CHAPTER III

AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF DIFFERENT ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAMMES
The bane of our sub-continent, India, is its haunting Specter of poverty. Poverty, with its wide and far reaching tentacles, has a stranglehold on population and material prosperity of India. That is why an attempt is made in this chapter to study the topics indicated below:

i) Wide ranging tentacles of poverty;

ii) The need of its removal; and

iii) Five Year Plan efforts towards poverty alleviation.

By initiating and implementing in spirit and letter several poverty eradication programmes and integrating them with the old ones have yielded significant results. It is also observed that mere planning at the top would not do but it should be translated into action in spirit and letter. The rank and file should work towards total poverty eradication with a single minded dedication to uplift the country from poverty, rural as well as urban, to hold our head high in the comity of progressive nations.

WIDE RANGING TENTACLES OF POVERTY

PERSONAL

Though one may not believe in fate in the modern time but no one can deny the importance of personal capacity, efforts and characteristics, in the economic status of the person. The important personal causes of poverty are:

- Sickness
- Mental disease
- Accidents
- Illiteracy
- Idleness
• Demoralization, and
• Extravagance

Any one or combination of some or all of them can cause poverty.

Besides the above mentioned personal causes, the following geographical factors are also responsible for increasing poverty. These play important role and become great hurdles in national development, if the geographical factors are not good. The factors are explained below:

A) UNFAVORABLE CLIMATE AND WEATHER

Favorable climate and weather is very much necessary for work as well as for production both agricultural and industrial. Hence, in the extremely cold and hot climatic weather conditions, the amount of work and production is considerably for workers cannot work for longer hours. This increases the intensity of poverty.

B) ABSENCE OF NATURAL RESOURCES

No country can become rich in the absence of sufficient natural resources eg. fertile land, sufficient water, mineral marine and forest products. In the absence of natural resources, the inhabitants of the deserts, high mountains and extremely hot and extremely cold countries generally remain poor.

C) NATIONAL CALAMITIES

Besides, unfavourable climate and weather, natural calamities, such as, the eruptions of volcanoes, typhoons, floods, earthquakes and lightning cause serious damages to property and agriculture. In Japan, earthquakes cause serious damage to property. In China, floods are the major cause of damage to agriculture. In India, the absence of timely rains, excessive or deficient rains cause serious damage to agriculture.
D) PESTS

Pests are the major cause of damage to agriculture and movable property such as books, furniture etc.

Besides personal and geographical causes, Economic factor also plays important role Among different causes, the important ones are explained here under:

a) Agricultural Causes

Absence of sufficient manure, improved tools, implements and machines, means of irrigation and cattle of high-breed, diseases, absence of sufficient means to protect the fields from pests and animals, superstitions, exploitation of farmers and labourers by the landlords and constant fragmentation of land are some important causes in the rural parts of India which increase the poverty among people who are engaged in agricultural sector.

b) Unequal Distribution

Even if production is sufficient, millions of farmers and labourers remain poor in the country where distribution of wealth is unequal. In the capitalist system, the rich becomes richer and the poor poorer.

c) Economic Depression

Economic-depression factor such as decrease in trade and commerce, lockout of mills and factories and unemployment of millions of persons and small traders add and multiply serious setback in the eradication of poverty.

d) Unemployment

Unemployment is the most serious causative economic factor of poverty. In India, it is the major cause of the lower-standard of living of the people, both in urban and rural areas.
e) Unproductive Hoarding

If a major portion of the wealth of the country is hoarded in unproductive forms, such as, Jewelry, furniture etc., the economic development of the country is seriously handicapped. This is a serious cause of poverty in India.

f) Unwise Economic Policy

Sometimes, in spite of the presence of sufficient resources and manpower in a country, the people remain poor because of the unwise economic policy of the government. This was an important factor of economic backwardness in India under the British rule.

