

LOK SABHA DEBATES

LOK SABHA

Thursday, June 4 1998/Jyaistha 14, 1920 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

[Translation]

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

*122. SHRI THAWAR CHAND GEHLOT : Will the Minister of URBAN AFFAIRS & EMPLOYMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the target fixed for providing employment opportunities during the year 1996-97 and 1997-98;

(b) the number of people benefitted as against the target fixed, state-wise; and

(c) the States that have not achieved the physical targets during the period?

[English]

THE MINISTER OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND

EMPLOYMENT (SHRI RAM JETHMALANI) : (a) to (c) : A Statement is laid on the Table of the Sabha.

STATEMENT

(a) to (c) : Two Centrally sponsored schemes namely Nehru Rojgar Yojana (NRY) and Prime Minister's Integrated Urban Poverty Eradication Programme (PMIUEP) were implemented by this Ministry till 30.11.1997. These two schemes have been replaced by the Swarna Jayanti Shahari Rojgar Yojana (SJSRY) w.e.f. 1.12.1997.

NEHRU ROJGAR YOJANA:

The targets and achievements/people benefitted during the year 1996-97 and 1997-98 under NRY are given in enclosed Annexure-I.

PRIME MINISTER'S INTEGRATED URBAN POVERTY ERADICATION PROGRAMME:

Under PMIUEP, no specific targets were fixed either State-wise or year-wise. However, 5 million urban poor were targetted to benefit under the programme from 1995-96 to 1999-2000 in the country. Achievement under PMIUEP is shown at Annexure-II

SWARNA JAYANTI SHAHARI ROJGAR YOJANA :

SJSRY is still at an early stage of implementation and it is too early to report achievement.

Annexure-I

Nehru Rozgar Yojana

S. No.	State/UTs	No. of Beneficiaries under SUME				Mandays of Work Generated under SUWE (in lakhs)			
		1996-97		1997-98		1996-97		1997-98	
		T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1.	Andhra Pd.	10985	18315	2787	59709	2.18	1.59	1.87	12.43
2.	Arunachal Pd.	-	813	611	-	0.18	1.47	0.20	-
3.	Assam	1278	-	1586	-	1.13	0.85	0.85	0.57
4.	Bihar	9283	428	1590	-	2.80	-	1.20	-
5.	Goa	-	-	56	1023	0.05	-	0.08	0.71
6.	Gujarat	-	1512	-	1159	0.65	0.38	0.46	0.30
7.	Haryana	1211	1644	548	1338	0.48	-	0.42	-
8.	Himachal Pd.	667	108	167	-	0.36	-	0.08	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9.	J & K	778	2386	389	500	0.31	1.80	0.19	-
10.	Karnataka	-	4358	-	-	1.48	0.70	1.21	-
11.	Kerala	2981	-	766	-	0.94	-	0.79	-
12.	Madhya Pd.	7944	16581	6156	15281	2.38	0.30	2.06	11.04
13.	Maharashtra	13736	13441	4585	5968	3.62	-	1.61	-
14.	Manipur	444	-	732	-	0.33	-	0.20	-
15.	Meghalaya	278	1415	488	-	0.16	0.11	0.10	-
16.	Mizoram	167	-	488	130	0.12	-	0.17	0.30
17.	Nagaland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18.	Orissa	-	3408	737	-	1.08	1.50	0.47	1.54
19.	Punjab	1106	3931	548	1344	1.01	-	0.87	0.35
20.	Rajasthan	4889	12140	2529	5199	1.92	1.15	1.69	1.20
21.	Sikkim	222	406	111	111	0.09	0.78	0.06	0.50
22.	Tamil Nadu	11497	26618	3406	165	2.59	2.52	1.09	-
23.	Tripura	167	119	610	1676	0.72	-	0.18	0.41
24.	Uttar Pd.	19328	24833	8097	14426	7.53	7.72	3.35	5.75
25.	West Bengal	-	-	-	2055	2.00	1.99	0.85	0.33
26.	A & N Islands	186	328	46	19	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.03
27.	Chandigarh	-	64	-	-	0.07	-	0.02	0.11
28.	D. & N. Haveli	-	40	14	23	0.03	0.01	0.01	-
29.	Daman & Diu	-	245	28	59	0.10	-	0.01	3.33
30.	Delhi	-	518	-	192	-	-	-	-
31.	Pondicherry	-	616	55	266	-	-	-	0.09
Total		87147	134267	37130	110643	34.35	22.89	20.10	38.39

T-Target A-Achievement

SUME - Scheme of Urban Micro Enterprises

SUWE - Scheme of Urban Wage Employment

Annexure-II

Physical Achievement under PMIUPEP (Upto 30.11.1997)

