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I feel highly honoured by the invitation of Indian Society of Agricultural Statistics to deliver the technical address at this annual conference. I have been associated with the Society and Agricultural Statistics research and development for more than forty years. During this period I have worked not only as agricultural statistician but also as a chief executive of Agricultural Development in one of the largest states of India as well as a planner for development of agriculture and I have studied the role of agricultural development in enriching the overall human development. It is in this background that I have chosen this topic for my address.
2. The title I have chosen today for the address would appear a little non-statistical in its narrow sense of term. What I have observed is that the statisticians are generally consulted in conducting sample surveys like NSS, crop estimation surveys etc., they are associated to build up various estimates of parameters of special interest and at best they are required to provide some estimates of the precision of these estimates and then they themselves forget or forgotten when time comes to use such set of information in formulating policies. I am attempting to cover one such area where statisticians have applied large-scale sample survey methodology for estimating cost of production of crops and livestock production. Inter-alia these surveys throw estimates of man-power requirement in the crop and livestock production. For cultivators and agricultural labourers, crop and livestock production are the two areas which are supposed to provide them enough employment in a year. In this address, an attempt has been made to match the total work force and employment opportunities in these two areas as well as other related areas of rural economy. An attempt has also been made to suggest some remedial measures to ensure adequate employment to rural workers in the rural areas itself through

[^0]intensification and diversification of agricultural economy as also the entire economy of the state.
3. During 1998-90, agriculture, forestry and fisheries in India accounted for about 29 percent share in the total national income. However, the percentage of the cultivators and agricultural labourers in the total main workers according to the 1991 census was 59 . The number of cultivators and agricultural labourers in the country was 1257 lakhs during 1971 which has increased to 1853 lakhs during 1991 and if this trend goes unabated, it is expected that this number would touch a mark of about 2400 lakhs during the year 2006. There would be no doubt a marginal shift from 59 percent during 1991 to 56 percent during the year 2006 (Table-1).

Table 1. Trends in population in India (in million)

| S.No. | Category | Years |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1971 | 1981 | 1991 | $2001(\mathrm{P})$ | $2006(\mathrm{P})$ |
| 1 | 2 |  | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1. | Total population | 548.2 | 683.3 | 846.3 | 1012.4 | 1094.1 |
| 2. | Total workers | 180.4 | 244.6 | 314.1 | 384.7 | 426.7 |
| 3. Agricultural workers |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (a) Total | 125.7 | 148.0 | 185.3 | 220.7 | 238.5 |
|  | (b) As \% of total population | 22.9 | 21.7 | 21.9 | 21.8 | 21.8 |
|  | (c) Agricultural worker \% of | 69.7 | 60.5 | 59.0 | 57.4 | 56.0 |

Source: Agricultural Statistics at a Glance, 2000
$P$ stands for estimated
4. It is at this point that a question regarding the capacity of agriculture and allied sectors for providing enough employment opportunity to each of these workers arises. The answer to this question has been attempted by analysing the present employment capacity of agriculture sector based on prevailing cropping pattern and man power required per unit of area under different crops, appraisal of likely changes in cropping pattern and structure of livestock, impact of labour saving devices in agriculture and changes in technology etc.

## The Present Employment Capacity of Agriculture and Allied Sectors

5. Under the prevailing structure of rural economy, the main sources of employment in the rural areas are crop husbandry and animal husbandry. Some other minor activities like trade, cottage industry, services, public works like construction of roads, irrigation works, communication etc. also provide some employment. Recently employment generation programmes like Jawahar Rojgar

Yoina (JRY) and Employment Assurance Schemes (EAS) were executed to augment employment to landless agricultural labourers, marginal farmers and others needing such opportunities.
6. Of all these various components of employment activities, crop and animal husbandry continue to be the main source of employment. The various farm management studies being conducted by Govt. of India in different states on important crops do provide us the manpower absorption in different crops. As this information is available for only important crops for a state, the average manpower absorption has been used for other crops. These are shown in Annexure-2.
7. The employment capacity widely differs from crop to crop and from state to state implying in both the situations the nature of the crop and degree of agricultural development. Inspite of the fact that many of the agricultural operations are being executed by machines in Punjab, it still continues to generate sufficiently high degree of employment (Annexure-3) compared to Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka. However, West Bengal and Kerala are the two states where the per-hectare man-power absorption in the crop husbandry operations is high mainly on account of crops requiring man-power per unit of area and low level of mechanization in these states.

