

1

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1996-97)**

ELEVENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR THE YEAR 1996-97 OF
THE MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT**

(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)

FIRST REPORT



8.3657R LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

5.1;1

August, 1996/Bhadra, 1918 (Saka)

FIRST REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1996-97)

(ELEVENTH LOK SABHA)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (1996-97)

MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT

(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 27th August, 1996
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 27th August, 1996



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

August, 1996/Bhadra, 1918 (Saka)

Price : Rs. 35.00

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY
Central Collection
Acc. No. LC 94988(2)
Date.....

LC
328.3657R
NG.1j1

© 1996 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Seventh Edition) and Printed by Jainco Art India, 13/10, W.E.A., Saraswati Marg, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005.

(1996-97)

Corrigenda to First Report

Page No.	Para No.	Line No.	In Place of	Read
1	1.2	12	Add Rural after Department of	
5	3.6	7th from the bottom	Add of Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment after outlay	
7	4.1	4	thee	the
14	5.8	9	wholistic	holistic
14	5.8	12	In charge	Incharge
18	6.6	4 from bottom	delete etc. after training etc.	
23	7.12	10 from bottom	thee	the
27	9.2	14 from bottom	Add and after basis	
34	13.2	9 from bottom	rural	Rural
36	13.4(d)	5 from	Add be after should	

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
CHAPTER I Introductory :.....	1
CHAPTER II Reorganisation of the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment.....	3
CHAPTER III Analysis of Demands for Grants and Plan Budget of the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment.....	4
CHAPTER IV Rural Water Supply Programme	7
CHAPTER V Central Rural Sanitation Programme	12
CHAPTER VI Land Records A. Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Strengthening of Administration and Updating of Land Records	15
B. Computerisation of Land Records	19
CHAPTER VII National Social Security Programme	21
CHAPTER VIII Training and Research	25
CHAPTER IX Roads in Special Problem Areas	27
CHAPTER X Panchayat Development and Training	28
CHAPTER XI Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology	31
CHAPTER XII National Institute of Agricultural Marketing	33
CHAPTER XIII Review of 8th Five Year Plan and Strategy for Ninth Five Year Plan	34

APPENDICES

I.	Minutes of the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 9th sittings of the Committee held on 2.8.96, 5.8.96, 16.8.96 (Morning), 16.8.96 (Afternoon), 19.8.96 (Morning), and 23.8.96.....	49
II	Statement of Recommendations/Observations.....	61

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1996-97)

Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Nand Kumar Sai
3. Shri Shivraj Singh Chauhan
4. Shri Lalmuni Chaubey
5. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
6. Shri Chitrasen Sinku
7. Smt. Ketki Singh
8. Shri Shankar Prasad Jaiswal
9. Shri Chintaman Vanaga
10. Shri Ashok Singh
11. Shri Kishanlal Diler
12. Shri J.P. Aggarwal
13. Shri Sarat Pattanayak
14. Shri Joyanta Bhattacharya
15. Shri B.N. Reddy
16. Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria
17. Shri Maruti Patil D. Shelke
18. Shri C. Narayanaswamy
19. Shri Basavaraj Raya Reddy
20. Shri Subrata Mukherjee
21. Shri T. Govindhan
22. Shri L. Balaraman
23. Shri Ramkant Yadav
24. Shri D. Venugopal

25. Shri Chhayyanna Patrudu
26. Shri Anant G. Geete
27. Shri B. Dharma Biksham
28. Shri Ram Sajivan
29. Shri Surjit Singh Barnala
30. Shri Jai Parkash

Rajya Sabha

31. Shri Thennala Balakrishna Pallai
32. Shri Ajit P.K. Jogi
33. Shri V. Rajeshwar Rao
34. Shri Radhakrishan Malviya
35. Shri Sitaram Kesri
36. Shri O.P. Kohli
37. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
38. Shri Jagdambi Mandal
39. Shri Bhagaban Majhi
40. Shri Nilotpal Basu
41. Shri V. Rajan Chellappa
42. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
43. Shri Joy Nadukkara

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Dr. A. K. Pandey | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Smt. Roli Srivastava | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 3. Shri G.R. Juneja | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 4. Smt. Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Assistant Director</i> |

INTRODUCTION

1. the Chairman of Standing Committee on Urban and Rural Development (1996-97) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this First Report on Demands for Grants (1996-97) of Department of Rural Development of Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment.