Besides the above mentioned economic causes, the following social factors also increase poverty. They can be stated as below:

- Faulty Educational System
- Faulty and Insufficient Housing
- Absence of Training in Home Science
- Evil customs and traditions
- Insufficient Provision of Medical Aid, and
- War

The above mentioned personal, geographical, economic and social causes do not exhaust all the causes of poverty. In fact, they differ from man to man and society to society. But, the above mentioned are the important causes of poverty everywhere. Eradication of poverty requires removal of all these causes. This involves titanic efforts not only from the government but also from the people.

NEED FOR REMOVAL OF POVERTY

While poverty in itself is a curse that need be removed at the earliest possible both from ethical and humanitarian considerations, there is a strong economic rationale for
promoting poverty-alleviation programme. This is not withstanding a strong belief among a section of economists that there is a trade-off between rapid economic growth on the one hand and removal of poverty and equal distribution of income on the other. The World Bank too in a recent report has come heavily on this belief in trade-off.

Indeed, poverty removal is being seen as an essential condition for self-sustaining growth. The following reasons are advanced in support of this argument,

One, the rich in the contemporary UDCs are not noted for their frugality or for their desire to save and invest substantial proportions of their incomes in the local economy. Their activities do not add to the nations productive resources.

Two, a raise in the incomes and levels of living of the poor would contribute not only to their material well-being but also to the productivity and income of the economy as a whole.

Three, raising the income levels of the poor will stimulate an overall increase in the demand for locally produced products. Rising demand for local goods provides a greater stimulus to local production, local employment, and local investment. Such demand, thus, creates the conditions for rapid economic growth and broader popular participation in the process of economic growth.

Finally, a more equitable distribution of income achieved through the reduction of mass poverty can stimulate healthy economic expansion by acting as a powerful material and psychological incentive to widespread public participation in the development process.

In addition, technological breakthroughs have made the reduction of poverty, if not its elimination, a distinct possibility for the first time in human history. From foodgrains production, to immunization, to contraception, to drinking water and sanitation, to management systems and a whole range of related matters, new and efficient techniques unknown even 20 years ago are available.
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poverty. Sixth Plan aimed at creating 34 million jobs during the plan period. The Sixth Plan implemented IRDP programme under which small and marginal farmers, lendless labourers, rural artisans, schedule caste and schedule tribe were benefited. The Sixth Plan continued the minimum needs programme. The MNP consists of:

- Compulsory elementary and adult education;
- Rural water supply;
- Rural roads;
- Rural electrification; and
- Nutrition programmes (mid-day meals) etc.

Many people were benefited from the poverty alleviation programmes, like, IRDP and NREP. According to the Planning Commission the percentage of poor come down to 41.5 per cent and total number of persons below poverty line to 282 millions in 1981-82.

To sum up all these Five Year Plans and their implementations can be divided into three phases.

In the first phase, the prime emphasis was on growth, mainly through improvement in infrastructures and heavy industries. This should be supplemented by a few economic measures like MRTP act and planned allocation of investments. The solution to the problem of equity and poverty would come through 'filtration' or 'trickledown'. In this, upgradation of lendless poor farmers, labourers were considered a target group.

In the second phase, beginning with the Fifth Plan, poverty alleviation came to be adopted as an 'explicit objective' of economic planning. Several specific programmes for poverty alleviation and directed towards selected target groups were launched. This addition was in response to a consensus that the benefits of past growth had failed to percolate significantly to the lower income groups and weaker sections of society.
Bardhan\textsuperscript{6} has listed factors for failure of 'trickle-down' mechanism. Landlords or richer farmers had a significant role in it. It, hence, necessitated the emergence of poverty alleviation programme(s) to come into existence.

In the third phase, it is realized that planned growth or one on equity could not be helpful in alleviating poverty. Hence during Sixth Plan many of the Poverty Alleviation Programmes (\textit{PAPs}) came into existence. By the experience of Malaysia, Indonesia and other Asian countries it was learnt that slow growing economy can not be so helpful in alleviating the poverty. Sufficient fast growth can only help in alleviate poverty\textsuperscript{7}. Hence 'growth' and 'poverty' both are two complementary actions.

