

**CHAPTER - IV**  
**DEMOCRATIC**  
**DECENTRALIZATION AND**  
**DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA:**  
**HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE**

## DEMOCRATIC DECENTRALISATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN INDIA : HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

### *Democratic Decentralisation:*

The creation of a democratic, efficient and viable rural administration is the basic to the development of the country and is an essential part of modernisation. With the ever-expanding functions of the government in the area of welfare and development, the decentralised administration is not only desirable but also necessary (Government of India report 1978). Without decentralisation no meaningful development is possible.

To implement, coordinate and supervise the entire development programme, an organisation at an appropriate level is necessary. It is the district below the state, is the first point of decentralisation. The Administrative Reform Commission also recommended the district as the unit of planning and hence, the Zilla Parishad should be solely responsible for the formulation and implementation of central and state schemes within the district.

Democratic decentralisation in present context has, two positive virtues: it is consistent with the democratic trend and is also the most efficient method of formulating and executing local developmental plans. The fundamental purpose of decentralized democracy in the Indian context should be, to train local leadership to assume greater responsibility and to serve the local people with efficiency and economy (Government of Maharashtra, Report 1961).

### *Democratic Decentralisation In Development:*

Essential and pre-requisite for the success of decentralized planning at sub-state level is the presence of democratic institutions at grassroots level, endowed with powers, functions and adequate financial sources. During the

fifties planning for development was basically a centralized affair. But the importance of and the need for decentralized planning was keenly felt. Next phase of development (1960–70) witnessed the establishment of local-self Government under democratic decentralisation. Local-self government institutions (LSGI) in India has a hoary past. The modern local-self government was laid in 1882 with the Rippon resolutions. Working of the local-self government revealed that inadequate funds and excessive official control crippled the functioning of the local-self government.

As decentralisation works at grassroot level, the 'development' can be focused as development at the bottom, which takes the turn towards rural development. Decentralised governance have been considered the best suited agencies to carry out rural development. Panchayats were established in our country after independence but major thrust was given after Balwant Rai Mehta Committee (1957) Report. With the emergence of Janata Government at the centre and appointment of Ashok Mehta Committee (1977) the system took a new turn towards decentralisation and development.

The basic task of India was to dismantle the colonial structure and restore the traditional order of our civilization. But what actually happened was a continuation of the old colonial order with a little adjustment (Shankar K, 1999).

The 73rd constitutional amendment Act has adopted the colonial concept and as such village panchayats are apart of the political administrative patronage set up (Suri. PC 1993). While talking about decentralisation of power to lower bodies, central schemes are increasing both in number and in size, which became difficult to know about, kind of decentralisation India is heading (Hirway.I 1989). We cannot deny that Panchayat bodies has great potential, capacity and role in regard to development of our country, so this decentralisation process has to play an important role in the overall development of the economy and polity of India.

It is true that Panchayati Raj in India was not functioning in the right direction, requiring its revitalization leading to mass participation in socio-economic power structure. Therefore, the constitutional 73rd amendment Act is

no doubt an attempt in that direction and certainly will revitalize Panchayati Raj for decentralisation and development.

**Table – 4.1**  
**Panchayats in the States**

Name of the State	Number of Panchayat Units			Total
	District Panchayat	Block Panchayat	Village Panchayat	
Andhra Pradesh	22	1098	21943	23063
Bihar	55	725	12181	12961
Gujarat	19	184	13316	13519
Himachal Pradesh	12	72	2922	3006
Karnataka	27	175	5640	5842
Kerala	14	152	991	1157
Madhya Pradesh	45	459	30922	31426
Maharashtra	29	319	27619	27967
North East:				
Assam	21	202	2489	2172
Tripura	03	16	525	544
Manipur	03	-	166	169
Arunachal Pradesh	12	79	2012	2103
Orissa	30	314	5261	5605
Punjab	17	138	11591	11746
Rajasthan	31	237	9185	9453
Tamilnadu	28	384	12584	12996
Uttar Pradesh	68	901	58605	59574
West Bengal	17	341	3314	3672

**Source :** *Panchayati Raj in India – Status Report, 1999, Task force on Panchayati Raj, Rajeev Gandhi Foundation, New Delhi March 2000*

Table 4.1 and 4.2 show the number of Panchayat Units and their elected representatives in the three tier Panchayati Raj System. Uttar Pradesh

represents 59574, the maximum number of Panchayat units whereas Manipur represents only 169 units.

**Table – 4.2**

**Number of Elected Representatives in the three-tier**

**Panchayati Raj System, State-wise :**

States	No of Gram Panchayat	No of Elected Representatives	No of Inter-Mediate-ries	No of Elected Representatives	No of Zilla Parish-ads	No of Elected representatives
Andhra Pradesh	20500	396000	1093	22953	22	1210
Arunachal Pradesh	2012	5733	79	1205	12	77
Assam	2486	24860	196	2486	40	2486
Bihar	11653	150000	589	15000	39	1500
Goa	183	1433	-	-	2	-
Gujarat	13330	133300	82	2730	19	323
Haryana	5958	48201	10	3100	16	271
Himachal Pradesh	2921	18258	72	1661	12	252
J & K **	-	-	-	-	-	-
Karnataka	5640	77500	75	4860	20	1215
Kerala	991	10800	152	1550	14	360
Madhya Pradesh	28000	319056	296	-	29	1450
Maharashtra	30922	473500	459	8262	45	946
Manipur *	166	3714	9	-	-	-
Meghalaya *	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mizoram *	-	-	-	-	-	-
Nagaland	-	-	-	-	-	-
Orissa	5263	76462	814	5263	30	850
Punjab	11591	104319	136	1088	14	286
Rajasthan	9185	91850	237	3792	31	527
Sikkim	148	827	-	-	4	198
Tamil Nadu	12787	165000	387	7000	22	900
Tripura	525	5400	16	196	3	70
Uttar Pradesh	58605	804000	902	55750	68	2230
West Bengal	3242	61385	332	8516	17	664
India	226108	2971446	5736	145412	457	15815

- Traditional Councils

\*\* Information Not available

**Source:** *Basic Rural Statistics, 1996. Government of India, Ministry of Rural Areas and employment, Krishi Bhawan New Delhi.*

## *Concept of Development:*

Development has been defined in many ways (Ray M.N 1995). To Ronuld Bunch, 'Development' is a process by which people learn to take charge of their own lives and solve their own problems. To David.C Korten 'Development' is a process by which the members of a society increases their personal and institutional capacities to mobilize and manage resources to produce sustainable and justly distributed improvements in their quality of life consistent with their own aspirations. Thus, development is not merely growth in available goods and services, it is meaningful only when the same is consistent with the aspirations of the people and it is the people who are at the focus of development.

Any planning for the development of India could not be complete without embracing the rural chapter of India as about 70 percent of Indians live in villages.

Development is defined in terms of technological or industrial development, but rural development is a strategy to improve the economic and social life of a specific group of people. Uma Lele (1975), defined rural development in terms of raising living standard of rural people. Crops (1972), a sociologist, defined rural development as a process through collective efforts, aimed at improving the well being and self-realization of people living outside the urbanized area.

According to a UN report, rural development has in international usage to connote the process by which the efforts of people themselves are united to those of governmental authorities to improve the economic, social and cultural condition of life of the nation and to relate them to contribute fully to national programme (1966). In the words of Robert Chambers (1983), rural development is a strategy to enable a specific group of people, poor rural women and men, to gain for themselves and their children more of what they want and need.

Mishra and Sundaram (1979) define rural development as not merely development of rural areas but also the development of quality of life of the rural masses into self reliant and self sustaining modern communities. Rural development has been defined by Sharma and Malhotra (1977), as systematic

approach aiming at total development of the area and the people by bringing about the necessary institutional attitudinal changes and by a package of services with an ultimate objective of improving quality of life in the rural area.

To say, development is a multi-dimensional process including socio economic condition of the people and their participation in development process.

### ***Rural Development in India:***

It is necessary to know about the past attempts, which have given the present shape to rural development programme. The contribution of rural sector in national income is very much substantial and so, this important sector will naturally draw the attention of the people and the government for development.

The long history of Rural Development in India can be divided into three phases (Singh Hoshiar 1995).

#### **First Phase (1858-1919):**

Britishers of their period were not interested in socio-economic development of the Indian people. Rural development thus began as a humanitarian act which was not backed by any legal sanction when Indian people were affected badly by famines (Mishra BB 1983). Lord Curzon, the then Viceroy of India succeeded in establishing departments of agriculture in UP and Bihar. Curzon was interested in agricultural development because he was also pressurized by British cotton trade for cotton cultivation in India. So it was colonial interest rather than rural development.

#### **Second Phase (1920-1950):**

A number of rural reconstruction steps were taken by the nationalists during the national movements period. Among these steps, most well known were:

- (a) Srinikatan Experiment (1920): Tagore laid the foundation of this institute for rural reconstruction and all round village development (Ram

Bhai 1959). Though there was improvement but due to lack of professional support such examples of Tagore were not multiplied.

(b) Martandam Experiment (1921): Dr. Spencer Hatch set up a project at Martandam, near Trivandrum for the purpose to bring about a complete upward development of life of the rural people spiritually, mentally, physically, socially and economically (Singh P 1982).

(c) Gurgaon Experiment (1927):- Mr. Brayne ML, the then collector of Gurgaon district conceived the rural development scheme as those of the IKDP, but could not spread beyond Punjab.

(d) Baroda Experiment (1932):- The maharaja of Baroda was a progressive and enlightened person who started a rural reconstruction scheme covering the various aspects of rural life to self help and self-reliance.

(e) Firka Experiment (1946):- Short term objectives of the scheme were to develop basic amenities and sanitation. The long term objectives were to attain self-sufficiency in food, cloth, shelter, khadi and cotton industries for the development of Madras.

(f) Etawah Experiment (1948):- This Etawah pilot project was conceived by Mr. Albert Mayor for the development of the rural areas of Etawah district in Uttar Pradesh having its main objective to see the degree of improvement, self confidence and development (Mayor A 1958).

(g) The Gandhian Experiment:- Gandhi underlined the importance of rural India by saying that "India lives in villages". Gandhi started his reconstruction activities from Wardha which included the use of khadi promotion of village industries, adult education, sanitation, welfare of women upliftment of backward classes (Pyarelal 1963) that received mass



popular support in regard to rural development in India. His ideology of rural development is still deeply rooted to our national policies.

### Third Phase (1950 to till date):

The framers of Indian Constitution tried to incorporate Gandhi's ideas of rural reconstruction and because of his intervention at the last stage, local self government had found a place in the Directive Principles of State Policy. Ultimately rural development drew the attention of central government thus acquiring high priority in all the Five Year Plans. The 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act (1992) is also most important step towards decentralisation and making our women flock active in the process of development.

Though the development concern was not totally absent under colonial rule but the concern for rural development in India acquired a high level of priority only after Independence.

**Table No : 4.3**

#### Rural Development Programme Since Independence

Five Year Plan	Programme	Year of Introduction
I (1951-56)	1. Community Development Programme (CDP)	1952
	2. National Extension Service (NES)	1953
II (1956-61)	3. Khadi & Village Industries Programme	1957
	4. Village Housing Project Scheme	1957
	5. Multipurpose Tribal Development Blocks Programme	1959
	6. Package Programme	1960
III (1961-66)	7. Intensive Agricultural District Programme	1960
	8. Applied Nutrition Programme	1962
	9. Rural Industries Projects	1962
	10. Intensive Agriculture Area Programme	1964
	11. High Yielding Variety Programme	1966
	12. Farmers Training & Educational Programme	1966
	13. Well Construction Programme	1966
Annual Plans (1967, 1968 and 1969)	14. Rural Work Programme (RWP)	1967
	15. Tribal Development Block	1968
	16. Rural Manpower Programme	1969
	17. Composite Programme for Women & Pre-School Children	1969
IV (1969-74)	18. Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP)	1970
	19. Crash Scheme for Rural Employment	1971
	20. Small Farmer Development Agency (SFDA)	1971
	21. Tribal Area Development Programme	1972
	22. Pilot Projects for Tribal Development	1972

Contd.