Table 2. Cropping pattern in India: 1960-61 to 1999-2000(P)

|  |  | (Area in lakh hects.) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S.No. | Crops | Years |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 1960-61 | 1970-71 | 1980-81 | 1990-91 | 1995-96 | $\begin{gathered} 1999- \\ 2000(\mathrm{P}) \end{gathered}$ |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1. | Rice | 341 | 376 | 402 | 427 | 435 | 446 |
| 2. | Jowar | 184 | 174 | 158 | 148 | 130 | 110 |
| 3. | Bajra | 115 | 129 | 117 | 105 | 94 | 90 |
| 4. | Maize | 44 | 59 | 60 | 59 | 62 | 65 |
| 5. | Wheat | 129 | 182 | 223 | 242 | 255 | 267 |
| 6. | Barley | 32 | 25 | 18 | 10 | 5 | 5 |
| 7. | Other foodgrains | 311 | 298 | 289 | 297 | 290 | 285 |
| 8. | Oilseeds | 138 | 166 | 176 | 241 | 255 | 270 |
| 9. | Sugarcane | 24 | 26 | 27 | 34 | 40 | 45 |
| 10. | Potato | 4 | 5 | 7 | 9 | 11 | 12 |
| 11. | Other crops | 206 | 218 | 276 | 295 | 300 | 303 |
| 12. | Total | 1528 | 1658 | 1753 | 1867 | 1877 | 1898 |

[^1]8. At the All India level, crops were grown in about 188 million hectares in the year 1995-96. Thirty five years back, crops were grown only in 152.8 million hectares. The cropping pattern as it obtains today compared to 1960-61 and thereafter is shown in Table-2.
9. Animal husbandry is a very important sector of rural economy and is too closely related to agriculture to differentiate it as far as the question of employment and poverty is concerned. This sector has a definite advantage over crop husbandry in the sense that whereas the land base for crop husbandry is limited, its base in the form of the number as well as quality is immense and can be expanded significantly. Hence the animal husbandry has to be duly evaluated for its employment generation capabilities. In evaluating these capabilities, we do not have data base as strong and scientific as in the case of crops with the help of which we can work out present level of use of human labour. We have, however, the norms given by National Commission on Agriculture and by using these norms which are broadly based on the results of various studies conducted by IASRI and the data on the various categories of livestock as per latest Livestock Census.
10. Two national programmes of JRY and Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS) are in operation which provided work opportunities of about 1.3 and 1.6 million SPYs respectively during the year 1995-96.
11. As has been pointed out by the National Commission on Agriculture (NCA), the other important employment generation programmes are the government sponsored programmes like building of roads, bridges, irrigation works etc. The total employment potential through crop husbandry, animal husbandry, JRY and others works out to 109.6 million SPYs as detailed in Table-3.

Table 3. Employment opportunities in rural areas in different sectors

| S.No. | Sector | Employment (million SPYs) 1995-96 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | 3 |
| 1. | Crop husbandry | 3 |
| 2. | Animal husbandry | 62.1 |
| 3. | Employment generating programmes | 34.6 |
|  | of rural development |  |
|  | (a) JRY | 1.3 |
|  | (b) EAS | 1.6 |
| 4. | Other programmes | 10.0 |
|  | All | 109.6 |

12. Although the cropping pattern of 1995-96 and the results of cost of cultivation studies for the year 1994-95 to 1996-97 and similar other information for the previous year have been used, the updating of this information would not materially affect these estimates. Hence it can be inferred that the total employment opportunities available in the rural areas during 1995-96 through crop husbandry, animal husbandry, employment generation programmes etc. are of the order of 109.6 million SPYs against a total of 210.5 million agricultural workers leaving a gap of about 101 million SPYs. Thus against 273 days work in a year, an agricultural worker in rural area gets, on an average, work opportunities for only 142 days and that in order to give these workers right to work, additional employment opportunities of the order of 101 million SPYs for the existing workers have to be created in addition to the new incumbents who are expected to be about 18 million during 2006.

## Inter State Variation in Employment Opportunities in Rural Areas

13. The macro level analysis of the employment opportunities in the country shows big gap of about 101 million SPYs. An attempt had also been made to study the situation obtaining in different states of the country. The methodology followed is almost similar to that used for national level. The broad cropping pattern and the estimated human labour utilization in cultivation of various crops are the same. The SPYs generated through JRY and EAS are given in Annexure 8.
14. On the basis of information mentioned above, the estimates of employment opportunities in rural areas for different states have been worked out and presented in Table-4.
15. The estimate of employment opportunities in the different states present a very gloomy picture for several states. On the one hand, there are states like Haryana and Punjab where an average worker gets about 200 days work opportunities in a year, there are states like Bihar and Tamil Nadu where an average agricultural worker gets less than 100 days work opportunities in a year. If the effect of the mechanisation is also taken into account, the employment scenario will further deteriorate in a number of states. Punjab and Haryana are the two states where local agricultural labour is not in far excess of the demand inspite a very high degree of mechanisation (Annexure-9).