The assault on poverty during the period of economic planning has relied on four types\textsuperscript{8}:

- growth
- redistribution
- basic needs, and
- direct targeted programmes, also known as Poverty Alleviation Programme.

The long-term growth rate during the period of economic planning has been 3.9 per cent, through this declines to 1.8 per cent after allowing for population growth. The record of growth per cent has been neither striking nor unimpressive considering pre-Independence rates of growth and against the background of a highly diverse land and population mass where production is considerably dependent on uncertain rainfall. In this mixed picture, economic growth has at best constrained the spread of poverty and at worst has accentuated structural and regional inequalities.

The redistribution of assets by means of land, largely, divorced from other development goals.

Basic needs provision is not impressive in comparison with other low income countries, such as, China, Cuba, Sri Lanka etc. Large proportions of the poor live with few and
variable 'minimum needs'. Their provision varies state-wise according to resources, political interests and administrative capacity.

Direct programmes have been related to target group. This concept itself is derived from the poverty-line which demarcates the technically poor from the technically non-poor.

POVERTY ALLEVIATION PROGRAMMES (PAPS) AND THEIR INTEGRATION WITH DEVELOPMENT STRATEY

INTEGRATED RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (IRDP)

The IRDP forms the core of the strategy of rural development, adopted since the Sixth Plan. It aims at an all-round development of the 'target group' to lift it above the poverty line. The target group consists of the poorest among the poor in the rural areas, namely Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, agricultural and non-agricultural labourers, rural artisans, marginal and small farmers. Under the programme, subsidies are provided to the identified families so as to enable them to acquire an income-earning asset. Initially, the programme was launched in 2,000 selected blocks, but now, it has been extended to whole of the country. The progress of the IRDP, however has been slow, primarily because of various administrative difficulties in implementation as also high administrative costs estimated at 20 per cent of the total outlay.

TRAINING OF RURAL YOUTH FOR SELF-EMPLOYMENT (TRYSEM)

A Centrally-sponsored scheme, TRYSEM was launched on August 15, 1979. The TRYSEM scheme is a facilitating component of the IRDP, so as to provide the human talent input by way of developing the skill and expertise. The objective of the scheme is to provide technical and entrepreneurial skills to rural youth from families below poverty-line to enable them to take up self-employment in the broad fields of agriculture and allied activities, industries services and business activities. The identified youth are put through a period of training either both a training institution or a master craftsman to provide necessary
technical and entrepreneurial skills. On the successful completion of training, they should receive a combination of subsidy and institutional credit under the IRDP for acquisition of income-generating assets, if they so desire for activities which have relevance to the training imparted under the scheme. A major problem faced by TRYSEM has been the absence of infrastructural support and backward and forward linkages when trained youth go for self-employment. These have to come largely from sectoral agencies in the form of better technology, production and supply of good quality assets, provision of other inputs, services and marketing facilities.

**JAWAHAR ROZGAR YOJANA (JRY)**

JRY was launched in April 1989. The JRY had been formulated by merging together two other wage-employment programmes that had been in operation earlier viz National rural employment programmes (in operation since 1980) and Rural lendless employment guarantee programme (in operation since 1983).

Similar to these two programmes the major objectives of the JRY are as follows:

1. Generation of additional gainful employment for the unemployed and underemployed in the rural areas;
2. Creation of productive community assets for direct and continuing benefits to the priority groups and for strengthening rural economic and social infrastructure which lead to rapid growth of rural economy and steady rise in the income levels of the rural poor; and
3. Improvement in the overall quality of life in the rural areas.

The target group of the JRY is those below the poverty line. This programme aims to provide wage employment to at least one member of each poor and rural family for 50-100 days a year, at a workplace near his residence throughout the country. It is hoped to incorporate into the programme integrated schemes to provide employment to nomadic
tribes. A special feature of these schemes is that 30 per cent of the employment generated will be reserved for women.

The JRY stands merged with the new scheme, PMRY, launched on October 2, 1993.