	23. Pilot Intensive Rural Employment Programme	1972
	24. Minimum Needs Programme (MNP)	1972
	25. Command Area Development Programme	1974
V (1974-78)	26. Hill Area Development Programme	1975
	27. Special Livestock Production Programme	1975
	28. Food for Work Programme	1977
	29. Desert Development Programme (DDP)	1977
Annual Plans (1978-80)	30. Whole Village Development Programme	1979
	31. Training Rural Youth for Self Employment	1979
	32. Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP)	1979
VI (1980-85)	33. National Rural Employment Programme	1980
	34. Prime Minister's New 20-Point Programme	1980
	35. Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme	1983
	36. Development of Women & Children in Rural Areas	1985
VII (1985-90)	37. Integrated Rural Energy Planning Programme	1985
	38. Special Livestock Breeding Programme (SLBP)	1986
	39. Jawahar Rozgar Yojana	1989
VIII (1992-97)	40. Prime Minister's Rozgar Yojana (PMRY)	1993
	41. Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS)	1993
	42. National Nutrition Policy (NNP)	1993
	43. Supply of Improved Tool-Kit to Rural Artisan (SITRA)	1993
	44. Watershed Development Programme (WDP)	
	45. National Plan of Action	1993
	46. Convergent Community Action (CCA)	1995
	47. National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP)	1995
	48. Self Employment Scheme for Minorities (SESM)	1995
	49. Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY)	1996
	50. Million Wells Scheme (MWS)	1996
IX (1997-2002)	51. Ganga Kalyan Yojana (GKY)	1997

Source : Compiled from Various Five Year Plans, Government of India, New Delhi.

Table 4.3 presents the various rural development programme introduced in India during different Five Year Plan. Eighth Plan has introduced a maximum number of programme, popular among them are PMRY, EAS, IAY, MWS and SITRA.

The First Five Year Plan was drafted to reconstruct the country economically and socially intending to:

(a) Provide for substantial increase in country's production and the improvement in the rural health and hygiene and in village education.

(b) Initiate and direct a process of integrated cultural change aimed at transforming the social and economic life of the village (Yasim M 1990). The intended change was sought to be achieved by initiating the scheme on

socio-economic development, which known as community Development programme (CDP) as a method and National Extension Service as an agency (NES).

### ***Community Development Programme (CDP):***

The community development programme was conceived, planned and initiated as a peoples self help programme, launched on Oct 02, 1952 on a pilot schème over 55 selected blocks all over the India to extend the development of the rural India.

The aims of the CDP and NES were more or less similar but the NES was a permanent organisation and was intended to cover the entire country in a relatively shorter period, by the end of the year 1956, There was 1,114 blocks with a population of 11million and by the end of sixties CDP covered the whole country (Mukherjee B 1961), so far as the organisational pattern of the CDP was concerned, it was under three basic units – the village, the mandi and the development block. For operation, there were Project Executive Officers, responsible for all developmental work under his area. BDO was to act as Project Executive Officer.

Community Development Programme was proclaimed as a people's movement and was premised on principles of sustained self-help and popular participation. The block area was carved as the main focus of the operation of CDP. It was the first service-oriented programme whereas the administrative system of the country was rooted in the basic law and order culture. Being the pioneering programme, the problem of adjustment was serious which resulted in the garbing of the benefits by larger farmers, and hence, others did not get much benefits from it.

### **Balwantray Mehta Committee Recommendations:**

The Balwantray Mehta Committee, which was constituted to evaluate the workings of CDP and NES, submitted its report on the 24th November, 1957.

This team observed, that the development cannot progress without power and responsibility.

The committee, as a way out, recommended the three tier panchayat system with “Gram Panchayat” at village level, “Panchayat Samiti” at the block level and “Zilla Parishad” at the district level. Main aim of the report was towards decentralisation for democratic institutions and to shift the decision-making process closer to the people to encourage them in participation (Yasin 1990).

The Balwantray Mehta Committee report was accepted by the Indian Government and was made operative in 1958. Rajasthan and Andhra Pradesh were first to adopt the Panchayati Raj system of local government in 1959.

According to the suitability of the state this new pattern of government was adopted by all the states by the end of the decade. The National Development Council (NDC) indicated the scope of variation among states in the implementation of such Panchayati Raj system, as the Mehta team had envisaged the structural variations. Though the committee admitted the urgency of democratic and decentralised administration but failed to recommend directly elected panchayats at these three levels (West Bengal panchayat Act 1973). Accordingly, each state adopted a different type of Panchayati Raj on the basis of their administration and tradition.

### **Pre Ashok Mehta Panchayati Raj System:**

Panchayati Raj which was so long operated for rural development since the period of community development has achieved a limited success in many states. In Kerala, Gram Panchayat did well, Panchayat Samiti and Zilla Parishad had become successful in Tamil Nadu and Andhra Pradesh. Maharashtra, Rajasthan and Gujarat had a record of better performance in Panchayati Raj as a whole. In West Bengal, Anchal Panchayats had achieved better performance (Prantosh Sen).

On the whole, Panchayati Raj generally failed to give the best result to the people. The reasons can be considered as:

- a) Structural inadequacy which resulted into imbalance in development.

- b) Panchayati Raj Institutions were dominated by the privileged section of people depriving the weaker section of its benefits.
- c) The functioning of Panchayati Raj Institutions revealed that they were plagued by corruption and inefficiency of the elected representatives.
- d) The social milieu also weakened the working of Panchayati Raj Institutions.

After the introduction of Panchayati Raj system on the Balwantray Mehta Committee Report, the state governments began to appoint various committees to review the functioning of Panchayati Raj Institutions in their respective states. VP Naik Committee (1961) in Maharashtra, Sadiq Ali Committee (1964) in Rajasthan, Hardayal Singh Committee (1964) in Himachal Pradesh and Ram M Committee (1965) in Uttar Pradesh reviewed the functioning of the Panchayati Raj system. All these Committees had recommended that the district should be hub of the development activities and Zilla Parishad should be positioned at a higher level in Panchayati Raj Institutions.

Thus, the Ashok Mehta Committee was set up in 1977 by the Janata government in order to rebuild and restructure the Panchayat Raj Institution. This committee submitted its report on the 21st August 1978.

### **Important Recommendations of Ashok Mehta Committee:**

The most important recommendation was that the structural and functional pattern of Panchayati Raj institutions should be changed in order to ensure effective participation of the people.

The decentralisation of planning process and developmental activities below the state level is necessary from the political and socio-developmental perspectives. Below the state, the next step should be the district.

A Mandal Panchayat should be constructed next to the district, which would be the hub of developmental activities.

A village committee could be constituted by the Mandal Panchayat to look after municipal and civic functions and other welfare activities.

In order to formulate plans and periodic review a planning committee at the district level would be constituted with all members of Zilla Parishad and MLA's and MP's of the concern district.

In order to ensure clearer orientation towards development programme and to facilitate healthier linkages with higher level political process, political parties should participate in the Panchayati Raj elections.

All the district level officials should be placed under the Zilla Parishad and lower tiers. A chief executive officer should be placed in Zilla Parishad for the proper implementation of the policies and programmes.

Besides allotment of fund by the state Government, the Panchayati Raj Institutions should have enough scope for mobilising their own resources. Panchayati Raj Institutions should have the power of imposing taxes.

However majority of the state Government opposed the idea of party based election and mandal panchayat. The proposals recommended by the Ashok Mehta Committee were not adequate for the complete transfer of power to the local bodies in making decentralisation a living reality. VKRV Rao committee (1985) also was in favour of a significant decentralisation at district level. This committee recommended that all the developmental work should be at district level or below be brought under Zilla Parishad. L.M Singhvi committee (1986) was of the view that Panchayati Raj Institutions should be treated as institution of self-government which will facilitate the peoples participation in decision-making process at planning and development. This committee also advocated that bureaucratic structure cannot achieve full participation of the people in a meaningful manner.

### ***73<sup>rd</sup> Constitutional Amendment Act and the Revitalization of Panchayati Raj:***

Mahatma Gandhi ardently believed in Gram Swaraj, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar was repulsive to it, Rajiv Gandhi cradled and nursed it and P.V. Narasimha Rao institutionalized it. Almost five decades after Indian independence, on April 24,

1993, the Government of India revitalized the concept of decentralization of power, through the Constitutional Amendment Act, by making Panchayati Raj Institutions as a part of the Constitution (Dhawan. G, 1995).

Many discussions on major issues raised by politicians, scholars, journalists, regarding the devolution of powers, functions, finance, responsibilities etc., upon the panchayat. Panchayati Raj encompasses both democracy and development and offer an institutional framework for democratic decentralization, which facilitates peoples participation in the framework of miniature governments in their own local areas. To this end, the Constitution 73<sup>rd</sup> Amendment Act has come into effect on 24<sup>th</sup> April, 1993, with mandates of uniform system of Panchayati Raj throughout the country except for some specified tribal and hill regions and state in which special arrangements already exists. This Act introduces Part-IX in the Constitution regarding the structure, composition, election and scope of powers of panchayats at district, block and village levels.

The main characteristics of the Act are:

- a) Provision for establishment of Gram Sabha in each panchayat area and the establishment of a uniform three-tier system of Panchayati Raj.
- b) Provision for reservation of seats for Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes in proportions to their percentage to the total population of a panchayat and reservation of seats of chairpersons for the SC/ST candidates in all tiers.
- c) Provision for reservation of one-third of seats in the panchayats at all levels for women including reservation of the seats of chairpersons in all the tiers.
- d) Provision for a state Finance Commission, appointed by the Governor.
- e) Provision for a state Election Commission, responsible for preparation of electoral roles and holding of regular elections to the Panchayats.

Table: 4.4

**Partially Comprehensive and Segmental Analysis of the Provision in  
the Various Bills for the Panchayati Raj Institutions**

Provisions in Bill	Ashok Mehta Report	Rajiv Gandhi's 64 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	Bomma and V.P. Singh	V.P. Singh's 74 <sup>th</sup> Amendment	Narasimha Rao's 73 <sup>rd</sup> Amendment
Composi- tion of Panchayat					Endured with State Legis- lature
Their duration					Five years to be enacted by State
Reservation for women, SC/STs					30% for women and a percen- tage for SC/STs to be enacted by state
Qualification for membership					Subject to provision in the Constitution
Powers, responsibili- ties and authority	Confer administra- tive and develop- mental functions	Endured with purely developmental function	Dilution and absurdity of the XI schedule removed	Stress on independent institution of self-govern- ment	Endured with purely developmental functions; legislative and executive powers at state
Financial Devolution and Reve- nue					State to authorise, assign, provide laws to Panchayats
Arrange- ment for election	State gover- nment in consulta- tion with CEC	Control and superintendence with EC	Control and superinten- dence with EC	Control and superinten- dence with state legislature	State to enact a law for elec- tion; control and superinten- dence with CEO

**Source:** Compiled from 1) The 73<sup>rd</sup> Amendment Act, 2) Mukherjee N., L.C. Jain & A. Ghosh (1991), the Panchayats Report of a Panel Discussion on Constitution Bill, 1991. Institute of Social Science, New Delhi.



It is found that revitalization of Panchayati Raj has been initiated in 73<sup>rd</sup> Constitution Amendment Act, 1993. Among various Amendments, government effort and report, the 73<sup>rd</sup> Amendment has put more emphasis on composition of Panchayat, duration, reservation for SC/ST and women and financial devolution.