## Employment Capacity in the Rural Areas during the Year 2005-2006

16. At present, the crop and animal husbandry have the capacity to provide 8 hour per day employment for 273 days in a year to only 96.7 million workers against the availability of about 221 million workers for the year 2001. Some
Table 4. Statewise estimates of employment in rural areas

| S.No. | States | Employment (in million SPY) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Crop Husbandry | Animal Husbandry | JRY | EAS | Sub <br> Total of Col. 3, 4, 5 \& 6 | Other <br> Sector | Grand <br> Total Col. 7 \& 8 | Total Ag. Workers (95-96) | Gap Col. (10-9) | Average number of days per worker (Col. $9 / 10 \times 273$ ) |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 5.4 | 2.9 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 8.6 | 0.9 | 9.5 | 22.0 | 12.5 | 118 |
| 2 | Bihar | 3.6 | 3.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 7.2 | 0.7 | 7.9 | 22.9 | 15.0 | 94 |
| 3 | Gujarat | 3.0 | 1.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 4.4 | 0.4 | 4.8 | 9.2 | 4.4 | 142 |
| 4 | Haryana | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 2.2 | 3.1 | 0.9 | 194 |
| 5 | Himachal Pradesh | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 137 |
| 6 | Karnataka | 4.5 | 2.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.9 | 0.7 | 7.6 | 12.7 | 5.1 | 163 |
| 7 | Kerala | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 4.3 | 2.4 | 121 |
| 8 | Madhya Pradesh | 5.9 | 3.9 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 10.0 | 1.0 | 11.0 | 21.0 | 10.0 | 143 |
| 9 | Maharashtra | 7.0 | 2.9 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 10.2 | 1.0 | 11.2 | 20.9 | 9.7 | 146 |
| 10 | Orissa | 4.0 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.0 | 0.6 | 6.6 | 8.6 | 2.0 | 209 |
| 11 | Punjab | 1.8 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.9 | 0.3 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 0.6 | 230 |
| 12 | Rajasthan | 4.1 | 2.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 6.7 | 0.7 | 7.4 | 10.8 | 3.4 | 187 |
| 13 | Tamil Nadu | 2.6 | 1.6 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 4.5 | 0.5 | 5.0 | 15.4 | 10.4 | 89 |
| 14 | Uttar Pradesh | 8.2 | 4.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 13.4 | 1.3 | 14.7 | 33.2 | 18.5 | 121 |
| 15 | West Bengal | 4.5 | 2.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 7.2 | 0.7 | 7.9 | 12.6 | 4.7 | 171 |
| 16 | Other States | 4.9 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 7.3 | 0.7 | 8.0 | 8.6 | 0.6 | 254 |
|  | India | 62.1 | 34.6 | 1.3 | 1.6 | 99.6 | 10.0 | 109.6 | 210.5 | 100.9 | 142 |

of these 221 million workers might be employed on non-farm activities. Assuming that the present trend in the structure of our economy continues, the total number of agricultural workers (both cultivators and agricultural labourers) would touch 239 million mark during 2005-06. There will be some improvement in the cropping pattern which would absorb some of this additional workforce as a result of expansion of irrigation facilities, strengthening of extension programmes, enlargement of credit system and improvement in delivery system etc. The area under some of the high valued and crops requiring high degree of manual labour would increase as well and the gross cropped area would also record an increase of about 4.4 million hectares (Table-5).

Table 5. Projected cropping pattern in India (Area in lakh hect.)

| S.No. | Crops | Year 2005-2006 |
| :---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | Rice | 455 |
| 2 | Jowar | 95 |
| 3 | Bajra | 90 |
| 4 | Maize | 70 |
| 5 | Wheat | 280 |
| 6 | Barley | 5 |
| 7 | Other foodgrains | 280 |
| 8 | Oilseeds | 275 |
| 9 | Sugarcane | 46 |
| 10 | Potato | 15 |
| 11 | Other crops | 310 |
|  | Total | 1921 |

17. Similarly the total livestock population would also record an increase of about 79 million during the year 1992-2006. The structure of livestock population is expected to undergo a change of far reaching consequences in the sense that the share of buffaloes in the bovine population and share of crossbred animals in the cattle would increase quite considerably and that would provide additional work opportunities.
18. Thus after taking into consideration the changes and improvement in the crop and livestock sectors as also some acceleration in programmes of employment generation in rural areas, it is expected that, given the present trend, the total employment potential of all the major programmes in rural areas would be of the order of 121 million SPYs against an expected number of

239 million workers who would be engaged as cultivators or agricultural labours. Another disturbing dimension of this unemployment/underemployment is that there is great variation among various states. Punjab, Haryana and Orissa are the three states where each of the agriculture workers has employment of about 194 to 230 days in a year but an average worker in Tamil Nadu and Bihar have less than 100 days employment in a year. In most of the other states, a worker, on an average, gets employment between 100 to 187 days. Thus these workers need additional employment of 125 days to 180 days in a year. All the efforts of providing employment opportunities to these rural workers pale into insignificance when contrasted against this gap because the total employment generated through JRY and EAS worked to less than 4 days per such workers during 1995-96.