**NEHRU ROZGAR YOJANA (NRY)**

The NRY is the urban counterpart of the JRY. It has been in operation since October 11, 1989. The NRY aims at creating one million jobs annually. It will create opportunities for self-employment as well as generate wage employment. The target group of the NRY will be the urban poor living below the poverty line. (i.e. households with an annual household income of Rs.11,850 at 1991-92 prices). The NRY consists of the following three schemes:

1. The scheme of Urban-Micro Enterprises (SUME). The scheme is designed to encourage unemployed and under-employed youth to take up self-employment ventures in all urban settlements.

2. The Scheme of Urban Wage Employment (SUWE). The scheme is designed to provide employment to the urban poor through the creation of socially and economically useful assets in the low income neighborhoods in towns with a population below one lakh.

3. The scheme of Housing and Shelter Upgradation (SHASU). The scheme aims at providing employment for persons involved in housing and building activities. The scheme has two components viz. Training and subsidy-cum-loan assistance.

The EAS became operational from October 2, 1993 in the 1752 backward blocks in which the Revamped Public Distribution System is in operation. The scheme aims at providing at least 100 days of unskilled manual work each to two members of all families seeking it. Its funding pattern is 80;20 by the Centre and states, respectively. It is targeted at the poor, especially, during the lean agricultural season in rural areas. The
works undertaken are run departmentally and no contractors are hired. Part of the wages may be paid in the form of food grains.

**RECENT EXTENSION**

Towards the end 1994, the *EAS* has been extended to 501 new blocks; as of now, the scheme covers nearly 40 per cent of the total blocks in the country. This extension of the scheme, however, has come in for criticism. One budgetary constraints imply that over time, this will result in the limited resources being spread out sparsely over a larger area, reducing the chances of these funds being used efficiently. Two, the programme envisaged employment generation through development of rural infrastructure. This secondary objective of the *EAS* will suffer due to lack of an adequate and steady streams of funds if funds are spread thinly over large areas. Three, if the relation of such permanent assets cannot be assured on an interrupted basis, the additional jobs created during construction will not give way to permanent jobs based on utilizing such assets.

**PRIME MINISTER'S ROZGAR YOJANA (PMRY)**

The *PMRY* was launched on October 2.12.1993. The *PMRY* integrates all the centrally-sponsored schemes of this nature, including the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana. The scheme would provide sustained employment to about 10 lakh educated unemployed youth in micro enterprises manufacturing services and business ventures. It would provide a loan up to a ceiling of Rs1 lakh, out of which the subsidy element will be 15% with a ceiling of Rs 7,500. The loans would not require any collateral guarantee, but assets created under the scheme would be hypothecated to the bank. Loans will be at the rate of interest applicable to such loans under *RBI* guidelines from time to time. All those who have undergone Government sponsored technical courses for a minimum duration of six months, besides matriculates and *ITI* diploma holders, will be eligible for the scheme. Youth between the age of 18 and 35 belonging to families with annual incomes of less than
Rs.24,000 would be eligible for assistance under the scheme. Not more than 30 per cent of the Micro-enterprises under the programme would be from the business sector.

All promotional, financial and development agencies of the state and central government at the field level would be involved in the implementation.

**PRIME MINISTER'S INTEGRATED URBAN POVERTY ERADICATION PROGRAMME (PMIUPFP)**

This programme, in short to be called *UPEP*, was launched on 12th November, 1995.

The programme provides for self-employment through skill development. The scheme provides for subsidy and easy loans to target beneficiaries. A housing and shelter upgradation scheme is also proposed. It also provides for a creation of a National Urban Poverty Eradication Fund with private sector contributions. The *UPEP* will also absorb the NRY.

**SELF-EMPLOYMENT SCHEME FOR RURAL YOUTH**

Under this scheme the rural youth below the poverty line who have a school education up to class VIII would be eligible for a subsidy of half of the project cost, though the ceiling cannot exceed Rs.7,500. In addition, if a group of five or more persons plans a joint self-employment scheme, the government would share half the cost. The ceiling for such a scheme is Rs.1.25 lakh.