2. Demands for Grants have been examined by the Committee under Rule 331E(1)(a) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment on 16th and 19th August, 1996.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 23rd August, 1996.

5. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officers of the Department of Rural Development who appeared before the Committee and placed their considered views. They also wish to thank the Ministry/Department for furnishing the written replies on the points raised by the Committee.

NEW DELHI;
August 25, 1996
Bhadra 3, 1918 (Saka)

SONTOSH MOHAN DEV,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Urban and
Rural Development.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

Rural India which encompasses three-fourth of the population of the country is represented by vulnerable sections of the Society. The development of rural areas and population has been the Central concern of development planning in India in the 8th Plan. The onerous task of alleviation of poverty and ushering in economic progress and social transformation has been entrusted mainly with the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment.

1.2 In March 1995, the Ministry of Rural Development was renamed as Rural Areas and Employment and its activities were bifurcated into the following three Departments:

1. Department of Rural Development
2. Department of Employment & Poverty Alleviation
3. Department of Wastelands Development

The principle behind the creation of the new Department is in order to achieve targets of higher economic growth with special emphasis on poverty alleviation and to ensure that benefits reach the targeted groups in full measure.

1.3 The Department of Rural Development implements the following major programmes/schemes to achieve the objectives.

1. Rural Water Supply Programme
2. Rural Sanitation Programme
3. Land Reforms:
 - (a) Distribution of Ceiling Surplus Land
 - (b) Strengthening of Revenue Administration and Updating of Land Records
 - (c) Computerisation of Land Records

4. National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP)
5. Roads in Special Problem Areas
6. National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)
7. Establishment/Strengthening of State Institutes for Training in Rural Development (SIRDs)
8. Establishment Strengthening of Extension Training Centres (ETCs)
9. Organisation of Training Courses, Seminars and Workshops
10. Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART)

1.4 In line with the objectives of reaching out to the last and most disadvantaged sections of society and towards the fulfilment of the Directive Principles in Article 41 and 42 of the Constitution on 15th August, 1995, *viz.* National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP) was launched. The programme consists of three components National Old Age Pension Scheme (NOAPS), National Family Benefit Scheme (NFBS) and National Maternity Benefit Scheme (NMBS).

1.5 The detailed Demands for Grants of the Ministry were laid in Parliament on 30th July, 1996.

1.6 In the present Report, the Committee have restricted its examination to only major issues related to Rural Water Supply and Sanitation, Land Records, Training, NSAP, CAPART, NIRD, Roads in Special problem Areas in the context of Plan budget and Demands for Grants for the ensuing year *i.e.* 1996-97.

CHAPTER II

REORGANISATION OF THE MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS & EMPLOYMENT

2.1 The Committee note that the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment has been reorganised w.e.f. 8.3.1995 and at present is having following three Departments:—

1. Department of Rural Development
2. Department of Wastelands Development
3. Department of Rural Employment and Poverty Alleviation

2.2 The Ministry in the written note explaining the objectives of reorganisation stated:—

- (i) "In order to achieve targets of higher economic growth, with special emphasis on poverty alleviation, and to ensure that benefits reach the targeted groups in full measure, streamlining of procedures and decision making has become crucial. This requires the enhancing of effective monitoring, coordination and supervision capability of Ministries of the Government of India, responsible for crucial economic programmes. Accordingly, it becomes necessary to rationalise Ministries/ Departments in a manner that concentrated attention can be given to various specific programmes. To that end, some new Departments have been created for dealing with the subjects and programmes, focussed on the poor and for evolving specific programmes for ensuring faster growth of the economy".