Article 243 (G) of the 73<sup>rd</sup> Constitution Amendment has enables State Government to provide necessary power and functions to the Panchayati Raj institutions. The XI Schedule added to the Constitution, lists the subject under which power and functions could be given to the Panchayat at all levels. These are:

- (1) Agriculture, including agricultural extension.
- (2) Land improvement and implementation of land reforms.
- (3) Minor irrigation and water management.
- (4) Animal husbandry, dairying and poultry.
- (5) Fisheries.
- (6) Social forestry and farm forestry.
- (7) Minor forest produce.
- (8) Small scale industries including food processing industries.
- (9) Khadi, village and cottage industries.
- (10) Rural housing.
- (11) Drinking water.
- (12) Fuel and fodder.
- (13) Roads, culverts, bridges and ferries.
- (14) Rural electrification including distribution of electricity.
- (15) Nonconventional energy sources.
- (16) Poverty alleviation programme.
- (17) Education including Primary and Secondary School.
- (18) Technical training and vocational education.
- (19) Adult and non-formal education.
- (20) Libraries.
- (21) Cultural activities.
- (22) Market and fairs.
- (23) Health and sanitation.
- (24) Family welfare.

- (25) Women and child development
- (26) Social welfare.
- (27) Welfare of the weaker sections.
- (28) Public distribution system
- (29) Maintenance of community assets.

However, since inception Panchayati Raj institutions have been on planning significant role in bringing about rural development. For the people, the Panchayati Raj institutions are implementing a numbers of rural development programmes. These are:

**Table :- 4.5**  
**Central Govt. Expenditure on Rural Development (Rs. in Crores)**

Year	Plan Expenditure	Total Expenditure	Share in Total Expenditure (%)
1979-80	14	14	0.08
1980-81	9	9	0.04
1981-82	79	79	0.32
1982-83	244	244	0.82
1983-84	383	384	1.08
1984-85	729	730	1.67
1985-86	706	707	1.34
1986-87	1360	1362	2.16
1987-88	1844	1847	2.71
1988-89	1753	1757	2.22
1989-90	2766	2769	2.98
1990-91	2672	2678	2.54
1991-92	2279	2283	2.05
1992-93	3208	3211	2.62
1993-94	4676	4680	3.30
1994-95	5801	5803	3.61
1995-96	6607	6609	3.71
1996-97	5080	5081	2.53
1997-98	5577	5583	2.41
1998-99	5396	5403	1.93
1999-00	5176	5185	1.71
2000-01	5388	5397	1.59

**Source:** *Budget Estimate, CMIE, March, 2000.*

Table 4.5 reveals the details of expenditure by Central Government on rural development programmes. During the year 1995-96 Central Government has expended Rs. 6609 crores, the highest expenditure since 1979-80.

## **Wage Employment and Infrastructure Development:**

### ***Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP):***

Poverty as a phenomenon has existed since the beginning of known history. As the centuries rolled by and population increased, it began to appear on a larger scale. By the time India got her freedom, many countries, mostly in the west, had already overcome the problem of mass poverty by the application of new and progressive expanding scientific and technological knowledge. In India, the need for rural development was felt with a view to transform the socio-economic life of rural India.

The concept of Integrated Rural Development came into vogue with the need for a multipurpose thrust to rural planning. It connotes a strategy for bringing about improvements in the economic and social life of the rural poor. The various dimensions of rural life – growth of agriculture, rural industrialization, education, health, public works, poverty alleviation and rural employment programmes – all together form a part of an integrated approach to the problem of rural development. It is called Integrated because it integrates various economic programmes in an area to ensure social development.

The IRDP was first proposed in India in 1976-77 and saw the light of day on a pilot basis in 20 selected districts representing different socio-economic and ecological conditions. In 1979-80, the IRDP was expanded to 2600 blocks. Though the idea of science and technology in the service of rural poor people was attractive, but were lacking for translating the ideal into practical schemes. Later, IRDP underwent modifications in 1978-79 and revised form was implemented from October 2, 1980, i.e., after the launching of Sixth Plan, and the IRDP was extended to all the 5011 development blocks throughout the country.

### **Objectives of IRDP:**

The principal objectives of the IRDP has been the elimination of unemployment and the eradication of poverty in the rural areas.

The main objectives are:

- a) To help the families below the poverty line to come up and cross it.
- b) To create substantial additional opportunities of employment in the rural sector.
- c) To reduce the rural poverty.
- d) To make the family economically viable and self-sufficient.
- e) To assist the rural population to derive economic benefits from the developmental assets of each area.

Thus, the overall objectives of the IRDP has been the reduction of unemployment and the provision of asset coupled with the inputs necessary to the rural poor for enabling them to rise above the poverty line.

### **Coverage under IRDP:**

In the selection of the beneficiaries under IRDP, income is considered to be the main criterion. Families below the poverty line (BPL) are listed and priority in selection is to be accorded to the poorest families among the poor. Assistance is provided to a target group which comprises small and marginal farmers, agricultural labourers and rural artisans. Though the poverty line is drawn at an annual income level of Rs. 11,000, the assistance is targeted primarily at families with an annual income of Rs. 6,000, the coverage emphasize among the identified group is on the Scheduled Caste, Scheduled Tribe, women and physically handicapped persons. At least 50 percent of the beneficiaries from SC/STs, 40 percent from women group and 3 percent for physically handicapped is always reserved.

### **Implementing Agency:**

The primary responsibility for formulation of the strategy for the rural poor rests with the Ministry of Rural Development at the Centre. At the state level, separate departments for rural development are responsible for the policy, planning and implementation of rural development programmes. At the district

level, the responsibility of IRDP has been entrusted to a single agency named DRDA, for the major functions:-

- (i) Identification of families below the poverty line.
- (ii) Preparation of action plan/schemes.
- (iii) arrangement of institutional credit support to the identified beneficiaries, and
- (iv) Overall charge of planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of IRDP.

At grassroot level, the block and panchayats are responsible for the smooth functioning of the IRDP.

### Performance of the IRDP:

The renewed IRDP was launched in the 6<sup>th</sup> Plan with an outlay of Rs. 1,500 crores and Rs. 1,767 crores were actually utilized. Total number of beneficiaries covered during the plan was 156.6 million against a target of 150 million. From Table 4.6, it is found that from 1985-86 to 1992-93, the performance as it is figured remained more than satisfactory. Coverage of women under the IRDP has steadily been increased from 9.89 percent in 1985-86 to over 32 percent during 1992-93.

**Table: 4.6**

#### Performance of the IRDP

Year	No. of families (in lakh)		Women beneficiaries (in lakh)	Total funds (in crore)
	Target	Achievement		
1985-86	24.71	30.60	3.03	407.36
1986-87	35.00	37.47	5.67	543.84
1987-88	39.64	42.47	8.30	613.38
1988-89	31.94	37.72	8.74	687.95
1989-90	29.09	33.51	8.59	747.75
1990-91	23.71	28.98	8.45	747.31
1991-92	22.52	25.37	8.41	703.61
1992-93	18.75	20.69	6.91	662.22

**Source:** Singh Hoshiar, *Administration of Rural Development in India*, Sterling Publication, New Delhi, 1995.

The above discussion shows that the IRDP has been a good innovation for ameliorating the socio-economic condition of the rural weaker sections. It believes in an integrated plan of actions, but also reveals certain causes responsible for the poor performance of the IRDP. The reasons are:

- a) The beneficiaries have been mis-identified.
- b) The amount of loans and subsidies have been reported to be inadequate in addition, the beneficiaries had to pay gratification fee or commission to get them cleared.
- c) Political intervention is also main cause responsible for low performance of the IRDP.
- d) Due to the untrained and inadequate field staff, to what extent the beneficiaries have improved their income and employment levels have never been investigated with thoroughness.
- e) The repayment of installments has been fixed without considering the capacity of the beneficiaries.
- f) Illiteracy and ignorance in rural areas have been the major hindrance in the rural transformation.

With the efforts to overcome the above said difficulties, a better implementation of the IRDP could go a long way for a total attack on rural poverty. The Integrated Rural Development Programme has been renamed from April 1, 1999, as Swarnajayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojana (SGSY) and working for the same objectives with new dimensions.

### ***Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY):***

From April 1989, the on going National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) and Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP) were merged into a single Rural Employment Programme known as the Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) having as its main objective the generation of additional gainful employment for the unemployed and under employed people, both men and women, in the rural areas through the creation of rural economic

infrastructure, community and social assets, with the aim of improving the quality of life in the rural areas.

After three years of implementation of JRY, it was felt that the resources were being too thinly spread and adequate attention was not being paid to the backward areas of the country. Accordingly, the scheme was revised in 1993 to include two more streams. The second stream of JRY called Intensified Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (IJRY) was launched in 120 identified districts in the country with the stipulation that the allocation of IJRY not to be less than Rs.700 crores or 20 percent of the funds earmarked for the total JRY. The third stream was also introduced for taking up innovative projects. A portion of the allocation under JRY was set apart for the stream. The second stream of JRY has been discontinued by merging the backward district under Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS). The Indira Awas Yojana (IAY) and the Million Wells Scheme (MWS) have also been made independent schemes with effect from 1st January 1996.

**Table No : 4.7**  
**Approved Outlays in respect of Plan Schemes**  
**Department of Rural Employment and Poverty Alleviation (Rs.in crores)**

SI No.	Name of the Scheme	Approved Outlay For 1997-98	Approved Outlay For 1998-99	Approved Outlay For 1999-2000
1.	Jawahar Rozgar Yojana	2077.70	2095.00	2095.00
2.	Employment Assurance Scheme	1970.00	1990.00	1700.00
3.	Million Wells Scheme	448.00	450.00	100.00
4.	Integrated Rural Development Programme	571.00	740.00	859.00
5.	Rural Artisans Scheme	40.00	60.00	70.00
6.	Ganga Kalyan Yojana	200.00	0.94	0.00
7.	Training of Rural Youth for Self-Employment	59.00	60.00	70.00
8.	Development of Women and Children in Rural Area	65.00	100.00	116.00
9.	Indira Awaas Yojana	1190.00	1600.00	1710.00
10.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	115.00	95.00	95.00
11.	Desert Development Programme	70.00	90.00	85.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>6805.70</b>	<b>7280.94</b>	<b>6900.00</b>

**Source:** *Annual Report – 1999-2000, Government of India, Ministry of Rural Development, New Delhi.*

Table 4.7 and 4.8 show the approved outlays in respect of various plan schemes in which JRY stands on top in the development of Rural Employment and Poverty Alleviation whereas in the department of Rural Development, Rural Water Supply Programmes has maximum outlays.

**Table -- 4.8**  
**Approved Outlays in respect of Plan Schemes**  
**Department of Rural Development**

(Rs.in crores)

Sl. No	Name of the Schemes	Approved Outlay for 1997-98	Approved Outlay for 1998-99	Approved Outlay for 1999-2000
1.	Rural Water Supply Programme	1302.00	1627.00	1800.00
2.	Rural Sanitation	100.00	100.00	110.00
3.	Grants to National Institute of Rural Development	5.00	5.00	6.00
4.	Strengthening of State Training Centre	3.25	3.25	3.25
5.	Assistance to CAPART	12.00	12.00	13.00
6.	Org. of Training Courses, Seminars	0.50	0.50	1.25
7.	Strengthening of Ext. Training Centre	3.00	3.00	3.00
8.	Assistance to Assignees of Ceiling Surplus Land	0.01	0.01	0.00
9.	Grants-in aid to institute for Agrarian Studies	0.68	0.68	0.00
10.	Computerisation of Land Reforms	20.00	30.00	33.00
11.	Strengthening of Revenue Machinery & Updating of L.R.	18.80	8.80	10.00
12.	Committee on Land Reforms	0.01	0.01	0.00
13.	Communication Cell	4.00	4.00	10.00
14.	Promotion of Voluntary Scheme	10.00	20.00	26.00
15.	Organisation of Beneficiaries	3.50	3.50	4.00
16.	Panchayat Development and Training	3.00	3.00	3.00
17.	Roads in Special Problem Areas	2.00	1.50	0.50
18.	NSAP	700.00	700.00	725.00
19.	Agricultural Marketing	7.25	7.25	0.00
20.	Monitoring Mechanism	0.00	0.50	2.00
	<b>Total</b>	<b>2195.00</b>	<b>2530.00</b>	<b>2750.00</b>

**Source :** *Compiled from Annual Report – 1997-98, 98-99, 99-2000, Government of India, Ministry of Rural Area and Employment, New Delhi.*



Since inception of JRY in 1989-90 to 1995-96, the states were released central assistance of Rs.17,442.24 Crores, with the state share total amounting to Rs.21,953.65 Crores. During these years the states utilised Rs.21,335.58 Crores which works out to an achievement of 98.18 percent. During 1996-97, total of Rs.1,992.09 Crores was available to the state, which includes central release of Rs.928.13 Crores, state share of Rs.224.69 Crores and an opening balance of Rs.832.27 Crores. Against this, the states have utilised Rs.1,033.29 Crores till the end of 1996, indicating an achievement of 51.87 percent.