**RECENT SCHEMES**

Three new schemes came in implementation from August 15, 1995. The new schemes are: Mid-day meal scheme, Rural Group Life Insurance Scheme and National Social Assistance Scheme. Under the Mid-day meal Scheme food grains would be provided to primary school-going children. The insurance scheme provides for a life cover of Rs.5,000 at a nominal monthly premium. The assistance scheme has three components, viz, old-age pension, family benefits in case of death of bread earner and maternity benefits.
DISTRICT RURAL INDUSTRIES PROJECT (DRIP)

The government launched in October 1994 the District Rural Industries project (DRIP) to strengthen the untapped potential for employment and for augmenting the income of the rural poor. It is designed to encourage setting up of commercially viable units in non-farming sector in rural areas and innovate, nurture and enhance the skills of rural artisans. It envisages to set up rural industrial estates in 500 selected villages within a period of five years generating sustainable employment opportunities for 25,000 rural population with an investment in the form of bank loan of about Rs.25 crores with all necessary linkages.

SOME OLD PROGRAMMES FOR POVERTY ALLEVIATION

Community Development (1952) and National Extension Service Programme (1963) were started to undertake works of agricultural and rural development partly on the government support and partly on the shramadan (voluntary donation of labour) basis. Blocks were created and they still exist for implementation various plan and non-plan development works.

NREP and RLEGP National Rural Employment Programme (on the pattern of Employment Guarantee Programme of Maharashtra) and Rural landless Labour Employment Guarantee Programmes (now merged in JRY) were intended to create employment in times of distress.

INTENSIVE AREA DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMME (IADP)

It was a strategy of doing everything somewhere 'rather than doing something everywhere'. Ford Foundation encouraged such a strategy in India (1959). Green revolution in India was a programme of this genre. It certainly solved India's food problem. IAAP (Intensive Agricultural Area Programme) was the programme through which IADP was actually implemented. After his programme was started (1964-65) green
revolution started from 1966 onwards. All technical, real, extension and financial inputs were provided on concentrated basis. The results were there for all to see. Real wages of agricultural workers went up. Family labour was withdrawn from agricultural operations by rich farmers, yet in all the employment generation also improved.

**CAD** (Command Area Development) programmes (revised in 1987-88) is for comprehensive and overall development of watershed areas and irrigation project areas. **CADPs** are there for major, medium and minor irrigation projects. Systematic land development, scientific land shaping, construction of water sources and field channels to carry water to individual fields, field drainage systems development and better water harvesting and conservation are part of this programme. Under the goals of 1992 policy where water potential is in excess of land potential, maximum agricultural potential per unit of area will be developed and in opposite conditions per unit of water will be developed. These measures will make direct and indirect dent on poverty through development of agriculture, particularly in drought prone areas.

**PIREP** (Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Projects) was precursor of the employment guarantee programmes. **SFDA** and **MFAL** (Small Farmers Development Agency and Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labourers (Development Programme) were for helping these persons with such assistance as would develop their uneconomical and non-viable agriculture or (in case of the landless agricultural workers) help them with wage employment and better implementation of the minimum wages provisions. Inputs supports was intended to be provided to marginal and small farmers.

**CSRD** (Crash Scheme for Rural Development) introduced in 1971 came a cropper that is, the crash programme crashed as soon as it was launched. Suddenly the planners planned that they will clear the backlog of development of run areas in a few years. Many labour intensive projects were conceived. Many works were conceived for increasing
productivity, employment and for reducing poverty. There were neither real not financial resources to sustain such programme and soon nobody was even mentioning it.

PERFORMANCE OF ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAMMES

According to Table 3.1, most of the poverty alleviation programmes - IRDP, NREP, RLEGP, MNP, Land Reforms and Jawahar Yojan have been implemented in all the 5092 blocks of the country; while DPAP and DDP in 615 and 132 blocks respectively. The Table 3.1 makes it clear that IRDP had the highest outlay of Rs.32,290 crores during the period from 1985 to 1990, followed by Rs.24,870 crores NREP, Rs.23,550 crores MNP and Rs.17,440 crores RLEGP. It clearly reflects the determined effort of the Government to reduce the intensity of poverty in the country.