## Some Measures to Solve the Problem of Underemployment/Unemployment

19. We have seen that during 1995-96, the total employment opportunities in the crop and animal husbandry sector, JRY and EAS, and other sectors related to overall development measures was of the order of 110 million SPYs against about 210 million agricultural workers. This left a gap of 100 millions SPYs to be generated to solve the problem of full employment to these workers in rural areas. By the year 2005-06, the number of agricultural workers would touch a mark of about 240 million against the total employment potential of about only 120 to 125 million SPYs. Thus this gap would further increase to a minimum of 115 million SPYs compared to 100 million SPYs during 1995-96 and in all likelihood would continue to increase every year if effective measures are not taken to combat it.
20. I would now suggest some broad measures to solve this problem of growing unemployment/underemployment in the rural areas of the country.
21. The first basic change has to be brought in our economy is the overall diversification of our economy. There are some significant signals to indicate that our economy is undergoing transformation from primary sector to secondary and tertiary sectors. During 1980-81, agriculture, forestry and fisheries had a share of 38 percent in the National Gross Domestic Product. It reduced to 29 percent during 1998-99. The percentage of total agricultural workers has declined from about 70 during 1971 to 59 during 1991; this reduction should have been more. In some of the states in India, the percentage of agricultural workers is as low as 21 (in Maharashtra); but on the other hand it is still as high as 75 in Bihar. The pressure on the land has to be reduced. But that would be long term strategy and it would require huge investment in
infrastructure, industries and other services. The land-based programmes which would generate sufficiently large employment opportunities are :
(i) Diversification of crop-production programmes: More and more areas should be devoted to such crops as are in short supply at present and are more labour intensive. Most of such crops belong to vegetable group. A vegetable crop generally require 250 man days compared to 50 to 60 man days for most of the food grain crops.
(ii) Livestock production : It is another area which is free from the constraint of limited land resource and which can help the marginal, small farmers and most of the agricultural labourers to improve their economic conditions. Almost all the marginal farmers and even small farmers in the dry areas do not get enough work from crop husbandry alone for keeping the working members fully employed throughout the year. Our annual milk production in the country is about 75 million tonnes which works out to about 230 gms per day per person compared to 600 gms in some developed countries. Even in some of our states like Punjab/Haryana, this average is 980 gms and 700 gms respectively. Cross breeding of cows supported by a programme of improved fodder, particularly green fodder and concentrates can lead to doubling of milk production. This would also add to job opportunities in rural areas.
(iii) Poultry and fisheries are other two areas with a very high potential of employment and with a very low ICOR. These two sectors can be developed manyfolds in a short span of time and both these products are in high demand. The total production of eggs in the country is about 30 per person in a year against a requirement of more than 200 eggs. Similarly production of fish, particularly inland, can be increased considerably. Each tonne of production of fish generates about 2 SPYs and consequently about 10 million SPYs can be generated if the production of fish is increased from the present level of 5 to 6 million tonnes to 10 to 12 million tonnes in next 5 years. These are the three sectors where very high growth rates can be achieved with not very huge investment.
(iv) Water and soil management: India is endowed with very rich resources of soil and water. The annual precipitation in the country is about 400 million hectometer. From meteorological considerations, India is divided into 35 zones. The normal rainfall during monsoon season in 14 zones exceeds 1000 mm , in 16 zones it lies between 500 to 1000 mm and in 5 zones it is below 500 mm . It is thus clear that except for 5 zones, the normal rainfall is quite satisfactory. What is needed is scientific harnessing of this water resource in all the areas through large scale moisture and soil conservation works. Land development and water management, drainage and social forestry are important component of this programme.
(a) Land Development and Water Management : Of the total geographical area in the country, 141.25 million hectare (Annexure-11) is subject to water and wind erosion and another 33.70 million hectares is degraded on account of water logging, alkalinity/salinity, ravines and gullies etc. Beside this 174.95 million hectares, about 40 million hectares area is prone to floods. All these areas ( 215 million hectare) need special treatment. Land development work of these problem areas should be undertaken on a war footing so that, atleast 50 million hectares of such area is improved by 2005-06. It is not possible nor necessary to give details of each of these components here. At present about 4000 crore rupees are earmarked under IRY/EAS. Hence given the political will and determination, resources are not constraints. And if this is done; another 10 years would see a sea change in the land-base of our economy which would boost the productivity to new heights. If the programme of development of degraded land is undertaken on such scale, it would create about 5 million SPYs and double the productivity of land in a period of 2 to 3 years. Fifty million families can be benefited in the next 5 to 6 years by this programme. While soil conservation and drainage works have to be executed and funded by Governments, the measures of social forestry can be undertaken through private investments.
(b) Drainage : Floods and water logging cause considerable damages not only to the crops, but also to a number of other sectors of the economy like roads, houses, irrigation network, create health problem etc. As much as 40 million hectare of area is flood prone and annual average area affected by floods is of the order of 12 million hectares (Annexure-11). Most of this area can be improved by providing adequate drainage facilities. As a matter of fact, all irrigation programmes must have a component of drainage. The case of vertical drainage should also be given due attention atleast in the areas which have become prone to waterlodgging due to the developmental works like roads, canals, houses etc. which have choked the natural drainage. The damage caused by floods per annum in the last 20 years is of the order of 8 to 10 thousand crores rupees. The drainage for one million hectares of area would require an investment of about 100 to 150 crore rupees and would generate about 5 lakh SPYs and increase the overall productivity of the land.
(c) Afforestation : Much of the degraded land can be improved through afforestation which, on the one hand, is very labour intensive and, on the other hand, is extremely rewarding with one of the lowest ICOR. Each hectare of degraded land brought under
afforestation provide about 2 SPYs and costs about 20 thousand rupees only. The total area under forests in the country is only 22 percent of the total geographical area of about 328.73 million hectares against an accepted norm of 30 percent. Thus additional area of the order of 25 million hectares should be brought under forest cover. Far more area is available in the country. Hence this deserves the due attention of planners. The total investment required for bringing 25 million hectares under afforestation would be of the order of 40 to 50 thousand crore rupees. Obviously, this would be beyond the capacity of public funds, howsoever thinly they are spread over the next five or ten years. Hence, the private investment has to be attracted. The major portion of this area should be leased out to private individuals and institutions for a sufficiently long period say 20 to 25 years whereafter the land would revert back to the village community for social use.