2.3 It is observed by the Committee that the recent reorganisation of Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment has mainly been effected in order to provide sharper focus on formulation of policies and strategies of sustained attack on rural poverty. The Committee are of the opinion that despite launching of so many Schemes to eradicate rural poverty, the performance seems to be quite far from expectation. They feel that the recent reorganisation would help in the effective implementation of the programmes of the Ministry and ensure upliftment of the rural poor from the poverty line.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS AND PLAN BUDGET FOR THE YEAR 1996-97 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT OF THE MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT

Overall Performance

Eighth Plan outlay

3.1 The Eighth Plan outlay for the various Schemes under the Department of Rural Development has been fixed as Rs. 6116.00 crores out of which, Rs. 4647.09 crores have been funded so far. As per written note furnished by the Department likely expenditure during 8th Plan would be Rs. 6842.09.

Plan Schemes	Rs. in crores
Budget Estimates 1994-95	Rs. 1045.00
Budget Estimates 1995-96	Rs. 1263.00
Revised Expenditure 1995-96	Rs. 1814.00
Budget Estimates 1996-97	Rs. 2195.00

Non-Plan

BE 1994-95	—	Rs. 14.64 crores
BE 1995-96	—	Rs. 18.06 crores
RE 1995-96	—	Rs. 20.00 crores
BE 1996-97	—	Rs. 20.50 crores

3.2 The outlay for 1996-97 has been pegged at the level of 1995-96 except for an increase of Rs. 382 crores i.e. 69.45% in respect of National Social Assistance Programme. The Statement showing BE, RE 1995-96 & 1996-97 under Plan & Non-Plan heads is given at Annexure I.

3.3 The Committee have been informed as per written replies furnished before the Committee that the Department proposed outlay for 1996-97 i.e. Rs. 4098 crores to the Planning Commission. During Plan discussion the allocation indicated was to the tune of Rs. 2645.37 crores. However, the final allocation has been made for Rs. 2195 crores which was a little more than 50% of the proposed outlay of that Department. The Position scheme-wise is given at Annexure II.

3.4 During 1995-96 unspent Amount under the Plan Head was Rs. 255.13 crore that is about 11% of the allocated amount during that year. However, under the Non-plan head there was no unspent expenditure.

3.5 The Committee are very perturbed to note the outlay for 1996-97 which has been pegged at the outlay for 1995-96 except for the one programme National Social Security Programme launched on 15th August, 1995 under which there is substantial increase of 69.45%. They note that the outlay for 1996-97 doesn't cover even the percentage hike due to inflationary trends.

3.6 It is noted that one third of India's population live below the defined poverty line. Rural Development which encompasses the entire gamut of improvement in the overall quality of life in the rural areas can only be achieved with the eradication of poverty. They further note that an ambitious programme 'National Social Security Programme' has recently been launched by the Government. Considering the large activities of the Department and also the fact that providing minimum required necessity of life has been of primary concern in the economic planning and development process in the country, the Committee feel that the plan outlay for 1995-96 is not sufficient to meet the targets fixed for different Schemes by the Department. Further they observe that the Standing Committee in their 16th Report had recommended to increase the outlay for 1995-96 from Rs. 7700 crore to Rs. 10,500 crores. However, no increase was made during 1995-96. Further BE 1996-97 has also been pegged at the outlay of 1995-96.

3.7 The Committee are equally dismayed to note that the allocation of Rs. 2195 crores under 'plan head' could not be utilized fully by the Department. The unspent amount is Rs. 255 crores which is equivalent to 11% of the total plan allocation. Expressing their

concern about it Hon'ble Chairman during the course of oral evidence stated:—

"The Ministry of Rural Development as well as the State Governments are responsible for not getting higher allocation. The claim of a Department to have an increase depends on its performance. In many areas, the money have been unspent. Not only that. I am surprised and rather shocked to see that in your note you have not given a satisfactory reply to this point. You have to elaborate. After giving Rs. 100 crore to a State on a specific Head of Account, you cannot wash your hands saying that we have given the money. State is supposed to give you utilisation certificate."