It is to be noted that JRY was accorded a top priority programme during the year 1990-91. This was supported by the highest allocation of amount of Rs.2586.48 crores during the year for its implementation (Vide Table 3.2).

It is heartening to note that the achievement-rate of the implementation of the poverty alleviation programmes was 122.24 per cent during 1990-91 in 1991-92, (Vide Table 3.3) and the major beneficiaries covered under the schemes happened to be families belonged to SC and ST; over 30 per cent of the beneficiaries were women in this category.

The performance of the various anti-poverty programmes were impressive during the year 1990-91 as compared to 1991-92 (Vide Table 3.4). According to Table 3.5, generation of employment was also appreciable, with an achievement of 8732.29 lakhs Man Days during 1990-91 as compared to 4664.11 lakhs mandays during 1991-92. Social forestry also made headway during 1990-91 with trees planted in 2066.61 lakh hectares to only 722.19 Lakh hectares during 1991-92. Addition irrigation potential created was with Rs.215.162 lakh during 1990-91 as against Rs.75.83 lakhs (Vide Table 3.8).
Even in the case of TRYSEM Scheme implementation too, relatively more money was spent during the year 1990-91 compared to 1991-92. The amount spent on TRYSEM during 1990-91 was Rs.3260.93 lakh as against Rs.2563.175 lakh during 1991-92. (Table 3.9).

To empower the youth with adequate means to earn a decent livelihood the Union Government had released an amount of Rs.1800.00 lakh as its share to effectively implement the TRYSEM Programme (Vide Table 3.10).

The foregone discussion clearly underlines the fact that the performance of different anti-poverty programmes happened to be of impressive and encouraging trend in the reduction of the intensity of the poverty levels as reflected through the lower financial allocation of funds for the implementation of the anti-poverty programmes during 1991-92 as compared to 1990-91.
TABLE- 3.1
POVERTY ALLEVLATION PROGRAMMES FOR THE RURAL PEOPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMME</th>
<th>OUTLAY (1985-90) (Rs. Million)</th>
<th>COVERAGE (Blocks) TOTAL: 5,092</th>
<th>ELEMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRDP</td>
<td>32.290</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Subsidised loans for self-employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NREP</td>
<td>24.870</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Wage-employment in slack season</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLEGP</td>
<td>17,440</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>80-100 days of wage-employment to every land-less household.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNP</td>
<td>43,550</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Minimum facilities of elementary and adult education health and family planning, nutrition, roads, drinking water and house-sites for the landless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPAP</td>
<td>2,370</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>Area development of drought prone areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDP</td>
<td>2,450</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>Area development of hot and cold deserts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDPR</td>
<td>3,522</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Communal facilities and expenses for PR institutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land reform</td>
<td>3,960</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Redistribution of land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jawahar Yojana</td>
<td>Started only in April, 1989</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>Employment for 50-100 days in a year to at least one member in poor family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE- 3.2

**RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES: EXPENDITURE, 1990-91 AND 1991-92**

(\( \text{Rs. In Crores} \))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAMME</th>
<th>1990-91</th>
<th>1991-92</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRDP</td>
<td>809.49(b)</td>
<td>481.56 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWCRA</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRYSEM</td>
<td>32.60</td>
<td>25.63 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JRY</td>
<td>2586.48</td>
<td>1303.33 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNP</td>
<td>572.27 (a)</td>
<td>340.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARWSP</td>
<td>371.48</td>
<td>231.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPAP</td>
<td>93.89</td>
<td>48.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDP</td>
<td>58.33</td>
<td>25.59 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Up to Dec'91  ** Provisional  NA - Not Available

(a) NA = Not Available


### TABLE- 3.3

**IRDP: PHYSICAL TARGETS AND ACHIEVEMENT 1990-91, 1991-92.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>FAMILIES ASSISTED (Lakhs)</th>
<th>PERCENTAGE OF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>ACHIEVEMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>23.71</td>
<td>28.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92*</td>
<td>22.52</td>
<td>14.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Up to December 91

