

- group (Rs. 1-2265) and 28% to the very very poor (Rs. 2266-3500).
- ii) About 20% beneficiaries were selected in the meetings of the Gram Sabha and about 75% beneficiaries selected by officials.
- iii) About 83% of the beneficiaries have found the assistance (Subsidy and credit) sufficient for acquiring the assets.
- iv) About 27% the sample families had no overdues and about 41% had overdues less than Rs. 1000/-.
- v) In 78% cases the assets were found intact.
- vi) The assets had generated incremental income of more than Rs. 2000 in about 26% cases, the incremental income was between Rs. 1001 to Rs. 2000 in about 28% cases and between Rs. 501-1000 in about 13% cases. It was upto Rs. 500 in another about 9% cases. The asset had not generated income in about 24% cases.
- vii)
- viii) In about 57% cases, there was no difference in the assessed and recorded value of assets. However in 8% cases the difference was more than Rs. 1000 and in about 9% cases, between Rs. 501 and Rs. 1000.
- ix) Working capital was required in 60% cases but was not provided in 26% cases to beneficiaries.
- x) The repayment period was less than 3 years in about 14% cases and just 3 years in about 53% cases, together accounting for 67% cases.
- xi) Insurance of the assets was done in 38% cases, but could not done in 35% cases, and was not required in 27% cases.
- xii) Training was not imparted to beneficiaries in 31% Cases out of 35% requiring training.
- xiii) Aftercare and support by Government agencies was not made available to beneficiaries in about 57% cases out of the 68% requiring such support and after-care.

Interest Subsidy to States

4321. SHRI MAHENDRA SINGH:
SHRI KAMAL NATH:
SHRIMATI VIDYAVATI
CHATURVEDI:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government are considering any scheme to give 'interest subsidy' to States for building up sufficient stock of fertilizers and other 'inputs';

(b) if so, the time by which this scheme is likely to be finalised; and

*About 50% old beneficiaries, had crossed the poverty line of Rs. 3500 and about 10% old beneficiaries, the revised poverty line of Rs. 6400.

(c) whether there is any such scheme going on at present, if so, the norms laid down therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE DEPARTMENT OF FERTILIZERS IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI R. PRABHU): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.

(c) No, sir.

Funds to States Under DDP

4322. SHRI VIRDHI CHANDER JAIN: Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) the provision made in the Seventh Five Year Plan for Desert Development Programme and the State-wise details in this regard;

(b) the amount spent in various States under the said programme;

(c) the success achieved so far;

(d) the criteria adopted for the allocation of said amount;

(e) whether it is a fact that the said criteria do not do any justice to the most drought affected Barmer and Jaisalmer districts of Rajasthan; and

(f) if so, the time by which just be will be done to these districts by making changes in the said criteria?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI

RAMANAND YADAV): (a) The financial outlay for Desert Development Programme (DDP) approved in Seventh Plan is Rs. 244.94 crores. State-wise allocations are not indicated in the Plan but are made on year to year basis depending on budgetary provision for the programme.

(b) Statement - I indicating the State-wise expenditure under DDP during 1985-86 and 1986-87 is given below

(c) The physical achievements reported in key sectors during 1985-86 and 1986-87 are given in statement - II below.

(d) to (f). The allocation for hot deserts is made on area basis. It was to start with Rs. 15 lakhs per 1000 Sq. Kms. during 1985-86 (subject to a maximum of Rs. 4 crores per district) and go up gradually each year so as to reach Rs. 25 lakhs per 1000 Sq. Kms. during the terminal year of the Plan (1989-90) subject to a maximum of Rs. 6 crores per district. For cold arid areas the scale of the funding was to be gradually raised from the Plan period. However, for hot as well as cold arid areas, it has not been possible to strictly adhere to these norms in view of reduced budgetary provision.

All areas covered by DDP including Jaisalmer and Barmer districts are given due weightage. As the availability of funds under DDP is limited, this programme is only of supplemental nature and has to be integrated with other rural development programmes and suitable State Government schemes as well as funds released for drought relief in order to achieve the maximum desired objectives. Therefore, it is not correct to say that allocation criteria of DDP are unfair to Jaisalmer and Barmer Districts.