Since the inception of this programme till 1995-96, against a target of 5,936.40 Million man days of employment, the state Governments have reported employment of 5,823.54 Million man days, which was 98.10 percent of achievement. SCs share was 2,179.56 million mandays (37.43 %), STs share, 1,063.66 million mandays (18.26 %). The share of women was 1,458.23 million mandays (25.04 %).

Besides generating massive employment in rural areas, the scheme has created a wide range of physical assets in the sector of social, forestry, minor irrigation, soil conservation, wells, rural roads, primary school buildings, sanitary system etc.

**Table No : 4.9**

**Financial Progress Under Jawahar Rozgar Yojana During 1998-99  
(Progress upto November , 98)**

(Rs. in Lakh)

States/UTs	Balance As on 1.4.98	Allocation		Release		Total Funds Available	Funds Utilised
		Centre	State	Centre	State		
Andhra Pradesh	2893.90	11703.94	2925.99	7022.36	1755.59	1167.85	8364.24
Arunachal Pradesh	86.68	257.32	64.33	129.68	32.42	248.78	73.16
Assam	1145.81	6686.18	1671.55	4011.71	1002.93	6160.45	2735.23
Bihar	13323.20	38340.77	9585.19	23004.46	5751.12	42078.78	20847.84
Goa	24.58	172.20	43.05	103.32	25.83	153.73	122.32
Gujarat	1076.52	4405.58	1101.40	2756.73	689.18	4522.43	3180.05
Haryana	213.86	2591.88	647.97	1555.13	388.78	2157.77	1215.92
Himachal Pradesh	189.25	1091.54	272.89	710.02	177.51	1076.78	577.82
J & K	368.41	1350.93	337.73	856.15	214.04	1438.60	805.66
Karnataka	2748.83	8838.13	2209.53	5434.00	1358.50	9541.33	6398.97
Kerala	1308.26	3965.64	991.41	2536.58	634.15	4478.99	1801.13
Madhya Pradesh	3753.71	19433.93	4858.48	12207.04	2915.09	18875.84	12539.15
Maharashtra	2156.99	17470.82	4367.71	10482.27	2620.57	15259.83	10518.12

Contd.

Manipur	37.24	448.24	112.06	155.56	38.89	231.69	37.82
Meghalaya	162.15	502.19	125.55	301.75	75.44	539.34	79.70
Mizoram	4.82	116.21	29.05	116.10	29.03	149.95	82.70
Nagaland	6.97	344.48	86.12	206.69	51.67	265.33	290.92
Orissa	2870.78	13386.90	3346.73	8216.81	2054.20	13141.79	8050.64
Punjab	200.06	1259.63	314.91	851.45	212.86	1264.37	920.78
Rajasthan	427.52	67110.09	1677.77	4039.82	1009.96	5477.30	5146.64
Sikkim	21.76	128.66	32.17	77.20	19.30	118.26	169.80
Tamil Nadu	1045.98	10348.85	2587.21	10348.85	2587.21	13982.04	9363.68
Tripura	9.95	809.31	202.33	807.68	201.92	1019.55	824.32
Uttar Pradesh	8494.04	42194.35	10548.59	35723.74	8930.94	53148.72	24597.01
West Bengal	4964.52	14876.87	3719.22	7957.84	1989.46	14911.82	5553.43
A & N Islands	61.26	117.89	0.00	31.44	0.00	92.70	20.70
D & N Haveli	7.67	77.81	0.00	46.69	0.00	54.36	10.43
Daman & Diu	3.67	37.70	0.00	10.06	0.00	13.73	2.06
Laksha-dweep	14.10	59.10	0.00	35.46	0.00	49.56	21.13
Pondicherry	7.72	115.42	0.00	82.14	0.00	89.86	19.74
<b>Total :</b>	<b>47630.21</b>	<b>207843.56</b>	<b>51858.91</b>	<b>139818.73</b>	<b>34766.57</b>	<b>222215.51</b>	<b>124371.11</b>

**Source :** *Compiled from Annual Report – 1998-99, Government of India, Ministry of Rural Area and Employment, New Delhi.*

In Table 4.9 and 4.10 the financial and physical progress under JRY during 1998-99 have been shown. West Bengal has given Rs. 14876.87 lakhs (7.15% of total central allocation) and this state is able to achieve 27.76% of its target. Nagaland has 95.42% achievement whereas Sikkim achieved 109.61% of its target

**Table No : 4.10**  
**Physical Performance Under JRY During 1998-99**

(Progress upto November' 98)

States/Uts	Annual Target (tentative)	Achievement	% Achievement	Sectoral Achievement (Lakh Man Days)			
				SC/ST	Others	Women	Landless
Andhra Pradesh	254.01	131.16	41.34	55.50	75.66	44.86	95.67
Arunachal Pradesh	7.97	0.62	7.78	0.62	0.00	0.00	0.00
Assam	144.36	50.00	34.64	26.71	23.29	5.43	13.81
Bihar	688.11	299.11	43.47	179.48	119.63	77.75	188.55
Goa	3.32	1.21	36.45	0.00	1.21	0.52	0.00
Gujarat	53.34	36.63	68.67	21.02	15.61	7.23	11.06
Haryana	30.49	9.35	30.67	5.57	3.78	1.87	9.09
Himachal Pradesh	17.00	7.05	41.47	3.66	3.39	0.34	0.01
J & K	27.50	9.56	34.76	0.00	9.55	0.00	0.00
Karnataka	188.82	133.77	70.85	53.13	80.64	36.80	44.16
Kerala	69.77	19.08	27.35	6.17	12.91	6.45	2.73
Madhya Pradesh	325.80	176.77	54.26	110.93	65.84	60.63	61.59
Maharashtra	541.22	203.55	37.61	102.45	101.10	69.29	75.24
Manipur	6.92	0.50	7.15	0.40	0.10	0.04	0.00
Meghalaya	10.22	9.18	89.82	4.59	0.00	0.00	0.00

**Contd.**

Mizoram	1.84	1.10	59.78	1.10	0.00	0.39	0.00
Nagaland	9.82	9.37	95.42	9.37	0.00	2.64	0.00
Orissa	317.94	158.57	49.87	104.72	53.85	48.07	36.04
Punjab	15.46	8.50	54.98	6.25	2.25	0.17	6.20
Rajasthan	49.43	80.67	53.99	52.22	28.45	26.72	9.78
Sikkim	2.29	2.51	109.61	1.62	0.89	0.80	0.08
Tamil Nadu	230.42	173.96	75.50	89.11	84.85	66.78	130.17
Tripura	18.02	24.11	78.30	10.63	3.48	4.22	4.98
Uttar Pradesh	626.32	304.38	48.60	155.93	148.45	57.62	62.63
<b>West Bengal</b>	<b>220.83</b>	<b>61.31</b>	<b>27.76</b>	<b>32.75</b>	<b>28.56</b>	<b>14.95</b>	<b>38.48</b>
A & N Islands	1.30	0.15	0.01	0.07	0.08	0.03	0.06
D & N Haveli	1.11	0.19	17.12	0.19	0.00	0.13	0.00
Daman & Diu	0.57	0.14	24.56	0.02	0.10	0.00	0.00
Lakshadweep	1.12	0.30	26.79	0.30	0.00	0.11	0.00
Pondicherry	1.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>3966.57</b>	<b>1902.80</b>	<b>47.97</b>	<b>1034.51</b>	<b>863.67</b>	<b>533.84</b>	<b>790.33</b>

*Source : Compiled from Annual Report – 1998-99, Government of India, Ministry of Rural Area and Employment, New Delhi.*

### **New initiatives has been taken to this programme:**

- (a) To further empower the Panchayati Raj institutions it has been decided to allocate 15 percent of the funds under JRY to intermediate level of Panchayati Raj system. Funds to be distributed among Zilla Parishads, intermediate levels and village panchayats in the ratio of 20:15:65.
- (b) Three percent of the funds were proposed to be earmarked for the benefit of persons with disabilities.

### ***Million Wells Scheme:***

The Million Wells scheme (MWS) was launched as a sub-scheme of the National Rural Employment Programme (NREP) and the Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP) during the year 1988-89. After the merge of the two programmes, in April 1989, into JRY, it continued as sub-scheme of JRY till December 1995. Million Wells Scheme has been delinked from JRY and made into an independent scheme with effect from January 1996.

Million Wells Scheme is a centrally supported scheme and the expenditure under the scheme is shared by the centre and the states on 80:20 basis. Allocation to the states is made on the basis of proportion of rural poor in a state to total rural poor in the country. Allocation for a district is decided by the state Government, keeping in view the potential of well, irrigation and the

land held by the target group. MWS aims to provide an asset in the form of an irrigation sources or land development, free of cost, to the target group. Upto 1992-93, the target group for MWS comprised of poor, small and marginal farmers belonging to SCs/STs and freed bonded labours only, but from 1993-94 onwards, MWS has been extended to non SC/ST, small and marginal farmers also who are below the poverty line. It is however, ensured that the funds under MWS for non- SC/ST beneficiaries do not exceed one third (1/3) of the total allocation for the scheme. Where wells are not feasible due to geological factors, the amounts allotted under the scheme could be utilised for other schemes of minor irrigation like tanks, water harvesting structures and also for the development of lands belonging to small and marginal farmers. The cost and area norms in regard to works under MWS are decided by a specially constituted state level committee. The beneficiaries themselves are to undertake the construction of their wells through their own labour and the local labour for which they are paid. In no case, works are entrusted to a contractor by the project authorities. Each well or irrigation sources constructed under the scheme has to be located in the holding of the beneficiaries and an entry to that effect was made in revenue records. DRDAs/ZPs are responsible for maintenance of accounts, monitoring , implementation and supervision of the programme in a district.

**Table No : 4.11**

**Allocation and Release Under Million Wells Scheme During 1998-99**

(Progress upto November 1998)

(Rs. In lakhs)

States/UTS	O.B. As on 1.4.98 (prov)	Allocation		Release		Total Availab ility
		Centre	State	Centre	State	
Andhra Pradesh	679.88	2532.39	633.10	1266.20	316.55	2262.63
Arunachal Pradesh	16.14	55.68	13.92	23.38	5.85	45.37
Assam	430.05	1446.70	361.68	723.35	180.84	1334.24
Bihar	3890.50	8295.83	2073.96	3619.85	904.96	8415.31
Goa	17.94	5.84	1.46	0.00	0.00	17.94
Gujarat	280.88	953.24	238.31	474.23	118.56	873.67
Haryana	116.00	560.81	140.20	121.75	30.44	268.19

Contd.