S. No.	State/UT	Townwise Project Reports Prepared (No. of Towns)	Household Survey Conducted (No. of Towns)	No. of Applications Under Self Employment Component		No. of Applications Under Shelter Upgradation Component		No. of Beneficiaries given training for setting up Micro Enterprises
				Forwarded to Banks/Fls	Approved	Forwarded to Banks/ HUDCO	Approved	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1.	Andhra Pd.	34	34	9651	1368	3286	152	1121
2.	Arunachal Pd.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
3.	Assam	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.	Bihar	24	-	-	-	-	-	-
5.	Goa	1	1	275	84	-	-	38
6.	Gujarat	-	27	-	-	-	-	-
7.	Haryana	8	8	-	-	1090	1090	-
8.	Himachal Pd.	7	7	-	-	-	-	-
9.	J & K	-	-	-	-	-	390	-
10.	Karnataka	17	16	216	-	390	390	-
11.	Kerala	9	9	2951	907	1650	1650	1113
12.	Madhya Pd.	26	26	9510	4155	1219	297	3610
13.	Maharashtra	28	28	3834	415	625	625	-
14.	Manipur	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15.	Meghalaya	3	3	-	-	-	-	-
16.	Mizoram	2	2	155	-	146	-	100
17.	Nagaland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
18.	Orissa	10	10	1169	466	-	-	273
19.	Punjab	5	18	1855	481	899	91	208
20.	Rajasthan	20	20	7228	1304	4100	3343	1172
21.	Sikkim	-	-	-	-	-	-	225
22.	Tamil Nadu	41	41	6437	1144	1769	-	697
23.	Tripura	-	-	253	253	139	139	-
24.	Uttar Pd.	53	50	5134	1142	8469	8469	444
25.	West Bengal	16	16	466	14	1343	1343	391
26.	A & N Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
27.	Pondicherry	-	1	113	39	145	25	-
Total		304	317	49247	11772	25270	18004	9400

[Translation]

SHRI THAWAR CHAND GEHLOT : Mr. Speaker, Sir, the position with regard to the urban employment schemes going on in the country is very bad. Reply given by the Hon'ble Minister also shows that not even one-fourth of the cases forwarded to banks for approval have been accepted. Less than half of the cases forwarded to HUDCO were approved. The Hon'ble Minister has stated in his reply that these schemes have not been formulated on statewide basis with any specific target but these are formulated on town-wise basis. I would like to know from the Hon'ble Minister the total number of towns in the country and

whether any survey has been conducted in these towns to implement such schemes? If so, the number of people covered under these schemes from different towns and the reasons for not approving even one fourth of the total applications submitted to the banks?

[English]

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : Sir, whatever the hon. Member has said is wholly right. It is like a drop in the ocean. In the ocean of poverty, if you put a drop, it has no effect at all. Both the schemes have been totally ineffective. I believe that my friend is from Rajasthan. If

you look at Annexure I . . . (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI THAWAR CHAND GEHLOT : Sir, I come from Madhya Pradesh.

[English]

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI : I am sorry. For example, if you look at the figures of Madhya Pradesh, you will find that hardly any applications were received and the amount granted was a small amount. The Central funds were only a fraction of the total amount needed. Sir, it has had no impact at all. Both these schemes have, therefore, been wound up. Now, from 1.12.1997, they have started a third scheme. Some of the bad features of the earlier two schemes had been removed. But, nevertheless I must admit that the new third scheme is also equally ineffective, which has no effect. The real solution of the problem, which the hon. Member is concerned about and rightly concerned about is macro-sensible management of our economic affairs. For example, when we build two million houses and when that programme of building houses starts, if you say that only one person will be employed per house, you will have two million persons employed. But, here you will find miserable figures in Annexure II; about 1150 persons in the whole State of Rajasthan have received employment for three months. Now, what does it do for the economic condition of the people in this country? Sir, these are the schemes which existed with high sounding names but it is very unfortunate that the performance is totally miserable. I do not wish to use a stronger language.

[Translation]

SHRI THAWAR CHAND GEHLOT: Mr Speaker, Sir, only half reply has been given to the question asked by me. I would request the Hon'ble Minister to give complete reply first. How many towns are there in the country? These Schemes are implemented at town level. As per the survey conducted, how many people of these towns are covered under these schemes? I will ask my second supplementary question after the figures regarding these two points are given by the Hon'ble Minister.

MR.SPEAKER: One question is enough.

SHRI THAWAR CHAND GEHLOT: . . . (Interruptions)
Mr. speaker, Sir, I want your protection.

[English]

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I must frankly confess to the hon. Member that I have got Statewise break-up but I do not have citywise break-up in each State.

