

Sea Erosion

1107. DR. SUGUNA KUMARI CHELLAMELLA:
SHRI A. VENKATESH NAIK:
SHRI T. GOVINDAN:
SHRI MULLAPALLY RAMACHANDRAN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether any international meeting to check sea erosion in the coastal eco-system was held recently;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether the Union Government have received any proposal from any coastal States for controlling the sea erosion;

(d) if so, the decision taken by the Government in this regard and funds provided to each coastal State during the last three years, State-wise;

(e) whether the construction work of sea wall in Kerala has commenced; and

(f) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI SOMPAL):

(a) No Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) and (d) Yes. Nine coastal states have sent proposals for protection of vulnerable coastal reaches of their respective states from sea erosion for inclusion in the National Coastal protection Project. These proposals have been examined, modified and included in the National Coastal protection project estimated to cost about Rs. 1275 crore. So far Government of India has not identified any funding agency and no funds have been provided to the State Government of India has not identified any funding agency and no funds have been provided to the State Government.

(e) and (f) Construction of anti sea erosion works is the responsibility of State Governments. Over the years Government of Kerala has been undertaking anti sea erosion works in the form of sea walls along the coastline as per priority fixed by the State. So far the State of Kerala has constructed 354 km. of sea walls up to the end of VIII Plan for protecting vulnerable reaches against sea erosion.

Irrigation Projects of Manipur

1108. SHRI TH. CHAOBA SINGH: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Union Government have received proposals from the State Government of Manipur for inclusion the Thoubal and Khuga Multipurpose Projects and Dolaitabi Barrage Project under Non-lapsable Development fund;

(b) if so, the details thereof alongwith the decision taken by the Union Government in this regard; and

(c) the funds released for each of these projects during 1997-98 and 1998-99?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF WATER RESOURCES (SHRI SOMPAL):

(a) to (c) Ministry of Water Resources has not received any such proposal.

[Translation]

Below Poverty Line

1109. DR. SUSHIL INDORA:
SHRI H.P. SINGH:
SHRI MAHESH KANODIA:
DR. MADAN PRASAD JAISWAL:
PROF. PREM SINGH CHANDUMAJRA:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government have estimated the number of persons living below poverty line in various States at the end of Eighth Five Year Plan;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) the areas where more than 40% of the people living below poverty line, State-wise; and

(d) the new directions proposed in the Ninth Five Year Plan for giving priority to the development of these regions?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS, MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION (SHRI RAM NAIK): (a) and (b) The Planning Commission estimates poverty at

National and State level from quinquennial consumer expenditure data obtained from the National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO). The latest available estimates of poverty are based on the NSS consumer expenditure data of 50th Round (1993-94). As such, the estimates of poverty at the end of the Eighth Five Year Plan *i.e.* 1996-97, are not available. However, the estimates of poverty at national and state level for the year 1993-94 are given in the statement attached.

(c) Statewise estimates of poverty in 1993-94 show that out of a total of 32 States and Union Territories in the country, the poverty ratio in seven States and Union

Territories are more than 40 per cent. These are Assam, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Orissa, Sikkim, Uttar Pradesh and Dadra and Nagar Haveli.

(d) High rate of growth of output and employment and a special emphasis on all-round human development, with stress on Social Sector and a thrust on eradication of poverty, are central to the objective of reducing poverty during the Ninth Plan. In addition, the Ninth Plan will create the condition by which the disadvantaged are not only empowered to take advantage of the opportunities created by the growth process but also to contribute actively in the process of creation of wealth and well-being.

Statement

State-wise population and percentage of people living below poverty line, 1993-94

States	Rural		Urban		Total	
	Number of People (in lakh)	Percentage of people	Number of People (in lakh)	Percentage of people	Number of People (in lakh)	Percentage of people
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Andhra Pradesh	79.49	15.92	74.47	38.33	153.97	22.19
2. Arunachal Pradesh	3.62	45.01	0.11	7.73	3.73	33.35
3. Assam	94.33	45.01	2.03	7.73	96.36	40.35
4. Bihar	450.88	50.21	42.48	34.50	493.35	54.98
5. Goa	0.38	5.34	1.53	27.02	1.91	14.92
6. Gujarat	62.16	22.18	43.02	27.89	105.19	24.21
7. Haryana	36.56	28.02	7.31	10.38	43.88	25.06
8. Himachal Pradesh	15.40	30.84	0.46	9.18	15.86	28.44

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Jammu & Kashmir		19.05	30.84	1.88	9.18	20.92	25.17
10. Karnataka		95.88	29.88	60.46	40.14	156.46	33.16
11. Kerala		55.95	25.76	20.46	24.55	76.41	25.43
12. Madhya Pradesh		216.19	40.84	82.33	40.38	298.52	42.52
13. Maharashtra		183.30	87.83	111.90	35.15	305.22	30.85
14. Manipur		6.33	45.01	0.47	7.73	6.80	33.78
15. Meghalaya		7.09	45.01	0.29	7.73	7.38	37.92
16. Mizoram		1.64	45.01	0.30	7.73	1.94	25.66
17. Nagaland		4.85	45.01	0.20	7.73	5.05	37.92
18. Orissa		140.90	49.72	19.70	41.64	160.60	48.56
19. Punjab		17.76	11.95	7.35	11.35	25.11	11.77
20. Rajasthan		94.68	26.46	33.82	30.49	128.50	27.41
21. Sikkim		1.81	45.01	0.03	7.73	1.84	41.43
22. Tamil Nadu		121.70	32.48	80.40	33.77	202.10	35.03
23. Tripura		11.41	45.01	0.38	7.73	11.79	39.01
24. Uttar Pradesh		496.17	42.28	108.28	35.38	604.46	40.85

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. West Bengal		209.90	40.80	44.68	22.41	254.58	35.66
26. Andaman and Nicobar		0.73	32.46	0.33	39.77	1.06	34.47
27. Chandigarh		0.07	11.35	0.73	11.35	0.80	11.35
28. Dadra and Nagar Haveli		0.72	51.95	0.06	39.93	0.77	50.84
29. Daman and Diu		0.03	5.34	0.15	27.03	0.18	15.80
30. Delhi		0.19	1.90	15.32	16.03	15.51	14.69
31. Lakshadweep		0.06	25.76	0.08	24.55	0.14	25.04
32. Pondicherry		0.93	32.48	2.38	39.77	3.31	37.40
All India		2440.31	37.27	763.37	32.36	3203.68	35.97

- Poverty ratio of Assam has been followed in case of Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Manipur and Tripura.
- Poverty ratio of Tamil Nadu has been followed in case of Pondicherry, Andaman and Nicobar Islands.
- Poverty ratio of Kerala has been followed in case of Lakshadweep.
- Poverty ratio of Goa has been used in case of Daman and Diu.
- Poverty ratio of urban areas of Punjab has been followed in case of rural and urban population of Chandigarh.
- Poverty line of Maharashtra and distribution of Expenditure of Goa has been followed for estimating poverty ratio of Goa.
- Poverty line of Maharashtra and distribution of Expenditure of Dadra and Nagar Haveli has been followed in case of estimating poverty ratio of Dadra and Nagar Haveli.
- Poverty ratio of Himachal Pradesh for 1993-94 has been followed in case of Jammu and Kashmir.

[English]

Support Price of Coconut

1110. SHRI V.V. RAGHAVAN:
SHRI N.K. PREMCHANDRAN:
SHRI VARKALA RADHAKRISHNAN:

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government have received any representation from various Organisations and Members of Parliament regarding the fixation of support price of coconut;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the decision taken by the Government on the representation?