Himachal Pradesh	112.67	236.18	59.05	118.09	29.52	260.28
Jammu & Kashmir	72.80	292.30	73.08	148.01	37.00	257.81
Karnataka	637.85	1912.32	478.08	862.99	215.75	1716.59
Kerala	161.95	858.05	214.51	461.62	115.41	738.98
Madhya Pradesh	2526.42	4204.94	1051.24	1904.71	476.18	4907.31
Maharashtra	825.16	3780.18	945.05	1884.03	471.01	3180.20
Manipur	18.21	96.99	24.25	25.70	6.43	50.34
Meghalaya	27.50	108.66	27.17	57.71	14.43	99.64
Mizoram	0.69	25.14	6.29	25.14	6.29	32.12
Nagaland	3.25	74.53	18.63	37.27	9.32	49.84
Orissa	1179.39	2896.54	724.14	1448.27	362.07	2989.73
Punjab	238.33	272.55	68.14	0.00	0.00	238.33
Rajasthan	3739.70	1452.09	363.02	203.28	50.82	3993.80
Sikkim	5.55	27.84	6.96	13.92	3.48	22.95
Tamil Nadu	182.81	2239.19	559.80	2239.19	559.80	2981.80
Tripura	0.00	175.11	43.78	172.04	43.01	215.05
Uttar Pradesh	2405.22	9129.64	2282.41	5957.10	1489.28	9851.60
<b>West Bengal</b>	<b>2553.83</b>	<b>3218.92</b>	<b>804.73</b>	<b>1019.03</b>	<b>254.76</b>	<b>3827.62</b>
A & N Islands	10.04	13.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.04
D & N Haveli	4.72	13.47	0.00	6.74	0.00	11.46
Daman & Diu	1.63	00.45	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.63
Lakshadweep	0.00	0.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pondicherry	8.94	17.06	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.94
<b>Total</b>	<b>20148.05</b>	<b>44897.01</b>	<b>11212.92</b>	<b>22813.60</b>	<b>5701.72</b>	<b>48663.37</b>

**Source:** *Annual Report, 1998-99 Government of India Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment, New Delhi.*

In Table 4.11 the allocation and release reflects under Million Wells Scheme during 1998-99. Centre has allotted Rs 321.92 Lakhs to West Bengal which is 7.17 percent of total central allotment on MWS. This table indicates 18.47 percent (Rs 8295.83 Lakhs) of total central allocation to Bihar.

**Table No : 4.12**  
**Financial Performance Under Million Wells Scheme During 1998-99**  
 (Progress upto November 1998)

States/UTS	Total Availab- ility	Expenditure			% Utilisa- tion against Total availabi- lity
		SC+ST	Others	Total	
Andhra Pradesh	2262.63	658.62	415.71	1387.20	61.31
Arunachal Pradesh	45.37	11.15	0.00	11.15	24.58

**Contd.**

Assam	1334.24	282.76	185.54	468.30	35.10
Bihar	8415.31	2361.93	1134.35	3496.28	41.55
Goa	17.94	0.00	16.03	16.03	89.35
Gujarat	873.67	465.13	166.67	631.80	72.32
Haryana	268.19	37.86	26.70	64.56	24.07
Himachal Pradesh	260.28	47.12	33.47	80.58	30.96
Jammu & Kashmir	257.81	0.00	0.00	133.29	51.70
Karnataka	1716.59	754.41	219.78	974.19	56.75
Kerala	738.98	256.85	153.44	410.29	55.52
Madhya Pradesh	4907.31	1175.13	657.54	1832.67	37.35
Maharashtra	3180.20	1211.30	759.78	1971.08	61.98
Manipur	50.34	11.02	6.52	17.54	34.85
Meghalaya	99.64	7.94	0.00	7.94	7.97
Mizoram	32.12	14.98	0.00	14.98	46.64
Nagaland	49.84	38.77	0.00	38.77	77.79
Orissa	2989.73	1060.96	397.10	1458.06	48.77
Punjab	238.33	9.41	3.62	13.03	5.47
Rajasthan	3993.80	353.79	181.68	535.47	13.14
Sikkim	22.95	8.33	8.36	16.69	72.72
Tamil Nadu	2981.80	1365.86	709.40	2075.26	69.60
Tripura	215.05	170.30	43.55	213.85	99.44
Uttar Pradesh	9851.60	3506.72	1754.39	5261.11	53.40
<b>West Bengal</b>	<b>3827.62</b>	<b>878.31</b>	<b>573.81</b>	<b>1452.12</b>	<b>37.94</b>
A & N Islands	10.04	1.63	0.96	2.59	25.80
D & N Haveli	11.46	3.83	0.00	3.83	33.42
Daman & Diu	1.63	0.00	0.52	0.52	31.90
Lakshadweep	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pondicheery	8.94	0.00	0.06	0.06	0.67
<b>Total</b>	<b>48663.37</b>	<b>14694.11</b>	<b>7448.98</b>	<b>22589.24</b>	<b>46.42</b>

**Source :** Annual Report 1998-99, Government of India, Ministry of Rural Area and Employment, New Delhi.

Total Expenditure is for the month of September. Whereas break-up of SC/ST/Others is for August

**Table : 4.13****Physical Performance Under Million Wells Scheme 1998-99**

(Progress upto November 1998)

States/UTS	Well Constructed (Nos.)				Wells under Construction (Nos.)
	SC+ST	Others	Total	Women	
Andhra Pradesh *	1705	615	2320	21	12437
Arunachal Pradesh	20	0	20	0	55
Assam	572	201	773	0	811
Bihar	6380	3300	9680	94	26563
Goa	0	43	43	0	183
Gujarat	1107	388	1495	65	4957
Haryana	77	100	177	3	94
Himachal Pradesh	104	69	173	0	202
J & K §	0	0	746	0	1284
Karnataka	978	238	1216	142	3233
Kerala	1822	761	2583	448	3432
Madhya Pradesh	6104	3503	9607	696	18713
Maharashtra	1983	1659	3642	252	15916
Manipur	53	34	87	2	0
Meghalaya	162	0	162	0	2
Mizoram	188	0	188	51	0
Nagaland	242	0	242	92	8
Orissa	4407	1759	6166	168	9233
Punjab #	0	0	0	0	0
Rajasthan	627	263	890	16	5017
Sikkim	19	15	34	7	19
Tamil Nadu	2289	794	3083	408	6098
Tripura	850	218	1068	0	0
Uttar Pradesh	38	26	64	0	14
West Bengal	3967	1372	5339	35	192
A & N Islands	4	2	6	0	20
D & N Haveli	17	0	17	1	20
Daman & Diu	0	0	0	0	1
Lakshadweep	0	0	0	0	0
Pondicherry	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>33715</b>	<b>15360</b>	<b>49821</b>	<b>2501</b>	<b>108504</b>

- Physical Performance is for the month of August, report for September is not available.
- # A sum of Rs.13.03 Lakh has incurred on land levelling for development of 106 Hect. Land which benefited 106 beneficiaries.
- § Break-up of SC, ST & Others in J & K is not available.

**Source :** Annual Report (1998-99), Government of India, Ministry of Rural Area and Employment, New Delhi.

From Table 4.12 and 4.13, the financial and physical performance under MWS is evident during 1998-99. West bengal has constructed 10.7 percent of the total well constructed under this scheme.

### *Ganga Kalyan Yojana:*

On 15 August 1996, the launching of Ganga Kalyan Yojana (GKY) for providing assistance to poor cultivators belonging to scheduled castes and scheduled tribes in the rural areas was announced. Ministry of Rural Area and Employment accordingly launched GKY on 1st February 1997 in all the districts of the country. The objective of the scheme was to provide irrigation through exploitation of ground water (bore wells and tube wells) to individuals as well as group of beneficiaries belonging to poor small and marginal farmers.

GKY was launched as a sub-scheme of Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) and was implemented as an independent centrally sponsored scheme where expenditure is shared between the centre and the state Governments in the ratio of 80:20 basis. At the district level the scheme is implemented by the DRDA or ZP. During the year 1996-97, central assistance of Rs.90.82 crores was released to the states under GKY.

Some of the broad features of the scheme are :

- i) To provide irrigation through exploitation of ground water to individuals and groups of beneficiaries of small and marginal farmers living below the poverty line.
- ii) The individual or groups are to be assisted through subsidy by Government and term credit by financial institutions.
- iii) The funds are allotted among the states on the basis of poverty ratio and among the districts on the basis of the recommendations of the state Government
- iv) At least 50 % of the funds are to be earmarked for SCs and STs.
- v) Under the scheme, subsidy of 75% of the project is allowed for SCs/STs and physically disabled groups and 50% for the others. The monetary ceiling on subsidy per group is however, Rs.40,000. In case of individual beneficiaries, subsidy is Rs.5,000 per acre of land under the scheme, subject to a ceiling of Rs.12,500 per beneficiary.



- vi) The gap between the project cost and subsidy admissible has to be bridged with term credit by financial intuitions or SC/ST/BC Financial and Development Corporation.
- vii) The selection of beneficiaries is to be approved by the Gram Sabha in an open central body meeting in the presence of concerned officers.
- viii) In GKY, for SC/ST/PH groups, part of the operation and maintenance cost, subject to a ceiling of 5% of the project cost per annum is admissible as additional subsidy for three years, for the other groups and for individual schemes, no subsidy on operation and maintenance would be admissible.
- ix) Areas where ground water is already over exploited such as grey areas, dark areas and pockets where significant fluctuations are observed during summer seasons and implementation of ground water schemes may cause drinking water scarcity and also the coastal strip is 15-20 km from the seashore are to be excluded from the operation of the scheme.

A large percentage of the land holding belongs to small and marginal farmers. From time immemorial, the ground water was used for irrigation. Be it a dug well or other minor irrigation schemes under MWS or bore well under GKY, both try to ensure assured sources of irrigation to the poor, small and marginal farmers in the rural areas. This assured irrigation would enable them to grow food crops, vegetables and other crops and would provide income and employment on sustained basis. The assistance provided under these scheme is tremendous. The assistance so provided under MWS or GKY would permanently lift the poor, small and marginal farmers above the poverty line for all time to come and the poverty of the assisted family would be eradicated on a permanent basis.

Table: 4.14

**Development of Irrigation Potential through Plan Period**

Plan	Major/Medium		Minor		Total	
	Potential	Utilization	Potential	Utilization	Potential	Utilization
Pre-Plan	9.70	9.70	12.90	12.90	22.60	22.60
I Plan (1951-56)	12.19	11.00	14.06	14.06	26.25	25.06
II Plan (1956-61)	14.33	13.30	14.79	14.75	29.08	28.05
III Plan (1961-66)	16.57	15.20	17.00	17.00	33.57	32.20
Annual Plan (1966-69)	18.10	16.80	19.00	19.00	37.20	35.80
IV Plan (1969-74)	20.71	18.70	23.50	25.50	44.21	42.20
V Plan (1974-78)	24.72	21.20	27.30	27.30	52.02	48.50
Annual Plan (1978-80)	26.61	22.70	30.00	30.00	56.61	52.70
VI Plan (1980-85)	30.01	25.33	37.52	35.25	67.53	60.58
VII Plan (1985-90)	31.52	27.77	46.00	43.12	78.12	70.89

**Source:** *Eight Five Year Plans, 1992-97, Government of India, Planning Commission, New Delhi.*

Table No : 4.15

**Numbers of Schemes Taken up in  
Different Plans (Irrigation)**

Plan	Major	Medium
First Five Year Plan (1951-56)	24	212
Second Five Year Plan (1956-61)	23	116
Third Five Year Plan (1961-66)	27	74
Annual Plan (1966-69)	10	38
Fourth Five Year Plan (1969-74)	33	94
Fifth Five Year Plan (1974-79)	73	333
Annual Plan (1979-80)	15	53
Sixth Five Year Plan (1980-85)	41	141
Seventh Five Year Plan (1985-90)	18	29

**Source :** *Five Year Plans, Government of India, New Delhi.*

From Table 4.14 and 4.15 we find the development of irrigation potential and number of schemes taken up through various Plan period. Fifth Five Year Plan has a maximum of 73 major and 333 schemes for irrigation. Table 4.14 also

shows that before the schemes Ganga Kalyan Yojna came into effect, government of India implemented many schemes for irrigation in various Five Year Plans.