[Translation]

SHRI THAWAR CHAND GEHLOT: Please let me know the figures on the basis of the total population

(Interruptions) total population can be ascertained on the basis of survey. . . (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: If the hon. Member will look at Annexures I&II and read them carefully, he will get all the answers about the figures. You do not want me to make the mathematical calculation.

[Translation]

SHRI THAWAR CHAND GEHLOT: I agree with what the hon'ble Minister is saying. I have seen the annexure. . . (Interruptions).

[English]

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, some body has made the calculations now. 3698 towns throughout the country had been covered and the number of targeted groups throughout the country is 7.63 crores. These are again figures in which some persons got Rs.5,000 and some persons got Rs.10,000. I must tell the hon. Member that the greatest joke about this whole scheme has been that the banks have never accepted the viability of these schemes. Therefore, when the Centre says that you give somebody Rs. 10,000, the bank says that they will give only Rs. 1000. So, the Centre's subsidy comes down to Rs. 250. Therefore, you find that on paper, whereas the targeted figure says 5,000 but the actual beneficiary is 20,000. Now it looks like big performance but it is, in fact, 'no performance' because 5000 people who were supposed to receive Rs.1000, only received Rs.250/- each. So, even these figures are misleading.

[Translation]

SHRI THAWAR CHAND GEHLOT: I have a second supplementary also. I have a second supplementary also. For the first time, I have got the opportunity to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: You do not have the second supplementary question.

SHRI LAKSHMAN SINGH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the Hon'ble Minister has stated in his reply that these schemes have not been fully successful. I do not agree with it. These schemes may not have been fully successful to an extent but they have been successful to a certain extent. The reason behind it was lack of co-ordination between Central and State Governments. Member of Parliament is the only medium which could establish co-ordination between these two. A question was raised in the last Lok Sabha also that Members of Parliament should participate in the implementation of these schemes as these schemes have been launched by the Central Government. An assurance was given in this regard at that time. However, that Lok Sabha could not complete its term. Therefore, that scheme also could not be implemented. Since a new scheme is

going to be formulated, I would like to know from the Hon'ble Minister whether Members of Parliament will also be associated in its implementation?

MR. SPEAKER: Please ask your supplementary question.

SHRI LAKSHMAN SINGH: I am just asking that. Will Members of Parliament be associated with this scheme? For how long shall we live on false hopes? All the hon. Members feel that they should be associated with the co-ordination Committee.

[English]

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: Sir, the suggestion made by the hon. Member is eminently sensible. It will be respectfully considered and perhaps, followed.

SHRI LAKSHMAN SINGH: You say it will be considered. Will it be implemented?

[Translation]

SHRI MOTILAL VORA: Mr. Speaker, Sir, the town wise report of 304 towns were prepared on Integrated Urban Poverty Eradication Programme. Under this Programme, 317 towns were surveyed. 49247 applications were sent to the banks out of which 11772 were accepted. Mr. Speaker, Sir, 25,270 applications were sent to HUDCO out of which 18,400 applications were accepted. It may be during tenure of your Government or any other Government, officers of the banks do not pay specific attention towards the applications received under the poverty Eradication Programme. However, your Government has spoken about commitment in this regard. The Prime Minister had said that.

[English]

'Accountability of every officer has to be taken into consideration'.

I would like to ask the hon. Minister if he would call the bank authorities and tell them that he wants the disposal of all these problems by the end of this month. I know that the Minister has got lot of courage. He is a legal luminary also. He can pull up the bank authorities. So, I hope that the hon. Minister will exercise all his powers as a Minister. Can he do so?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I have already indicated in my reply that the earlier two schemes no longer exist. They have been now substituted by a third one. The information obtained about the working of the third is practically nil. We have asked all the States to give the information. Only two have supplied very meagre information on the basis of which I can draw no conclusions. As soon as the working of the new scheme which started only on 1-12-97 becomes a little more apparent, be sure that I will very respectfully bear in mind

what the hon. Member has stated and we will probably deal with the bank employees in the manner in which he suggested.

SHRI MOTILAL VORA : Please call the bank authorities at the earliest.

DR. SAROJA V. : I would like to know from the hon. Minister if the Government is aware of the unemployed registered educated youth. During the year 1992 it was about 2.2 crores, both urban and rural. During the year 1997 it rose up to 5.8 crores at the rate of 80 lakhs per year.

I would like to know from the hon. Minister what will be the remedial measures that are planned by the Union Government. There is a Bill, Bill No. 19 dealing with unemployment allowance. There it is stated that the unemployed youths are graduated under three categories, Tenth standard, Eleventh standard and professionals. I would like to suggest. . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please ask your supplementary.