### TABLE- 3.4

**DWCRA: PHYSICAL AND FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE-1990-91 AND 1991-92**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECTOR</th>
<th>1990-91</th>
<th>1991-92*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of groups</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Target</td>
<td>7,139</td>
<td>5,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Achievement</td>
<td>109,557</td>
<td>103,097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of women</td>
<td>1,149+</td>
<td>634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Sector outlay (Rs. Lakhs)</td>
<td>1,300+</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: *Figures up to December 91 only.

+ Fig. From Annual Plan 1991-92, Planning Commission.


### TABLE- 3.5

**FINANCIAL AND PHYSICAL ACHIEVEMENTS UNDER JRY 1990-91 AND 1991-92.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>1990-91</th>
<th>1991-92* (a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total resources allocated</td>
<td>(Rs. Crores)</td>
<td>2627.80</td>
<td>2620.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total resources Released</td>
<td>(Rs. Crores)</td>
<td>2529.18</td>
<td>2031.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource utilised</td>
<td>(Rs. Crores)</td>
<td>2586.48</td>
<td>1303.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Generation Target</td>
<td>L.M.D</td>
<td>9291.04</td>
<td>8152.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Generation Achievement</td>
<td>L.M.D</td>
<td>8732.29</td>
<td>4664.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

L.M.D- Lakh Mandays

*Up to December 91. (a) Excluding Chandigarh, Delhi.

### TABLE - 3.6
FINANCIAL AND PHYSICAL PROGRESS UNDER INDIRA AWAAS YOJANA (IAY) - 1990-91 AND 1991-92

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>1990-91</th>
<th>1991-92*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allocations including the value of Foodgrains (Rs. Crores)</td>
<td>157.38</td>
<td>157.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target (Nos.)</td>
<td>1221.00</td>
<td>1221.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of houses constructed (No.s)</td>
<td>1708.05</td>
<td>1215.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure incurred (Rs. Crores)</td>
<td>187.96</td>
<td>145.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figures up to December 91.

### TABLE - 3.7
SOCIAL FORESTRY UNDER JRY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>1990-91</th>
<th>1991-92*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area afforsted/covered</td>
<td>L.Ha</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees planted</td>
<td>L.No</td>
<td>2066.61</td>
<td>722.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Figure is provisional.
## TABLE- 3.8

**DPAP: PROGRESS DURING 1990-91 AND 1991-92.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>EXPENDITURE (Rs. Lakhs)</th>
<th>PHYSICAL ACHIEVEMENT (00ha.)</th>
<th>Irrigation Potential created</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Area treated under soil and moisture conservation</td>
<td>Area under Forest &amp; pasture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990-91*</td>
<td>9179.0</td>
<td>1430.33</td>
<td>800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92*</td>
<td>4826.0</td>
<td>374.946</td>
<td>539.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Up to November 91

+ Fig. From Annual Plan 1991-92, Planning Commision.


## TABLE- 3.9

**TRYSEM: EXPENDITURE INCURRED ON TRAINING DURING 1990-91 AND 1991-92.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>CENTRAL SHARE</th>
<th>STATE SHARE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>1643.96</td>
<td>1616.97</td>
<td>3269.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92*</td>
<td>1288.051</td>
<td>1275.124</td>
<td>2563.175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Up to December 91

TABLE- 3.10

TRYSEM FUNDS RELEASED FOR STRENGTHENING OF TRAINING INFRASTRUCTURE 1990-91 AND 1991-92 (Rs. In Lakhs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>ALLOCATION</th>
<th>CENTRAL SHARE</th>
<th>AMOUNT RELEASED AS CENTRAL SHARE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-91</td>
<td>1595.28</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>411.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92 (up to Dec'91)</td>
<td>1595.40</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>145.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-92 (for recurring expenditure)</td>
<td>3591.40</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>1791.30 (State share) 1800.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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