### ***Employment Assurance Schemes (EAS):***

Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) was introduced with effect from 2nd October 1993 in 1,778 rural blocks of 261 districts in which the Revamped Public Distribution System (RPDS) was in operation. The blocks selected were in the draught prone areas, desert areas, tribal areas and hill areas, During 1994-95 EAS was extended to 409 blocks under DPAP/DDP and Modified Area Development Approach (MADA) blocks having a larger concentration of tribes. In march 1995 the scheme was further extended to 256 blocks, out of which 233 blocks were prone to floods in the state of Utter Pradesh, Bihar, Assam and 23 blocks of J&K.

The IJRY has been merged with EAS with effect from 1st January 1996. The EAS was extended to 722 non-EAS blocks in 120 IJRY districts as a result of the merger, rising the total number of blocks where EAS were being implemented to 3206. A decision was taken to extend EAS to cent percent of the remaining blocks of the country. This scheme was launched during the middle of 1993-94. As a result, some states initially experienced difficulties in mobilising the state share of funds for the scheme. Besides the lean agricultural season in some districts did not fully coincide with the implementation period of EAS during 1993-94.

A total assistance, amounting to Rs.548.77 crores, including the states share was provided under EAS during 1993-94, against which Rs.183.75 crores were utilised. The total employment generated under EAS during the year 1993-94 works out to 494.74 lakh mandays. During 1994-95 Rs.1200 crores was provided as control assistance under EAS, against which the central releases were Rs.1,128.52 crore, Rs.1,235.45 crore were utilised and 2,739.56 lakh man days were generated during 1994-95. During 1995-96 against an outlay of Rs.15,70.00 crore Rs.1707.61 crores were released as central share, Rs.207.61

crore were re-appropriated for JRY as a result of merger of IJRY with EAS. The total man days generated was 3,467.27 lakhs mandays. IJRY was merged with EAS with effect from 1st January 1996 and EAS was extended to 722 non EAS blocks in the IJRY districts. During 1996-97 against an outlay of Rs.1790.00 crores, Rs.1,089.07 crores has been released from centre and 1,547.13 lakh man days generated.

**Table No : 4.16**  
**Financial Performance under Employment Assurance Scheme During**  
**1998-99 (Progress up to November 1998)**

(Rs. In lakhs)						
States/UTS	Unspent Funds as on 1.4.98	Centre Release as on 30.11.98	State Matching Share	Total Available Funds	Expenditure	% Expenditure to Total Availability
Andhra Pradesh	5663.03	16660.00	4165.00	26488.03	14082.86	53.17
Arunachal Pradesh	823.27	1070.00	267.50	2160.77	792.90	36.70
Assam	4262.15	2488.00	622.00	7372.15	4512.37	61.21
Bihar	13527.41	12686.00	3171.50	29384.91	16019.92	54.52
Goa	36.48	180.00	45.00	261.48	197.38	75.49
Gujarat	3687.16	1760.00	440.00	5887.16	389.29	66.17
Haryana	3105.97	440.00	110.00	3655.97	1304.74	35.69
Himachal Pradesh	1778.27	1240.00	310.00	3328.27	1811.05	54.41
J & K	592.50	4760.00	1190.00	6542.50	4352.09	66.52
Karnataka	2592.03	8720.00	2180.00	13492.03	7500.74	55.59
Kerala	2528.23	3051.00	762.75	6341.98	3521.12	55.52
Madhya Pradesh	7033.29	18153.00	4538.25	29724.54	17384.09	58.48
Maharashtra	4146.45	5920.87	1480.00	11547.54	6397.84	55.40
Manipur	582.42	370.00	92.50	1044.92	333.31	31.90
Meghalaya	251.75	150.00	37.50	439.25	124.17	28.27
Mizoram	107.66	800.00	200.00	1107.66	952.96	86.03
Nagaland	8.75	1980.00	495.00	2483.75	1047.69	42.18
Orissa	3294.81	10522.00	2630.50	16447.31	9441.09	57.40
Punjab	2234.89	320.00	80.00	2634.89	1231.80	46.75
Rajasthan	4992.85	7105.00	1776.25	13874.10	9186.93	66.22
Sikkim	29.90	220.00	55.00	304.90	296.24	97.16
Tamil Nadu	755.58	18720.00	4680.00	24155.58	16244.97	67.25
Tripura	201.08	1440.00	360.00	2001.08	1994.52	99.67
Uttar Pradesh	17089.02	31564.83	7891.21	56545.06	30470.91	53.89
West Bengal	6541.81	6100.00	1525.00	14166.81	3993.71	28.19
A & N Islands	75.87	0.00	0.00	75.87	17.39	22.92
D & N Haveli	9.73	0.00	0.00	9.73	9.47	97.33
Daman & Diu	2.17	0.00	0.00	2.17	1.38	63.59
Lakshadweep	100.15	0.00	0.00	100.15	66.90	66.80
Pondicherry	112.29	0.00	0.00	112.29	11.18	9.96
<b>Total</b>	<b>86166.97</b>	<b>156420.70</b>	<b>39105.18</b>	<b>281692.85</b>	<b>157197.01</b>	<b>55.80</b>

Source : Annual Report 1998-99, Government of India, Ministry of Rural Area and Employment, New Delhi.

**Table No : 4.17**  
**Physical Performance under Employment Assurance Scheme**  
**During 1998-99** (lakh Mandays)

States/ UTS	Mandays Generated						No of Works	
	SC	ST	Others	Total	Women	Landless	Completed	In Progress
Andhra Pradesh	78.99	40.07	94.34	213.40	66.89	66.24	12745	16082
Arunachal Pradesh	0.00	12.68	0.00	12.68	4.23	0.00	269	611
Assam	14.24	20.24	44.60	79.08	4.99	26.03	1974	2605
Bihar	98.37	35.48	98.51	232.36	62.43	141.17	6829	15209
Goa	0.00	0.00	2.20	2.20	0.94	0.00	75	179
Gujarat	8.42	11.30	23.32	43.04	12.41	21.11	1206	3327
Haryana	4.43	0.00	3.47	7.90	1.75	7.77	569	960
Himachal Pradesh	9.97	1.35	9.47	20.79	1.07	0.02	3261	4818
J & K *	NR	NR	NR	55.81	NR	NR	10072	19187
Karnataka	41.97	17.87	99.96	159.80	45.37	63.86	11569	10055
Kerala	12.07	1.68	24.20	37.95	14.20	3.92	1827	2384
Madhya Pradesh	57.19	96.96	83.92	238.07	76.88	72.03	7542	15135
Maharashtra	30.60	37.93	61.19	129.72	43.81	45.50	4094	13382
Manipur	0.10	4.96	0.42	5.48	1.43	1.60	450	250
Meghalaya	0.00	3.01	0.00	3.01	0.79	0.72	166	119
Mizoram	0.00	16.82	0.00	16.82	5.80	0.00	1338	35
Nagaland	0.00	24.92	0.00	24.92	3.05	0.00	126	72
Orissa	59.16	63.00	64.51	186.67	44.27	56.60	7017	13108
Punjab	5.38	0.00	2.58	7.96	0.34	3.19	376	365
Rajasthan	44.19	38.98	54.32	137.49	52.16	18.32	3682	8275
Sikkim	1.27	1.63	1.18	4.08	1.22	0.30	151	200
Tamil Nadu	136.51	11.43	156.70	304.64	111.65	248.78	13279	14460
Tripura	8.58	17.09	8.51	34.18	18.25	4.25	NR	NR
Uttar Pradesh	176.18	2.84	192.69	371.71	62.66	61.90	1304	942
West Bengal	15.88	7.32	21.20	44.40	10.30	28.38	3629	2079
A & N Islands	0.00	0.03	0.28	0.31	0.04	0.08	7	23
D & N Haveli	0.00	0.13	0.00	0.13	0.09	0.00	0	14
Daman & Diu	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.00	0	0
Lakshadweep	0.00	1.32	0.00	1.32	0.41	0.00	9	12
Pondicherry	0.14	0.00	0.05	0.19	0.01	0.00	3	47
<b>Total</b>	<b>803.64</b>	<b>469.05</b>	<b>1047.64</b>	<b>2376.14</b>	<b>639.46</b>	<b>871.77</b>	<b>93569</b>	<b>143935</b>

NR Not Reported

- J & K has not shown SC/ST employment generation separately

**Source :** Annual Report 1998-99, Government of India, Ministry of Rural Area and Employment, New Delhi.

From table 4.16 and 4.17, the findings show the Financial and Physical performance under Employment Assurance Scheme during 1998-99, indicating 20 percent (Rs. 31,564.83 lakh) of the total central allotment to Uttar Pradesh where only 9.79 percent (Rs. 62.66lakh) of total women mandays were generated. In West Bengal getting only 3.89 percent (Rs. 6100 lakh) generated 1.86 percent (44.40 lakh) mandays, in which 1.61 percent (10.30 lakh) women mandays were generated.

**Table No: 4.18**

**Allotment on WES**

Year	Outlay / in crores	Released from Centre (in crores)	Man days generated (in lakhs)
1993-94	548.77	183.75	494.74
1994-95	1,200	1,128.52	2,739.56
1995-96	1,570	1,707.61	3,467.27
1996-97	1,970	1,089.07	1,547.13

**Source:** *Annual Report, 1997-98, Government of India, Ministry of Rural Area and Employment, New Delhi.*

***Indira Awaas Yojana:***

In June 1985, the union Finance Minister made an announcement in parliament earmarking a part of RLEGP fund for construction of houses of SCs / STs and freed bonded labourers. The Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) was a result of that announcement and has continued as a part of JRY which replaced NREP/RLEGP in April 1989. The scheme operates as a 100 percent subsidised centrally, sponsored independent programme with the resources being shared on 80:20 basis by the centre and the states.

In the chief ministers conference held on 4-5 July 1996, it was recommended that all shelterless rural poor should be provided with a house by 2000 AD. In the above conference it was also recommended that the construction assistance under IAY should be enhanced from Rs.14,000 to Rs.20,000. Accordingly, the ministry enhanced the ceiling of assistance on construction under JAY Rs.20,000 per unit for plain areas and Rs.22,000 per unit for hilly/difficult areas with effect from 1st April 1996. The beneficiary for IAY

house has to be identified by the Gram Panchayat in a Gram Sabha and than the list of beneficiaries has to be approved by the Panchayat Samiti. The provision is in conformity with the 73rd amendment Act 1992, of the constitution, which empowers Gram Panchayat to implement 29 subjects pertaining to village development, under which rural housing is also one of the subjects.

In order to ensure that women are not denied their due share, it has been provided that the allotment of houses should be in the name of the female members of the beneficiary household. Alternatively, it can be allotted in the joint name of both husband and wife. Suitable local voluntary agencies can be associated with the implementation of IAY. Particularly they can motivate the beneficiaries in regard to the use of sanitary latrines and smoke free stoves.

**Table No : 4.19**  
**Plan Wise Resources Utilisation and Houses**  
**Constructed Under Indira Awaas Yojana**

Plans	Rs. (in crores)
<b>Seventh Plan :</b>	
Resources Utilised	Rs. 780.63
Houses Constructed	No. 705966
<b>Annual Plan (1990-91)</b> <b>(1991-92)</b>	
Resources Utilised	Rs. 476.63
Houses Constructed	No. 389099
<b>Eighth Plan :</b>	
Resources Utilised	Rs. 3781.66
Houses Constructed	No. 177405
<b>Grand Total :</b>	
Resources Utilised	Rs. 5038.37
Houses Constructed	No. 3672470

**Source:** *Compiled from Five-Year Plans, Government of India, New Delhi.*

Table 4.19 reveals the information on resource utilization and house constructed under Indira Awaas Yojana during 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Five-Year Plan and Annual plan (1990-91, 1991-92). Total resources utilized Rs. 5,038.37 crore and 36,72,470 houses were constructed.

