is not feasible with the level of resources available with the Centre as well as the States and that the States should also supplement JRY, to the extent possible by their own wage employment programme.

1.23 Asked whether the Govt. have sought the views of various States on the above suggestion of the Planning Commission, the Ministry of Rural Development replied in the negative.

He further added:

"This Ministry has not received any such suggestion from the Planning Commission so far. However, besides participating in the JRY, some States do have their own wage employment programmes even now, notably Maharashtra which has its own employment guarantee scheme."

1.24 Emphasising the need to strengthen the programme both financially and structurally, a non official organisation has suggested the guarantee a certain number of days of employment to every family below the poverty line. According to the organisation number of days could be reduced from 100 to a more realistic 30 days per year, but if the person does not get employment he must be entitled to redressal.

1.25 In order to overcome the problem of inadequacy of funds, a non official expert has suggested as follows:

"Major programmes/schemes/departments dealing with public works are DPAP, DDP, JRY, MNP, TADP (Tribal Area Development Programme), Special Area Programmes, NWDE (National Wasteland Development Board), forest department, irrigation department, department of lane development and soil conservation, public works department, agroclimatic zonal planning cell etc.etc. Each of these is planned/implemented almost independently of each other. Though some efforts are made sometimes to intergrate the functioning of some of these departments, (For example, comprehensive watershed planning under DDAP), these are far from adequate. In order to reduce the wastage of resources

arising out of duplication and lack of coordination, it is necessary to pool these resources together and plan the works in a coordinated way. We consider this as a minimum planning of public works at the State, and specially at the district and below district levels."

1.26 In this context, the Public Accounts Committee (8th Lok Sabha) in their 91st Report had recommended as under:

"It is imperative that all allied programmes and activities and the economic infrastructure required for effective implementation of these programmes are integrated and brought under one Ministry to avoid overlapping and to enable the Government to have an effective control over these programmes. These must be an integral part of a single development plan formulated by a single Development Authority and for whose effective implementation a single authority is responsible and accountable. It is also desirable that a beneficiary is covered under only one programme/scheme and given adequate assistance to enable him to cross the poverty line in one go and on sustained basis."

1.27 A Consultant from the Planning Commission suggested to the Committee during her evidence:

".....The JRY should be split into two. In one case we will concentrate on selected backward districts, it can be 100 or 150 which can be worked out, and there the employment is the primary objective. In the selected areas we should move at least towards 90 to 100 days of employment so that the poor man can get some livelihood... There is need to have flexibility. Targetting should be done in a flexible way because lean season varies from State to State and district to district."

1.28 Alleviation of rural poverty has been one of the primary objectives of planned development in India. Since rural poverty is inextricably linked with low income level in the rural sector and therefore with the problem of unemployment including under-employment in the rural areas the objective of increasing employment opportunities has constantly been engaging the attention of planners and policy makers. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the endemic problem of rural unemployment forms the core of growth strategies followed in the country during the last two decades. The Committee, however, regret to note that none of the series of schemes implemented by Government of India with the help of State Governments have addressed the problem of rural employment in a comprehensive manner. The resources allocated for the purpose have not been commensurate with the magnitude of the problem, have been spread too thinly and implemented in a lackadaisical manner even as each new scheme has met with a new set of pitfalls. This is substantially true also of the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana which otherwise is the most comprehensive attempt at

removal of rural unemployment. It is, therefore, a matter of great concern that even after years of planned development there are still 200 million poor people living in rural India. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that there should be higher allocation of resources for Jawahar Rozgar Yojana to achieve the desired objective of generation of more employment and creating assets in the rural areas.

1.29 The Committee are constrained to find that the necessary funds meant for various poverty alleviation programmes, as admitted by the Government, did not invariably go to the areas of the concentration of landless and unemployed rural labour. In 1989-90, there were 120 backward districts with acute poverty. According to the evaluation of wage employment programmes made by the Government itself there were at least 53 per cent villages which had not ever got the benefit of any works programme at all.

The Committee would, therefore, like the Government to accord preference in allocation of funds to all the 120 backward districts identified to be suffering from acute poverty.

1.30 The Committee, while finding the objectives of JRY laudable have, however, noticed that there is no explicit focus on prioritization of assets being created under the programme. They, therefore, recommend that without interfering with freedom of Panchayat Samities in selecting the works to be undertaken under JRY, care should be taken that these works dovetail with an over all plan for development of each region under which first priority should be given to directly productive investment in items like irrigation, water-shed development, afforestation etc., which are labour intensive at construction as well as post construction stages. This, the Committee feel, will also call for larger allocation of funds and greater integration of the efforts of individual Panchayat Samities. The Committee further recommend that the next priority should be given to construction of roads for promoting regional development while the last priority may be given to construction of buildings for schools, housing, dispensaries, etc. At the same time Committee agree to have flexibility for prioritization varying from State to State.

1.31 The Committee observe that the JRY generally operates in isolation without having any meaningful linkages with the other on-going developmental as well as poverty alleviation programmes. Obviously, this situation impairs the investment efficiency of JRY. In this connection, the Committee note that Public Accounts Committee in their 91st Report (8th Lok Sabha) on IRDP, had recommended that it was imperative to integrate all allied programmes and activities and the infrastructure required for effective implementation of all such programmes. The Estimates Committee lend their full support to this view and desire that there must be a single integrated development plan formulated by each Panchayat Samiti, which must be made responsible and accountable for its successful implementation.

At the same time, a beneficiary should be assisted in a sustained manner over a certain period to enable him to cross the poverty line once for all. With this objective, the Committee recommend that all poverty alleviation programmes should be merged.

CHAPTER II

ALLOCATION, UTILIZATION AND ADEQUACY OF RESOURCES

(a) Criteria for Allocation of Resources

2.1 The Central assistance under JRY is allocated to States/UTs on the basis of proportion of rural poor in a State/U.T. to the total rural poor in the country. From State to the districts, the allocations are to be made according to the index of backwardness formulated on the basis of percentage of agricultural labourers to main workers in rural areas, percentage of rural SC/ST population to total rural population and inverse of agricultural productivity defined as the value of agriculture produce out of each unit of land for the rural areas taken on the net basis in the weights of 20:60:20.

2.2 However, Audit have revealed during scrutiny of State-wise allocation of funds that while six States (Goa, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Manipur and Rajasthan) and six U.Ts. (Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu, Lakshadweep and Pondicherry) were allocated more than their proportionate share, 19 States and one U.T. got less. The Deptt. stated, in November, 1989, that the additional funds were given to the above States/ U.Ts. keeping in view the geographical conditions and their backwardness. However, no fresh guidelines or criteria to determine allocation on the basis of geographical conditions or other factors were laid down.

2.3 In this context JRY manual provides that for the purposes of allocation of funds to the village panchayats, the population of each village panchayat having less than 1,000 population is to be taken as 1,000 and more than 10,000 as 10,000. The population of SCs/STs is also to be adjusted accordingly. 60% of the resources earmarked for village panchayats are to be distributed on the basis of adjusted SC/ST population and 40% on the basis of adjusted total population.

Not less than 80 per cent of the funds allocated to each district after providing for earmarked sectors in accordance to the conditions of sanction letter of the grant by the Government of India, are to be distributed to the village panchayats/mandals (that is the lowest elected body) in the district. The balance 20 per cent funds could be utilised at the district level for inter-block/village works.

(b) Financial Allocation and Physical Targets

2.4 The Ministry of Rural Development have furnished the following details of overall physical and financial targets fixed/achieved under the Yojana since its inception:—

Year	Financial Provision (Rs. in crores)	Expenditure	Employment Generated (Target) (in Million Mandays)	Actual Employment Generation
1989-90	2630.67	2458.10	815.725	864.387
1990-91	2627.80	2600.02	929.109	874.559
1991-92	2620.90	2646.20	735.435	812.766
1992-93	2556.47	721.29 (till August, 1992)	788.490	208.152 (till August, 1992)

2.5 It is seen from the Report of the C&AG of India for the year ended 31st March, 1989, Union Govt. (Civil) that the demands for grants for 1989-90 did not contain specific provision for Jawahar Rozgar Yojana. The first instalment totalling Rs. 987.40 crores was released by Government making the expenditure debitable to Grants-in-aid to the States. The funds were released direct to District Rural Development Agencies without being routed through the Consolidated Fund of the respective States.

2.6 Asked about the reasons for releasing first instalment of Rs. 987.40 crores to the DRDAs/Zila Parishads directly in 1989-90 and thereafter routing its share through State Govts. from 1990-91 onwards, the Ministry of Rural Development stated:

“When JRY was launched in the year 1989-90, it was proposed that the funds under the Yojana will be distributed to districts directly as it would eliminate delays in the resources reaching the implementing agencies. However, during 1990-91, when the new Government assumed office, it was felt that in a federal structure, it may not be proper to distribute the funds directly to the districts while by-passing the States especially in the implementation of a programme for which the State Govts. also contribute.”

2.7 The Ministry of Rural Development have informed the Committee that assistance from the Centre to the States under the Yojana is made on the basis of the proportion of the rural poor that a State had in 1983-84. The Committee therefore wanted to know whether the States have been releasing the funds arbitrarily or on the basis of proportion of the rural poor each district had in 1983-84. The Ministry, in a written reply stated:

“Funds under the Yojana are allocated to States/UTs on the basis of the proportion of rural poor in the State/UT, as against the total

rural poor in the country as per the 38th round of NSS (i.e. 1983-84). From the States to the Districts, the allocation is made on the index of backwardness. The funds are allocated to the districts by the Centre and the States have no right to alter the allocation of the district without the approval of the Central Govt."

2.8 Elucidating the point further, the Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development stated during evidence:

"From the State to the District, the State Governments are required to distribute the funds on the basis of three indices. One is the inverse of an agriculture productivity, the proportion of SC/ST population to the total rural population and also the proportion of agricultural workers to the total workers — the dates given a weightage of 20:60:20. The money goes to the district and from the district to the panchayats. We gave only two indices for the panchayats. The population with a 60 per cent weightage to SC/ST."

He further clarified:

"The idea giving 60 per cent to SC/ST is that the tribal areas are normally less thickly populated. If you go by population they will get less. So we will give a 60 per cent weightage."

2.9 Asked whether any comprehensive survey of the rural poor has been made in each State, the witness stated:

".....each State has done its own list of families below the poverty line. Now what we did was in November, 1991, we issued comprehensive instructions to all the States to build up the list of the people below the poverty line taking the 1991-92 level prices as index and arrange them according to small farmers, marginal farmers, agricultural labourers. This exercise was completed in three States. The other States will have to scrutinise it again and complete the register. It is going to take a little time. In the meantime we are going by the register prepared by them earlier."

2.10 To a question about the magnitude of the problem, he replied:

"We required three thousand million mandays for rural employment, this was based on two-three things. One is the National Sample Survey which has brought out a paper on the unemployment situation in the country. But even in that there is a little difficulty because Kerala will show a high unemployment whereas in terms of poverty it is much less. So we took the Maharashtra Employment Guarantee Scheme to see how much employment it has created on an average and we tried to multiply it and apply it for the country as a whole. Thereby we arrived at three thousand million mandays. Broadly many experts agreed that this would be the magnitude."

2.11 It has been stated that against the financial provisions of Rs. 2630.67 crores a sum of Rs. 2458.10 crores was spent in 1989-90 and 864.38 million mandays employment was generated against the target of 875.72 million mandays.

When the Committee wanted to know the reasons for not spending the full amount provided under the Yojana and also whether the amount remaining unspent during 1989-90 was transferred to the next financial year, the Ministry stated:

“Funds upto 25% of the total allocation of the Year is permitted to be carried forward, so as to maintain continuity in the programme. The funds which were not utilised during 1989-90 were automatically treated as resources under JRY and utilised in the subsequent year.”

2.12 In reply to another question as to how it was possible to achieve 98.7 per cent target of creating employment against an expenditure of 93.4 percentage of the financial provisions, the Ministry stated:

“Under the Yojana not less than 60% of the resources are required to be utilised on wage component and 40% on non-wage component. The targets of creating employment are fixed on this basis. If the wage component exceeds 50% of the total allocation, it will result in generation of more employment, as compared to the targets and also the total expenditure under the Yojana.”

2.13 Against financial provision of Rs. 2627.80 crores in 1990-91, target of creating of employment of 929.10 million mandays was fixed whereas during 1989-90 an employment generation target of 875.73 million mandays was fixed with a financial allocation of Rs. 2630.67 crores. Asked as to how during 1990-91 it was possible to generate more employment in terms of mandays with less financial allocations in comparison to allocations during 1989-90, the Ministry of Rural Development stated:

“The employment targets are fixed by dividing the wage component of JRY funds by the minimum wages fixed by each State/ U.T.”

The witness further stated:

“The reason for larger achievements for 1990-91 as compared to 1989-90 is the change in the wage non-wage ratio to 60:40 1990-91 as against 50:50; in 1989-90. However it may be mentioned that owing to the enhancement of minimum wages in some of the State during 1990-91 as compared to 1989-90, there had been a reduction in targets also in the case of some States during 1990-91.”

2.14 In the connection, the Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development stated during evidence:

"...Every year there is carry forward balance of the previous year. This carry forward balance plus the money released in that particular year taken together contribute to the creation of mandays. That is why in 1989-90 there was a carry forward balance plus the Budget provision released for that particular year. In 1990-91 we had a cut of 15 per cent."

Asked to clarify whether mandays are also carried forward, the witness stated that 'money is carried but mandays will come against the target'.

2.15 Resources allocated under JRY and the corresponding States contribution from 1989-90 to 1992-93 is given at Appendix I.

Asked whether the targets set for generation of employment have been achieved in each of the States/UTs, the Ministry stated:

"The targets fixed for the employment generation and the achievements made in each State during 1991-92 is given in Appendix II. It may be seen therefrom that some of the States viz. Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar, Goa, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Punjab, West Bengal, A&N Islands, Daman & Diu, Lakshadweep were not able to achieve the targets fully. But as a carry over of 25% to the next year is allowed, the achievement upto 75% may be considered as satisfactory. Taking this into consideration it can be said that only Arunachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Meghalaya, Punjab, Daman & Diu were not able to achieve the targets for the year 1991-92. The reason for the non-achievement of the targets by these States are as under:—

- (i) Non-release of JRY funds by the States to Districts and the districts to the panchayats in time, owing to their own ways and means problems;
- (ii) Disturbed conditions in some of these states; and
- (iii) Unfavoured seasonal conditions to take up works under JRY."

(c) Diversion of resources from poorly performing Mandal Panchayats/ Districts to better performing ones under JRY

2.16 Para 7.1 of the JRY Manual provides that diversion of resources from one district to another are not permissible. Similarly, diversion of resources from village panchayat to another village panchayat are also not permissible. However, additional allocation can be considered for those districts which are performing better within the overall State allocations. The Government of Karnataka have drawn attention of the Committee to the words 'additional allocation can be considered for those districts which are performing better within the overall State allocations' and stated that 'obviously, there can be no other way of giving effect to this stipulation for granting additional allocations to the better performing districts with the State. No other interpretation of the stipulation made in the last sentence

of para 7.1 of the JRY guidelines seems to be feasible or else the sentence itself would become entirely redundant'.

2.17 The State Government have further stated that as the existing guidelines themselves permit additional allocations to be made to the better performing districts (i.e., districts where the demand for wage works is more), any blanket ban on the diversion of resources from one district/panchayat to another district/panchayat within the overall State allocations, may not be called for. They have therefore suggested for agreeing to certain inter-district readjustment of the JRY resources allocated to the State in the light of the actual requirements and conditions prevailing in different areas of the State. The State Government have however assured the Committee that the 60:40 wage material ratio as well as all the other conditions stipulated in the JRY guidelines with regard to implementation of these works could be strictly adhered to.

(d) Unutilised Resources of NREP/RLEGP

2.18 Asked whether the unutilised resources of NREP & RLEGP available with the States were reckoned for fixing employment generation targets under JRY during 1989-90, the Ministry of Rural Development stated:

"The unutilised resources of NREP & RLEGP with the States/UTs as on 1.4.89 were not taken into consideration for fixing the employment generation target under JRY during 1989-90, as those figures were not readily available there. However, these resources were taken as resources available under JRY and were utilised under the Yojna."

(e) Delay in Release of Central Assistance/States' Share

2.19 Paras 10 and 11 of the JRY manual provided that the State Governments shall release the grants to the DRDA/Zila Parishads within a week after release of the Central assistance along with its own matching share. The funds to Village Panchayats will be distributed by the DRDAs/Zila Parishads within a week of the receipt of the funds from the State Government in accordance to the conditions prescribed in the sanction order of the Government of India.

2.20 However, it has been observed that there have been a number of cases of delay in releasing States' share to districts/Zila Parishads. Similarly, there were instances of short release/delay in release of funds by DRDAs to panchayats.

2.21 In regard to delay in releasing Central Govt.'s share, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development stated during evidence:

"The difficulty is in releasing funds from the Centre because of cuts imposed in the middle of the year.

As regards actual release of funds to the State Governments and

as regards the allocation made, one difficulty is that our allocation of first instalment.....is released generally by the first week of April. The second instalment is released only on the basis of actual expenditure of the first instalment in the field. In case of utilisation is less, naturally other releases are not made.

Secondly for utilisation, there are earmarked sectors for SC/T. If in these earmarked sectors actual expenditure falls short of whatever is the norm then in the case also there are less release of funds.....The second release will depend upon the actual expenditure incurred. According to the JRY manual we have laid down some conditions. The major important part there is that out of the earlier instalments, at least 50 per cent should be utilised. If it is not utilised then obviously there is no money for implementing the scheme and carrying on the work."

In this regard, the Secretary, Minsitry of Rural Development added:

"In regard to release of funds, normally funds is expected to be released quarterly. But in the case of JRY, we made a departure. For the year 1992-93, we already released a sum of Rs. 1046 crores out of the total amount of Rs. 2100 crores from this April. I am taking the whole country together. The Prime Minister had mentioned to us that we must release funds in summer season itself. As per the official system which we had, we cannot release the second instalment without getting utilisation certificate for the first instalment."

2.22 The Ministry of Rural Development have, in their O.M. dated 10th March, 1992, informed the Committee that Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Haryana, Karnataka, Orissa and Tripura have not contributed their full matching share of 20% in the year 1991-92.

2.23 The Committee during their study tour of various districts in the country and through their interaction with the implementing agencies confirmed the fact that fund releases to Panchyat Samities were not timely and, often, did not conform to the available working season. This obviously results in low employment generation as well as wastages..

(f) Non Opening of Savings Bank Account

2.24 JRY funds (Central share as well as states' share) are to be kept in a bank or a post office in an exclusive and separate savings bank account by the DRDAs/ZPs and panchayats. Interest amount accrued on the deposits is to be treated as additional resources for the programme. Audit have pointed out that there was delay in transferring the amount from treasuries to bank/non opening of separate bank

accounts for JRY funds in a number of DRDAs/Village Panchayats in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Karnataka. Delay in depositing amounts received for the programme in saving bank account resulted in loss of interest which would have accrued to the programme.

In this connection, the Ministry of Rural Development have, in a written note, stated:-

“In the beginning of the programme, these minor problems had to be faced initially in some of the States/UTs before the speedy implementation of the programme in these States/UTs picked up. Initially, even the Post Offices and Banks were not prepared to open an exclusive Savings Bank Account for JRY as laid down in the guidelines. Keeping all this in view, a practical view of the matter perhaps is required to be taken particularly when the programme was at its initial state of the implementation at the time the audit was conducted. The matter in this regard has also been taken up with the concerned State Govts. and the Govt. of Karnataka and UP have confirmed that Savings Bank Accounts have now been opened and the requisite transfer of money has been effected.”

2.25 In Kerala, the amounts released for DRDAs Panchayats were retained in treasuries savings bank account as per instructions of the State Government. During their Study Tour to Trivandrum, the Village Panchayats desired the Committee to recommend for opening of accounts only in Post Offices/Nationalised Banks as lot of difficulty was being experienced by them in withdrawing JRY funds from the treasuries Savings Bank Accounts.

2.26 The Committee note that the Central assistance is to be allocated on the basis of proportion of rural poor that a State/UT had in 1983-84 as per 38th round of NSS to the total rural poor in the country. However, they have found from the Report of the C&AG of India for the year ended 31st March, 1989 (No. 13 of 1990) that while six States (Goa, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Manipur and Rajasthan) and six UTs (Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Dadra & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu, Lakshadweep and Pondicherry) were allocated more than their proportionate share, 19 States and one UT got less. The Department of Rural Development have stated that the additional funds were given to the above States/UTs keeping in view the geographical conditions and their backwardness. However, no fresh guidelines or criteria to determine allocation on the basis of geographical conditions or other factors were laid down. In this regard, the Planning Commission has also admitted that in recent years, several issues have been raised about the methodology of poverty estimation, both by professionals and State Govts. and they have, therefore, appointed an Expert Group to look into these issues relating to the definition and measurement of poverty. The Committee would like to

know whether the issues raised have been sorted out by the Expert Group and if so, the necessary changes effected in allocation of resources under JRY to various States/UTs may be intimated to them.

2.27 The Committee note that although Jawhar Rozgar Yojana was launched from 1st April, 1989, Demands for Grants for 1989-90 did not contain any specific provisions for the Yojana. The first instalment of Rs. 987.40 crores was, however, released by Govt. making the expenditure debitable to Grants-in-aid to States. The Central Govt. instead of routing the funds through the consolidated funds of the respective States released the funds direct to the District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs). Apparently in order to eliminate delays in the resources reaching the implementing agencies. From the year 1991 onwards the funds are, however, being distributed to the districts through the concerned State Governments as it has not been considered proper to by-pass State Governments in a federal system particularly when State Governments are also expected to contribute their share to this programme. The Committee are constrained to observe that the wisdom of releasing funds direct to District Rural Development Agencies remains doubtful.