## Concluding Remarks

22. The Indian economy has registered remarkable growth (upto 5 percent per annum), but the problem of incidence of poverty has remained unsolved. Undoubtedly rapid growth of the economy is necessary but not sufficient for removing the twin problems of unemployment and poverty. The forgoing analysis of the incidence of underemployment (and of poverty) clearly indicated that it is the class of marginal farmers all over the country, the small farmers in the dry land areas who are grossly underemployed and poor. A marginal farmer with as average size of holding of 0.30 hectare can at best work for about 60 days even in area like Muzaffarnagar of Uttar Pradesh with 200 percent intensity of cultivator. Any effort to solve the problem of poverty without concentrating on this class would be as futile in future as has been in the past. Hence the need is to concentrate all efforts only on those programmes which benefit this and only this class of rural poor. There are other classes in rural areas like village artisans, agricultural labourers, small traders and unemployed educated youths in urban areas who need equal care. But once this vulnerable class of rural poor is taken care of, the other classes of poor people would be automatically covered as a result of the boom in rural economy and equitable distributive nature of these programmes.
ANNEXURE-1

| S.No. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (Rs. Crore) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sectors | 1980-81 |  | 1990-91 |  | 1995-96 |  | 1998-99 |  |
|  |  |  | \% |  | \% |  | \% |  | \% |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| 1 | Agriculture, forestry \& fisheries | 46649 | 38.1 | 148001 | 31.0 | 303122 | 28.4 | 469340 | 29.1 |
| 2 | Mining \& quarrying | 1887 | 1.5 | 11785 | 2.5 | 25109 | 2.4 | 33249 | 2.1 |
| 3 | Manufacturing | 21644 | 17.7 | 89160 | 18.6 | 189788 | 17.8 | 250905 | 15.5 |
| 4 | Elect. gas \& water supply | 2070 | 1.7 | 10464 | 2.2 | 27681 | 2.6 | 38066 | 2.4 |
| 5 | Construction | 6114 | 5.0 | 28616 | 6.0 | 55219 | 5.2 | 92239 | 5.7 |
| 6 | Trade, hotel \& resturant | 14713 | 12.0 | 61883 | 13.0 | 144078 | 13.5 | 213422 | 13.2 |
| 7 | Transport, storage \& communication | 5724 | 4.7 | 33913 | 7.1 | 70542 | 6.6 | 113042 | 7.0 |
| 8 | Financing, insurance, real estate \& business services | 10791 | 8.8 | 38902 | 8.1 | 125352 | 11.7 | 181806 | 11.3 |
| 9 | Community, social \& personal services | 12835 | 10.5 | 55090 | 11.5 | 126329 | 11.8 | 220314 | 13.7 |
| 10 | Gross domestic product at factor cost (1 to 9) | 122427 | 100.0 | 477814 | 100.0 | 1067220 | 100.0 | 1612383 | 100.0 |


| Statistics at a Glance 2000 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (B) Classification of workers : 1991 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | (Nos. in Million) |
| S.No. | Class | Nos. | Percentage to total |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 1 | Cultivators | 110.7 | 35.24 |
| 2 | Agricultural labours | 74.6 | 23.75 |
|  | Sub total | 185.3 | 58.99 |
| 3 | Other workers | 128.8 | 41.01 |
|  | Total | 314.1 | 100.00 |