**Table No : 4.20**  
**Financial Performance under Indira Awaas Yojana**  
**From April 98 to November, 98**

State	O.B as on 1.4.98	Allocation		Release		Total Availabil ity	Total Expend iture	% of Utilis ation
		Centre	State	Centre	State			
Andhra Pradesh	3568.42	8370.41	2092.60	5859.29	1464.82	10892.53	5473.55	50.25
Arunachal Pradesh	100.99	184.03	4601	36.54	9.14	146.67	80.49	54.88
Assam	532.13	4781.82	1195.46	3347.27	836.82	4716.22	842.13	17.86
Bihar	8633.21	27420.52	6855.13	19194.36	4798.59	32626.16	14135.4	43.33
Goa	0.00	19.20	4.80	29.21	7.30	36.51	48.45	132.7
Gujarat	464.84	3150.78	787.70	2258.27	564.57	3287.68	2282.72	69.43
Haryana	243.10	1853.66	463.42	1297.56	324.39	1865.05	347.37	18.63
Himachal Pradesh	66.53	780.64	195.16	546.45	136.61	749.59	215.73	28.78
J & K *	403.07	966.16	241.54	0.00	0.00	799.07	440.60	55.14
Karnataka	2394.69	6320.85	1580.21	4424.60	1106.15	7925.44	4222.63	53.28
Kerala	91.31	2836.20	709.05	1985.34	496.34	2572.99	1838.87	71.47
Madhya Pradesh	3855.05	13898.74	3474.69	9729.12	2432.28	16016.45	5713.49	35.67
Maharashtra	3544.59	12494.77	3123.69	8746.34	2186.59	14477.52	6589.28	45.51
Manipur	0.00	320.57	80.14	89.81	22.45	112.26	6.52	5.81
Meghalaya	0.00	359.16	89.79	33.92	8.48	42.40	21.88	51.60
Mizoram	2.53	83.11	20.78	58.18	14.55	75.25	56.01	74.43
Nagaland	0.00	246.36	61.59	172.45	43.11	215.56	138.24	64.13
Orissa	1556.66	9574.03	2393.51	6701.82	1675.46	9933.94	4539.13	45.69
Punjab	118.93	900.86	225.22	546.54	136.64	802.11	305.11	38.04
Rajasthan	1100.36	4799.63	1199.91	3359.74	839.94	5300.04	2908.20	54.87
Sikkim	9.06	92.02	23.01	64.41	16.10	89.57	72.01	80.39
Tamil Nadu	707.23	7401.30	1850.33	5180.91	1295.23	7183.36	9010.02	125.43
Tripura	9.94	578.80	144.70	405.16	101.29	516.39	513.55	99.45
Uttar Pradesh	4181.05	30176.52	7544.13	21123.56	5280.89	30685.50	14521.87	47.32
West Bengal	3597.49	10639.62	2659.91	4770.91	1192.73	9561.13	2554.51	26.72
A & N Islands	29.16	44.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	29.16	16.65	57.10
D & N Haveli	10.36	43.80	0.00	0.00	0.00	10.36	0.73	7.05
Daman & Diu	2.25	1.82	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.25	2.93	130.00
Lakshadweep	17.60	3.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	17.60	5.05	28.69
Pondicherry	0.00	56.57	0.00	39.60	0.00	39.60	50.52	127.58
<b>Total</b>	<b>35240.54</b>	<b>148400.00</b>	<b>37062.44</b>	<b>100001.4</b>	<b>24990.44</b>	<b>160728.34</b>	<b>76953.64</b>	<b>47.88</b>

**Source:** Annual Report 1998-99, Government of India, Ministry of Rural Area and Employment, New Delhi.

In Table 4.20 and 4.21, the financial and physical performance has been shown under Indira Awaas Yojana during 1998-99. Maximum number (61,943) of houses were constructed in Uttar Pradesh where only 2,764 for women. West Bengal has got 7.16 percent of Central allocation (Rs. 10,639.62 lakh) but percentage of utilization is 26.72 which is very low comparing to many other state. It is also found that West Bengal had 7.55 percent of the total target in India, percentage of achievements is 20.99 whereas total countris achievement is 35.93.



**Table No : 4.21**  
**Physical Performance under Indira Awaas Yojana During 1998-99**

States/ UTS	Target	(IN Nos.) Houses Constructed				Houses in Progress	% of Achieve- ment to Comple- tion
		SC+ST	Others	Total Houses	Women		
Andhra Pradesh	73645	14317	9796	24113	0	35397	32.74
Arunachal Pradesh	1046	56	0	56	10	244	5.35
Assam	28576	2772	1950	4722	1032	2225	16.52
Bihar	171378	51447	15482	66929	17390	132390	39.05
Goa	130	0	412	412	0	1647	316.92
Gujarat	19692	8358	2788	11146	3426	8705	56.60
Haryana	10690	1063	613	1676	451	1536	15.68
Himachal Pradesh	4435	252	141	393	0	1456	8.86
J & K *	7699	0	0	4200	0	7747	54.55
Karnataka	39505	12610	6850	19460	2722	18569	49.26
Kerala	17726	4852	2655	7507	1447	14601	42.35
Madhya Pradesh	103652	34837	16279	51116	3361	47458	49.32
Maharashtra	78092	9891	6313	16204	2340	27954	20.75
Manipur	1911	45	22	67	0	339	3.51
Meghalaya	2409	81	0	81	0	28	3.36
Mizoram	472	255	0	255	179	0	54.03
Nagaland	2050	876	0	876	0	0	42.73
Orissa	67684	15410	4994	20404	6070	32882	30.15
Punjab	5630	1396	92	1488	Nil	611	26.43
Rajasthan	35599	10781	4214	14995	12782	27396	42.12
Sikkim	784	179	217	396	114	103	50.51
Tamil Nadu	46258	23871	3991	27862	4003	51378	60.23
Tripura	4519	2488	78	2566	0	0	56.78
Uttar Pradesh	188051	45622	16321	61943	27643	NR	32.94
West Bengal	74594	9619	6042	15661	3634	8651	20.99
A & N Islands	202	0	6	6	0	0	2.97
D & N Haveli	309	5	0	5	NR	16	1.62
Daman & Diu	10	0	0	0		0	0.00
Lakshadweep	17	31	0	31		125	182.35
Pondicherry	257	86	27	113	6	760	43.97
<b>Total</b>	<b>987022</b>	<b>251200</b>	<b>99283</b>	<b>354683</b>	<b>86610</b>	<b>422218</b>	<b>35.93</b>

**Source:** Annual Report 1998-99, Government of India, Ministry of Rural Area and Employment, New Delhi.

Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) has many positive features. Its major achievement has been to provide the houseless poor a feeling of security, status and identity thus integrating him in the social milieu. This is a programme which is well received by all the states. Planning Commission evaluations have also highlighted its positive aspects. The IAY has proved to be a popular programme and targets have been exceeded in almost every year since its inception. A total of about 30 lakh houses were constructed from 1985-86 to 1996-97. Under this

scheme during 1996-97 an allocation of Rs.1,425 crores has been made for construction of 11,23,560 houses. (Annual Report)

### ***Draught Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) and Desert Development Programme (DDP):***

DPAP was under implementation in 947 blocks of 155 districts in 13 states. The total area covered under the programme was 746 lakh hectares. DDP was under implementation in 227 blocks of 36 districts in seven states. Total geographical area covered under the programme is 457 lakh hectares. Area development under DPAP and the DDP on watershed basis has been made mandatory under the new guidelines for watershed development. 1995-96 was the year transitional for switching over from the old to the new guidelines for implementation of the programmes. There were many ongoing works started prior to 1995-96 under the old guidelines.

Total allocation for the DPAP for 1995-96 was Rs.25,000 lakhs, out of which central share was Rs.12,500 lakhs. Based on the total allocation, 4611 watershed projects under the DPAP were targeted to be planned and developed from 1995-96 to 1998-99. Additional 384 projects were also targeted, as such the total numbers of watershed projects taken up for development during 1995-96 was 4995.

Allocation under DDP was Rs.10,585 lakh, out of which the central share was Rs.10,000 lakh. Based on the total allocation, 1,629 watershed projects were initially targeted to be planned and developed from 1995-96 to 1998-99. Additional 66 projects were also targeted, as such the total number of watershed projects taken up for development during 1995-96 was 1695. A watershed project should be completed in four years, funds @ 25%, 40%, 25% and 10% of the total cost of each project is to be released in the first, second, third and fourth year respectively.

The first year was earmarked for completion of the following activities:

- i) Construction of district watershed development advisory committee by DRDA.

- ii) Selection of project implementation agencies and appointment of watershed development teams by DRDA.
- iii) Formation of watershed associations and their registration under registration of societies act.
- iv) Formation of watershed committee by watershed associations.
- v) Setting up of watershed development fund.
- vi) Preparation of watershed development plans by watershed committee and development teams.
- vii) Approval of plan by district rural development agency or zilla parishad.
- viii) Training of Government officials and local people.

During 1995-96 the expenditure of new watershed projects was very low. The major portion of the fund was completion of on going work started prior to 1995-96.

During 1996-97, the allocation made for both the programmes has been kept at the level of the allocation of 1995-96. Total allocation central releases a expenditure upto Nov 1996 was as under (Rs. In lakhs)

**Table :- 4.22**  
**Allocation and Release under DPAP/DDP**

Programme	Allocation		Release	Expenditure		
	Total	Central Share		Ongoing Work	Projects	Total
DPAP	25,000	12,500	3,666.23	658.60	5,484.72	6,143.32
DDP	10,585	10,000	2,385.70	442.26	1,661.27	2,103.53

**Source:** *Annual Plan, 1996-97, Government of India, New Delhi.*

Out of Rs.25,000 lakhs, under DPAP, Rs.23,454.18 lakhs had been allocated to DRDA, under DDP, out of Rs.9,928 lakhs has been allocated to DRDA.

**Table No : 4.23**  
**Physical & Financial Progress Under DPAP During 1998-99**

(Rs. In lakhs)

State	No. of Projects Targetted	Taken-up Watershed Works	Central Release on Watershed Works #	State Release on Funds	Total Available Watershed Works	% of Expenditure
Andhra Pradesh	1608	1605	1051.37	1051.37	5365.17	45.50
Bihar	536	492	0.00	0.00	955.75	17.43
Gujarat	450	360	671.95	638.24	1930.23	39.52
Himachal Pradesh	64	40	14.00	35.25	300.52	33.33
Jammu & Kashmir @	0	0	40.00	40.00	193.88	51.64
Karnataka	453	406	777.03	408.86	2692.04	22.01
Madhya Pradesh	966	891	859.27	313.25	39500.90	37.52
Maharashtra	873	794	280.25	35.75	4037.71	28.73
Orissa	222	191	274.56	69.78	852.43	18.30
Rajasthan	176	176	112.00	112.00	928.23	45.24
Tamilnadu	339	297	272.71	0.00	1249.34	100.00
Uttar Pradesh	606	551	602.36	940.01	2651.04	47.74
West Bengal	161	153	0.00	0.00	559.93	1.96
<b>Total</b>	<b>6454</b>	<b>5956</b>	<b>4955.50</b>	<b>3644.50</b>	<b>25604.16</b>	<b>37.57</b>

@ As a special case, the State has been permitted to implement the programme as per old guidelines.

# Release upto December, 98.

Source: *Annual Report (1998-99)*, Govt. of India, New Delhi.

Table 4.23 shows the Physical and Financial progress under DPAP during 1998-99. A Maximum number (1608) of projects, 24.9 percent were targetted in Andhra Pradesh and only 161 Projects, 2.5 percent were targetted for West Bengal.