2.28 The Committee are surprised to note that the Ministry of Rural Development did not take into consideration unutilised resources of NREP and RLEGP with the States/Union territories as on 1.4.1989 for fixing the employment generation targets. Moreover, the programme was started without doing any comprehensive survey of the rural poor and the funds were allotted on the basis of rural poor in the country as per 38th round of N.S.S. i.e., 1983-84. In this connection, the Public Accounts Committee (1986-87) had, in paragraph 1.103 of their 94th Report also observed, that NREP had lacked focus on the target group population for whom it was meant. That Committee had, therefore, desired the Govt. to have reliable estimates of people in need of employment in different areas of districts and estimated demand for employment during various seasons in a year. It was also recommended that a system of registering the workers and issuing to them identity cards should be evolved. In spite of the specific recommendations made, it seems that the Govt. did not take any action in the matter and it was only in November, 1991 that the Ministry of Rural Development issued comprehensive instructions to all the States for preparing the list of people below poverty line taking 1991-92 level price as index. However, this exercise could be completed only in three States. The Committee would, therefore, like to know whether all the States/Union Territories have prepared the list of people below poverty line based on 1991-92 price-index. They also recommend that all the workers, after their identification, should be issued identity cards-cum pass books so that all the necessary entries such as days on which work given, wages paid etc. could be made and verified at a subsequent stage. This would also help the Government in getting the reliable data for future planning.

2.29 The Committee are of the view that the above instances are

indication of the hasty approach adopted by the Govt. while launching the Yojana without any proper preparatory measures. The deficiencies pointed out above and discussed in subsequent paragraphs indicate the defective approach of the Govt. in formulating and implementing the Yojana.

2.30 From the financial provisions made and targets for employment generation fixed, the Committee find that against the provision of Rs. 2630.67 crores, a sum of Rs. 2458.10 crores (93.4%) was spent in 1989-90 and 864.38 million mandays employment (98.7%) were generated against the target of 875.72 million man-days. Again, against the financial provision of Rs. 2627.80 crores in 1991, target of creating of employment of 929.10 million mandays was fixed whereas during 1989-90 employment generation of 875.73 million mandays was fixed with a financial allocation of Rs. 2630.67 crores. In this connection the Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development explained during evidence that States were allowed to carry forward about 25% of the funds released in one year for use in the next year and these carry forward balances plus the money released in that particular year taken together contributed to the creation of mandays. He clarified that only money was being carried forward to the next year and the mandays created were being shown against the targets fixed in that year. From the information furnished by the Ministry of Rural Development, the Committee are concerned to note that the employment targets are fixed by simply dividing the wage component of Jawahar Rozgar Yojana funds by the minimum wages fixed by each State/Union Territory.

2.31 The Committee feel that the above criteria adopted by the Government is faulty as it is not possible to verify the correctness of figures of achievement of employment actually generated. They, therefore, recommend that the State Governments should be asked to maintain authentic records like muster rolls susceptible of verification so that the position of achievement of generation of employment *vis-a-vis* those targetted is maintained correctly. At the same time scientifically designed sample studies should be carried out in each State/region to verify the empirical data generated by the State Governments.

2.32 The Committee observe that there have been a number of cases of delay in releasing States share to districts/Zila Parishads. Similarly, there were instances of short release/delay in release of funds by DRDAs to panchayats. The Ministry of Rural Development have also admitted that Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Haryana, Karnataka, Orissa and Tripura did not contribute their matching share of 20% in the year 1991-92 in time. Keeping in view the above facts, the Committee are in a fix to accept the figures of employment generation furnished to them by the Ministry.

* From 1991, the Ministry had brought the carry forward balances down to 15% of the total allocations.

2.33 During their Study Tours of various Districts in the country and through their interaction with the implementing agencies the Committee have found that funds released to the Panchayats were not timely and, often did not conform to the availability of working season. This obviously, results in low employment generation as well as wastages of funds. The Committee, therefore, recommend that Government should evolve a system by which grants/JRY funds are released to the DRDAs/Zila Parishads and Village Panchayats well in time:

2.34 From the JRY Manual the Committee find that diversion of resources from one district/village panchayat to another is not permissible. However, additional allocation can be considered for those districts which are performing better within the overall State allocations. In this connection, Government of Karnataka have stated that as the existing guidelines themselves permit additional allocations to be made to the better performing districts, any blanket ban on the diversion of resources from one district/panchayat to another district/panchayat within the overall State allocations may not be called for. The Committee agree with the views expressed by the Govt. of Karnataka and recommend that readjustment of the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana resources allocated to a State/Union Territory should be allowed with the approval of State/UT Administration within JRY provisions. However, the State Govt./Union Territory should simultaneously ensure that the wage material ratio as well as other conditions stipulated in Jawahar Rozgar Yojana Guidelines are strictly adhered to.

2.35 The Committee find that JRY funds (Central as well as State's share) are to be kept in a bank or a post office in an exclusive and separate Savings Bank A/c by the DRDAs/Zila Parishads and Panchayats. The amount of interest accrued on the deposits is to be treated as additional resources for the programme. However, Audit have pointed out that there was delay in transferring the amount from treasuries to bank/non opening of separate Bank A/c for JRY funds in a number of DRDAs/Village Panchats in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Karnataka. In this context, the Committee do not agree with the views of the Ministry of Rural Development that in the beginning of the programme such minor problems had to be faced.

2.36 During their study tour to Trivandrum a number of Village Panchayats complained that as per instructions of the State Govt., the amount released for DRDAs/Panchayats is to be retained in treasuries' Saving Bank A/c with the result that they have to face a lot of difficulties in withdrawing money from there. The Committee desire that instructions for keeping JRY funds in Post Offices/Nationalised/State Cooperative Banks only should be strictly adhered to.

CHAPTER III PLANNING AND EXECUTION OF WORKS

(a) Organisational set up

3.1 The Ministry of Rural Development of the Central Government is the administrative department responsible for planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme.

At the Central level, a committee set up in the department is to provide overall guidance, lay down guidelines and undertake continuous monitoring and supervision of implementation of the programme whereas at the State level, the responsibility devolves upon the State Level Co-ordination Committee.

3.2 At the District level, the District Rural Development Agency/Zilla Parishad (DRDA/ZP) is entrusted with the responsibility for co-ordination, review, supervision and monitoring of the programme. The DRDA/ZP is entrusted with the responsibility for co-ordination, review, supervision and monitoring of the programme. The DRDA/ZP is accountable to the State Government for ensuring that the report/returns in respect of works taken up for execution in the district are furnished on time. The DRDA is headed by a Project Officer, and ZP by a Chairman. They are supported by technical/administrative staff of the level of Executive Engineer, etc. on the technical side and Asstt. Project Officers, Clerks, Stenographers, etc. on the administrative side. The Block level officials, i.e., BDO2/Block Samiti staff help the district authorities in implementing and monitoring the programme.

3.3 At the village level, the programme is to be implemented through the village panchayat. The village panchayat would appoint a committee for each village to oversee, supervise and monitor the works under the programme. This committee should include at least one representative of SCs/STs. The members of the Panchayat are assisted by Village Secretary who is a Govt. official. Where Village panchayats are not in existence, their share of funds would be passed on to the concerned block/block samiti which would be responsible for implementing the programme. Technical supervision of work is the responsibility of the block agencies/DRDAs.

3.4 Asked whether the existing organisational set up of the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana at the Centre was adequate for planning; implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the programme and whether any review has been made for strengthening the implementation and monitoring aspects of the programme, the Ministry of Rural Development have stated:

“Planning, implementation and monitoring of JRY have been highly decentralised. Evaluation has to be done by independent agencies, so as to avoid any bias. Hence the limited organisational set-up at the centre now, appears adequate.

No review has been made to strengthen the implementation and monitoring aspects of the programme. Steps have, however, been taken to ensure that the Central Government Officers visit each State/UT. at least once a year. These visits will include discussions at the State/district/village panchayat level about the implementation of the programme and also to see some works taken up under the Yojana, both at the district and the village panchayat level. This would provide some idea about the implementation of the programme.”

3.5 In reply to another question whether the present organisational set up of the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana was adequate in each of the State/UT whether there was any machinery for monitoring the implementation of JRY projects in each of the State/UT, the Ministry stated:

“Since planning and implementation of JRY is entirely decentralised, the organisational set up at the State/UT level seems to be adequate. As per JRY guidelines, the officers at the district, sub-division and block level are required to monitor all aspects of the programme through field visits to work sites in the interior areas. Accordingly, a schedule of inspection, prescribing the minimum number of field visits, for each supervisory level of functionary from the State Government to block level is drawn up and adhered to.

A provision of 2% of the annual allocation (Central + State) is made under the guidelines for meeting the expenditure on Staff of the State/district/block/village panchayat level, including travel costs for purposes of inspection.”

(b) Target Group under the Yojana

3.6 People below the poverty line are the target group under the JRY. Preference is to be given to SC/STs and freed bonded labourers for employment under the programme and 30 per cent of the employment opportunities are to be reserved for women. In this connection Secretary, Rural Development stated during evidence:

“This programmes is targeted towards the rural poor in the country. As this programme is targeted at providing wage employment at local level and largely manual labour, in one sense, the people who turn up for such type of work are really those who are poor and who are prepared to do manual work.”

3.7 The Ministry of Rural Development, in a written reply, informed the Committee that:

“Poverty and backwardness in each of the States/districts has been computed on the basis of consumption expenditure by the National Sample Survey Organisation of the Planning Commission. The proportion of rural poor in each State to the total rural poor in the country has been shown in the Appendix III Punjab has the lowest percentage of population below the poverty line i.e. 7.20% while Orissa has the highest i.e. 48.30%.

Families living below the poverty line are identified and registered in the IRDP Survey Register at the district level. However, the lists are not available at the Government of India level.”

3.8 To a question whether the districts have been identified on the basis of index of backwardness in all the States/Union Territories, the Ministry of Rural Development replied in negative. When asked whether the identification of the targeted beneficiary families, essential for proper implementation of the programme, has been completed in all the states, the Ministry stated:

“JRY is a self-targetting programme wherein identification of targetted beneficiaries families not required. Whosoever, comes for manual work at minimum wages has to be given employment. People below poverty line statewide as per N.S.S.O. survey conducted in 1988-89 is given in the Appendix II.

3.9 In this connection, the Committee have been informed in another communication received from the Ministry that Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jammu and Kashmir, Maharashtra, Orissa, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have not prepared the list of people below poverty line (BPL) according to income and occupational categories required for BPL survey for 8th Plan.

In reply to another question whether there were any complaints regarding selection of labour from targeted groups, the Ministry stated:

“No specific complaints have been received in the matter. However, wherever such complaints are received, they are referred to State Government for remedial action.”

3.10 Asked whether the Government have evolved any mechanism to identify the quantum of unemployment and under-employment at the village/Block level and whether areas which may not require the wage employment programme for the poor at all have been identified, the Ministry replied:

“There is no mechanism to identify the quantum of unemployment/under-employment at present. The Planning Commission is currently under taking an exercise to identify most backward areas

of high employment needs, which will have to be tackled through better targeting of JRY No areas have been identified so far, as those which do not require any wage employment programme."

3.11 In reply to a question as to how it is ensured that only SCs/STs/ economically backward classes are involved in JRY works, the Ministry stated:

"Though no steps have been indicated to ensure their participation, the share of SCs/STs in the employment is regularly monitored at the State and Central levels. The % share of SCs/STs in employment during the last three years is as under:

Year	Total employ- ment generated	Share of SCs/STs	%
1989-90	8643.87	4740.79	54.85
1990-91	8745.59	4764.67	54.48
1991-92	8081.05	4538.95	56.17

The share of economically backward classes under the Yojana is not monitored."

3.12 It has been stated that the Gram Panchayats are entitled to a Share of JRY funds on the basis of Poverty computed by giving 60% weightage to the population of SCs/STs and 40% to the total population. Asked whether all the village have been surveyed so as to know the percentage of people living below the poverty line and their proportion to the population of SCs/STs, the Ministry stated:

"For the purpose of allocation of funds from the Districts to the Panchayats, the total population of the Village Panchayat and population of SCs/STs only are required. Each village Panchayat is maintaining a IRDO Survey Registers, Where is the list of people below poverty line including SCs/STs, is indicated."

3.13 To a question as to how it is ensured that the 30% of the employment opportunities under the Yojana are offered to women as per guidelines, the Ministry replied:

"It is difficult to ensure strict compliance of this provision, especially when the implemention is totally decentralised. The

share of women in employment generated under the Yojana during the last three years is as under:

Year	Total employment generated	Share of Women	%
1989-90	8643.87	1905.17	22.04
1990-91	8745.59	2153.01	24.62
1991-92	8081.05	1951.87	24.15

The low percentage of women is attributable to social taboos and also to their unwillingness to come forward and take up manual labour in some parts of the country.

3.14 The Committee aver that the identification of beneficiary families is important to ensure that benefits under the programme reach the targeted group. The guidelines issued by the Department did not specify the income limit for identification of families to be benefited. In the absence of specific guidelines for annual income limit to be adopted, different income limits ranging from Rs. 3600 to Rs. 6400 were adopted for identifying the families living below the poverty line in Karnataka.

3.15 Identification of the targeted beneficiary families was not done in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar and Uttar Pradesh while in Karnataka and Rajasthan, the work was still to be in progress. When the attention of the Ministry of Rural Development was drawn to the above deficiencies, they stated:

“Although the target group under the Yojana continues to be the people below poverty line, out of which preference is given to the SCs/STs for employment under the Yojana, no formal instructions for identification of beneficiary families have been issued by the Government of India....the objective was to be achieved by fixing the programme parameters that it is self-targeting in nature.”

(c) Preparation of Annual Plans

3.16 Preparation of annual plans has been given high priority under JRY. As per para 27.1 & 27.2 of the JRY Manual, the DRDAs are to prepare annual action plan equivalent to the value of 125 per cent of its share of funds allocated in the preceding year before the beginning of the financial year. No work can be taken up unless it forms part of the Annual Action Plan.

3.17 While preparing the Annual Action Plan, completion of the incomplete works are to be given priority over taking up of new works. No work shall be taken up by the DRDA/ZP which cannot be completed within two financial years.

3.18 Audit has pointed out that annual plans of work for District Rural Development Agencies/Panchayats were not prepared/completed in any of the States test-checked. In this connection, the Ministry of Rural Development have, in their OM dated 10/3/1993 stated as under:

“As regards the preparation of Annual Plan of works to be taken by the DRDAs/Village Panchayats, the JRY guidelines clearly indicated that DRDAs/ZPs shall prepare Annual Action Plans equivalent to 125% of its share of funds allocated in the preceding year before the beginning of the financial year. The guidelines further lay down that the plans of development of villages in the jurisdiction of different village panchayats/mandals should be discussed thoroughly in the meetings of the village panchayats and the final decision arrived at should determine the plan of works to be taken up during a particular year.

As the programme of JRY was launched only in April 1989, it might have initially taken some time to give final shape to the Annual Action Plans by the Village Panchayats/DRDAs. In this context, it needs to be further mentioned that the implementation of the programme through the Village Panchayats was as such an entirely new approach and it was for the first time that they had been involved with the planning and implementation of works. In the Northern India, the months of April to June are the harvesting season, as a result most of the people in the rural areas remain busy during this time and chalking out of the priorities of works to be taken up was not an easy task for the panchayats. The matter as pointed out by the Audit has also been taken up with the concerned State Govts.”

(d) Implementing Agencies

3.19 The various agencies involved in the implementation of JRY have been mentioned in para 3.2 above. At the village level, however, the programme is to be implemented through the Village Panchayats, who will be responsible for planning and execution of the Yojana. The technical supervision is the responsibility of the Block Agencies/DRDAs. According to JRY Guidelines Village Panchayat means the lowest elected body and includes Gram Panchayats, Mandal, Nagar Panchayats or traditional village institutions like Village Councils and Village Development Boards having statutory character.

3.20 In such cases where the Village Panchayat/Panchayats are not in existence, while their share will be passed on to the concerned Block/Block Samiti for implementing the Yojana in respective Panchayat/Panchayats, the items of works to be taken up would be decided at the Village Level itself by the gram sabha (village assembly) of the concerned Panchayat/Panchayats.

3.21 When pointed out by a member that in Tamil Nadu there are no panchayats or panchayat samities and how the programme is to be implemented in such a situation? The Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development stated:

“The entire JRY presupposes that there will be elected panchayats at the village level, Block level or district level. Supposing only Gram Panchayats are superceded and Panchayat Samiti exists, we have said that the Block will implement it. Supposing the Samiti also is superceded and Zila Parishad is also superceded, then there is really no remedy in the manual at all for the funds which are going to panchayat. But the DRDA, of which Chairman is the Collector and MLAs and M.Ps. are also members, is expected to implement the programme.”

3.22 Asked whether MPs or MLAs are to be associated with the implementation of the programme, the Additional Secretary of the Ministry stated:

“The M.P. and MLAs are members of the DRDA. So, when a meeting of DRDA is called, the MLAs or M.Ps. who are members of that committee are also to be called.”

3.23 Clarifying the position in this regard, the Secretary, Rural Development stated:

“At the district level it is to be implemented by DRDA. DRDA is a registered body which is set up for all the poverty alleviation programmes. DRDA is a body of which the District Collector is the Chairman. The name may be different—as collector, Adhyakasha etc.”

3.24 To a question as to whether the DRDA should be headed by non-official or only by officials, the witness stated:

“This was taken up two years earlier when Shri..... was our Minister. All these things were considered then. Many States said Collector should head the DRDA.”

Clarifying the position further he said:

“We do go to State Governments for implementation of the schemes. They create the district level organisation. Each state has its own view in this regard. Maharashtra Government recently wrote that the Zila Parishad should take over the DRDA. We go by whatever State Government suggests. We do not impose anything from here. I may add here that in the Orissa Z.P. Act there is a provision that they can take over the DRDAs which, of course, they have not done.”

When asked whether the Department would agree if the State Govt. wanted that a non-official should head DRDA, the witness stated:

“Zila Parishad is an elected body of which, obviously, non-official

will be the Chairman. In the new Panchayat Raj Legislation, a Constitution Amendment Bill there is a provision that the Zila Parishads and Panchayats shall take-over all developmental functions. If it is legislated most of the powers will be vested with them."

3.26 When the Committee insisted that the Secretary, Rural Development should give his opinion about a non-official heading the DRDA, he stated that it is for the Committee to take a view. This is quite a ticklish problem.

(c) Technical Inputs & Training (Preparatory Stage)

3.27 The Manual issued, in August 1989, by the Department provides that in order to facilitate the technical scrutiny of the plans of action of the village panchayats, the authorities at the block samiti/district level should prepare and approve standard designs and cost estimates of those items of work which are generally taken up by the village panchayats. This will help in quicker preparation of plans of action by the village panchayats and also quicker technical scrutiny by the block/district authorities.

The Manual also envisages provision of necessary orientation to the officers handling JRY work at various levels. Regular training workshops/programmes should, accordingly, be organised for the purpose. It was, however, noticed in Audit that no such training programme has either been arranged or contemplated in the States of Bihar and Rajasthan.

3.28 Audit had pointed out in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1983-84—Union Government (Civil) that Officers handling NREP works were given no training and out of 981 block level seminars financed by the Centre in 1981-82, only 307 seminars were held till January, 1984. Audit had also pointed out that a number of posts of experts in various disciplines and staff essential for the effective implementation/monitoring of IRDP had been kept vacant in various States/UTs.

The Department did not keep in view the above findings in taking measures for imparting training to the officers concerned for meaningful technical scrutiny of schemes at various levels.

3.29 In this connection the Ministry of Rural Development in their OM dated 10th March, 1993 stated as Under:

"A special provision had already been made in the JRY Guidelines during the year 1989-90 for incurring training expenses of the officials/non-officials involved in the implementation of the programme at the district/village level. For this purpose, a maximum of 1/5th of the provision meant for administrative/contingent expenditure could be spent for training of officials/non-officials at the district/village level. Besides the above, the Department of Rural Development organised 6 Regional Workshops during 1989-90 in

which the officials involved in the implementation of the programme from all the States/UTs participated. These workshops were held with the objective of imparting training and necessary orientation to the officers dealing with the implementation of the programme at the State/District levels. The places where the workshops were held were Delhi, Madras, Bhopal, Bhubaneswar, Varanasi and Ahmedabad. The States of Bihar and Rajasthan were represented in the workshops held at Varanasi and New Delhi respectively.

The provision for incurring training expenses under the JRY have now been revised since the year 1990-91 to the effect that a maximum of Rs. 50,000/- can be spent by the DRDAs/ZPs in order to meet the training expenses of the concerned officials/non-officials who are involved in the implementation of the programme at the various levels. With a view to ensure proper representation of the non-officials in these training programmes, it has been further stipulated that at least 50% of the above amount should be spent on the training of the non-officials. During the year 1990-91, the Department of Rural Development have further organised three workshops at the National level in which the project Directors of the DRDAs/other rural development programmes including the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana participated. During the current financial year (1991-92) also, there is a programme to organise similar workshops.

So far as the requirement of technical inputs to the Plans of Action prepared by the village Panchayats in concerned, the JRY guidelines in this connection are quite clear and it has been stipulated that in order to facilitate the technical scrutiny of the Plan of Action of the Village Panchayats, the authorities at the Block Samiti/District level should prepare and approve the standard designs and cost estimates of items of works which are generally taken by the Panchayats. The Department, in this regard, have also laid emphasis from time to time and special attention of all the State Government/UT Adms. has been drawn to the above requirement and for making the services of the technically qualified personnel available for providing technical inputs to the Action Plans of the Village Panchayats.¹

The Union Government also is aware that workshops, seminars, training programmes etc. of the functionaries at all levels including non-officials is an ongoing activity undertaken by the States very frequently. Even the Chief Minister,

Rural Development Ministers and the State level officers have participated the training/education programme of officials and non-officials.”