3.8 The Committee would like to have an explanation of the Department in this regard. They urge that the Department should ensure 100% utilisation of funds to get the sufficient outlay for their different activities commensurating with the targets. The Committee feel that due to ineffective implementation, the poorest of the poor should not suffer for no fault of theirs. To achieve the laudable objectives set-forth by the Department there is an urgent need to take corrective steps for the effective implementation of the Programmes/Schemes.

3.9 The Committee note that during 1996-97 under Non-Plan head not only there was hike of around 33% over BE of 1995-96, but there was 100% utilisation of funds which is indicative of the effective infrastructure provided for the implementation of the Programme/Schemes of the Department. In spite of getting the adequate infrastructure there is lack of proper-planning and co-ordination. The Committee hope that the sufficient infrastructure would help in the 100% utilisation of funds under the 'Plan-heads' and effective implementation of the Schemes.

CHAPTER IV

RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROGRAMME

DEMAND NO. :—71

MAJOR HEAD :— 2215, 3601, 3602

4.1 Provision of safe drinking water in rural areas continues to be a high priority programme as water is one of the fundamental needs of the human beings as well as the cattle. The Eighth Plan emphasizes the importance of provision of drinking water in all no sources or partially covered villages during the Eighth Plan.

VIIIth Plan outlay	Rs. 5100.00 crores
Likely Releases during the plan period	Rs. 4158.49 crores
BE 1994-95	Rs. 890 crores
Budget Estimates (1995-96)	Rs. 1110 crores

4.2 As regards underspending in the 8th Plan outlay to the tune of Rs. 154.28 crore, the Committee have been informed in the written replies as that:—

- “(a) The budget provision of Rs. 40 crore made in 1995-96 for introduction of ARWSP in DPAP areas could not be utilized as the scheme could not be got approved by the Government.
- (b) Adequate projects under the Sub-Missions, Information Education and Communication (IEC) and Human Resource Development (HR) were not received from the States and there was also slow progress in some of the States due to which further funds were not released.”

4.3 Whereas actual expenditure during 1995-96 has been stated as 93.86%. The position regarding unspent balances in States/UTs is as below:—

Unspent balances as on 1994-95	Rs. 159.997 crore
--------------------------------	-------------------

Unspent balances as on 1995-96	Rs. 154.295 crores
--------------------------------	--------------------

4.4 Unspent balances on all India basis have marginally decreased. However, in Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, UP the outstanding balances have almost doubled.

4.5 As per information furnished to the Committee total Rural Population as per 1991 census is 6286.914 lakh and total coverage of population as on 1.4.1996 as per survey is 5132.94 lakh i.e. 81.64%.

Total Habitations	1318699
-------------------	---------

Status as on 1.4.1996

Not covered	75782
-------------	-------

Partially covered	332454
-------------------	--------

Fully covered	910463
---------------	--------

4.6 The Committee have been informed as per written replies that on all India basis total coverage of population is 81.64%. However, in 6 States/UTs viz. Assam, Manipur, Mizoram, Kerala, Nagaland, Punjab, Tamil Nadu the coverage is less than 70%.

4.7 In the written notes the Department has stated that the Conference of Chief Ministers on Basic Minimum Services held on 4th-5th July, 1996 recommended that the totally uncovered or very poorly covered (upto 10 lpcd) habitations should be taken up on priority and the State and the Centre should provide adequate funds to cover all by 1997-98. It was also urged at the Conference that the entire population may be provided with safe drinking water by 2000 AD. The recommendations of the conference of Chief Ministers were discussed with the States/UTs in the second meeting of the Empowered Committee of Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission held on 11th July, 1996. All the States have been requested to prepare an action plan for coverage of NC/PC (upto 10 lpcd) habitations by 1997-98 and the remaining PC habitations by the year 2000 A.D. In the first phase immediate action is being taken to finalize the action plan for NC/PC habitations to be covered upto 1997-98.