DR. SAROJA V. : May I request the hon. Minister to consider this suggestion to constitute a high-powered committee at the district level in coordination with the State Government whichever State is coming forward to take up this case. In Tamil Nadu we have implemented this in coordination with the employment exchanges.

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: I have agreed to consider all the suggestions from the male Members of the House. How can I refuse to consider the suggestion which comes from a lady Member and particularly a Member from my party? I will respectfully consider it.

DR. ASIM BALA: Unemployment is a headache for any Government. I would like to remind the Government as well as the Minister that in the last Lok Sabha the main party of the Government promised in their manifesto that they would give jobs of one crore per year. I would like to know from the Government about the programme of their manifesto. Are they going to implement it? If they are going to implement it what are the steps they have taken?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: It is a little premature to answer that question. That matter is being considered and a careful policy statement will be considered and presented to this House and then there will be enough time to debate.

SHRI P.M. SAYEED: Yesterday also similar questions were there. The second question was with regard to implementing the DRDA Scheme. Question of employment generation was there. The hon. Prime Minister was very kind enough to say that the whole scheme was going to be reviewed. There is almost an unspent amount of Rs. 2700 crore.

I happened to see in your statement yesterday that

there are monitoring committees at the implementation level and even village committees are arranged. I am a Member of Parliament for the past three decades. Since the inception of this scheme I have never seen any such Committee functioning at that level. I want to ask the hon. Minister whether he is tempted to assure the House that he is going to accept all such suggestions. When the review takes place, if that Committee of elected public representatives is going to be strengthened, the intended purpose of anti-poverty programmes could be achieved. Can the hon. Minister assure this House to include public representatives in such Committees, and if necessary such Committees could be strengthened and their say would be final even on the bankers?

SHRI RAM JETHMALANI: While I cannot give complete assurance of accepting everything which the hon. Member has said but broadly speaking this suggestion is also a facet of the other suggestions which have been made. But be sure that when we are going to carry on the review which the hon. Prime Minister has promised, all these considerations would be very carefully borne in mind.

Instrument Landing System at Airports

*123. DR. BIZAY SONKAR SHASTRI : Will the Minister of CIVIL AVIATION be pleased to state :

(a) whether the Category II Instrument Landing System has not been operational at Delhi Airport for a couple of years due to minor hiccup;

(b) if so, when was the system installed and the reasons for not tackling this problem;

(c) whether flights get delayed for hours due to inclement weather; and

(d) if so, the steps taken to overcome delays?

THE MINISTER OF CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI ANANTH KUMAR) : (a) to (d) A statement is laid on the table of the Sabha.

Statement

(a) and (b) The Category II Instrument Landing system was installed at Delhi airport in May, 1995 and is being operated as Category I because the equipment does not meet ICAO specifications. Airports Authority of India has taken up with the supplier the need to resolve the anomaly and make the system operational for Category II operations.

(c) and (d) Airline operators fix their minima for operating under Category II conditions and the length of the delay varies from airline to airline. No Indian operator has the approval to operate under Category II conditions.

After the equipment becomes operational as Category II, about 20 international operators could be benefited, since they have filed the Category II minima. Under current conditions, aircraft are cleared as soon as weather/visibility conditions permit.

[Translation]

DR. BIZAY SONKAR SHASTRI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, through you I would like to inform the House about a big scam. In this question I had asked as to whether the Instrument Landing System purchased recently is lying out of order for the last two years. What are the reasons therefor? Why it is not being used properly? The reply to this question has revealed a new development. As the hon. Minister has stated that category II Instrument Landing System is a sophisticated instrument, which was purchased during the regime of previous Government and presently it is being used as category-I. My question is whether the Category-II instrument is as per the specification given by ICA officers. The first part of my question is that why the sophisticated category II instrument is not being used as category II?

'B' part of my question is whether the specification of category II instrument is as per the specifications of ICAO or not? If so, who are responsible for the specifications given by ICA? . . . (Interruptions)

'D' part of my question is about the action taken so far in this regard?

[English]

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Shastri, please ask your questions. You are not supposed to read the entire thing.

[Transation]

DR. BIZAY SONKAR SHASTRI : Whether the Government propose to issue some White Paper on this issue.

[English]

SHRI ANANTH KUMAR: The hon. Member has asked many supplementaries in one supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: You can answer only one supplementary.

[Translation]

DR. BIZAY SONKAR SHASTRI : These are parts of this question.

[English]

SHRI ANANTH KUMAR: The thing is that we have ordered for Category I instrument and what they have supplied is Category II. There has been a discussion with them. The amount has been withheld for not supplying according to the specifications. Now, the fresh