3.30 The Ministry, in another written note to the Committee, have further stated:

“Training facilities will have to be made at State-DRDA/Block/Village Panchayat levels. the NIRD at Hyderabad, the State institutes of Rural Development and the district training centres undertake training programmes and seminars on JRY. The details of the programmes organised by the States/UTs are however not monitored at the Central level.”

(f) Execution of Works

3.31 After earmarking 6 per cent of the resources at the national level for Indira Awas Yojana, another 20 per cent of the resources for implementation of Million Wells Scheme and land improvement of SCs/STs and freed bonded labour; and 2 per cent of the annual allocations for administrative and contingent expenditure inclusive of the additional staff which have been created or may have to be created at any level of administration (State/District/Block/Village Panchayat), not less than 80 per cent of the remaining funds are to be distributed to the Village/Mandal Panchayats and balance 20 per cent funds are to be retained at the district level for inter-block/village work.

3.32 DRDAs/ZPs share of funds is to be utilised for different sectoral works as under:

(a) economically productive assets	35%
(b) social forestry work	25%
(c) individual beneficiaries Scheme for SCs/STs	15%
(d) other works including roads and buildings	25%

There are no sectoral earmarkings of resources at the village panchayat level except that 15% of the annual allocations must be spent on items of work which directly benefit the SCs/STs. Diversion of funds meant for SCs/STs is not permitted.

3.33 All rural works which result in creation of durable productive community assets can be taken up under the Yojana. Preference is to be given to works (i) having potential of maximum direct and continuing benefits to the members of poverty groups, (ii) which are, or can be, owned by or are assigned to groups of beneficiaries either for direct use of the assets by the groups(s) or for sale of the services/facilities created by the assets to ensure continuing income to the groups.

3.34 Higher priority is to be given to works which are required for infrastructure of poverty alleviation programmes like DDP, DPAP, DWCRA, IRDP and construction of primary school buildings in those revenue villages which have primary schools without buildings.

3.35 Illustrative list of the activities for which JRY resources can be used to provide infrastructure support are as follows:

- (i) Planting of mulberry trees;
- (ii) Chawki rearing sheds and reeling sheds for sericulture;
- (iii) Poultry sheds;
- (iv) Handloom sheds;
- (v) Work sheds for food processing;
- (vi) Retail outlets of district supply and marketing societies; and
- (vii) Raw materials, godowns and common worksheds for DWCRA groups.

Private land belonging to small and marginal farmers who are below poverty line and figure in IRDP Survey register can be developed with JRY funds. Items of work which will constitute land development will be land shaping, construction of drainage, fields, channels etc.

3.36 All capital expenditure on land development including the costs of soil amendment and irrigation is permissible on land development subject to the condition that not less than 60% expenditure of a land development project is incurred on payment of wages of unskilled labourers. Dovetailing of resources from any other source is permissible to make up for excess material component of a land development project. The costs of family labour used for cultivation of developed land is also permissible to small/marginal farmers only below poverty line whose names figure in IRDP survey register for a maximum period of 2 years at the rate of 100 mandays per hectare per year calculated @ minimum wages for unskilled labourer.

3.37 Recurring costs of cultivation on items like seeds, Chemical fertilizer, insecticides, pesticides, weedicides, irrigation etc. are most permissible under a land development project even if it forms the part of a project. Any project capable of improving the productivity of land in a Watershed or Command Area can be treated as a land development project. Only such blocks of land would be permitted under JRY which

- have at least 10 farmers;
- at least 50% of the land holders are small and marginal farmers; and
- at least 25% the land belongs to small & marginal farmers.

3.38 In this connection, a non-official expert has, in a written memorandum stated:

“The blanket rules regarding the allocation of JRY funds - mainly at the district level are too rigid. We believe that micro level allocations of the funds should be decided at the micro level only. Broad guidelines from above may help, but detailed allocations should be determined at the micro level.”

3.39 It has been admitted by all the non-officials appeared before the Committee that there are some problems sometimes about the selection of works and implementation of works at the village level.

3.40 However, a non official representative from Ahmedabad stated:

“There are, however, some problems regarding the working of village panchayats which need to be sorted out. At appears that the selection of works by village panchayats mainly serves the interests of the better off and the rich in the villages (panchayat buildings, community centres, shopping centres, school rooms etc. and approach roads are some of the most popular assets constructed under the programme), and development of land and water resources is more or less neglected at the village level. As construction of buildings generate low (unskilled) employment, the generation of employment for the unskilled at the village level has remained fairly low under JRY. Secondly, there is no concept of planning or preparing a shelf of project at the village level. The selection of works is usually done in an *ad hoc* fashion. Consequently works that create sustained employment in the long run are usually neglected at the village level.”

3.41 The non-official witness has therefore suggested that the main requirement of the programme is to introduce decentralised planning of these works at regional/district/block/village levels to incorporate local needs of the area and people. An important feature needed in the programme is the flexibility of approach which can take care of local situations easily.....public works can be and should be planned and implemented at several levels, such as regional level (For example, to fight regional environmental degradation), district level and sub district levels including village level (at the village level the programmes can include infrastructural planning, planning for sanitation and hygienic as well as micro watershed planning). The programmes therefore should be designed in such a fashion that his flexibility of operation is feasible.

(g) Technical Support for Execution of Works

3.42 It has been stated that the project officers DRDA/Chairman, Zila Parishad are supported by technical/administrative staff of the level of Executive Engineers/Engineers etc. on the technical side and Asstt. Project Officer, Stenographers, Clerk etc. on the administration side. However, during the Study Tours of the Committee it has been complained by all concerned that the technical support is lacking. Most Panchayat Samities visited by the Committee during their study tour also complained about inadequate technical support available for execution of works under JRY. Asked as to how it is ensured that each DRDA/Zila Parishad is provided adequate technical support in execution of works/programmes undertaken under Jawahar Rozgar Yojana, the Ministry of Rural Development stated:

"The village Panchayats are competent to accord approval to the projects themselves after, it has been technically appraised by the Panchayat Samiti officials. In case the Panchayat Samiti is not in existence, the power of technical scrutiny is vested at DRDA/ZP level.

In case of the shortage of technical staff or otherwise it is permissible that the village Panchayat may have the projects technically appraised by even private technical qualified people. State Governments have been asked to lay down norms for engaging such private technically qualified staff."

3.43 Enquired about the number of works which are supposed to be supervised by the technical staff at a given point in time and whether any criterion has been fixed in this regard, the Ministry stated:

"JRY is on going plan/scheme of wage employment and is being continuously reviewed by the Central and the State Governments. For its effective implementation, at the instance of the Government of India, the States have drawn up a schedule of Inspection prescribing minimum number of field visits for supervisory level of functionaries at the State/District/Block level to ascertain whether the programme is implemented satisfactorily and the execution of works is in accordance with the prescribed procedure and specifications.

Though no criteria has been fixed by the Government of India for supervision of works taken up under JRY by the officers, most of the State Governments have prescribed that a minimum of 5% of the works are to be covered by the officers during their inspection."

3.44 From the notes submitted by the State Governments, the Committee have noted that in Andhra Pradesh and Goa, one Assistant Engineer has to supervise about 40 JRY works/200 works respectively in addition to his normal work. In this connection, Secretary, Rural Development has stated during evidence:

"These programmes should be covered by the State Governments. We are allowing 2 per cent of the total expenditure for administrative expenditure. Earlier it was 5 per cent.... We thought that it should be reduced and we brought it down to 2 per cent. At present it is only 2 per cent. My view is that 2 per cent should be adequate."

3.45 Admitting that there is no technical support at the Panchayat level, the witness stated:

"At the Panchayat level, there is no technical support. This has created a problem. Of course, technical support is to be

strengthened. Technical support for this programme is weak. It can be increased.”

He further informed the Committee:

“As far as creating the structure for implementation is concerned, as I mentioned earlier, we have really left it to the States. It varies from State to State. Some other States had rural engineering organisation. Some others had combined. We had not laid down any particular pattern. We have said that Panchayats should get technical support from block level, from the district level. That is what we have laid down. We have left it to them to devise their own method. We also feel that this has to be strengthened so that leakages are reduced and quality of work is improved.”

(h) Wage & non-wage components on the works under JRY

3.46 The JRY Manual stipulates that village panchayats shall spend at least 60 per cent of the funds given to them on wage component. Expenditure on non-wage components comprising of the cost of materials, administrative and supervisory expenses, cost of handling and transportation of materials and foodgrains, cost of equipments, wages of workers other than unskilled workers etc. in excess of non-wage component shall be met from outside the JRY funds. Similar provisions will be applicable to DRDAs/Zila Parishads share of funds separately.

3.47 During the Study Tours of the Committee, the representatives of various State Governments/non-officials organisations have been more or less unanimous in expressing the view that the existing ratio between material and wage cost requires to be reviewed and made elastic. Asked whether any such proposals have also been received by the Government, the Ministry of Rural Development stated:

“Some of the States have requested this department to revise the wage and non-wage component from 60:40 to atleast 50:50 on the plea that durable assets could not be created within the prescribed ratio... In view of the fact that JRY is basically an employment programme, the dominant share of resources should be utilised directly as wages. Hence, it is not found advisable to revise the existing ratio between the wage and non-wage components for the time being.”

3.48 In this connection, Additional Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development stated:

“This is very vast country and the situations differ. There are occasions and areas where we have allowed norm of less than 60:40 in a different way. For example, in the Nicobar Islands everything has to be carried from Port Blair. The District Magistrate came up and said that if 60:40 is insisted, the cost of the transport being what it is, it is not possible. So we devised a

system for computing it as 60:40, made a discount of the transport charges from Port Blair to Car Nicobar or wherever it is. Then we fixed the wage and non-wage component.”

3.49 Commenting on the wage component material ratio; a non-official witness from Development Alternatives stated during evidence:

“Most of the work listed in this Manual which is really relevant for integrated rural development cannot be undertaken unless we have laxity for wages. It would be very difficult to fix a ratio of 50:50 or 40:60. All I can say that States/Districts/Panchayats should have some freedom to fix ratio provided the proposed work to be undertaken has the full approval of the people and meets the main aims of the JRY.”

3.50 In this connection, Government of Karnataka have stated as under:

“The objective of the J.R.Y. is to generate employment alongwith the creation of durable economic assets in the rural areas. With the increase in the costs of material components, it has become extremely difficult to adhere to the 60:40 ratio and simultaneously to maintain quality of work while creating assets. Particularly, construction of school buildings, community structures and irrigation works now make it inevitable that the 60:40 ratio between wage and non-wage components be revised atleast to 50:50. The 50:50 ratio existed in the predecessor programme of J.R.Y. (NREP & RLEGP). If the emphasis is on quality of work and the creation of durable economic assets revision of the cost ratio is absolutely necessary.”

3.51 The Planning Commission has also suggested that ratio between material and wage cost needs to be reviewed in view of difficulties faced by some states.

(i) Ban of Contractors

3.52 JRY Manual stipulates that contractors are not permitted to be engaged for execution of any of works under the programme. No middleman or any such intermediate agency is to be employed for executing works under the programme so that the full benefits of wages to be paid reach the workers and the cost of the works does not go up on account of commission charges payable to such contractors, middlemen or intermediate agency. Cautioning the Village Panchayats/DRDAs etc. in this regard, the Ministry of Rural Development have stated that the experience has shown that surrogate contractors by the names of village youth coordinators, village organisers or similar other names substitutes the regular contractors under the wage employment programmes. Care should be taken that emergence of contractors in devious ways is scrupulously checked.

3.53 Asked as to how the Government ensure that the Village

Panchayats/DRDAs etc. do not engage contractors for execution of work at all, the Ministry of Rural Development have stated that JRY Manual strictly prohibits the engagement of contractors under the Yojana.

3.54 Executive Secretary, PRDATA in a memorandum submitted to the Committee stated:

“The execution should be done by the village people and not by contractors. Since village people do not have necessary funds for the execution of the project so peoples’ committee/voluntary organisations should be given at least 75% of necessary advance for the work; otherwise they will have to take shelter of money lender/contractors for investment.”

3.55 Commenting on the practice of engaging the contractors for JRY works, one of the non-official organisation stated that ‘although use of contractors is banned under the programme, the practice is still widely prevalent. This obviously cuts into the insufficient allocations meant for creating employment’.

(j) Maintenance of Assets

3.56 The assets created under the Yojana should be taken over by the concerned regular departments of the State Government and are also to be maintained by those departments.

Maintenance of assets created under the wage employment programmes for which maintenance funds are not ordinarily available shall be done by the Village Panchayat/Mandal with maintenance of the funds made available to them under the Yojana.

3.57 The village panchayat is permitted to spend upto a maximum of 10% on maintenance of the public assets within its geographical boundary. The assets on which funds earmarked for maintenance can be spent are as under:

(a) Assets created under erstwhile programmes of NREP/RLEGP and JRY which have not been taken over by the State Government or a local body;

(b) any public assets the responsibility of maintenance of which is that of the village panchayat; and

(c) Any public asset which is required to be maintained by any other agency and it makes a written request to the panchayat for helping it with resources for maintenance on the ground of lack of resources. This, however, is an enabling provision to tackle situation of extreme emergency and should be resorted to very sparingly.

3.58 It has been stated by various Study Groups that 50% of the assets created under NREP were not being maintained.

3.59 Asked whether ten percent of JRY funds were sufficient for maintenance of assets, the Ministry of Rural Development stated:

“Most of the assets created under the Yojana are taken over by the concerned regular departments of the State Government and are to be maintained by these Departments, through their normal budget grants.

Maintenance of assets under NREP/RLEGP or under JRY for which maintenance funds are not ordinarily available is done by the village Panchayat/Mandal within 10% of their allocation under JRY. This seems to be adequate as no State has requested for its further enhancement. No technical know-how is however provided to the gram panchayats for maintaining the assets, as of now.”

3.60 From the replies to the questionnaire issued to various States/UTs, the Committee find that most of the States were satisfied with the present allocation of funds for maintenance of assets.

Unfinished works under NREP/RLEGP

3.61 Instructions issued by the Department envisage that unfinished works under NREP/RLEGP become part of JRY. Priority was to be given for completion of incomplete works over new works. A test check in Audit have revealed that unfinished works under NREP/RLEGP had not been identified for completion on priority in Bihar and Kerala. The Ministry of Rural Development, in their O.M. dated 10th March, 1993 stated on this issue:

“...While issuing sanction of release of funds for implementation of JRY in the beginning of the year 1989-90 and also in the year 1990-91, it has been specifically mentioned in these sanctions, that 20% of amount available at district level may be utilised wherever necessary for the completion of spill over works of the erstwhile programmes of NREP and RLEGP.”

3.62 Whereas the Government of Bihar stated that priority was being given to the spill-over-works over the new works under the Yojana, the Government of Kerala reported that there were a large number of unfinished works under NREP and RLEGP and the directives have been issued for speedy completion of the on-going works on priority basis.

(k) Misappropriation/Leakages of Funds and Means of Redressal of Grievances/Complaints

(i) Leakages of funds

3.63 One of the non-official witness from the Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Bombay has, in a memorandum submitted to the Committee stated that public works programme (PWP) have a lot of leakage of funds at various levels. On an average not more than 60-70 per cent of the funds actually reach the target groups. In this regard he has stated that the role of labour contractors, corrupt officials, and unusually long delays in the bureaucracy, are pivotal to the phenomenon.

3.64 Asked about the methodology adopted in such cases, he stated during evidence:

“I would like to point out two or three methods. One is in the measurement of work. Normally, wages are fixed according to movement of earth, movement of various things like stone moving or digging. There are certain norms according to which piece-rate wages are given. What happens is that on an average when we are talking about certain area which is to be dug, it is done by four, ten or twenty people—depending on the size of the gang. Now that measurement takes place once in a while by the junior engineer concerned who is available at the local level. More often, it is the concerned department which does this. What happens is that these people show measurements to be less and pay the workers less accordingly..... The JRY is supposed to operate through the Panchayats. But it is not always that the panchayats have technical departments. The contractors come in through the Government agencies.

The third level which I have seen is where works are started and on paper these are complete. But actually the works are far from complete. This is particularly so in Rajasthan. I have seen about 4-5 years back in 1987-88 that there were problems regarding completion. The money is spent but the work is actually not done. Who takes the money where, I do not know because we have not gone into the investigation how the leaks take place. But we have seen that the financial targets are completed but the physical targets are not completed.”

3.65 In this connection the non-official witness added:

“The aim of JRY or other employment guarantee programmes is to provide employment as and when necessary and proper care is not given to the completion of the programme. When top priority is not given, over a period, there is vertical division and those programmes which are meant for only employment guarantee and where no targets are fixed and no supervision is done, will suffer. So, instead of saying that employment alone is the target, we should say that both employment as well as the creation of assets should be the joint targets.”

Suggesting the need for coordination amongst various departments, he stated during evidence:

“(Another) aspect is in relation to coordination between departments. Right now, it appears that such coordination is not possible at the Gram Panchayat level because the Gram Panchayat has a limited vision and what is required is a sort of global vision which could come only from the district level. This is because plans are

made generally for a district and there is a district coordination committee chaired by the district collector. The collector is the Chairman of several other committees and is also in charge of law and order, revenue, and so on..... collector alone just cannot discharge all the duties. Therefore, alternate committees with statutory powers are necessary.”

3.67 Elaborating the points further the non-official witness from Bombay stated in a written memorandum:

“The planning and implementation of different schemes lacks coordination. The scheme in principle, is meant to not only provide employment to the workers but also provide productive assets to the rural economy. The latter part is woefully lacking. There are irrigation tanks constructed where there is no water, roads constructed where there is no need and, due to inter-departmental non-coordination, complimentary schemes are not effectively implemented.”

3.68 Pointing out the need for improvement in the information system, he suggested:

“There is need for lot of improvement in the information system relating to the locational and time specific demands for labour. Presently one notices that while on the one hand, workers often complain of non-availability of works on the other many works cannot be initiated for want of adequate labour. This disequilibrium has been a cause of loss of welfare to the workers as well as loss of revenue to the State.”

3.69 In this connection, another non-official witness from Ahmedabad, has stated during evidence:

“Regarding panchayats, I would say that panchayats are all right, if they have regular election. But Panchayats are one of the agencies involved in development work. Other organisations of people should also be involved in JRY at the district and taluka levels, and at the state level, we can have vigilance cells for the redressal of complaints. The cells should have 2/3 members from outside the Government, i.e., debureaucratisation can be utilised in these areas and more of the outsiders can be involved to redress the grievances or the complaints.”

Commenting on the solution to the problem, the witness said:

“There is no foolproof solution to this problem because corruption is there from top to bottom. But if we have the vigilance cell, it will be helpful.”

3.70 For doing away with the corruption, Executive Secretary, PRDATA suggested that:

- “(i) Political interference should be avoided in the scheme;
- (ii) Regular flow of funds should be ensured for the execution of work to be undertaken by voluntary organisation/executing agencies.
- (iii) At district level there should be a organisation to check and monitor the scheme.
- (iv) In case of delayed approvals of the projects/programmes under JRY the revised cost must be approved to compensate the existing rates at the time of execution of the project.”

(ii) Means of Redressal of Grievances/Complaints

3.71 One of the Social organisation from Rajasthan has, in their Memorandum, submitted to the Committee, stated that while JRY manual is indicative of types redressal, there is no enforcement; no levels prescribed for responsibility; no redressal for the worker and no punitive damages to prevent further misappropriation.

Asked about the avenues for redressal of grievances in regard to misappropriation of funds etc., the Ministry of Rural Development stated that whenever complaints regarding misappropriation/misutilisation of JRY funds are received, these are sent to the concerned State Government for taking remedial measures.

3.72 In reply to a question about the number of complaints received directly or through field visit Reports, the Secretary Rural Development stated during evidence:

“We are fully alive to the criticism. Large fund is voted by Parliament. Since it is implemented through the State Government, the first level of reference is the State Government, suppose a mistake has been committed by Sarpanch or somebody. In Rajasthan, a Project Director has been suspended. In Madhya Pradesh, action has been taken against a number of Sarpanches. When a complaint comes to our notice, in a federal set up, we refer to the State Government for action.”

3.73 Elaborating the point further, the witness stated:

“When a public complaint comes, we send it to the State Government. In very serious cases, we have personally gone; we send a team from here and get a report.”

3.74 In cases of misappropriation of funds or pilferages of funds, the Committee wanted to know on whom the responsibility would be fixed. The witness stated:

“In the case of misappropriation the responsibility will fall on the implementing agency. The work is being implemented by the Panchayat and therefore the Chief Executive of the Panchayat will become responsible.”

3.75 Asked about the number of persons punished, he stated:

“.....in terms of punishing people from here, I do not think that the Government of India has punished anybody.”

As a matter of fact, in Madhya Pradesh against 39 Sarpanches criminal cases have been registered.”

3.76 The Ministry of Rural Development have further informed:

“Criminal cases registered against Surpanches/Panchayats in different States are not monitored at Central level and hence no information is available with this Ministry. However, once the Government of Orissa have reported that criminal cases have been registered against 12 offenders who are responsible for misappropriation of Gram Panchayat funds to the extent of Rs. 2.37 lakhs.”

(1) Administrative/Contingent Expenditure

3.77 JRY Manual stipulates that States may spend upto a maximum of 20% of the annual allocations (Central + State) on the administration/contingencies inclusive of the additional staff which have been created or may have to be created at any of the levels of administration (State/District/Block/Village Panchayat).

3.78 During the Study Tours of the Committee, the representatives of various State Governments have requested for increase in permissible level of utilisation of JRY funds for administrative expenditure. Asked whether Government also received such suggestions from the States, the Ministry of Rural Development stated:

“We have also received requests for increasing the permissible level of funds for administrative expenditure under JRY.....it is not found advisable to increase the share of administrative costs for the time being.”