4.8 Total project cost for covering NC&PC population is as below:—

Central share 50% Rs. 5429.48 crores

State share 50% Rs. 5429.48 crores

4.9 Coverage of spilled over problem villages in the last three years

Total Coverage	No. of Villages
1993-94	472
1994-95	132
1995-96	26
Balance as on 1.4.1996	120

4.10 Explaining the position regarding quality of water, Secretary, Rural Development during the course of oral evidence stated:

“There were five main points of quality problems which we come across in drinking water. One was the presence of guinea worm in water; second is the presence of fluoride; third is the presence of brackishness; fourth is the presence of iron; and the fifth is the presence of arsenic. So, the Committee gave instructions and also told them, how to do it. They also collected information about the habitations and about water quality. There were as on 31st March 1994, about 1,40,000 habitations which did not have public source of drinking water. There were 4,31,000 habitations which were partially covered”.

4.11 When asked about R&D under the programme, the Department in the written note stated that a sum of Rs. 112.40 lakh was utilized during 1994-95, Rs. 289.56 lakh in 1995-96 and a provision of Rs. 300 lakh has been made for the year 1996-97.

4.12 The Department in the written note have submitted that so far the monitoring by the Elected representatives in rural areas as per 73rd Amendment is concerned the same has not been introduced.

4.13 As regards association of MPs/MLAs/MLCs in the process of monitoring & review of the Programme, the Department has stated that the State Governments are free to involve MPs/MLAs/MLCs at the appropriate form for monitoring and review of the programme.

4.14 Explaining the lack of maintenance of tubewells and pumps the Chairman stated:—

“Then, the tubewell facility has been given. But the maintenance of tubewells is very poor. You create an asset and some facilities. What is the infrastructure that is there to take care of those things? When you meet me, I told you about my experience that the Block is give crores of rupees. It has got one Engineer to look after those things. But actually it is not possible for him to do justice.”

4.15 The Committee are dismayed to note the underspending of 6.24% under Rural Water Supply Programme. Of equal concern is the position in States viz. Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, UP where outstanding balances have almost doubled from 1994-95 to 1995-96. They would like an explanation of the Department in this regard.

4.16 The Committee appreciate the laudable objectives as expressed at the Conference of Chief Ministers on 4th & 5th July, 1996 to cover entire population by 2000 A.D. and to cover totally uncovered or very poorly covered (upto 10 lpcd) habitations by 1997-98.

4.17 They would like to recommend that funds for the programme should be substantially stepped up so as to achieve the target set at the Chief Minister's Conference. They urge that the Department should ensure 100% utilization of funds allocated for the programme.

4.18 The Committee note with concern the achievement with regard to the coverage of problem villages which declined from 472 in 1993-94 to 132 and further 132 in 1994-95 to 26 in 1995-96. They would like an explanation of the Government in this regard. They would also like to recommend that priority should be given to the problem villages.

4.19 The Committee are dismayed to note the meagre allocation of Rs. 300 lakh during 1996-97 on R&D under the programme. They would like to recommend that the allocation for R&D should be substantially stepped up under this programme so that the benefit of new technology should be taken to address the specific requirement of an area. Besides more and more attention should be paid towards R&D in the specific areas to improve the quality of drinking water as contaminated water is one of the major area of concern in the Country.

4.20 The Committee note that sufficient attention has not been paid towards the maintenance of assets i.e. pumps, tubewells under the programme. Necessary infrastructure should be provided to the Block Development Officer/Panchayats to ensure the maintenance of assets created under the programme.

4.21 The Committee would also like to recommend that monitoring of the programme should be strengthened for the effective implementation of the programmes. They urge that there should be some sort of guidelines issued to the States under the specific programme to involve MPs & MLAs in the monitoring process.

4.22 The Committee would like to recommend that Government should take appropriate steps for recharging the ground water in the dark zone areas in the country in respective States where water level is going down.

4.23 It is urged that trainees under Training of Rural Youth for Self Employment (TRYSEM) should be trained in the trades like repairing and maintenance of tubewells, pumps, etc. under the scheme so as to benefit the rural people in maintaining their assets.