Source: Agricultural Statistics at a Glance 2000
（Average 1994－97）（Labour input days／hectare）

| $\underset{\sim}{i}$ | 苍 | $\dot{C}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 点 } \\ \text { 鬲 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 总 } \\ & \stackrel{y y y}{3} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 安 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\pi}{4} \\ & \frac{4}{4} \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\dot{\Sigma}$ |  | 淫 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 受 } \\ & \text { 雨 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 哥 } \\ & \text { 霜 } \\ & \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{H}{\underset{H}{2}}$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 30 } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 3 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| 1 | Paddy | 143 | 94 | 94 | 86 | 94 | 194 | 94 | 85 | 94 | 133 | 63 | 94 | 94 | 102 | 143 |
| 2 | Jowar | 55 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 56 | 58 | 52 | 64 | 58 | 58 | 58 | 60 | 58 | 58 |
| 3 | Bajra | 54 | 58 | 65 | 41 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 32 | 65 | 56 | 54 |
| 4 | Maize | 95 | 116 | 81 | 81 | 70 | 81 | 81 | 56 | 81 | 81 | 81 | 86 | 81 | 88 | 81 |
| 5 | Arhar（Tur） | 60 | 60 | 70 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 62 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 63 | 60 |
| 6 | Moong | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 41 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 |
| 7 | Urd | 33 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 52 | 51 | 54 | 54 | 46 | 54 | 54 |
| 8 | Groundnut | 79 | 60 | 60 | 60 | 133 | 133 | 133 | 133 | 111 | 133 | 133 | 133 | 113 | 60 | 60 |
| 9 | Soyabean | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 50 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 44 | 47 | 47 | 47 |
| 10 | Cotton | 117 | 67 | 99 | 87 | 67 | 110 | 67 | 94 | 110 | 94 | 95 | 67 | 207 | 67 | 67 |
| 11 | Wheat | 70 | 70 | 74 | 44 | 38 | 70 | 70 | 48 | 70 | 70 | 43 | 73 | 70 | 65 | 89 |
| 12 | Barley | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 65 | 73 | 65 | 58 | 65 |

ANNEXURE－2（Contd．）

| $\dot{Z}_{i}^{\circ}$ | O |  | 急 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت! } \\ & \text { B } \\ & \text { B } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 倠 } \\ & \text { Ky } \\ & \text { y } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\sum_{\Sigma}^{0}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { W } \\ & \text { E } \end{aligned}$ | 夢 |  | $\underset{F}{\underset{F}{z}}$ |  | W 卨 0 3 3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| 13 | Gram | 37 | 37 | 37 | 29 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 36 | 37 | 37 | 37 | 28 | 37 | 54 | 37 |
| 14 | R．Mustard | 43 | 43 | 65 | 30 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 33 | 43 | 43 | 34 | 44 | 43 | 49 | 43 |
| 15 | Jute | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 197 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 192 | 187 |
| 16 | Sugarcane | 297 | 229 | 229 | 138 | 229 | 197 | 229 | 229 | 249 | 229 | 229 | 229 | 333 | 162 | 229 |
| 17 | Nigerseed | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 | 40 |
| 18 | Sunflower | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 |
| 19 | Safflower | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| 20 | Potato | 231 | 231 | 231 | 231 | 231 | 231 | 231 | 231 | 231 | 231 | 231 | 231 | 231 | 231 | 231 |
| 21 | Onion | 184 | 184 | 184 | 184 | 184 | 184 | 184 | 184 | 184 | 184 | 184 | 184 | 184 | 184 | 184 |
| 22 | Tobacco | 227 | 227 | 227 | 227 | 227 | 227 | 227 | 227 | 227 | 227 | 227 | 227 | 227 | 227 | 227 |
| 23 | Sesamum | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 50 | 37 | 59 | 54 | 50 |
| 24 | Other crops | 98 | 92 | 94 | 84 | 92 | 98 | 93 | 91 | 96 | 96 | 92 | 92 | 104 | 89 | 93 |