3.79 However from the replies of various States/UTs to a questionnaire issued to them, the Committee find that almost all the States/UTs have complained that the present ceiling of spending 2% funds for administrative/contingent expenditure is inadequate and suggested to increase it to about 5 per cent.

3.80 In reply to another question, the Ministry of Rural Development have stated:

“Some of the States have requested this Ministry to enhance the administrative expenditure from 2 per cent to 5 per cent. The same is under consideration.”

(m) Social Forestry Works

3.81 It has been provided in JRY Manual that 25 per cent of DRDAs/ZPs share of funds will be utilised for social forestry works. The main objective in implementation of social forestry works under JRY has to be

such that its benefits accrue to the rural communities and more particularly to the rural poor.

3.82 Social Forestry works will include soil and water conservation measures taken to ensure the survival of the plants. Social forestry works under JRY can be taken up on Government and community lands and on road-sides, canal embankments and the sides of the railway lines. Such works can also be undertaken on degraded forest lands on the following conditions:

- (a) if suitable community lands are not available; and
- (b) the entire produce from such lands is made available for the community use under a general or specific order of the State Government.

3.83 Planting of all types of fruits, fodder and fuel trees can be taken up under the programme. However, the plant species are to be selected by the DRDAs/Village Panchayats taking into account the needs of the area and geo-climatic condition. Quick growing fuel, fodder and small timber trees alongwith the fruit trees of local variety may be given preference over the exotic species.

3.84 The cost of saplings to be planted and the wages for the labour put in tree-permit/tree patta holder by planting the saplings and also the cost of maintenance of such plantations upto the time the trees are able to survive is to be met from the JRY funds.

3.85 In this connection, Government of Karnataka have pointed out that whereas 25 per cent of the funds allotted to DRDAs/ZPs can be spent for social forestry works, there are no sectoral earmarkings of resources at the village panchayat level except that 15 per cent of their annual allocations must be spent on items of work which directly benefit the SCs/STs. As such release of funds for Forestry works under JRY by Mandal Panchayats is not mandatory and that, as a consequence, almost all the Mandals in that State have not been releasing funds for Forestry works. 25% of the Zila Parishad's share of the funds is not found to be adequate to meet the requirement of funds for the social forestry sector. This position is adversely affecting the progress of the social forestry works in the State.

3.86 In this connection, the State Government have brought to the notice of the Committee the following facts:

“Prior to the introduction of JRY in the middle of 1989-90, 25% of the total allocations of the Government of India under RLEGP/NREP was being made available to the Forestry works in this State, which was of the Order of Rs. 20.00 crores per annum. However, with the introduction of new JRY guidelines, the allocations for social forestry works in Karnataka during 1989-90 and 1990-91 have drastically slumped down to below Rs. five

crores per annum (being 25% of the Zila Parishad's share of JRY funds).

The above imbalance requires urgent rectification in order to keep up the tempo of the social forestry works under JRY, in Karnataka as well as in other States."

3.87 The Committee find that the guidelines issued by the Ministry of Rural Development did not specify the income limit for identification of families to be benefited under the Yojana with the result that different income limits ranging from Rs. 3600 to Rs. 6400 were adopted for identifying the families living below the poverty line in a number of States. In this connection, Audit have also pointed out that identification of the targeted beneficiary families, was not done in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh while the work was in progress in Karnataka and Rajasthan. The Ministry of Rural Development have also admitted that Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jammu & Kashmir, Maharashtra, Orissa, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have not prepared the list of people below poverty line according to income and occupational categories. The Committee are surprised to note that no formal instructions for identification of beneficiary families were issued by the Government and that the objective was to be achieved by merely fixing the programme parameters. The Committee take a very serious view of this attitude on the part of Government. They consider identification of beneficiary families is very important to ensure that benefits under the programme reach the targeted group, recommended the Government to ensure that identification of persons below poverty line according to their income and occupation is completed within a fixed time frame. They also desire immediate action in this regard the progress of which should be communicated to the Committee within a period of six months.

3.88 Whereas the Committee find that the share of SCs/STs has been between 54.48 per cent to 56.17 per cent in employment generated under JRY during 1989-90 to 1991-92, the share of women has been considerably below norms i.e. between 22.04 to 24.62 per cent. This leads to the inevitable conclusion that identification of beneficiaries has been faulty and that monitoring of the implementation of the Yojana has been weak. The Committee would like to be apprised of the remedial measures taken by the Government in this regard.

3.89 The Committee note that the preparation of Annual Action Plans has been given higher priority under JRY and these plans are to be prepared by the respective DRDAs before beginning of the financial year according to the value of 125 per cent of its share of funds allotted in the preceding year. While preparing Annual Action Plans, completion of the incomplete works is to be given priority over taking up of new works. At the same time no work can be taken unless it forms part of the Annual Action Plans. The Committee regret to find from the Audit Report that

Annual Plans of work for DRDAs/Panchayats were not prepared/completed in any of the State test checked. During their study tour to various districts in the country, the Committee have found that Panchayats are not fully equipped to undertake preparation of Annual Plans for want of technical know-how and due to uncertainty about the funds. There are also some influential persons having vested interests interfering with the process of preparation of Action Plans. It has also been pointed out to the Committee that unemployment is more during lean months around monsoon when no works can be undertaken for execution.

3.90 The Committee feel that the above points may be kept in view by each State/Union Territory while preparing Annual Action Plans. They would also like to know specifically whether each DRDA/Zila Parishad in the country has prepared their Annual Plans for 1993-94.

3.91 After earmarking the resources at national level for Indira Awas Yojana (IAY); Million Wells Scheme and land improvement of SCs/STs and freed bonded labour; and for administrative and contingency expenditure, not less than 80 per cent of the remaining funds are to be distributed to the Village Panchayats. All rural works which result in creation of durable productive community assets can be taken up under the Yojana. However, preference is to be given to works (i) having potential of maximum direct and continuing benefits to the members of poverty groups, (ii) which are, or can be, owned by or are assigned to groups of beneficiaries either for direct use of the asset by the group(s) or sale of the services/facilities created by the assets to ensure continuing income to the groups. Higher priority is to be given to the works which are required for infrastructure of other poverty alleviation programmes and construction of primary school buildings in those villages where these schools are without any buildings. In this regard a non-official representative from Gandhi Labour Institute, Ahmedabad have stated that there were certain problems regarding selection of works by the Village Panchayats and it appeared to her that the Panchayats mainly serve the interest of the better off and rich in the villages by construction of Panchayats buildings, community centres, shopping centres, approach roads etc. Development of land and water resources is more or less neglected in the works selected for execution. According to her selection of works was usually being done in an *ad hoc* fashion and consequently the works which could create sustained employment in the long run were being neglected at the village level.

The Committee recommend that the deficiencies pointed out above should be taken care of while selecting works for execution or incorporating in Annual Action Plans.

3.92 While implementing JRY the authorities at block samiti / district level are required to prepare and approve standard designs and cost estimates of those items of work which are generally taken up by the village panchayats. The Committee have neither been informed whether all the

DRDAs have prepared and approved standard designs and cost estimates nor about the items for which these have been prepared. In this context, they would also like to know whether standardised technical manual / guide books have been prepared at the Central level and translated in local languages as recommended by the Public Accounts Committee in their 94th Report (1986-87).

3.93 It has been provided to organise regular training work shops / programmes for the officers handling JRY works at various levels. Against the provision of spending a maximum of 1 / 5th of the provision made for administrative / contingent expenditure that could be spent for training of officials/non-officials at the district / village level, a provision for spending a maximum of Rs. 50,000/— has been made since 1990-91. 50 per cent of the above amount is to be spent on the training of the non-officials. The Committee would like to know whether the amount earmarked for training in each DRDA is being spent for training of officials and non-officials as well every year and there are no savings out of the provisions made in this regard.

3.94 The Ministry of Rural Development have informed the Committee that the Project Officer, DRDA/Chairman, Zila Parishad are supported by technical staff of the level of executive engineers/engineers etc. However, during the Study Tours of the Committee to various States/ Panchayat Samities, it has been complained by all concerned that in the implementation of JRY, technical support to Panchayat Samities was lacking. From the notes submitted by the State Governments, the Committee have found that in Andhra Pradesh and Goa one assistant engineer has to supervise about 40 JRY works/200 works respectively, in addition to his normal work. The Committee are amazed to find that the Ministry of Rural Development have fixed no criteria for supervision of works taken up under JRY. during evidence, the Rural Development Secretary, however, admitted that at the Panchayat level no technical support is available and that this aspect needs to be strengthened. The Committee are unable to comprehend how in absence of proper technical support, durable assets can be created. They, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Rural Development should provide necessary funds to the States for providing technical support to all the DRDAs/Village Panchayats.

3.95 At the district level, the entire work relating to coordination, review, provision and monitoring of the programme is the responsibility of DRDA/ Zila Parishad who are accountable to the State Government for ensuring that the returns / reports in respect of the works taken up for execution in the districts are furnished in time. The Committee find that DRDA is a registered body set up for all poverty alleviation programmes and district collector is its Chairman. It has been the experience of the Committee that the district collectors have a number of duties relating to district administration to perform and virtually there is little time left for him to supervise and monitor the poverty alleviation programmes. They, therefore, suggest

the DRDA should be independently headed preferably by a non-official of proven competence and commitment.

3.95 A. It has come to the notice of the Committee during the course of evidence that in the absence of Panchayats in the State of Tamil Nadu, the DRDA is implementing the JRY programmes. It was also stated that M.Ps. and M.L.As. are automatically members of the D.R.D.A. But one Member of the Committee hailing from Tamil Nadu has stated that the State Government has not issued any instructions regarding M.Ps. and M.L.As. association in the programme. This has also been corroborated by another Member hailing from Madhya Pradesh. In view of this, the Committee strongly urge the Government to take up the matter with the respective State Government for taking immediate corrective steps in the matter in order to ensure that the elected representatives like M.Ps. and M.L.As. are invariably associated with the programme.

3.95 B. The Committee further desire that Government of India should also monitor the JRY programmes in the States where the Panchayat system is not in existence and immediate action should be initiated to constitute the Panchayats on the lines of 72nd Amendment of the Constitution.

3.95C. The Committee are further pained to note that in many districts, the DRDA meetings are not regularly held and Collectors themselves are deciding the very important matters regarding poverty alleviation programmes without involving the elected public representatives. The Committee desire that this trend should be corrected forthwith.

3.96 During the Study Tours of the Committee, the representatives of various State Government/non-official organisations have suggested revision of wage and material cost of 50:50 as with the present inflationary trend it was not possible to create durable assets within the prescribed material component. In this regard it has also been suggested to the Committee that village Panchayats/districts should have some freedom to fix the ratio themselves provided the proposed work to be undertaken has the full approval of the village people and meets the main aims of JRY. It has also been suggested to the Committee that compliance with material wage component should be watched for the State/District as a whole while leaving scope for flexibility in adjusting this ratio to the situation on the ground. Keeping in view the representations received and evidence tendered before them, the Committee are inclined to agree with this view and desire that necessary instructions may be issued to State Governments for the purposes.

3.97 The Committee observe that no contractor or a middleman or any such intermediary agency can be engaged for execution of any works under JRY. Even so the Committee are informed that the practice of engaging contractors under JRY was still widely prevalent and this obviously diminishes the already insufficient allocations available for creating employment. The Committee, therefore, recommend that stringent action should be taken against the Surpanchs/Pradhans DRDAs found to have engaged

contractors for panchayats works. Surprise visits by Central/State teams to interior areas would also prove deterrent to engaging contractors by village panchayats/DRDAs. The position also needs to be monitored more actively in the Ministry of Rural Development.

3.98 The Committee are apprised that according to various study reports 50 per cent of assets created under NREP / RLEGP were not being properly maintained. They further note that although the village panchayats are permitted to spend up to a maximum of 10 per cent of their funds on maintenance of public assets within their geographical boundary this has not sufficiently persuaded these bodies to undertake voluntary maintenance of assets created under various public expenditure programmes. Even though it is well realised that the primary emphasis of the Yojana is on creation of employment, the Committee cannot accept the situation where assets created under the scheme are allowed to depreciate rapidly for want of maintenance. In this regard the explanation of the Department of Rural Development that most of such assets would be taken over ultimately by the State Governments is not sufficiently re-assuring. The Committee feel that for certain types of assets the village panchayats ought to be enabled to provide assured maintenance of assets created under JRY. For this purpose the Committee recommend that monetary provision may be suitably enhanced while allocating funds years after year.

3.99 The Committee are informed that the instructions issued by the Ministry of Rural Development envisages that unfinished works under NREP/RLEGP will become part of JRY works and the funds out of 20 per cent of amount available at District level could be utilised for spillover works. However, the Committee find from para 13.8 of the JRY Manual that DRDA's share of funds are to be utilised for different works as under:—

- (a) Economically productive assets — 35%
- (b) Social forestry works — 25%
- (c) Individual beneficiary schemes for SCs/STs — 15%
- (d) Other works including roads and buildings — 25%

3.100 As the sectoral earmarking of DRDA's share of funds, as stated above, does not contain any provisions for completion of spillover works of NREP and RLEGP, the Committee would like the Department to clarify the position.

The Committee are apprised that there has been leakages of funds to the extent of 62% to 70% at various levels in most of the public works programme for which labour contractor, corrupt officials and unusually long time taken by bureaucrats are responsible. The Committee want the Government to look into all these aspects and ensure that the funds made available for the poverty alleviation schemes are not pilfered away by such unscrupulous elements.

3.101 The Committee are further informed that there is no system of redressal of grievances/complaints for the workers and engaged in JRY works and no punitive damages can be imposed on the persons responsible for misappropriation of funds. In this connection, the Ministry of Rural Development have stated that whenever any complaint regarding misappropriation/misutilisation of funds is received, the same is sent to the concerned State Government/U.T. for taking remedial measures. During evidence, the Secretary, Rural Development cited a few instances in which action was initiated against persons who were responsible for misappropriation of Gram Panchayats Funds. As such cases might have also occurred in other States / U.Ts, the Committee recommend that cases of misappropriation / mis-utilisation should be monitored at the Central Government level and State Governments persuaded to award exemplary punishment to such persons.

3.102 From the JRY Manual the Committee find that States can spend upto a maximum of 2 per cent of the total allocations on the administration / contingencies inclusive of additional staff which have been created or may have to be created at any of the levels of the administration. During the Study Tours of the Committee as well as from the replies furnished by States/Union Territories to a questionnaire issued to them, the Committee find that almost all the States have complained that the present ceiling of 2 per cent is inadequate and suggested to increase it to about 5 per cent. The Committee desire that the Government should suitably enhance the percentage of funds to be made available for administrative purposes.

3.103 According the paras 13.1 to 13.5 of the JRY Manual, after setting apart 6 per cent of the funds towards IAY, 20 per cent towards MWS and 2 per cent towards administration and contingency charges etc. 80 per cent of the remaining 72 per cent funds (i.e. 57.6 per cent of the total funds) have to be distributed among the village panchayats and the balance 20 per cent (14.4 per cent of the total funds) are allotted to Zila Parishads / DRDAs etc. 25 per cent of this share i.e. 3.6 per cent of the total funds allocated can only be utilised for social forestry works under JRY whereas the Committee find that a minimum of 10 per cent of resources allocated under NREP was required to be earmarked every year for utilisation exclusively on social forestry and fuel plantation. In this regard, the Government of Karnataka have pointed out that except the funds allotted out of DRDAs / Zila Parishad's funds, there are no sectoral earmarkings of resources at the Village panchayat level for social forestry. This according to Karnataka Government has resulted in ecological imbalances. In order to improve ecological environment in the country and also to meet timber and fuel needs of the rural poor, the Committee recommend that 15 per cent of the annual allocation of village panchayat to be spent on items of work which directly benefit the SCs / STs must be utilised for social forestry by engaging SC/ST freed bonded labourers. Under this scheme plantation of fruit bearing trees could also be taken up where SCs / STs could be allowed to plant trees, nurture them and eventually enjoy the product.

CHAPTER IV PAYMENT OF WAGES UNDER JRY

(a) Payment of Minimum Wages

4.1 The Manual, issued by the Ministry of Rural Development, provides that the wages under the Yojana may be paid partly in cash and partly in foodgrains and shall be same for all workers whether males or females. The wages for a category of employment shall be the same as notified for the relevant schedule of employment under the Minimum Wages Act. There should not be any attempt to avoid or evade this mandatory obligation by denotifying an area or an employment from Minimum Wages Act.

The State Government are to identify those categories of employment under JRY for which a notification under Minimum Wages Act has not been issued. In all such cases the wages are to be notified as far as possible, under the Minimum Wages Act.

4.2 For categories of employment for which Minimum Wages has not been notified under the Minimum Wages Act, till such notifications are issued, payment may be made at the rates at which payment for similar categories of employment is being made by the State Government Departments such as Rural Engineering, PWD Irrigation, Forest, Agriculture etc.

In this connection, Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development stated during evidence:

“They (workers) would be paid the minimum wages prescribed by the State. Many States have different minimum wages. In Punjab it is Rs. 33, in Maharashtra it is Rs. 14.25. Whatever may be the rate notified by the State, it should be paid to the workers under JRY.”

4.3 The wages under the Yojana are the minimum wages prescribed under the Minimum Wages Act. However, a non-official social organisation from District Rajasamund (Rajasthan) in their Memorandum submitted to the Committee have stated that in villages of Ajmer, Bhilwara, Pali and Rajasamund Districts of Rajasthan average actual payments made to the workers varied from Rs. 6 to Rs. 18 whereas the statutory minimum wages in Rajasthan was Rs. 22 per day.

4.4 When the above instance was brought to the notice of the Secretary, Rural Development, he stated during evidence:

“In Rajasthan’s case, our officers visited the place and examined their minimum wages Notification. At that time, it was Rs. 22.

But, actually, they related to the task rate; it is not time rate. They try to measure the work and then say that this man is entitled to Rs. 7. Then we took a view that task rate is something which should lead to minimum wages to their workers; and if they did not do so, then we would not release their grant. In this particular case, Rs. 22 were paid and the problem at that time was resolved. There was a dharna going on which was called off.

4.5 In this connection, the Ministry of Rural Development have in a subsequent written communication stated as under:

“The Ministry of Rural Development had received this complaint. On receipt of this complaint a team of officers was sent from Govt. of India to Rajasthan, who along with officers of the Rajasthan Govt. visited Rajsamund District. The team stressed the need for payment of minimum wages to the workers engaged under Jawahar Rozgar Yojana, which is a statutory obligation. The Govt. of Rajasthan thereafter amended the relevant notification and is now paying the minimum wages to the workers engaged under the Yojana.”

To a question whether any such complaints were also received from other States/UTs, the Ministry replied in the negative.

(b) Equal Wages both for Men & Women

4.6 Under Sections 4 and 5 of the Equal Remuneration Act, 1976 (Act No. 25 of 1976), a duty has been cast on the employer to pay equal remuneration to men and women workers for same work or work of a similar nature as well as not to discriminate while recruiting men and women workers.

4.7 Pointing out about the discrimination made in payment of wages to women workers in contravention of the above Sections 4 & 5 of the Equal Remuneration Act, 1976, a non-official, a representative from a social organisation stated during evidence that less wages were being paid to women workers in comparison to wages paid to male workers for the same work. In this connection, she gave an example of Lotia Panchayat, Panchayat Samiti Jawaja, Distt. Ajmer where men and women were paid wages at the rate of Rs. 15/- and Rs. 13/- per day respectively against the minimum wages of Rs. 22/- per day.

4.8 Asked as to how it is ensured that labourers employed were paid the minimum statutory wages and what is the system of investigation of complaints regarding under-payment of wages/wages paid less than the

statutory wages,-the Ministry of Rural Development stated:

“The wages to the workers under JRY are to be paid as notified in the relevant schedule of employment under the Minimum Wages Act of the concerned State. Whenever any complaint is made about non-payment of minimum wages, it has to be investigated by the next higher authority, including the Deputy Commissioner/Collector of the district concerned. If the implementing agencies do not pay the wages for a category of employment at the rates notified for the relevant schedule under the Minimum Wages Act, the Central Government will withhold the grants to the State / UT under the JRY.”

(c) Wages on Piece Rate / Time Rate Basis

4.9 The minimum wages for various categories of employment can be notified under Minimum Wages Act either on a time rate basis or on a piece rate basis. Where a time rate wage is notified under Minimum Wages Act for categories of employment, then wages not less than minimum time rate have to be paid to the employees. In other words when time rates are prescribed under the Minimum Wages Act, no piece rates can be prescribed by executive orders. Where a piece rate wage is notified under the Minimum Wages Act, payment will be made as per piece rate with an element of irriducible fallback wage component piece rate should also be fair and reasonable.

4.10 Giving an example of continuing both time and piece rates simultaneously in Rajasthan, a non-official representative from a social organisation said that the labourers were asked to work from 8 A.M. to 5 P.M. and thereafter payment was being made on the basis of measurement of work done. She is of the opinion that if wages are to be paid on the basis of measurement of work done, then there should not be any compulsion for the labourers to come and go in time. She has therefore suggested that the labourers should either be paid on time rate basis or on piece rate basis and both the systems should not go together.

4.11 In her views, one of the disadvantages of piece rate is that an efficient as well as a lazy worker gets the same amount as wages with the result that there is no incentive for a worker to do the work efficiently.

4.12 The notifications issued by Labour Departments of the States/UTs are relevant for Jawahar Rozgar Yojana. Provisions of notifications issued by other agencies in respect of Minimum Wages payable to workers should be followed only as long as notifications are not issued by the States Labour Departments for which they should be moved by the Rural Development Department of the State / UT.

As considerable length of time is being taken to cover JRY under the notification after its issuance by a State Govt., a non-official representative supported during evidence that minimum wages to be paid under

JRY should automatically be included in the notification issued by State Government.