### ***Role of Panchayat in Development:***

It is thus seen that panchayats play an important role in poverty alleviation and rural development in the country. The most significant role of panchayats in poverty eradication is to help in the process of empowerment of the poor. It is hoped that the situation is bound to change as the provisions of the 73rd amendment of the constitution are implemented by all states in the near future. State functions and finances have to be devolved on local bodies precisely for the same reasons the state Governments are today demanding the

decentralisation from the national to the state level. The role of panchayati raj institutions (PRIs) in poverty eradication is not only to implement certain schemes handed down to them by the state Government, but their greatest strength lies in mobilising and motivating the people to fight poverty and social justice in connection to a total development. When a development programme involves poor people, it helps them to become self-confident, conscious and powerful. When this stage is achieved, poverty can be removed. Planning is now widely accepted way to handle any complex problems of decision-making. It involves the use of collective intelligence and foresight to chart direction, order, harmony and progress in public activity relating to general welfare (Mishra. R.P, 1990). Developmental planning can be viewed at panchayat level for greater integration between the developmental needs and priorities of smaller areas and different social classes with national level policies and goals (Mishra. S, 1997). Under decentralisation, plans are formulated independently either by local bureaucracy or a local body as panchayats. The autonomy enjoyed in the formulation and implementation of plans is the essence of panchayats. There may be assistance from above in the planning process but it would not substantially alter the freedom of the local authority in its planning activities (Ranga Rao, 1997). The importance of the panchayat system at the local level has been recognised, yet the function is to be improved.

Since the acceptance of democratic decentralisation as a policy for community development by the National Development Council and state Governments, the role of non officials also has acquired equal importance. Decentralisation calls not only for political but also economic and administrative decentralised development, ensures equality, economy, effectiveness and people centred development (Bave.N, 1996). The development of rural economy depends upon the extent to which rural development takes place in our country and this depends upon the way in which the development programmes are implemented by the Panchayati Raj institutions, unless the common people come forward to participate in development, the development would not be realistic. Advantage of involving local people through panchayats in planning and development helps to raise the level of development (Prasad.K, 1990).

Involvement of the local people by the way of discussions in open assemblies in villages may be equally useful in identification, formulation, selection and location of schemes of local importance.

### ***Decentralised Development in West Bengal:***

In the context of decentralisation and development, West Bengal presents a model and a path which could be usefully emulated, when in most of the Indian states, Panchayati Raj or decentralised Government has been unsuccessful due to excessive bureaucratic control, political interference, inadequate resources, elite domination. West Bengal, under Left Front Government in 1978, initiated the decentralisation with many success (Roy.S N, 1997). It goes to the credit of the West Bengal Government that regular elections of this decentralised governance body have been held. It brought the rural population and the state administration closer to each other helping in fundamental and durable developmental change in West Bengal.

To take the West Bengal on account it is found in the various schemes the allotment and achievements (up to December 1996).

Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY) – 3813 lakh man days of employment generated and Rs.1,78,715 lakh was utilised.

Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY) – 166161 houses constructed and distributed at the cost of Rs.20,385 lakhs.

Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) – Assured employment of 582 lakh man days of employment, over 48,41000 persons registered, Rs.36,558 lakh incurred.

Million wells scheme (MWS) – over 41,443 wells constructed, Rs.35,863 lakh utilised.

Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) – over 32,20,879 families assisted at the cost of Rs. 70,914 lakh.

Rural water supply and sanitation – over 50,929 villages covered, more than Rs. 575.723 crores spent, over 2,62,390 sanitary latrines constructed, Rs.873.180 lakh spent.

Watershed Development- under integrated wasteland development projects sanctioned. Over Rs.0.8 crores released, 20 voluntary agencies assisted and over Rs.44 lakh released.

Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP) – minimise drought conditions of 72,948 lakh hectors under land resources development. 46,823 lakh hectors area under resource development and 1,26,100 lakh hector area under afforestation and pasture development have been treated. 161 micro-watersheds have been targeted through peoples participation, Rs.79.85 crore were utilised up to 1996-97. Table No. 4.17, 4.18, 4.20, 4.21, 4.22 reflects the achievements in development programme in West Bengal.

Last 24 years of Left Front Government working in West Bengal show that it has been able to carve out a crucial role for itself in the process of social change and economic development.

The main focus of the West Bengal Governments policy regarding decentralisation has been on (i) Acceleration of organizational development, (ii) development of human resources and (iii) effective implementations (Ray SN, 1997). Actually, peoples participation in decision-making, grassroots planning and programme implementation through Panchayati Raj has been the moving spirit and the motive force behind the successful development in West Bengal. Left Front Government has introduced the principle of decentralised rural developmental planning. The District Planning Committee (DPC) and Block Planning Committee (BPC) have been constituted to bring together panchayat members and concerned officials. DPC and BPC are headed by sabhadhipati and Sabhapati respectively (Basu Jyoti, 1997). Effective implementation of land reform have generated significant socio-economic development in West Bengal. A Planning Commission study has revealed that till 1978 about 95% of panchayat members at all India level belonged to landlord families, but the Left Front Government changed the trend having 71% of the panchayat members in West Bengal from small and marginal farmers. The West Bengal model of development is different from that of other parts in the country where the bureaucracy dominates the development programme (Datta.P, 1996). Development policy of the West Bengal Government is guided by the

philosophy of what may be called redistribution before growth to ensure growth with social justice. Decentralised governance can be greatly strengthened with the better relationship between panchayat and the people. To monitor and implement the development programme, West Bengal decentralised governance has formed ten standing committees as (i) Bon -o- Bhumi Sanskar (BOB) (ii) Krishi, Sech -O Samabay (KSS) (iii) Artha, Sanstha, Unnayan -O- Parikalpana (ASUP) (iv) Purtya, Kara - O - Paribahan (PKP) (v) Janaswantha - O - Paribesh (JP) (vi) Siksha, Sanskriti, Tathya - O - Krira (SSTK) (vii) Khudra Shilpa, Tran - O - Janakalyan (KTJ) (viii) Matsya - O - Prani Sampad Bikas (MP) (ix) Khadya - O - Sarabaraha (KS) (x) Bidyut - O - Achiracharit Shakti (BA).

West Bengal has commendable performance on account of its policy on rural development (Lieten, 1994). The index can be noticed as (a) out migration from villages has virtually stopped; (b) the percentage of rural non-worker in most Indian states has gone up but in West Bengal it has come down; (c) agrarian production has virtually doubled; (d) process of polarisation and depeasantisation also appears to have been reversed. The socio-historical backdrop of West Bengal is one of the major causes of a pro-poor, successful rural development process (Kar S, 1999) which relied mostly on meaningful land reforms and a vigilant, poor-friendly panchayat system mostly on meaningful land reforms and a vigilant, poor friendly panchayat system.



## **Notes and Reference**

**Ali, Sadiq** (1964): *Report of the Study Team and Panchayati Raj*, Rajasthan.

**Annual Report** 1998-99, *Government of India*, New Delhi, Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment.

**Bava, Noorjahan** (1996), Enhancing Financial Autonomy of PRIs, task before State Finance Commission. *Kurukshetra*, Vol XL IV issue 7 April, P-17.

**Datta Prabhat** (1996), Rural Development through Panchayats : The West Bengal experience, *Kurukshetra*, Vol 44 issue 7, April, P.P-64-67.

**Hirway Indira** (1989):- Panchayati Raj at the Crossroads, *Economic and Political Weekly*, July 22, P.P-1663-1664.

**James H Grops**, (1972) :- Rural sociology and Rural development, *Rural Sociology*. Vol 37 issue – 4, December, P.P-515-523.

**Kar Sumit** (1999), Panchayati Raj and Rural Social Change, the experience in West Bengal, *Mainstream*, Vol 37 issue 10, February 27, P.P-15-19.

**Lieten GK** (1994), For a new debate on West Bengal, *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol XXIX issue 29, July 16, P.P-1835-1838.

**Mayor A** (1959) :- Pilot Project in India, University of California Press, P-37 cited in Hoshiar Singh (1995).

**Mishra B.B** (1983) :- *District Administration and Rural Development*, Delhi, Oxford University Press. P.P-386.387.

**Mishra R.P and K.V Sundaram**, (1979) :- *Rural Development : Perspectives and Approaches*, New Delhi, Sterling Publishers, P-4.

**Mishra R.P(ed)**, (1990) :- *District Planning : A Handbook*, New Delhi, Concept Publishing Co, P-3.

**Mishra, Sweta** (1997) :- Decentralised Planning : Retrospect and Prospect. *Kurukshetra*, Vol 45, issue 9, June. P-23.

**Mukherjee B**, (1961):- *Community Development in India*, Bombay, Orient Longman, P-18.

**Murti, Ram,** (1965) :- *Report of the Study Team on Panchayati Raj*, Utter Pradesh.

**Naik V.P,** (1961):- *Report of the committee on Democratic Decentralisation*, Bombay, Government of Maharashtra, Oxford University Press, P.P-387.

**Prasad, Kamta** (1990) :- People's Participation in Rural Development . *Yojana*, Vol 34 issue 14-15, August 15, P-16.

**Pyaralal,** (1963) :- *Mahatma Gandhi, The last phase*, Vol II, Ahmedabad, Navjivan publishing house, P.P-551-552.

**Rambhai B** ,(1959) :- *The Silent Revolutions*, Delhi, Jiwan Prakashan, P-10.

**Ranga Rao S.P,** (1997) :- Decentralised Planning: The Emerging Scenario, *Kurukshetra*, Vol 45 issue- 9 June, P-2.

**Rao V.K.R.V** ,(1985) :- *Report of the Study Team on Panchayati Raj* , New Delhi Government of India.

**Report of Rural Urban Relationship Committee,** (1966) :- New Delhi Government of India Publication, P-135.

**Report of the Committee on Democratic Decentralisation,** (1961) Bombay, Government of Maharashtra, Dept of Cooperation and Rural Development, P-52.

**Report of the Committee on Panchayati Raj Institutions,** (1978) New Delhi, Government of India, Dept of Rural Development , P-9.

**Report of the study of community projects and NES,** (1957), committee on planned projects, New Delhi, Government of India, November, Section 2 P-23.

**Robert Chambers,** (1983) :- *Rural Development Putting The Last First*, London, Longman, P-147.

**Roy M.N,** (1995) :- Panchayats as Development Delivery System, *The Administrator*, Vol XL, April-June, P-95.

**Roy S.N** (1997) :- Re-conceptualized Rural Development and Revitalized Panchayati Raj : The West Bengal experience, *Social Action*, Vol 47, January-March, P-47.

**Sen Prontosha** (1988), Official Non-Official Relationship in the Panchayati Raj institutions: A study of the emerging relationship pattern under new panchayat system in the district of Malda. *Unpublished Ph.D Thesis*, University of North Bengal, P-P-71-75.

**Shanker Kripa** (1999) :- Decentralisation for Rural Development . *Kurukshetra*, Vol.48 No.3, December, P.P-20-23.

**Sharma S.K and S.L Malhotra** (1977) :- *Integrated Rural Development : Approaches, Strategy and Perspectives*, New Delhi, Abhinav Publications, P.P-16-17.

**Singh Hardayal** (1965) :- *Report of the Committee on Panchayati Raj* , Himachal Pradesh.

**Singh Hoshier** (1995) :- *Administration of Rural Development in India*. New Delhi, Sterling Publishers Pvt Ltd. P.P-13-14.

**Singhvi L.M** (1986) :- *Report on the Committee and Panchayati Raj Institutions*, New Delhi Government of India.

**Sundaram J.S** (1994) :- Book Review- Decentralised Planning and Panchayati Raj. *The Indian Journal of Political Science*, Vol LV, issue 2, April-June, P-193.

**Suri Parkash Chandra** (1993) Panchayati Raj Power to the people, *The Hindustan Times*, New Delhi, 2nd June.

**Suri Prakash Chandra** (1993), Panchayati Raj, Power to the People. *The Hindustan Times*, New Delhi, 02 June.

**Uma Lele** (1975) :- *The Design of Rural Development, Lesson from America*, Baltimore, John Hopkins University Press P-20.

**Yasin M** (1990), Administrative Reform for Rural Development. A study of two districts of North Bengal, *Unpublished Ph.D Thesis* ,University of North Bengal, P.P-130-131.