ANNEXURE-3
Intensity of labour absorption

| S.No. | States | Net area sown* <br> (1995-96) <br> (lakh hect.) | Total SPY from <br> crop husbandry <br> (lakh SPYs) | Average SPY/hect. <br> of Net area sown <br> (4)/(3) |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2 | 106.37 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 73.21 | 56.00 | 0.53 |
| 2 | Bihar | 96.09 | 29.12 | 0.40 |
| 3 | Gujarat | 35.86 | 28.27 | 0.29 |
| 4 | Haryana | 5.68 | 21.37 | 0.60 |
| 5 | Himachal | 104.20 | 1.87 | 0.33 |
|  | Pradesh | 22.65 |  |  |
| 6 | Karnataka | 197.52 | 22.21 | 0.21 |
| 7 | Kerala | 179.11 | 17.00 | 0.75 |
| 8 | Madhya Pradesh | 62.10 | 59.85 | 0.30 |
| 9 | Maharashtra | 41.39 | 58.57 | 0.33 |
| 10 | Orissa | 165.75 | 32.09 | 0.52 |
| 11 | Punjab | 53.42 | 19.12 | 0.46 |
| 12 | Rajasthan | 173.99 | 33.83 | 0.20 |
| 13 | Tamil Nadu | 54.62 | 29.12 | 0.55 |
| 14 | Uttar Pradesh | 1422.15 | 89.94 | 0.52 |
| 15 | West Bengal |  | 583.48 | 0.94 |
|  | India |  |  | 0.41 |

* Fertilizers Statistics, 1998-99.

ANNEXURE-4
Norms of employment in animal husbandry

| S.No. | Category of livestock | Total Nos. <br> (lakh) | No. of mandays* per <br> livestock in a year | Total no. of <br> mandays |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | Cattle |  |  |  |
|  | Adults | 1332 | 36.50 | 48618 |
|  | Young | 627 | 9.13 | 5725 |
| 2 | Buffaloes |  |  |  |
|  | Adults | 491 | 36.50 | 17921 |
|  | Young | 308 | 9.13 | 2812 |
| 3 | Goats | 1094 | 4.87 | 5328 |
| 4 | Sheep | 489 | 7.30 | 3570 |
| 5 | Equines and camels | 7 | 36.50 | 256 |
| 6 | Poultry birds | 2827 | 3.65 | 10319 |

[^2]ANNEXURE－5

| State－wise livestock and poultry |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \dot{8} \\ & \dot{\sim} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{8}{<}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 爱 } \\ & \text { B } \end{aligned}$ |  | 安 |  |  | $\sum_{\Sigma}^{\perp}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 药 } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | 受 |  | $\underset{F}{z}$ |  |  | 蒠 |
| 1 | Cattle | （i）Adult | 82 | 140 | 48 | 12 | 16 | 89 | 18 | 187 | 124 | 89 | 18 | 74 | 55 | 173 | 106 | 1332 |
|  |  | （ii）Young | 26 | 72 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 37 | 15 | 90 | 45 | 43 | 9 | 39 | 25 | 76 | 63 | 627 |
| 2 | Buffaloes | （i）Adult | 53 | 34 | 30 | 24 | 5 | 25 | 2 | 47 | 32 | 10 | 36 | 40 | 15 | 116 | 8 | 491 |
|  |  | （ii）Young | 35 | 18 | 20 | 18 | 2 | 15 | 0.9 | 29 | 18 | 4 | 21 | 34 | 8 | 76 | 1 | 308 |
| 3 | Goats |  | 42 | 166 | 39 | 8 | 11 | 60 | 17 | 79 | 94 | 48 | 5 | 143 | 56 | 125 | 138 | 1094 |
| 4 | Sheep |  | 77 | 17 | 19 | 10 | 11 | 53 | 0.3 | 8 | 30 | 18 | 5 | 119 | 53 | 24 | 15 | 489 |
| 5 | Horses \＆ | Ponies | 0.07 | 1 | 0.11 | 0.46 | 0.13 | 0.09 |  | 0.61 | 0.34 |  | 0.37 | 0.22 | 0.05 | 2 | 0.12 | 7 |
| 6 | Poultry \＆ | other birds | 471 | 160 | 52 | 83 | 7 | 148 | 203 | 111 | 286 | 125 | 178 | 27 | 205 | 98 | 356 | 2827 |