4.13 Payment of wages is to be made on a fixed day of the week which should preferably be the local market day as per Manual on JRY. Payment of wages to workers is not to be delayed by more than a week except at the option of the workers and in the latter case for not more than 15 days.

4.14 However, a non Govt. Social Organisation from Barar (Rajasthan) have, in their Memorandum submitted to the Committee, stated that 'most payments are made much later than the 7 days stated in the JRY manual, and there are several outstanding for over a year.

4.15 From the Memorandum submitted by the Planning Commission the Committee find that there are considerable inter-state variations in the minimum wage rates varying from Rs. 13.70 to Rs. 34.00 per day for the unskilled workers. Asked whether there was any proposal to reduce the variations in the minimum wage rates in different State, the Ministry of Rural Development stated:

"Minimum wages are fixed as per the provisions of the Minimum Wages Act of the concerned State Government. Hence it may not be possible to reduce the variations in the Minimum wage rates in different States."

4.16 In this connection Secretary, Rural Development stated during evidence:

"The National Commission on Rural Labour headed by Dr. Hanumantha Rao recommended a National minimum of Rs. 20/- all over the country. The Minister of Labour has been discussing whether there should be a general minimum all over the country and it can be over and above the minimum fixed."

(d) Supply of foodgrains as part of Wages

4.17 According to Manual on JRY, 1.5 Kg. of foodgrains per manday are to be distributed as a component of wages and the foodgrains are to be given on the work site itself. The State Government may also use the facilities under the public distribution system for payment of the foodgrains' component of the wages.

Asked whether payment of wages should be foodgrains plus cash or only in cash, the Secretary Ministry of Rural Development stated:

"This issue has a long history. We had been saying part of it should be paid in cash. Then in 1989 many of the States complained that they were not able to get supply of foodgrains. At that time, we gave an option to the State that if they wanted to take foodgrains they could do so; otherwise, they should pay in cash. Recently, the Prime Minister has reviewed the matter in the month of July and we took a decision that immediately two kg. of

foodgrains should be part of the JRY wages. That has been communicated to all the State Governments and foodgrains have been allocated to them.”

4.18 When the attention of the witness was drawn to the fact that at many places wages had to be paid in cash because foodgrains were not supplied to the fair price shops and that nobody wanted to bear the cost of carrying foodgrains, the Joint Secretary Ministry of Rural Development replied:—

“During the current year, we have made some changes in the policy regarding the distribution of grains. What we have said is that this handling charges can be met by DRDA itself and it will be shared between the Centre and the States. Earlier the problem was in some cases, the foodgrains were distributed even on the work spots and then there was the question of handling charges.

What we have done now is firstly, if the State Government so desires the foodgrains can be distributed in the PDS shop itself. Secondly, we are allowing Rs. 20 per quintal as handling charges. If that is not sufficient then the excess can be charged to JRY funds.”

4.19 As regards handling charges, Sales Tax or any other local taxes it has been provided in the JRY Manual:

“Executing Agencies can incur expenditure upto a maximum of Rs. 20 per quintal as handling charges for bringing the foodgrains from FCI godowns to the sites of work. This is the maximum allowable limit. Handling charges must be charged on the basis of actuals.

In some of the difficult areas, the handling cost of Rs. 20 per quintal may not be sufficient. In such cases, the handling cost can be incurred to a higher limit of expenditure as approved by the DRDA/ZP/Village Panchayat. However, the expenditure incurred in excess of Rs. 20 per quintal will be booked to the material component of the JRY.

Sales Tax or any other local tax, if levied by any of the States/UTs on foodgrains supplied by FCI for JRY will be borne by the State Government/UT Administration concerned from outside the JRY funds.”

4.20 In this connection, the Public Accounts Committee had, in paragraph 1.111 of their 94th Report (8th Lok Sabha), desired that the Health Departments of the respective State Governments should be advised to take samples of foodgrains from time to time to ensure that the foodgrains supplied to workers are of the prescribed quality and safe for human consumption. The report had also pointed out instances of

diversion of foodgrains for unauthorised purposes, loss of foodgrains due to long and improper storage, shortage or misappropriation etc.

4.21 Regarding quality of foodgrains, the Secretary, Rural Development stated during evidence:

“It is the same as the public distribution system. I think the quality and variety will be controlled by the Food Department and Department of Civil Supplies. What we have done, we have linked up this with the public distribution system, in progress, and it moves in the same manner as PDS.”

(e) Proper Maintenance of Muster Rolls

4.22 The JRY Manual provides that muster rolls for all workers should have entries showing Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes/Landless/Women workers. The officials responsible for the muster rolls should be made responsible for these entries.

4.23 The concerned officials should also record on the muster rolls at the time of weekly payments, a Certificate indicating the employment generation for others as also the total employment generated. The total number of mandays generated for the landless labour and women labour should also be indicated separately.

Employment generation figures should be compiled from the certificates on the muster rolls.

Supervisory levels should check the employment generation reports and the certificates on the muster rolls during their inspections.

4.24 However during their study tour to Silvasa the Committee found that the muster rolls were not being maintained properly and when they wanted to see the attendance sheet of the persons working on a JRY scheme, a loose sheet showing their names etc. was produced before them.

Work is supposed to be done according to rates and norms specified in a document called the “Basic Schedule of Rates”.

4.25 Pointing out that the Basic Schedule of Rates is too rigid, a non-govt. organisation from Lunkaransar Rajasthan, stated in a written memorandum:

“For instance, a mason cannot be paid more than sixty rupees a day according to the rules, but in practice when you’re actually paying eighty rupees, how do you “adjust”?”

The way it’s done is to add another name on to the muster. Now take the situation where you have three masons, each of whom is being paid eighty rupees a day. An honest man would write four names, at sixty rupees a day, to make up the deficit — but many don’t have such fine qualms. A couple of extra names represents the commission, the non-taxable benefits that keep a whole section of engineers in clover.”

4.26 The non-govt. organisation has also brought out that in most cases, workers engaged in famine relief works, get less than the minimum wages that they are entitled to. The *Modus Operandi* is as follows:

“Since many false names would be on the muster roll, and the payment is made on the basis of total work done, the amount payable to each real person is less than what he has worked. So in fact in a case where ten of the fifty names on the muster are fictitious, the forty persons must dig 87.5 cubic metres every day to be paid the minimum wage. When this equation becomes apparent (usually after the first payment) this acts as a further disincentive”.

The organisation also stated that in a number of cases Sarpanch of a Village also falsify the muster rolls to supplement the material shortfall in the following manner:

“For instance, every muster roll, with fifty names on both sides, represents a payment of Rs. 16,500/- (For fifteen days, at the minimum wage of twenty two rupees a day). For work worth Rs. 1 lakh, he would issue 6 muster rolls. Since the actual labour payment would be well within one muster roll, the others would be used to supplement the material shortfall, or in many cases, just represent a ‘leakage’ in the system”.

4.27 The Committee note that the wages under the Yojana are to be paid partly in cash and partly in foodgrains and shall be the same for all workers whether male or female. The wages for a category of employment shall be the same as notified for the relevant schedule of employment under the Minimum Wages Act. However, certain Non-Governmental Organisations working in the State of Rajasthan have pointed out to the Committee that in some villages of Rajasthan average payments made to the workers varied from Rs. 6/- to Rs. 18/- against the statutory minimum wages of Rs. 22/- per day. Although, according to Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of India in some of these cases necessary corrective action has been taken, the Committee cannot rule out the possibility of this malpractice being followed on a much wider scale in Rajasthan and also in other States/Union Territories. The Committee, therefore, recommend that apart from registering criminal cases against persons including Sarpanches and officers found involved, a country-wide survey needs to be undertaken in regard to payment of minimum wages and strict instructions and legal action taken to stop such malpractices.

4.28 The Committee are perturbed at instances of violation of Sections 4 and 5 of the Equal Remuneration Act, 1976, under JRY.

They are dismayed to find that presently there is no system of investigation of complaints regarding underpayment of wages/wages paid less than the statutory wages except that the complaint is referred to the next higher authority for investigation. The Committee desire the

Department of Rural Development to launch an early investigation of the prevalence of such illegal practices in regard to payment of wages and to initiate strict administrative/legal action against those found guilty.

4.29 The Committee are apprised that minimum wages for various categories of employment under JRY can be paid either on a time rate basis or on a piece rate basis. They are, however, concerned to find that there are instances where workers though engaged on piece rate basis are compelled to come and go according to fixed timing. The Committee desire that the Department of Rural Development should take up the matter with the State Governments so that such unfair practices are stopped altogether.

4.30 The Committee are further apprised that a considerable time lag exists between the notification of revised minimum wages and the extension of these rates to JRY workers. The Committee desire that as soon as a notification regarding revision of minimum wages is issued by a State Government/Union Territory, wages paid under JRY should automatically be included in such notifications.

4.31 Although payment of wages to workers is not to be delayed by more than a week except at the option of the worker it has been brought to the notice of the Committee that in several cases payments are made much later than the prescribed period of 7 days and there were several cases outstanding for over a year. The Committee desire the Government to have such cases investigated and to recommend that erring officers who are found guilty of not making payment of wages within the prescribed period should be given exemplary punishment.

4.32 The Committee are informed by the Planning Commission that there are considerable inter-State variations in the minimum wage rates varying from Rs. 13.70 to Rs. 34.00 per day for the unskilled workers. In this connection, Secretary, Rural Development, stated during evidence that the National Commission on Rural Labour headed by Dr. Hanumantha Rao has recommended a national minimum wage of Rs. 20.00 all over the country, and that the Minister of Labour has been discussing this issue with various organisations. The Committee feel that a minimum wage all over the country to be fixed by the Union Government would be a step in the right direction. They also suggest that the States/Union Territories may be persuaded to fix minimum wage within their State not below the national minimum wage.

4.33 The Committee note that according to JRY Manual, 1.5 kg. of foodgrains per manday were to be distributed as a component of wages. The Ministry of Rural Development have informed the Committee that they have reviewed the position in July, 1992 and taken the decision that 2 kg. of foodgrains per manday would be supplied to the labourers as part of their JRY wages. The foodgrains are to be given to the labourers on the work site itself while the handling charges upto a maximum of Rs. 20 per quintal would be met by DRDA itself whereafter it would be shared between the

Centre and the State. Further, expenditure in excess of Rs. 20 per quintal is to be booked to the material component of the JRY. For this purpose, the foodgrains can also be distributed through Fair Price Shops. Keeping in view the comfortable food stocks and the desirability of improving nutritional standard of workers, the Committee feel that utilisation of foodgrains under the programme should be stepped up. This would also result in higher real income for the workers as they would also get the benefit of subsidized foodgrains.

4.34 The Committee also desire that the Ministry of Rural Development should impress upon the State Governments the need to distribute the foodgrains immediately on lifting them from FCI godowns. Moreover samples of foodgrains should be taken from time to time so as to ensure the prescribed quality of the foodgrains being supplied to workers.

4.35 The Committee note that the muster-rolls for all workers are to have entries indicating of the person engaged is a Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribe, landless labour, freed bonded labour or a woman worker. The official responsible for maintaining the muster-rolls is also required to record, at the time of weekly payments, a certificate indicating the employment generated for these categories of people. Supervisory level officers during their inspection are required to check the employment generation reports and the Certificates on the muster-rolls regarding employment generation. However, during their Study Tour, the Committee found that at some places the muster-rolls were being maintained in a very unsatisfactory manner in total disregard of the provisions of JRY manual. As there exists every possibility of tempering with the record, the Committee recommend that all the States/Union Territories should be advised to maintain the muster-rolls in a stitched form and all its pages must be numbered and signed by an officer of a supervisory level.

CHAPTER V

MONITORING AND EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAMME

(a) Monitoring arrangements

5.1 Guidelines issued by the Department envisage submission of monthly progress reports by the State Governments to the Department by 10th of the succeeding month and detailed quarterly progress reports by 25th of the month following the quarter. The monitoring arrangements for the programme envisage regular visits to the districts by officers from State headquarters and visits by officers at the district/sub-division and block levels to the sites of work in interior areas. A schedule of such inspections prescribing the minimum number of field visits for each supervisory level to block level is required to be drawn up and strictly adhered to. The schedule so drawn is further required to be approved by the State Level Coordination Committee and intimated to Government of India. The State Governments were to prescribe the periodical reports/returns for monitoring the performance of the districts and were also to get appropriate returns and reports prescribed, to be collected by the DRDAs/ZPs from the village panchayats/mandals/blocks. Audit have pointed out that prescribed monitoring arrangements for implementation of the programme had not been made in a number of States.

5.2 In this regard, the Ministry of Rural Development have informed the Committee :

“State Level Coordination Committee (SLCC) for rural development programmes in the States is responsible for monitoring of the programme at the State level. JRY Manual issued by the Govt. of India specifically lays emphasis on physical monitoring through the field inspections besides periodical reports/returns to be sent by the States Govt. to the Department by a specified date. This has also been taken up by the Govt. of India with the State Govts. by issue of general Circular in November, 1989 asking the State Govts. to prepare the schedules of inspection for the physical monitoring of the programme”

5.3 Admitting the need for proper monitoring including surprise checking/inspection of the programme, the Additional Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development stated during evidence that “there are no two opinions that these programmes should be properly monitored. We have to see as to how the monitoring arrangements can be better. We would also discuss this matter with the States”

(b) Evaluation Studies of the Programme

5.4 The JRY Manual provides that the States/UTs should conduct periodical evaluation studies of the implementation of the programmes. Evaluation studies are to be given to the reputed institutions and organisations on issues thrown up by concurrent evaluation meriting detailed studies. These studies can be given by the Centre as well as States/UTs. Copies of the evaluation studies conducted by the State are to be furnished to the Central Government.

5.5 Asked whether any evaluation of the programme has been done, the Secretary, Rural Development stated during evidence :

“The JRY started in 1989-90. What happened is in 1990-91 I think hon. Members will recollect there was a debate on the right to work employment guarantee, and there was also a move in the Planning Commission that these programmes can be transferred once for all to the States. So, there was a feeling that these programmes will be transferred to the States. So, we did not think of evaluation in 1990-91. In 1991-92 again the schemes were continued and there was a certainty that these programmes would continue. We entrusted it to 33 research organisations in the country.”

5.6 To a question whether the research organisation are non-Governmental, he replied in the affirmative. He further added :

“In all 450 rural districts in two blocks and five panchayats each, 4500 panchayats, the evaluation is going on but the results of the evaluation will come by the end of this year.”

5.7 In this connection, the Ministry of Rural Development in a written note have further clarified as under :

“The Ministry of Rural Development, Government of India has taken Concurrent Evaluation of JRY in all the districts of the country through independent institutions/organisations to assess the impact of the Yojana in rural areas in relation to its stated objectives.

In the Concurrent Evaluation, the impact of the programme as regards employment generated, type of assets created, their usefulness to the Society, in general, and to poorer sections of the community in particular, and the contribution of the JRY to the welfare of the families below the poverty line are the main points for evaluation.

The field work of the Concurrent Evaluation has already started from January, 1992 and will be over by the end of the year. It envisages covering 40 districts each month. The

results of the first three months i.e. in respect of 120 districts are likely to be available by December, 1992.

The Government will take steps to restructure the programme if the results of the Concurrent Evaluation so warrant."

5.8 The Planning Commission, in a Memorandum submitted to the Committee stated that a quick evaluation of the JRY has been conducted by the Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission. Its findings may help identify inadequacies and suitable corrective measures that can be taken.

Asked whether the Government have received the Report of the Programme Evaluation Organisation and if so what are its findings, the Ministry of Rural Development stated :

"The findings of the Programme Evaluation Organisation of the Planning Commission which conducted a Quick Study in 10 major States viz. Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Karnataka, Madhya Pradesh, and West Bengal (covering only 600 beneficiaries in 40 village panchayats of 20 districts) which represents 0.2% at the village panchayat level) that Yojana did not provide employment to the extent expected as the average number of days a person got employment was 11.44 days during 1989-90, 15.68 days during 1990-91 and 12.84 days during 1991-92 (upto Sept. 91) in the Panchayats which were studied; that adequate attention was not given to the maintenance of assets and that some Gram Panchayats did not utilise funds provided to them." The Department further stated that the sample size in the Concurrent Evaluation of JRY at village panchayat level is more than 2% through reputed research institutions (NGOs) in all the districts of the country. The Government will restructure the programme if the results of the Concurrent Evaluation warrant it.

(c) Social Audit of JRY

5.9 In order to ensure social control of the Yojana, meetings of the village panchayat are to be held every month at fixed date, time and place to consider the issues regarding the planning, execution, monitoring and supervision of the JRY. These meetings must be opened to any member of the village community, who is free to raise any issue regarding implementation of the Yojana. The village assembly to be held atleast twice a year should also be kept informed about the progress of the implementation of JRY and all related issues.

5.10 In this connection, a social organisation from Rajasthan in a Memorandum to the Committee stated :

"The JRY Manual states the importance of social audit but no modalities are stated. In our experience there has not been a single instance of such an audit being done. When the Sangathan

attempted to organise such audits, there was no cooperation from the authorities, and the concerned Sarpanches simply absented themselves to avoid pressure.”

5.11 Asked whether there is any prescribed system of internal Audit of JRY expenditure, the Ministry of Rural Development stated that there is no system of internal audit, as JRY is implemented by over 2.20 lakhs village Panchayats and DRDA's in the country. Annual audit is conducted by the authorities of the State Governments as prescribed in the respective Panchayats Acts.

5.12 The Committee note that the monitoring arrangements for the programme envisage regular visits to the Districts by officers and visits by officers at the District/Sub-division and block levels to the sites of work in interior areas. The State Governments were also to prescribe the periodical reports/returns for monitoring the performance of the Districts and were also to get appropriate returns and reports prescribed, to be collected by DRDAs from the village panchayats. In this connection, Audit have pointed out that the necessary monitoring arrangements for implementation of the programme were not made in a number of States. The Committee need hardly to emphasise that proper monitoring including surprise checking/inspections and field visits are necessary for successful implementation of any programme. The Committee would, therefore, like to know whether the schedule of inspections prescribing the minimum number of field visits for each supervisor level functionary, after its approval by the State Level Coordination Committee, has been drawn up and strictly adhered to in all the States/Union Territories.

5.13 The State Governments/Union Territories are also required to submit monthly progress reports to the Ministry of Rural Development by 10th of succeeding months and detailed quarterly progress reports by 25th of the month following the quarter. The Committee desire to be informed as to whether all the State Government/Union Territories are submitting their reports on due dates and also whether central teams have visited appropriate sites of work in interior areas to verify the contents of such reports. In the absence of such visits, the Committee fail to understand what mechanism has been followed for verifying the reliability of the reports received from the State Governments/Union Territories.

5.14 According to JRY Manual, Centre as well as States/UTs are to conduct periodical evaluation study of the implementation of the programme through reputed institutions and organisations. In this connection, the Committee are informed that Ministry of Rural Development have entrusted evaluation of JRY to 33 non-governmental research organisations in the country and in all 450 rural districts 2 blocks and 5 panchayats in each district are to be covered by the evaluation studies. The Study aims at gauging the impact created by JRY in relation to its objectives. Although a quick evaluation of the JRY has already been conducted by the Programme

Evaluation Organisation (PEO) of the Planning Commission and although the findings of PEO corroborate the Estimates Committee's own observations on the subject, they would like to know the final results of the concurrent.

Evaluation taken up by the Voluntary Organisations / PEO.

5.15 The Committee find from a Memorandum submitted to them by a non-governmental organisation that whereas the JRY Manual stress upon the importance of social special audit, no modalities have been framed in this regard by the Government so far. The Committee are of the view that apart from getting the internal audit done, non-governmental organisations should also be allowed to conduct a social special audit of JRY expenditure.

CHAPTER VI

(a) Indira Awas Yojana (IAY)

6.1 Indira Awas Yojana (IAY) was started in year 1985 and it become part of JRY in 1989. Six per cent of the resources at the national level are to be earmarked for IAY and distributed among the States in accordance to the proportion of poor among SCs/STs and bonded labourers out of the total rural population below the poverty line belonging to this particular group. The IAY funds are to be distributed amongst the districts on the basis of number of SCs/STs in a district. These funds are to be operated by the DRDAs/ZPs at the District level. The number of houses constructed and the expenditure incurred under IAY is as under:

Year	No. of houses constructed	Expenditure incurred (Rs. in crores)
1985-86	51406	57.69
1986-87	151812	147.97
1987-88	164055	167.30
1988-89	137435	150.76
1989-90	182242	175.86
1990-91	170805	187.96
1991-92	207588	263.63
1992-93	71378	63.72
(Upto August, 1992)— Provisional		
Total:	1136721	1214.89

6.2 Asked whether all the houses constructed so far have been occupied by the beneficiaries, the Ministry of Rural Development stated:

“Under Indira Awas Yojana (IAY), the construction of houses has to be done by the beneficiaries themselves from the very beginning. The responsibility for proper construction of the houses is also that of the beneficiaries. Since the construction is done by the beneficiaries themselves, they would be ultimately occupying the same.”

6.3 However, one of the representative of a social organisation from Bharat (Rajasthan) stated during evidence that about 85 per cent of houses constructed under IAY in Rajasthan are not occupied. In the selection

process also, many houses were allotted to influential and more affluent scheduled caste and scheduled tribe families who have used them as fodder storage sheds. That is why even where houses are somewhat habitable, they lie empty.

6.4 To a question whether the amount allocated for construction of a house under IAY is reasonable and adequate, the Ministry replied in affirmative. In this connection, Secretary Rural Development stated during evidence:

“Earlier, it was Rs. 10,200 and it was raised to Rs. 12700 in April, 1990. The point is that the beneficiary should construct the house as he likes in 20 sq.m. plinth area with enough ventilation and sanitation facilities. In practice, they have constructed a line of houses and somebody else also will be imposing certain types on the beneficiaries.”

