

(c) The number of these tractors 1973 is as follows:—

Suggestion made by Finance Minister

| | |
|---|----------|
| 1. M/s. Hindustan Machine Tools Ltd. (HMT Zetor-2511) | 32 nos. |
| 2. M/s. Harsha Tractors Ltd. (Harsha T-25) | 1 no. |
| 3. M/s. Auto Tractors Ltd. (Leyland) | 143 nos. |
| 4. M/s. Kirloskar Tractors Ltd. (DEUTZ) | 55 nos. |

Suggestion made by Finance Minister in regard to Formulation of a Crop and Cattle Insurance Scheme on a National scale

5107. SHRI RAJDEO SINGH: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Cattle Insurance Scheme on a national scale will stabilise the incomes of the small and marginal farmers; and

(b) if so, whether premium rate fixation will have twin principles of capacity to pay and the extent of the risk covered?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI ANNASAHEB P. SHINDE): (a) and (b). There is no proposal to introduce Cattle Insurance Scheme on a national scale or any special scheme for the benefit of small and marginal farmers on a national scale. However in the SFDA/MFAL project areas, the Agencies have been advised to set up a cattle mortality fund to benefit the identified beneficiaries.

CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 8540(c) DT. 30-4-1973 REGARDING "MODERN BAZAR" IN A RESIDENTIAL BUILDING IN VASANT VIHAR, NEW DELHI

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND IN THE MINISTRY OF WORKS AND HOUSING (SHRI OM MEHTA): I refer to the reply given to part (c) of the Unstarred Question No. 8540 dated 30-4-

1973 in regard to the action taken by the Delhi Development Authority about the misuse of a building, and I regret to state that a factual error had crept therein.

2. In answer to part (c) of the Question I had stated that the tenant and the landlord had been prosecuted by the Delhi Development Authority under the Delhi Development Act. On a verification I now find that only notice had been issued to the landlord and that prosecution proceedings had not been commenced before the court as such. The Delhi Development Authority had furnished the earlier information under the impression that the prosecution proceedings had been set in motion with the issue of notice to the landlord and this is how a mistake had occurred. The correct position is that the tenant had been prosecuted by the Delhi Development Authority under the Delhi Development Act and that notice had been issued against the landlord.

3. I may also avail myself of this opportunity to state that the order cancelling the sub-lease of the plot to the landlord was sent on 2nd April, 1973.

4. The delay in correcting the answer to part (c) of the Question referred to is also regretted.