Source：Livestock Census，1992，Govt．of India，Ministry of Industry．


Source: Agricultural Statistics at a glance 2000

* Figures relate to year 1995-96

ANNEXURE-8
Statewise JRY \& EAS achievement: 1997-98

| S.No. | States | Employment (lakh mandays) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | JRY | EAS | TOTAL |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 Andhra Pradesh |  | 219.31 | 505.06 | 724.37 |
| 2 Bihar |  | 533.04 | 420.45 | 953.49 |
| 3 Gujarat |  | 82.81 | 92.71 | 175.52 |
| 4 Haryana |  | 11.12 | 18.45 | 29.57 |
| 5 Himachal Pradesh |  | 9.13 | 35.65 | 44.78 |
| 6 Karnataka |  | 265.91 | 349.41 | 615.32 |
| 7 Kerala |  | 41.82 | 47.26 | 89.08 |
| 8 Madhya Pradesh |  | 281.69 | 328.71 | 610.40 |
| 9 Maharashtra |  | 527.74 | 363.24 | 890.98 |
| 10 Orissa |  | 201.82 | 382.14 | 583.96 |
| 11 Punjab |  | 12.83 | 4.55 | 17.38 |
| 12 Rajasthan |  | 196.14 | 250.06 | 446.20 |
| 13 Tamil Nadu |  | 388.81 | 558.28 | 947.09 |
| 14 Uttar Pradesh |  | 599.49 | 522.76 | 1122.25 |
| 15 West Bengal |  | 154.62 | 138.60 | 293.22 |
| 16 Other States |  | 122.02 | 437.43 | 559.45 |
| India |  | 3648.30 | 4454.76 | 8103.06 |

Source: Annual Report 1997-98, Govt. of India, Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment

| ANNEXURE-9 <br> Extent of mechanisation in agriculture <br> (expressed as expense Rs./hect. on machine labour) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S.No. | States | Paddy |  | Wheat |  |
|  |  | 1990-91 | 1996-97 | 1990-91 | 1996-97 |
| 1. | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| 1 | Andhra Pradesh | 580 | 1065 | N.A. | N.A. |
| 2 | Assam | 27* | 66 | N.A. | N.A. |
| 3 | Bihar | 104 | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. |
|  | Haryana | 582 | 1427 | 1027 | 1682 |
| 5 | Karnataka | 222* | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. |
| 6 | Madhya Pradesh | 64 | 223 | 331 | 947 |
| 7 | Orissa | 23 | 62 | N.A. | N.A. |
| 8 | Punjab | 991 | 1789 | 974 | 1586 |
| 9 | Rajasthan | N.A. | N.A. | 684** | 1470 |
| 10 | Tamil Nadu | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. | N.A. |
|  | Uttar Pradesh | 343 | 507 | 713 | 1390 |
| 12 | West Bengal | 131* | 259 | N.A. | N.A. |

*1991-92 **1992-93
Source : Cost of cultivation, Government of India, 2000

ANNEXURE-10
No. of livestock and poultry

| (in lakh) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Cattle | Buffaloes | Sheep | Goat | Horses \& Ponies | Other Livestock | Total | Poultry |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| 1961 | 1756 | 512 | 402 | 609 | 13 | 72 | 3364 | 1143 |
| 1966 | 1762 | 530 | 420 | 646 | 11 | 72 | 3441 | 1154 |
| 1972 | 1784 | 574 | 400 | 675 | 9 | 91 | 3533 | 1385 |
| 1977 | 1801 | 620 | 409 | 756 | 9 | 99 | 3694 | 1609 |
| 1982 | 1925 | 698 | 488 | 952 | 9 | 124 | 4196 | 2077 |
| 1987 | 1997 | 760 | 457 | 1102 | 8 | 129 | 4453 | 2753 |
| 1992 | 2046 | 842 | 508 | 1153 | 8 | 152 | 4709 | 3071 |
| 2000(P) | 2100 | 920 | 550 | 1200 | 8 | 170 | 5000 | 3400 |
| 2005(P) | 2150 | 1000 | 600 | 1250 | 8 | 200 | 5500 | 3800 |

## $P$ stands for projected

Statistical : Agricultural Statistics at a Glance 2000

ANNEXURE-11
Problems of soil erosion and land degradation

| S.No. | Items | Area (Million <br> hectares <br> $(1984-85)$ | \% to total <br> geographical <br> area |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

1 Total geographical area 328.73

2 Area subject to water and wind erosion $141.25 \quad 42.97$
3 Water logged area $\quad 8.51 \quad 2.59$
4 Alkali soils $\quad 3.58 \quad 1.09$
5 Others (including ravines, and gullies) $\quad 21.61 \quad 6.57$
6 Total problem areas $174.95 \quad 53.22$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Total flood prone area } & 40.00 & 12.17\end{array}$
7 (i) Annual average area affected by floods $\quad 8.00 \quad 2.43$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { (ii) Annual average cropped area affected } & 3.70 & 1.13\end{array}$ by floods

8 Total drought prone area 260.00
79.09

Source: Indian Agriculture in Brief, Directorate of Economics and Statistics, New Delhi, 25th Edition, 1994.


[^0]:    1 Technical Address delivered at the 54th Annual Conference held at Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Narendra Nagar, Kumarganj, Faizabad, U.P. on 28th November, 2000.

[^1]:    Source: Agricultural Statistics at a Glance, various issues. Column 8 is estimated

[^2]:    * Based on the norms fixed in the report of National Commission on agriculture.