6.5 However, Government of Karnataka, in a Memorandum submitted to the Committee suggested:

“The Indira Awas Yojana, component of JRY, envisages construction of houses for scheduled castes and scheduled tribes as well as released bonded labourers respectively. These houses are constructed free of cost and the unit cost ranges from Rs. 12,700/- in the plain areas to Rs. 14,500/- in difficult terrain. The programme makes it mandatory for providing sanitation facilities to each individual unit.

It is our experience that the unit cost prescribed require urgent upward revision. In the first instance the minimum wage prescribed under JRY has been recently revised to Rs. 16/- from Rs. 12/- with effect from 1-4-1991 i.e., an increase of 33%. Correspondingly, there have also been significant increases in the other material components required for the construction of the house such as jelly, cement, wood etc. Our estimate in this increase averages 50%. Keeping this in mind we have worked out the revised unit cost and this is indicated below:

Proposed Unit Cost of IAY Houses:

	Existing Cost	Escalation Cost	Total Cost Proposed	Escalation percentage
1	2	3	4	5
I. PLAIN AREA:				
(a) Labour Component (60%)	Rs. 7620.00	2540.00	10160.00	33.33

1	2	3	4	5
(b) Non-wage Component (40%)	Rs. 5080.00	3302.00	8382.00	65.00
	12700.00	5842.00	18542.00	
II. DIFFICULT AREA:				
(a) Labour Component (60%)	Rs. 8700.00	2899.00	11599.00	33.33%
(b) Non-wage Component (40%)	Rs. 5800.00	3770.00	9570.00	65.00%
Total	14500.00	6669.00	21169.00	

If the revision suggested is too steep, then atleast the unit costs may be pegged at Rs. 15,000/— in plain areas and Rs. 18,000/— in difficult areas respectively.”

6.6 Asked as to how it is ensured that houses are constructed under the Yojana by the beneficiaries themselves and not by the contractors. It was stated by the Ministry:

“IAY guidelines issued by the Centre clearly indicate that no contractors be engaged for the construction of IAY houses. If any case of construction through contractors comes to our notice, Government of India will recover the allocation made for such works from the State concerned.”

6.7 During evidence, the Secretary, Rural Development also stated:

“The instructions are clearly issued that no contractor is allowed and the beneficiary himself should construct the house in his own plot. The Government agency would give him money in instalments and arrange for cement and steel.”

6.8 However, a social organisation from Rajasthan submitted in this regard:

“As for as implementation is concerned, it is clear that there has been massive corruption and pilferage. There was a ban on contractors but almost every colony has been unofficially built on contract. The attempt has been to create houses on paper, not for habitation.”

6.9 There have been complaints that instead of allowing the beneficiaries to construct their houses on their own plots, they are forced to construct their houses in separate clusters. In this connection, Ministry of Rural Development stated:

“It is not correct to say that beneficiaries are forced to construct

their houses in a cluster. The cluster approach was suggested, as that would help in the provision of other facilities such as link roads, water supply, sanitation etc., However, the IAY guidelines clearly specify that the houses may be built without following the cluster/micro-habitat approach if the beneficiaries so desire.”

6.10 For making the Indira Awas Yojana more useful and viable, a social organisation from Rajasthan have suggested:

- “1. to do away with the colony requirements and encourage houses to be built individually.
2. to allow any local design, material and plinth area to be constructed, as long as the funds provided are spent on the house.
3. to choose the allottees in the gram sabha before commencing construction and hold annual block level meetings with all the allottees in which housing experts be present to make suggestions with low-cost technology and alternative materials.
4. to open an inquiry into every colony constructed so far, and take action against those found guilty.
5. to make all the vacant colonies usable, and either find occupants for them or to put them to some other public use.”

During their study tours to different districts in the country, the Committee observed that design of the dwelling units being constructed under Indira Awas Yojana leaves much to be desired. It has also been pointed out by the beneficiaries that the design of the houses should be such that it affords them an opportunity to construct an additional room on the roof top at a later stage.

6.11 Indira Awas Yojana (IAY), which started in 1985 and a component of JRY since 1989, envisages construction of houses for SC/ST as well as released bonded labourers. It is mandatory for the beneficiaries to construct their houses themselves on their plots with enough ventilation and sanitation facilities. These houses are constructed free of cost and the unit cost ranges from Rs. 12,700/- in the plain area to Rs. 14,500/- in difficult terrain. In this regard, Government of Karnataka have brought to the notice of the Committee that there has been escalation of about 33.33% and 65% in wages and material cost respectively both in plain as well as difficult areas. It has, therefore, been suggested to the Committee that the unit cost of houses should be raised upwards to Rs. 15,000 in plain areas and to Rs. 18,000/- in difficult areas. The Committee are inclined to agree with this view and recommend that the prescribed unit cost of a house to be constructed under JRY should be revised every year at the time of releasing funds to the States, on the basis of average increase in wages and material cost during the preceding year.

6.12 IAY guidelines clearly indicate that no contractor can be engaged for

construction of houses under the Yojana. However, it has been brought to the notice of the Committee, that there has been widespread violation of this stipulation. Moreover, massive corruption and pilferage has characterised the implementation of IAY in some parts of the country and almost every colony has been unofficially built on contract. It has also been pointed out that in the selection of beneficiaries also, influential and more affluent SC/ST were also covered. The Committee are further distressed to know such underserving beneficiaries have been using these houses as fodder storage and that at some place, about 85 per cent houses constructed under the Yojana were lying vacant. It has also been alleged that the beneficiaries have also been forced to construct their houses in separate clusters. The Committee take a very serious view of these irregularities and recommend the Government to report the matter to them after thoroughly going into all the complaints. For this purpose, the assistance and cooperation of NGO, must also be taken. The Committee further desire that similar irregularities in other parts of the country may also be investigated and guilty officials punished.

(b) Million Wells Scheme

6.13 20 per cent of the total allocation to a State/Union Territory under JRY is earmarked for Million Wells Scheme (MWS). 15% resources earmarked under JRY for SC/ST works can also be used for the Scheme. The target group for MWS is small and marginal farmers amongst Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and Freed bonded Labourers who are below the poverty line and are listed in the IRDP register of the village. While extending benefits under the Scheme, the freed bonded labourers would be given overriding priority.

The beneficiaries who have already been assisted under IRDP for minor irrigation are not given assistance under this programme. There is, however, no bar in providing assistance to those IRDP beneficiaries who were not assisted for minor irrigation.

Objectives of the Scheme

6.14 The objective of the scheme is to create employment in the first instance; and to provide for construction of irrigation sources and land development, free-of-cost, for the target group, as the secondary objective. The Million Wells Scheme funds, being part of wage employment funds, can be used for open wells only provided they are the cost effective method in comparison to tubewells and borewells. Construction of borewells and tubewells can not be taken up under this scheme. Where wells are not feasible due to geological factors, the earmarked funds under the Million Wells Scheme may be utilised for other schemes of minor irrigation like irrigation tanks, water harvesting structures and for the development of lands of Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and freed bonded labourers, including ceiling surplus

lands or Bhoodan land etc. allotted to them. The provision cannot be diverted for any other scheme nor for categories other than the target groups.

6.15 For extending the benefits under MWS to small and marginal farmers belonging to other communities, the Government of Karnataka have suggested:

“The benefits under MWS which are at present, confined only to SC/ST beneficiaries and freed bonded labourers should be extended to the small and marginal farmers belonging to all communities falling below the poverty line, specially in the Districts where adequate number of SC/ST beneficiaries owning land are not available. Earmarking of 20% of the total corpus of JRY funds under MWS has affected the overall performance of JRY programme during 1990-91 in a large number of districts of this State and, perhaps, also of other States. Considering the fact that about 6% of JRY funds have been earmarked for Indira Awaas Yojana for the benefit of SC/STs. 20 earmarking out of overall JRY allocation of the State under MWS exclusively for the small & marginal farmers belonging to SC/STs has restricted the scope of expanding JRY funds earmarked due to limited number of holdings belonging to the target group and lack of feasibility of taking up permissible works under MWS in many districts.”

6.16 The Committee during their Study Tours to various districts in the country found the scheme very popular and demand for incorporating ‘well digging’ under JRY was raised by a wide cross-section of beneficiaries.

6.17 The Planning Commission have also in a Memorandum submitted to the Committee suggested that the ‘present system of earmarking of a certain quantum for Million Wells Scheme and for Housing under Indira Awaas Yojana needs to be relaxed as several State Governments are not in a position to fulfil these stipulations. In fact, in respect of some States the Ministry of Rural Development has already done so’.

6.18 The Ministry of Rural Development have informed the Committee that a sum of Rs. 106941.32 lakhs have been spent for construction of wells under MWS so far (on the basis of reports received upto the September, 1992). Asked about the total area for which irrigation facilities have been created under this Scheme, the Ministry stated:

“While the area irrigated by wells under MWS is not being monitored at the Central level as it will fluctuate from year to year depending upon several factors including rain fall, it is seen that one open irrigation well normally commands an area of about one to two hectare of irrigation purposes.”

To a question about the time lag in constructing a well and its energisation, the Ministry replied:

“Though this is not monitored at the Central level, the time lag would depend upon a number of issues, including the potential to provide power at that level.”

6.19 The Committee find that 20% of the total allocations of a State/ Union Territory earmarked under JRY for Million Wells Schemes (MWS) can be used only in the schemes mentioned in the Manual and the same can not be diverted for any other scheme or for categories other than the target groups *i.e.* small and marginal farmers amongst SC/ST and freed bonded labourers who are below the poverty line and are also listed in the IRDP register of the village. In this connection, the Planning Commission as well as the Government of Karnataka have suggested for extending the scheme to small and marginal farmers belonging to all other communities especially in those districts where the adequate number of SC/ST beneficiaries owning lands are not available. Whereas the Committee agree with the above suggestion, they however, desire the Government to obtain comments from all States/Union Territories on the issue before taking any final decision in the matter.

6.20 This scheme, being part of wage employment funds, can be used for open wells only. In areas where well digging is not feasible owing to geological factors, the earmarked funds under the scheme can be utilised for other schemes of minor irrigation like irrigation tanks, water harvesting structure and for the development of lands belonging to SC/ST and freed bonded labourers. Construction of bore wells and tube wells can not be taken up under the scheme. The Committee feel that these stipulations are not in overall benefit of the people and recommend that if five or more beneficiaries desire, they should be allowed to dig bore wells/tube wells on a joint basis. Simultaneously, they also recommend that all the State Governments/Union Territories should be instructed to provide power connections to all such tube wells etc. on a priority basis.

6.21 As the Committee have found the scheme very popular amongst the rural poor in as much as the facility operates as a key to better agricultural productivity, they desire the Government to seriously consider the desirability of permitting digging of wells under JRY itself.

6.22 On the basis of Reports received upto September, 1992, the Ministry of Rural Development have informed the Committee that a sum of Rs. 1069.41 crores have been spent for construction of wells under MWS so far. The Committee are constrained to note that the Ministry of Rural Development was not monitoring the total area being irrigated after the introduction of the scheme. The Committee feel that unless the statistics regarding irrigated areas under the scheme are known, it was not possible for them to conclude that the scheme has been able to achieve the desired objectives. They desire suitable steps to be taken in this regard.

Miscellaneous Recommendations

6.23 During their study visits to various States and Union Territories, the Committee observed that there was a total need to involve Community Block Development Gram Panchayats in implementing rural development programmes. It was also observed that in the last stage of Community Block Development, a skeleton staff is working and BDO functions more or less as a coordinator with all other departments and officials. The Committee, therefore, recommend that all the Block Development Officers in the State and Union Territories be brought under the administrative control of Director, Rural Development to facilitate better coordination and effective implementation of JRY programmes.

6.24 It was also found that each of the Panchayats was getting the financial allocations in parts and as such some of the Panchayats got a very meagre sum of four digits thereby frustrating the very division of funds sector-wise as stipulated in JRY Manual. Keeping in view the above facts, the Committee recommend that the JRY funds should be allocated on one time basis to remote, hilly and isolated Islands and backward territories so that they can overcome the inherent geographical and other problems in implementation of JRY programmes.

6.25 They also desire that in each State and Union Territory some mechanism be created for having compulsory audit of Gram Panchayat Funds to ensure better and purposeful spending of JRY funds.

NEW DELHI;
April 28, 1993

Vaisakha 8, 1915 (Saka)

MANORANJAN BHAKTA
Chairman,
Estimates Committee

APPENDIX I
(Vide Para 2.15)
Allocation of Resources under JRY during 1989-90 to 1992-93 (Rs. in Lakhs)

Sl. No.	State/UT's	1989-90			1990-91			1991-92			1992-93		
		Centre	State	Total	Centre	State	Total	Centre	State	Total	Centre	State	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1.	ANDHRA PRADESH	15455.61	3863.90	19319.51	15332.96	3833.24	19166.20	15332.96	3833.24	19166.20	14954.56	3738.64	18693.20
2.	ARUNACHAL PRADESH	245.72	61.43	307.15	264.54	66.14	330.68	264.54	66.13	330.67	258.01	64.50	322.51
3.	ASSAM	4223.12	1055.78	5278.90	4091.67	1022.92	5114.59	4091.67	1022.92	5114.59	3990.69	997.67	4988.36
4.	BIHAR	30969.53	7742.38	38711.91	30773.42	7693.36	38466.78	30773.42	7693.36	38466.78	30013.98	7503.50	37517.48
5.	GOA	303.00	75.75	378.75	285.82	71.46	357.28	285.82	71.45	357.27	278.77	69.69	348.46
6.	GUJARAT	6363.83	1590.96	7954.79	6472.57	1618.14	8090.71	6472.57	1618.14	8090.71	6312.84	1578.21	7891.05
7.	HARYANA	1654.55	413.64	2068.19	1541.46	385.37	1926.83	1541.46	385.36	1926.82	1503.42	375.86	1879.28
8.	HIMACHAL PRADESH	922.80	230.70	1153.50	908.22	227.06	1135.28	908.22	227.06	1135.28	885.81	221.45	1107.26
9.	JAMMU & KASHMIR	1346.19	336.55	1682.74	1600.00	400.00	2000.00	1289.21	322.30	1611.51	1257.39	314.35	1571.74
10.	KARNATAKA	9674.86	2418.72	12093.58	9647.76	2411.94	12059.70	9647.76	2411.94	12059.70	9409.67	2352.42	11762.09
11.	KERALA	5255.99	1314.00	6569.99	5116.95	1279.24	6396.19	5116.95	1279.24	6396.19	4990.67	1247.67	6238.34
12.	MADHYA PRADESH	20495.03	5123.76	25618.79	21122.00	5280.50	26402.50	21122.00	5280.50	26402.50	20600.74	5150.19	25750.93
13.	MAHARASHTRA	16795.12	4198.78	20993.90	16339.87	4084.97	20424.84	16339.88	4084.97	20424.85	15936.64	3984.16	19920.80
14.	MANIPUR	353.38	88.35	441.73	339.06	84.77	423.83	339.06	84.77	423.83	330.69	82.67	413.36
15.	MEGHALAYA	366.50	91.63	458.13	396.73	98.18	495.91	396.73	99.18	495.91	386.94	96.74	483.68
16.	MEIZORAM	149.93	37.48	187.41	167.12	41.78	208.90	167.12	41.78	208.90	163.00	40.75	203.75

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
17.	NAĀGALAND		403.99	101.00	504.99	488.00	122.00	610.00	425.26	106.32	531.58	414.77	103.69	518.46
18.	ORISSA		10124.65	2531.16	12655.81	10475.94	2618.99	13094.93	10475.94	2618.99	13094.93	10217.41	2554.35	12771.76
19.	PUNJAB		1286.9	321.73	1608.66	1340.52	335.13	1675.65	1340.52	335.13	1675.65	1307.44	326.86	1634.30
20.	RAJASTHAN		10075.39	2518.85	12594.24	10244.22	2561.06	12805.28	10244.22	2561.06	12805.28	9991.41	2497.85	12489.26
21.	SIKKIM		158.26	39.57	197.83	154.83	38.71	193.54	154.83	38.71	193.54	151.01	37.75	188.76
22.	TAMIL NADU		14127.71	3531.93	17659.64	13778.93	3444.73	17223.66	13788.98	3444.73	17223.66	13438.89	3359.72	16798.61
23.	TRIPURA		433.14	108.29	541.43	440.39	110.10	550.49	440.00	110.10	550.49	429.52	107.38	536.90
24.	UTTAR PRADESH		41364.90	10341.23	51706.13	40874.62	10218.66	51093.28	40874.62	10218.66	51093.28	29865.89	9966.47	49832.36
25.	WEST BENGAL		17288.13	4322.03	21610.16	17429.55	4357.39	21786.94	17429.55	4357.39	21786.94	16999.41	4249.85	21249.26
26.	A & N ISLANDS		164.80	0.00	164.80	156.56	0.00	156.56	156.56	0.00	156.56	152.70	0.00	152.70
27.	CHANDIGARH		40.77	0.00	40.77	38.81	0.00	38.81	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
28.	D & N HAVELI		83.80	0.00	83.80	84.99	0.00	84.99	84.99	0.00	84.99	82.89	0.00	82.89
29.	DAMAN & DIU		52.40	0.00	52.40	50.07	0.00	50.07	50.07	0.00	50.07	48.63	0.00	48.63
30.	DELHI		187.42	0.00	187.42	184.18	0.00	184.18	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
31.	LAKSHADWEEP		81.75	0.00	81.75	78.49	0.00	78.49	78.49	0.00	78.49	76.55	0.00	76.55
32.	PONDICHERY		157.80	0.00	157.80	153.25	0.00	153.25	153.25	0.00	153.25	149.47	0.00	149.47
TOTAL														
210607.00 52459.60 263066.60 210373.50 52406.77 262780.27 209776.99 52313.39 263090.38 204600.00 51022.39 255622.39														

APPENDIX IX*(vide Para 2)**Employment Generated Under JRY During 1991-92*

Sl. No.	State/UT	Target	Achievement	% Achievement
1.	Andhra Pradesh	698.88	728.54	104.24
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	12.47	6.57	52.69
3.	Assam	100.94	124.02	122.27
4.	Bihar	893.77	836.73	93.62
5.	Goa	10.96	9.56	87.23
6.	Gujarat	244.25	254.13	104.05
7.	Haryana	37.67	37.49	99.52
8.	Himachal Pradesh	30.47	34.16	112.11
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	95.88	60.37	62.96
10.	Karnataka	418.36	401.64	96.00
11.	Kerala	138.98	177.08	127.41
12.	Madhya Pradesh	812.43	945.39	116.37
13.	Maharashtra	654.72	771.64	117.86
14.	Manipur	30.87	5.11	132.04
15.	Meghalaya	23.07	12.02	52.10
16.	Mizoram	3.71	5.94	160.11
17.	Nagaland	21.71	27.92	128.60
18.	Orissa	300.09	348.86	116.25
19.	Punjab	29.42	19.76	67.17
20.	Rajasthan	242.64	387.63	159.76
21.	Sikkim	9.58	13.62	142.17
22.	Tamil Nadu	521.03	831.73	159.63
23.	Tripura	19.02	20.71	108.89
24.	Uttar Pradesh	1472.69	1562.14	106.07
25.	West Bengal	544.08	491.99	90.43
26.	A & N Islands	2.68	2.18	81.34
27.	Chandigarh	—	—	—
28.	D & N Haveli	3.51	3.94	112.25
29.	Daman & Diu	1.45	0.88	60.69
30.	Delhi	—	—	—
31.	Lakshadweep	2.64	2.23	84.47
32.	Pondicherry	3.37	5.20	154.30
	All India	7354.35	8129.18	110.54

APPENDIX III*(vide Para 3.7)**Number and Percentage of Rural Population below Poverty Line*

Sl. No.	State / UT	38th Round		43rd Round	
		No. of Poor People (Lakhs)	% of Pop. Below Poverty Line	No. of Poor People (Lakhs)	% of Pop. Below Poverty Line
1	2	3	4	5	6
1.	Andhra Pradesh	164.40	38.70	153.10	33.76
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	2.60	47.40	0.74	10.69
3.	Assam	44.90	23.80	50.40	24.52
4.	Bihar	329.40	51.40	300.30	42.67
5.	Goa	2.89	47.40	0.80	10.69
6.	Gujarat	67.70	27.60	56.20	21.22
7.	Haryana	16.20	15.20	13.50	11.68
8.	Himachal Pradesh	5.80	14.00	4.40	9.70
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	8.10	16.40	8.40	15.46
10.	Karnataka	102.90	37.50	102.80	35.90
11.	Kerala	55.90	26.10	37.40	16.44
12.	Madhya Pradesh	218.00	50.30	194.00	41.52
13.	Maharashtra	176.10	41.50	166.90	36.67
14.	Manipur	1.30	11.70	1.28	10.69
15.	Meghalaya	3.90	33.70	1.33	10.69
16.	Mizoram	1.60	47.40	0.45	10.69
17.	Nagaland	4.30	47.40	0.83	10.69
18.	Orissa	107.70	44.80	124.20	48.36
19.	Punjab	13.70	10.90	9.60	7.21
20.	Rajasthan	105.00	36.60	80.60	25.98
21.	Sikkim	1.70	47.40	0.34	10.69
22.	Tamil Nadu	147.60	44.10	138.40	39.46
23.	Tripura	4.60	23.50	2.30	10.69
24.	Uttar Pradesh	440.00	46.50	373.10	37.22
25.	West Bengal	183.90	43.80	137.20	30.25
26.	A & N Islands	0.60	47.40	0.19	10.68
27.	Chandigarh	0.10	47.40	0.03	10.74
28.	D & N Haveli	0.40	47.40	0.13	10.71
29.	Daman & Diu	0.31	47.40	0.06	10.73
30.	Delhi	2.00	47.40	0.48	10.69
31.	Lakshadweep	0.10	47.40	0.02	10.58
32.	Pondicherry	1.30	47.40	0.32	10.71
Total		2215.00	40.40	1959.80	33.37

APPENDIX IV

Statement of Observations and Recommendations

Sl. No.	Para No.	Ministry concerned	Observations/Recommendation
1	2	3	4
1	1.28	Ministry of Rural Development Planning Commission	Alleviation of rural poverty has been one of the primary objectives of planned development in India. Since rural poverty is inextricably linked with low income level in the rural sector and therefore with the problem of unemployment including under-employment in the rural areas the objective of increasing employment opportunities has constantly been engaging the attention of planners and policy makers. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the endemic problem of rural unemployment forms the core of growth strategies followed in the country during the last two decades. The Committee, however, regret to note that none of the series of schemes implemented by Government of India with the help of State Governments have addressed the problem of rural employment in a comprehensive manner. The resources allocated for the purpose have not been commensurate with the magnitude of the problem, have been spread too thinly and implemented in a lackadaisical manner even as each new scheme has met with a new set of pitfalls. This is substantially true also of the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana which otherwise is the most comprehensive attempt at removal of rural unemployment. It is, therefore, a matter of great concern that even after years of planned development there are still 200 million poor people living in rural India. The Committee, therefore, strongly

1	2	3	4
			<p>recommend that there should be higher allocation of resources for Jawahar Rozgar Yojana to achieve the desired objective of generation of more employment and creative assets in the rural areas.</p>
2.	1.29	<p>Ministry of Rural Development</p>	<p>The Committee are constrained to find that the necessary funds meant for various poverty alleviation programmes, as admitted by the Government, did not invariably go to the areas of the concentration of landless and unemployed rural labour. In 1989-90, there were 120 backward districts with acute poverty. According to the evaluation of wage employment programmes made by the Government itself there were at least 53 per cent villages which had not ever got the benefit of any works programme at all.</p> <p>The Committee would, therefore, like the Government to accord preference in allocation of funds to all the 120 backward districts identified to be suffering from acute poverty.</p>
3.	1.30	-do-	<p>The Committee, while finding the objectives of JRY laudable have, however, noticed that there is no explicit focus on prioritization of assets being created under the programme. They, therefore, recommend that without interfering with freedom of Panchayat Samities in selecting the works to be undertaken under JRY, care should be taken that these works dovetail with an over all plan for development of each region under which first priority should be given to directly productive investment in items like irrigation, water-shed development, afforestation etc., which are labour intensive at construction as well as post construction stages. This, the Committee feel, will also call for larger allocation</p>

1	2	3	4
			<p>of funds and greater integration of the efforts of individual Panchayat Samities. The Committee further recommend that the next priority should be given to construction of roads for promoting regional development while the last priority may be given to construction of buildings for schools, housing, dispensaries, etc. At the same time Committee agree to have flexibility for prioritization varying from State to State.</p>
4.	1.31	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>The Committee observe that the JRY generally operates in isolation without having any meaningful linkages with the other on-going developmental as well as poverty alleviation programmes. Obviously, this situation impairs the investment efficiency of JRY. In this connection, the Committee note that Public Accounts Committee in their 91st Report (8th Lok Sabha) on IRDP, had recommended that it was imperative to integrate all allied programmes and activities and the infrastructure required for effective implementation of all such programmes. The Estimates Committee lend their full support to this view and desire that there must be a single integrated development plan formulated by each Panchayat Samiti, which must be made responsible and accountable for its successful implementation. At the same time, a beneficiary should be assisted in a sustained manner over a certain period to enable him to cross the poverty line once for all. With this objective, the Committee recommend that all poverty alleviation programmes should be merged.</p>
5.	2.26	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>The Committee note that the Central assistance is to be allocated on the basis of proportion of rural poor that a State/UT had in 1983-84 as per 38th round of NSS to the total rural poor in the country. However, they have found from the Report of the</p>

1

2

3

4

C&AG of India for the year ended 31st March, 1989 (No. 13 of 1990) that while six States (Goa, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Manipur and Rajasthan) and six UTs (Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Chandigarh, Dadar & Nagar Haveli, Daman & Diu, Lakshadweep and Pondicherry) were allocated more than their proportionate share, 19 States and one UT got less. The Department of Rural Development have stated that the additional funds were given to the above States/UTs keeping in view the geographical conditions and their backwardness. However, no fresh guidelines or criteria to determine allocation on the basis of geographical conditions or other factors were laid down. In this regard, the Planning Commission has also admitted that in recent years, several issues have been raised about the methodology of poverty estimation, both by professionals and State Govts. and they have, therefore, appointed an Expert Group to look into these issues relating to the definition and measurement of poverty. The Committee would like to know whether the issues raised have been sorted out by the Expert Group and if so, the necessary changes effected in allocation of resources under JRY to various States/UTs may be intimated to them.

6.

2.27

Ministry of
Rural
Develop-
ment

The Committee note that although Jawahar Rozgar Yojana was launched from 1st April, 1989, Demands for Grants for 1989-90 did not contain any specific provisions for the Yojana. The first instalment of Rs. 987.40 crores was, however, released by Govt. making the expenditure debitable to Grants-in-aid to States. The Central Govt. instead of routing the funds through the consolidated funds of the respective States released the funds

1

2

3

4

direct to the District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs), apparently in order to eliminate delays in the resources reaching the implementing agencies. From the year 1991 onwards the funds are, however, being distributed to the districts through the concerned State Governments as it has not been considered proper to by-pass State Governments in a federal system particularly when State Governments are also expected to contribute their share to this programme. The Committee are constrained to observe that the wisdom of releasing funds direct to District Rural Development Agencies remains doubtful.

7. 2.28 Ministry of Rural Development
- The Committee are surprised to note that the Ministry of Rural Development did not take into consideration unutilised resources of NREP and RLEGP with the States/Union Territories as on 1.4.1989 for fixing the employment generation targets. Moreover, the programmes was started without doing any comprehensive survey of the rural poor and the funds were allotted on the basis of rural poor in the country as per 38th round of N.S.S. *i.e.* 1983-84. In this connection, the Public Accounts Committee (1986-87) had, in-paragraph 1.103 of their 94th Report also observed, that NREP had lacked focus on the target group population for whom it was meant. That Committee had, therefore, desired the Govt. to have reliable estimates of people in need of employment on different areas of districts and estimated demand for for employment during various seasons in a year. It was also recommended that a system of registering the workers and issuing to them identity cards should be evolved. In spite of the specific recommendations made, it seems that the Govt. did not take any action in the matter and its was only in November, 1991

1	2	3	4
			<p>that the Ministry of Rural Development issued comprehensive instructions to all the States for preparing the list of people below poverty line taking 1991-92 level price as index. However, this exercise could be completed only in three States. The Committee would, therefore, like to know whether all the States/Union Territories have prepared the list of people below poverty line based on 1991-92 price-index. They also recommend that all the workers, after their identification, should be issued identity cards-cum-pass books so that all the necessary entries such as days on which work given, wages paid etc. could be made and verified at a subsequent stage. This would also help the Government in getting the reliable data for future planning.</p>
8.	2.29	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>The Committee are of the view that the above instances are indication of the hasty approach adopted by the Govt. while launching the Yojana without any proper preparative measures. The deficiencies pointed out above and discussed in subsequent paragraphs indicate the defective approach of the Govt. in formulating and implementing the Yojana.</p>
9.	2.30	-do-	<p>From the financial provisions made and targets for employment generation fixed, the Committee find that against the provision of Rs. 2630.67 crores, a sum of Rs 2458.10 crores (93.4%) was spent in 1989-90 and 864.38 million mandays employment (98.7%) were generated against the target of 875.72 million mandays. Again, against the financial provision of Rs. 2627.80 crores in 1991, target of creating of employment of 929.10 million mandays was fixed whereas during 1989-90 employment generation of 875.73 million mandays was fixed with a financial allocation of Rs. 2630.67 crores. In this</p>

1	2	3	4
10.	2.31	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>connection the Secretary, Ministry of Rural Development explained during evidence that States were allowed to carry forward about 25%* of the funds released in one year for use in the next year and, these carry-forward balances plus the money released in that particular year taken together contributed to the creation of mandays. He clarified that only money was being carried forward to the next year and the mandays created were being shown against the targets fixed in that year. From the information furnished by the Ministry of Rural Development, the Committee are concerned to note that the employment targets are fixed by simply dividing the wage component of Jawahar Rozgar Yojana funds by the minimum wages fixed by each State/Union Territory.</p> <p>The Committee feel that the above criteria adopted by the Government is faulty as it is not possible to verify the correctness of figures of achievement of employment actual ly generated. They, therefore, recommend that the State Governments should be asked to maintain authentic records like muster rolls susceptible of verification so that the position of achievement of generation of employment <i>vis-a-vis</i> those targetted is maintained correctly. At the same time scientifically designed sample studies should be carried out in each State/region to verify the emperical data generated by the State Governments.</p>
11.	2.32	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>The Committee observe that there have been a number of cases of delay in releasing States' share to districts/Zila Parishads. Similarly, there were instances of short release/ delay in release of funds by DRDAs to panchayats. The Ministry of Rural Develop-</p>

* From 1991, the Ministry had brought the carry forward balances down to 15% of the total allocations.

1	2	3	4
			<p>ment have also admitted that Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Haryana, Karnataka, Orissa and Tripura did not contribute their matching share of 20% in the year 1991-92 in time. Keeping in view the above facts, the Committee are in a fix to accept the figures of employment generation furnished to them by the Ministry.</p>
12.	2.33	-do-	<p>During their Study Tours of various Districts in the country and through their interaction with the implementing agencies the Committee have found that funds released to the Panchayats were not timely and, often, did not conform to the availability of working season. This obviously, results in low employment generation as well as wastages of funds. The Committee, therefore, recommend that Government should evolve a system by which grants/JRY funds are released to the DRDAs/Zila Parishads and Village Panchayats well in time.</p>
13.	2.34	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>From the JRY Manual the Committee find that diversion of resources from one district/village panchayat to another is not permissible. However, additional allocation can be considered for those districts which are performing better within the overall State allocations. In this connection, Government of Karnataka have stated that as the existing guidelines themselves permit additional allocations to be made to the better performing districts, any blanket ban on the diversion of resources from one district/panchayat to another district/panchayat within the overall State allocations may not be called for. The Committee agree with the views expressed by the Govt. of Karnataka and recommend that readjustment of the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana resources allocated to a State/Union Territory should be allowed with the approval of State/UT Administration within JRY provisions. However, the State Govt./Union</p>

1	2	3	4
			Territory should simultaneously ensure that the wage material ratio as well as other conditions stipulated in Jawahar Rozgar Yojana Guidelines are strictly adhered to.
14.	2.35	Ministry of Rural Development	The Committee find that JRY funds (Central as well as States' share) are to be kept in a bank or a post office in an exclusive and separate Savings Bank A/c by the DRDAs/Zila Parishads and Panchayats. The amount of interest accrued on the deposits is to be treated as additional resources for the programme. However, Audit have pointed out that there was delay in transferring the amount from treasuries to bank/non-opening of separate Bank A/c for JRY funds in a number of DRDAs/Village Panchayats in Bihar, Uttar Pradesh and Karnataka. In this context, the Committee do not agree with the views of the Ministry of Rural Development that in the beginning of the programme such minor problems had to be faced.
15.	2.36	-do-	During their study tour to Trivandrum a number of Village panchayats complained that as per instructions of the State Govt., the amount released for DRDAs/panchayats is to be retained in treasuries' Saving Bank A/c with the result that they have to face a lot of difficulties in withdrawing money from there. The Committee desire that instructions for keeping JRY funds in post offices/Nationalised/State Cooperative Banks only should be strictly adhered to.
16.	3.87	Ministry of Rural Development	The Committee find that the guidelines issued by the Ministry of Rural Development did not specify the income limit for identification of families to be benefited under the Yojana with the result that different income limits ranging from Rs. 3600 to Rs. 6400 were adopted for identifying the families living below the poverty line in a

1

2

3

4

number of States. In this connection, Audit have also pointed out that identification of the targetted beneficiary families was not done in Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh while the work was in progress in Karnataka and Rajasthan. The Ministry of Rural Development have also admitted that Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Jammu & Kashmir, Maharashtra, Orissa, Tripura, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have not prepared the list of people below poverty line according to income and occupational categories. The Committee are surprised to note that no formal instructions for identification of beneficiary families were issued by the Government and that the objective was to be achieved by merely fixing the programme parameters. The Committee take a very serious view of this attitude on the part of Government. They consider identification of beneficiary families is very important to ensure that benefits under the programme reach the targetted group, recommend the Government to ensure that identification of persons below poverty line according to their income and occupation is completed within a fixed time-frame. They also desire immediate action in this regard the progress of which should be communicated to the Committee within a period of six months.

17. 3.88 -do-

Whereas the Committee find that the share of SC/ST has been between 54.48 percent to 56.17 percent in employment generated under JRY during 1989-90 to 1991-92, the share of women has been considerably below norms *i.e.* between 22.04 to 24.62 percent. This leads to the inevitable conclusion that identification of beneficiaries has been faulty and that monitoring of the implementation of the Yojana has been weak. The Committee would like to be apprised of the remedial measures taken by the Government in this regard.

1	2	3	4
18.	3.89	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>The Committee note that the preparation of Annual Action Plans has been given higher priority under JRY and these Plans are to be prepared by the respective DRDAs before beginning of the financial year according to the value of 125 per cent of its share of funds allotted in the preceding year. While preparing Annual Action Plans, completion of the incomplete works is to be given priority over taking up of new works. At the same time no work can be taken unless it forms part of the annual Action Plan. The Committee regret to find from the Audit Report that Annual Plans of work for DRDAs/Panchayats were not prepared/completed in any of the State test checked. During their study tour to various districts in the country, the Committee have found that Panchayats are not fully equipped to undertake preparation of Annual Plans for want of technical know-how and due to uncertainty about the funds. There are also some influential persons having vested interests interfering with the process of preparation of Action Plans. It has also been pointed out to the Committee that unemployment is more during lean months around monsoon when no works can be undertaken for execution.</p>
19.	3.90	-do-	<p>The Committee feel that the above points may be kept in view by each State/Union Territory while preparing Annual Action Plans. They would also like to know specifically whether each DRDA/Zila Parishad in the country has prepared their Annual Plans for 1993-94.</p>
20	3.91	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>After earmarking the resources at national level for Indira Awas Yojana (IAY); Million Wells Scheme and land improvement of SC/ST and freed bonded labour; and for administrative and contingency expenditure, not less than 80 per cent of the remaining funds are to be distributed to the Village</p>

1

2

3

4

yats. All rural works which result in creation of durable productive community assets can be taken up under the Yojana. However, preference is to be given to works (i) having potential of maximum direct and continuing benefits to the members of poverty groups, (ii) which are, or can be, owned by or are assigned to groups of beneficiaries either for direct use of the asset by the group(s) or sale of the services/facilities created by the assets to ensure continuing income to the groups. Higher priority, is to be given to the works which are required for infrastructure of other poverty alleviation programmes and construction of primary school buildings in those villages where these schools are without any buildings. In this regard a non-official representative from Gandhi Labour Institute, Ahmedabad have stated that there were certain problems regarding selection of works by the Village Panchayats and it appeared to her that the Panchayats mainly serve the interest of the better off and rich in the villages by construction of Panchayats buildings, community centres, shopping centres, approach roads etc. Development of land and water resources is more or less neglected in the works selected for execution. According to her selection of works was usually being done in an *ad hoc* fashion and consequently the works which could create sustained employment in the long run were being neglected at the village level.

The Committee recommend that the deficiencies pointed out above should be taken care of while selecting works for execution or incorporating in Annual Action Plans.

- | | | | |
|-----|------|-------------------------------|--|
| 21. | 3.92 | Ministry of Rural Development | While implementing JRY the authorities at block samiti/district level are required to prepare and approve standard designs and cost estimates of those items of work which are generally taken up by the village panchayats. The Committee have neither been |
|-----|------|-------------------------------|--|

1	2	3	4
22.	3.93	-do-	<p>informed whether all the DRDAs have prepared and approved standard designs and cost estimates nor about the items for which these have been prepared. In this context, they would also like to know whether standardised technical manual/guide books have been prepared at the Central level and translated in local languages as recommended by the Public Accounts Committee in their 94th Report (1986-87).</p> <p>It has been provided to organise regular training workshops/programmes for the officers handling JRY works at various levels. Against the provision of spending a maximum of 1/5 of the provision made for administrative/contingent expenditure that could be spent for training of officials/non-officials at the district/village level, a provision for spending a maximum of Rs. 50,000/- has been made since 1990-91. 50 per cent of the above amount is to be spent on the training of the non-officials. The Committee would like to know whether the amount earmarked for training in each DRDA is being spent for training of officials and non-officials as well every year and there are no savings out of the provisions made in this regard.</p>
23.	3.94	-do-	<p>The Ministry of Rural Development have informed the Committee that the Project Officer, DRDA/Chairman, Zila Parishad are supported by technical staff of the level of executive engineers/engineers etc. However, during the Study Tours of the Committee to various States/Panchayat Samitis, it has been complained by all concerned that in the implementation of JRY, technical support to Panchayat Samitis was lacking. From the notes submitted by the State Governments, the Committee have found that in Andhra Pradesh and Goa one Assistant Engineer has to supervise about 40 JRY works/200 works</p>

1	2	3	4
24	3.95	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>respectively, in addition to his normal work. The Committee are amazed to find that the Ministry of Rural Development have fixed no criteria for supervision of works taken up under JRY. During evidence, the Rural Development Secretary, however, admitted that at the Panchayat level no technical support is available and that this aspect needs to be strengthened. The Committee are unable to comprehend how in absence of proper technical support, durable assets can be created. They, therefore, recommend that the Ministry of Rural Development should provide necessary funds to the States for providing technical support to all the DRDAs/Village Panchayats.</p> <p>At the district level, the entire work relating to coordination, review, provision and monitoring of the programme is the responsibility of DRDA/Zila Parishad who are accountable to the State Government for ensuring that the returns/reports in respect of the works taken up for execution in the districts are furnished in time. The Committee find that DRDA is a registered body set up for the poverty alleviation programmes and district collector is its Chairman. It has been the experience of the Committee that the district collectors have a number of duties relating to district administration to perform and virtually there is little time left for him to supervise and monitor the poverty alleviation programmes. They, therefore, suggest that DRDA should be independently headed preferably by a non official of proven competence and commitment.</p>
25	3.95A	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>It has come to the notice of the Committee during the course of evidence that in the absence of Panchayats in the State of Tamil Nadu, the DRDA is implementing the JRY programmes. It was also stated that M.Ps. and M.L.As. are automatically members of</p>

1	2	3	4
			<p>the D.R.D.A. But one Member of the Committee hailing from Tamil Nadu has stated that the State Government has not issued any instructions regarding M.Ps. and M.L.As. association in this programme. This has also been corroborated by another Member hailing from Madhya Pradesh. In view of this, the Committee strongly urge the Government to take up the matter with the respective State Governments for taking immediate corrective steps in the matter in order to ensure that the elected representatives like M.Ps. and M.L.As. are invariably associated with the programme.</p>
26	3.95B	-do-	<p>The Committee further desire that Government of India should also monitor the JRY programmes in the States where the Panchayat system is not in existence and immediate action should be initiated to constitute the Panchayats on the lines of 72nd Amendment of the Constitution.</p>
27	3.95C	-do-	<p>The Committee are further pained to note that in many districts, the DRDA meetings are not regularly held and Collectors themselves are deciding the very important matters regarding poverty alleviation programmes without involving the elected public representatives. The Committee desire that this trend should be corrected forthwith.</p>
28	3.96	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>During the Study Tours of the Committee, the representatives of various State Governments/non-official organisations have suggested revision of wage and material cost to 50:50 as with the present inflationary trend it was not possible to create durable assets within the prescribed material component. In this regard it has also been suggested to the Committee that village Panchayats/districts should have some freedom to fix the ratio themselves provided the proposed work to be undertaken has the full approval of the village people and meets the main aims of JRY.</p>

1	2	3	4
			<p>It has also been suggested to the Committee that compliance with material wage component should be watched for the State/District as a whole while leaving scope for flexibility in adjusting this ratio to the situation on the ground. Keeping in view the representations received and evidence tendered before them, the Committee are inclined to agree with this view and desire that necessary instructions may be issued to State Governments for the purpose.</p>
29	3.97	-do-	<p>The Committee observe that no contractor or a middleman or any such intermeditary agency can be engaged for execution of any works under JRY. Even so the Committee are informed that the practice of engaging contractors under JRY was still widely prevalent and this obviously diminishes the already insufficient allocations available for creating employment. The Committee, therefore, recommend that stringent action should be taken against the Sarpanchs/Pradhans/DRDAs found to have engaged contractors for panchayats works. Surprise visits by Central/State teams to interior areas would also prove deterrent to engaging contractors by village panchayats/DRDAs. The position also need to be monitored more actively in the Ministry of Rural Development.</p>
30	3.98	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>The Committee are apprised that according to various study reports 50 per cent of assets created under NREP/RLEGP were not being properly maintained. They further note that although the village panchayats are permitted to spend up to a maximum of 10 per cent of their funds on maintenance of public assets within their geographical boundary this has not sufficiently persuaded these bodies to undertake voluntary maintenance of assets created under various public expenditure programmes. Even though it is well realised that the primary emphasis of the Yojana is</p>

1	2	3	4								
			<p>on creation of employment, the Committee cannot accept the situation where assets created under the scheme are allowed to depreciate rapidly for want of maintenance. In this regard the explanation of the Department of Rural Development that most of such assets would be taken over ultimately by the State Governments is not sufficiently re-assuring. The Committee feel that for certain types of assets the village panchayats ought to be enabled to provide assured maintenance of assets created under JRY. For this purpose the Committee recommend that monetary provision may be suitably enhanced while allocating funds year after year.</p>								
31.	3.99	-do-	<p>The Committee are informed that the instructions issued by the Ministry of Rural Development envisages that unfinished works under NREP/RLEGP will become part of JRY works and the funds out of 20 per cent of amount available at District level could be utilised for spillover works. However, the Committee find from para 13.8 of the JRY Manual that DRDA's share of funds are to be utilised for different works as under:—</p> <table data-bbox="462 1043 997 1286"> <tbody> <tr> <td>(a) Economically productive assets'</td> <td>35%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(b) Social forestry works</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(c) Individual beneficiary schemes for SCs/STs</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>(d) Other works including roads and buildings</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	(a) Economically productive assets'	35%	(b) Social forestry works	25%	(c) Individual beneficiary schemes for SCs/STs	15%	(d) Other works including roads and buildings	25%
(a) Economically productive assets'	35%										
(b) Social forestry works	25%										
(c) Individual beneficiary schemes for SCs/STs	15%										
(d) Other works including roads and buildings	25%										
32	3.100	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>As the sectoral earmarking of DRDA's share of funds, as stated above, does not contain any provisions for completion of spillover works of NREP and RLEGP, the Committee would like the Department to clarify the position.</p> <p>The Committee are apprised that there has been leakages of funds to the extent of 62 to</p>								

1	2	3	4
33	3.101	-do-	<p>70% at various levels in most of the public works programme for which labour contractor, corrupt officials and unusually long time taken by bureaucrats are responsible. The Committee want the Government to look into all these aspects and ensure that the funds made available for the poverty alleviation schemes are not pilfered away by such unscrupulous elements.</p> <p>The Committee are further informed that there is no system of redressal of grievances/complaints for the workers and engaged in JRY works and no punitive damages can be imposed on the persons responsible for misappropriation of funds. In this connection, the Ministry of Rural Development have stated that whenever any complaint regarding misappropriation/misutilisation of funds is received, the same is sent to the concerned State Government/U.T. for taking remedial measures. During evidence, the Secretary, Rural Development cited a few instances in which action was initiated against persons who were responsible for misappropriation of Gram Panchayats Funds. As such cases might have also occurred in other States/U.Ts., the Committee recommend that cases of misappropriation/mis-utilisation should be monitored at the Central Government level and State Governments persuaded to award exemplary punishment to such persons.</p>
34	3.102	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>From the JRY Manual the Committee find that States can spend upto a maximum of 2 per cent of the total allocations on the administration/contingencies inclusive of additional staff which have been created or may have to be created at any of the levels of the administration. During the Study Tours of the Committee as well as from the replies furnished by States/Union Territories to a questionnaire issued to them, the Committee find that almost all the States have com-</p>

1	2	3	4
			plained that the present ceiling of 2 per cent is inadequate and suggested to increase it to about 5 per cent. The Committee desire that the Government should suitably enhance the percentage of funds to be made available for administrative purposes.
35	3.103	-do-	<p>According to paras 13.1 to 13.5 of the JRY Manual, after setting apart 6 per cent of the funds towards IAY, 20 per cent towards MWS and 2 per cent towards administration and contingency charges etc. 80 per cent of the remaining 72 per cent funds (<i>i.e.</i> 57 per cent of the total funds) have to be distributed among the village panchayats and the balance 20 per cent (14.4 per cent of the total funds) are allotted to Zila Parishads/DRDAs etc. 25 per cent of this share <i>i.e.</i> 3.6 per cent of the total funds allocated can only be utilised for social forestry works under JRY whereas the Committee find that a minimum of 10 per cent of resources allocated under NREP was required to be earmarked every year for utilisation exclusively on social forestry and fuel plantation. In this regard, the Government of Karnataka have pointed out that except the funds allotted out of DRDAs/Zila Parishad's funds, there are no sectoral earmarkings of resources at the village panchayat level for social forestry. This according to Karnataka Government has resulted in ecological imbalances. In order to improve ecological environment in the country and also to meet timber and fuel needs of the rural poor, the Committee recommend that 15 per cent of the annual allocation of village panchayat to be spent on items of work which directly benefit the SCs/STs must be utilised for social forestry by engaging SC/ST freed bonded labourers. Under this scheme plantation of fruit bearing trees could also be taken up where SCs/STs could be allowed to plant trees, nurture them and eventually enjoy the product.</p>

1	2	3	4
36.	4.27	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>The Committee note that the wages under the Yojana are to be paid partly in cash and partly in foodgrains and shall be the same for all workers whether male or female. The wages for a category of employment shall be the same as notified for the relevant schedule of employment under the Minimum Wages Act. However, certain Non-Governmental Organisations working in the State of Rajasthan have pointed out to the Committee that in some villages of Rajasthan average payments made to the workers varied from Rs. 6/- to Rs. 18/- against the statutory minimum wages of Rs. 22/-per day. Although, according to Secretary, Department of Rural Development, Government of India in some of these cases necessary corrective action has been taken, the committee cannot rule out the possibility of this malpractice being followed on a much wider scale in Rajasthan and also in other States/Union Territories. The Committee, therefore, recommend that apart from registering criminal cases against persons including Sarpanches and officers found involved, a country wide survey needs to be undertaken in regard to payment of minimum wages and strict instructions and legal action taken to stop such malpractices.</p>
37.	4.28	-do-	<p>The Committee are perturbed at instance of violation of Section 4 and 5 of the Equal Remuneration Act, 1967, under JRY.</p> <p>They are dismayed to find that presently there is no system of investigation of complaints regarding underpayment of wages/ wages paid less than the statutory wages except that the complaint is referred to the next higher authority for investigation. The Committee desire the Department of Rural Development to Lunch an early investigation of the prevalence of such illgal practices in</p>

1	2	3	4
			regard to payment of wages and to initiate strict administrative/legal action against those found guilty.
38	4.29	Ministry of Rural Development	The Committee are apprised that minimum wages for various categories of employment under JRY can be paid either on a time basis or on a piece rate basis. They are, however, concerned to find that there are instances where workers though engaged on piece rate basis are compelled to come and go according to fixed timing. The Committee desire that the Department of Rural Development should take up the matter with the State Governments so that such unfair practices are topped altogether.
39	4.30	-do-	The Committee are further apprised that a considerable time lag exists between the notification of revised minimum wages and the extension of these rates to JRY workers. The Committee desire that as soon as a notification regarding revision of minimum wages is issued by a State Government / Union Territory, wages paid under JRY should automatically be included in such notifications.
40	4.31	-do-	Although payment of wages to workers is not to be delayed by more than a week except at the option of the worker it has been brought to the notice of the Committee that in several cases payments are made much later than the prescribed period of 7 days and there were several cases outstanding for over a year. The Committee desire the Government to have such cases investigated and to recommend that erring officers who are found guilty of not making payment of wages within the prescribed period should be given exemplary punishment.
41	4.32	Ministry of Rural Development	The Committee are informed by the Planning Commission that there are considerable inter-State variations in the minimum wage rates varying from Rs.13.70 to Rs. 34.00 per

1

2

3

4

day the unskilled workers. In this connection, Secretary, Rural Development, stated during evidence that the National Commission on Rural labour headed by Dr. Hanumantha Rao has recommended a national minimum wage of Rs. 20.00 all over the country, and that the Minister of Labour has been discussing this issue with various organisations. The Committee feel that a minimum wage all over the country to be fixed by the Union Government would be a step in the right direction. They also suggest that the States / Union Territories may be persuaded to fix minimum wage within their State not below the national minimum wage.

42

4.33

-do-

The Committee note that according to JRY Manual, 1.5 Kg. of foodgrains per manday were to be distributed as a component of wages. The Ministry of Rural Development have informed the Committee that they have reviewed the position in July, 1992 and taken the decision that 2 kg. of foodgrains per manday would be supplied to the labourers as part of their JRY wages. The foodgrains are to be given to the labourers on the work site itself while the handling charges upto a mamimum of Rs. 20 per quintal would be met by DRDA itself where after it would be shared between the Centre and the State. Further, expenditure in excess of Rs. 20 per quintal is to be booked to the material component of the JRY. For this purpose, the foodgrains can also be distributed through Fair Price Shops. Keeping in view the comfortable food stocks and the desirbility of improving nutritional standard of workers, the Committee feel that utilisation of foodgrains under the programme should be stepped up. This would also result in higher real income for the workers as they would also get the benefit of subsidized foodgrains.

1	2	3	4
43	4.34	Ministry of Rural Development	The Committee also desire that the Ministry of Rural Development should impress upon the State Government the need to distribute the foodgrains immediately on lifting them FCI godowns. Moreover samples of foodgrains should be taken from time to time so as to ensure the prescribed quality of the foodgrains being supplied to workers.
44	4.35	-do-	The Committee note that the muster-rolls for all workers are to have entries indicating of the person engaged is a Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribe, landless labour, freed bonded labour or a woman worker. The official responsible for maintaining the muster-rolls is also required to record, at the time of weekly payments, a certificate indicating the employment generated for these categories of people. Supervisory level officers during their inspection are required to check the employment generation reports and the Certificates on the muster-rolls regarding employment generation. However, during their Study Tour, the Committee found that at some places the muster-rolls were being maintained in a very unsatisfactory manner in total disregard of the Provisions of JRY manual. As there exists every possibility of tempering with the record, the Committee recommend that all the States / Union Territories should be advised to maintain the muster-rolls in a stitched form and all its pages must be numbered and signed by an officer of a superisory level.
45	5.12	-do-	The Committee note that the monitoring arrangements for the programme envisage regular visits to the Districts by officers and visits by officers at the District / Sub-division and block levels to the sites of work in interior areas. The State Government were also to prescribe the periodical reports / returns for monitoring the performance of

1	2	3	4
			<p>the Districts and were also to get appropriate returns and reports prescribed, to be collected by DRDAs from the village panchayats. In this connection, Audit have pointed out that the necessary monitoring arrangements for implementation of the programme were not made in a number of States. The Committee need hardly to emphasise that proper monitoring including surprise checking / inspections and field visits are necessary for successful implementation of any programme. The Committee would, therefore, like to know whether the schedule of inspections prescribing the minimum number of field visits for each supervisor level functionary, after its approval by the State Level Coordination Committee, has been drawn up and strictly adhered to in all the States / Union Territories.</p>
46	5.13	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>The State Governments / Union Territories are also required to submit monthly progress reports to the Ministry of Rural Development by 10th of succeeding months and detailed quarterly progress reports by 25th of the month following the quarter. The Committee desire to be informed as to whether all the State Government / Union Territories are submitting their reports on due dates and also whether central teams have visited appropriate sites of work in interior areas to verify the contents of such reports. In the absence of such visits, the Committee fail to understand what mechanism has been followed for verifying the reliability of the reports, received from the State Governments / Union Territories.</p>
47	5.14	-do-	<p>According to JRY Manual, Centre as well as States / UTs are to conduct periodical evaluation study of the implementation of the programme through reputed institutions and organisation. In this connection, the Committee are informed that Ministry of Rural</p>

1	2	3	4
			<p>Development have entrusted evaluation of JRY to 33 non-governmental research organisation in the country and in all 450 rural districts—2 blocks and 5 panchayats in each district are to be covered by the evaluation studies. The Study aims at gauging the impact created by JRY in relation to its objectives. Although a quick evaluation of the JRY has already been conducted by the programme Evaluation Organisation (PEO) of the Planning Commission and although the findings of PEO corroborate the Estimates Committee's own observations on the subject, they would like to know the final results of the concurrent Evaluation taken up by the voluntary organisations / PEC.</p>
48	5.15	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>The Committee find from a Memorandum submitted to them by a non-governmental organisation that whereas the JRY Manual stress upon the importance of social/special audit, no modalities have been framed in this regard by the Government so far. The Committee are of the view that apart from getting the internal audit done, non-governmental organisations should also be allowed to conduct a social/special audit of JRY expenditure.</p>
49	6.11	-do-	<p>Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY), which started in 1985 and a component of JRY since 1989, envisages construction of houses for SC/ST as well as released bonded labourers. It is mandatory for the beneficiaries to construct their houses themselves on their plots with enough ventilation and sanitation facilities. These houses are constructed free of cost and the unit cost ranges from Rs. 12,700/- in the plain area to Rs. 14,500/- in difficult terrain. In this regard, Government of Karnataka have brought to the notice of the Committee that there has been escalation of about 33.33% and 65% in wages and material cost</p>

1	2	3	4
50	6.12	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>respectively both in plain as well as difficult areas. It has, therefore, been suggested to the Committee that the unit cost of houses should be raised upwards to Rs. 15,000 in plain areas and to Rs. 18,000 in difficult areas. The Committee are included to agree with this view and recommend that the prescribed unit cost of a house to be constructed under JRY should be revised every year at the time of releasing funds to the States, on the basis of average increase in wages and material cost during the preceding year.</p> <p>IAY guidelines clearly indicate that no contractor can be engaged for construction of houses under the Yojana. However, it has been brought to the notice of the Committee, that there has been widespread violation of this stipulation. Moreover, massive corruption and pilferage has characterised the implementation of IAY in some parts of the country and almost every colony has been unofficially built on contract. It has also been pointed out that in the selection of beneficiaries also, influential and more affluent SC/ST were also covered. The Committee are further distressed to know such undeserving beneficiaries have been using these houses as fodder storage and that at some place, about 85 per cent houses constructed under the Yojana were lying vacant. It has also been alleged that the beneficiaries have also been forced to construct their houses in separate clusters. The Committee take a very serious view of these irregularities and recommend the Government to report the matter to them after thoroughly going into all the complaints. For this purpose, the assistance and cooperation of NGO, must also be taken. The Committee further desire that similar irregularities in other parts of the country may also be investigated and guilty officials punished.</p>

1	2	3	4
51	6.19	-do-	<p>The Committee find that 20% of the total allocations of a State/Union Territory earmarked under JRY for Million Wells Scheme (MWS) can be used only in the scheme mentioned in the Manual and the same can not be diverted for any other scheme or for categories other than the target groups i.e. small and marginal farmers amongst SC/ST and freed bonded labourers who are below poverty line are also listed in the IRDP register of the village. In this connection, the Planning Commission as well as the Government of Karnataka have suggested for extending the scheme to small and marginal farmers belonging to all other communities falling below the poverty line especially in those Districts where the adequate number of SC/ST beneficiaries owning lands are not available. Whereas the Committee agree with the above suggestion, they, however, desire the Government to obtain comments from all State/Union Territories on the issue before taking any final decision in the matter.</p>
52	6.20	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>This scheme, being part of wage employment funds, can be used for open wells only. In areas where well digging is not feasible owing to geological factors, the earmarked funds under the scheme can be utilised for other schemes of minor irrigation like irrigation tanks, water harvesting structure and for the development of lands belonging to SC/ST and freed bonded labourers. Construction of bore wells and tube wells can not be taken up under the scheme. The Committee feel that these stipulations are not in overall benefit of the people and recommend that if five or more beneficiaries desire, they should be allowed to dig bore wells/tube wells on a joint basis. Simultaneously, they also recommend that all the State Government/Union Territories should be instructed to provide power connections to all such tube wells etc. on a priority basis.</p>

1	2	3	4
53	6.21	-do-	As the Committee have found the scheme very popular amongst the rural poor in as much as the facility operates as a key to better agricultural productivity, they desire the Government to seriously consider the desirability of permitting digging of wells under JRY itself.
54	6.22	Ministry of Rural Development	On the basis of Reports received upto September, 1992, the Ministry of Rural Development have informed the Committee that a sum of Rs. 1069.41 crores have been spent for construction of wells under MWS so far. The Committee are constrained to note that the Ministry of Rural Development was not monitoring the total area being irrigated after the introduction of the scheme. The Committee feel that unless the statistics regarding irrigated areas under the scheme are known, it was not possible for them to conclude that the scheme has been able to achieve the desired objectives. They desire suitable steps to be taken in this regard.
Miscellaneous Recommendations			
55	6.23	-do-	During their study visits to various States and Union Territories, the Committee observed that there was a total need to involve Community Block Development Gram Panchayats in implementing rural development programmes. It was also observed that in the last stage of Community Block Development, a skeleton staff is working and BDO functions more or less as a coordinator with all other departments and officials. The Committee, therefore, recommend that all the Block Development officers in the States and Union Territories be brought under the administrative control of Director, Rural Development to facilitate better coordination and effective implementation of JRY programmes.
56	6.24	-do-	It was also found that each of the Panchayats was getting the financial allocations in

1	2	3	4
57	6.25	Ministry of Rural Development	<p>parts and as such some of the Panchayats got a very meagre sum of four digits thereby frustrating the very division of funds sector-wise as stipulated in JRY Manual. Keeping in view the above facts, the Committee recommend that the JRY funds should be allocated on one time basis to remote, hilly and isolated Islands and backward territories so that they can overcome the inherent geographical and other problems in implementation of JRY programmes.</p> <p>They also desire that in each State and Union Territory some mechanism be created for having compulsory audit of Gram Panchayat Funds to ensure better and purposeful spending of JRY funds.</p>

**LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF LOK SABHA
SECRETARIAT PUBLICATION**

Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Sl. No.	Name of Agent
ANDHRA PRADESH		UTTAR PRADESH	
1.	M/s. Vijay Book Agency, 11-1-477. MvIargadda, Secunderabad-500 306.	12.	Law Publishers, Sardar Patel Marg, P.B. No. 77, Allahabad, U.P.
BIHAR		WEST BENGAL	
2.	M/s. Crown Book Depot. Uppar Bazar, Ranchi (Bihar).	13.	M/s. Madimala, Buys & Sells, 123, Bow bazar Street, Calcutta-1.
GUJARAT		DELHI	
3.	The New Order Book Company, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad-380 006. (T.No. 79065)	14.	M/s. Jain Book Agency. C-9, Connaught Place, New Delhi, (T.No. 351663 & 350806).
MADHYA PRADESH		15.	M/s. J.M. Jaina & Brothers, P. Box 1020, Mori Gate, Delhi-110006. (T. No. 2915064 & 230936).
4.	Modern Book House, Shiv Vilas place, Indore City. (T.No. 35289)	16.	M/s. Oxford Book & Stationry Co., Scindia House, Connaught Place, New Delhi-110001. (T.No. 3315308 & 45896).
MAHARASHTRA		17.	M/s. Bookwell, 2/72. Sant Nirankari Colony, Kingsway Camp, Delhi-110009. (T.No. 7112309).
5.	M/s. Sunderdas Gian Chand, 601, Girgaum Road, Near Princes Street, Bombay-400 002.	18.	M/s. Rajendra Book Agency, IV-DR59, Lajpat Nagar, Old, Double Storey, New Delhi-110 024. (T.No. 6412362 & 6412131).
6.	The International Book Service, Deccan Gymkhana, Poona-4.	19.	M/s. Ashok Book Agency. BH-82, Poorvi Shalimar Bagh, Delhi-110 033.
7.	The Current Book House, Maruti lane, Raghunath Dadaji Street, Bombay-400 001.	20.	M/s. Venus Enterprises, B-2/85; Phase-II, Ashok Vihar, Delhi.
8.	M/s. Usha Book Depot, 'Law Book Seller and Publishers' Agents Govt. Publications, 585, Chira Bazar, Khan House, Bombay-400 002.	21.	M/s. Central News Agency Pvt. Ltd., 23/90, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-110 001. (T.No. 344448 322705, 344478 & 344508).
9.	M & J Services, Publishers, Rep- resentative Accounts & Law Book Sellers, Mohan Kunj, Ground Floor, 68, Jyotiba Fuele Road Nalgaum, Dadar, Bombay-400 014	22.	M/s. Amrit Book Co., N-21, Connaught Circus, New Delhi.
10.	Subscribers Subscription Service India, 21, Raghunath Dadaji Street, 2nd Floor, Bombay-400 001.	23.	M/s. Books India Corporation Publishers, Importers & Exporters, L-27, Shastri Nagar, Delhi-110 052. (T. No. 269631 & 714465).
TAMIL NADU		24.	M/s. Sangam Book Depot, 4378/4B, Murari Lal Street, Ansari Road, Darya Ganj, New Delhi-110 002.
11.	M/s. M.M. Subscription Agencies, 14th Murali Street, (1st Floor), Mahalingapuram, Nungambakkam, Madras-600 034. (T.No. 476558)		

Corrigenda to 30th Report of the
Estimates Committee (1992-93) on
Jawahar Rozgar Yojana

...

<u>Page</u>	<u>Para</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
2	1.3	11	village	villages
3	1.7	1	export	expert
5	1.13	21	It	If
5	1.14	3	of clear	clear
8	1.24	2	the	to
8	1.25	7	lane	land
13	2.4	5	815.725	875.725
14	2.8	7	dates	datas
15	2.13	13	1990-91	during 1990-91
15	2.13	14	50:5	50:50
18	2.21	7-8	SC/T	SC/ST
20	2.27	7-8	(DRDA), Apparently	(DRDA), apparently
20	2.28	26	date	data
23	3.2	12	BDO2	BDO
26	3.12	10	Where is	Where
31	-	29	in	is
34	3.41	12	his	this
35	3.43	2	in	of
37	3.50	2	generage	generate
39	3.63	last	the phenomenon	this phenomenon
40	3.63	3	movment	movement
42	3.70	4	a organisation	an organisation
45	3.87	17	is very	very
45	3.87	18	recommended	and recommend
47	3.94	12	during	During
49	3.98	16	suitable	suitably
50	3.101	2	and engaged	workers engaged
52	4.7	5	make	male
53	4.9	9	irriducible	irreducible
57	4.28	3	find	find out
58	4.31	2	worker	worker,
66	6.5	5	repectively	respectively
67	6.8	3	for	far
69	6.12	8	underserving	undeserving
81	2.28	7	programmes	programme
81	2.28	26	its	it
86	3.87	21	is very	very
86	3.87	23	recommend	and recommend