CHAPTER V

CENTRAL RURAL SANITATION PROGRAMME (CRSP)

MAJOR HEAD 71

DEMAND NO. 2215, 3601 & 3602

5.1 The Central Rural Sanitation Programme was launched in 1986 and it was decided to provide sanitary latrines in Rural population with preference to SC/ST families and people below the poverty line. Today, it connotes a comprehensive concept which includes liquid and solid waste disposal, hygiene domestic as well as environmental hygiene.

Eighth's Plan Objectives

5.2 To accelerate coverage of rural population sepecially among the households below proverty line with sanitation facilities complementing the efforts in rural water supply and slowly breaking the vicious circle of disease, morbidity and poor health resulting from insanitary conditions and water borne diseases.

To generate felt need through awareness creation and health education involving voluntary organisations and Panchayati Raj Institutions helping thereby to establish sanitary latrines with lesser dependence on Government subsidy.

To eradicate manual scavenging by converting all existing dry latrines in rural areas into low cost sanitary latrines.

To encourage suitable cost effective and appropriate technologies to support the other objectives.

To provide drinking water and toilets in all schools in rural areas.

5.3 The total resources to be mobilised under the programme were to be shared by the State Government and the Centre on 50:50 basis.

5.4 During the 8th Five Year Plan, an outlay of Rs. 380 crores has been provided for CRSP. The financial and physical performance during the first three years of the VIIIth Plan has been as under:

Year	Financial (CRSP)			Physical (CRSP & MNP)		
	BE	Actual Expdr. (Rs. in crores)	% of Expdr.	Target achievement		% of achi- evement
1993-94	30.00	32.67	108.90			
1994-95	60.00	58.65	99.42	671056	592333	88
1995-96	60.00	59.48	93.13	870289	746986	85

5.5 An outlay of Rs. 60.00 crores has been approved for 1996-97. The tentative target is to construct 853364 lakh latrines under CRSP/ MNP during the year 1996-97.

5.6 The Committee was informed as per written replies that only 14.62% of total population has been covered under Rural Sanitation upto 1995-96. The position is worse in some of the States.

The coverage in some of the States is as below:

Bihar	7%
Karnataka	9%
Madhya Pradesh	7%
Maharashtra	8%
Nagaland	7%
Orissa	7%
UP	10%

5.7 As regards the position of unspent balance, as per the written information furnished to the Committee, opening balance on 1.4.93 was 1865.39 lakhs which increased to 4236.09 on 1.4.96.

Financial Achievement in States

	Programme	Expenditure
1993-94	5689.60	5174.75
1994-95	9536.49	6950.26
1995-96	9207.27	8171.18

5.8 The Standing Committee in the 16th Report had recommended to enhance the allocation during 1995-96 to Rs. 300 crores. However there was no increase in the allocation. Further, outlay for 1996-97 has been pegged at the outlay of 1995-96. With regard to the recommendation of the Committee to make a time bound programme to cover each habitation, it has been stated by the Department, the Working Group on 9th Plan is expected to provide the information. The Standing Committee had also recommended that the Rural Sanitation Programme should be launched in a wholistic manner so as to benefit all categories of people/habitations in the rural urban. With regard to said recommendation the Department in the written note have stated that in the meeting of all Secretaries, in charge of rural sanitation programme on 5th August, 1996, it has been decided that whole village coverage approach may be adopted as coverage of people below poverty line in a village without touching the other segments of households may not make any impact on the cleanliness of the entire village. It is expected that State Governments would take appropriate measures in this regard. The people above poverty line are proposed to be motivated through intensive IEC campaign to construct sanitary latrines as self help programme. In view of constraints of resources subsidy is not given to all sections of the society.

5.9 The Committee have been informed as per written note that the programme was reviewed in the meeting of Secretaries, incharge of Rural Sanitation Programme on 5.8.96. The evaluation has not been carried out so far.

5.10 As per the last audit Report of C&AG for the year ending March 1993 No. 2 of 1994 various irregularities in the implementation of the programme have been found viz., diversion of funds, construction not in accordance with specifications, lack of training, non-involvement of NGO shortfall in physical achievement in various States like Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu. In Tripura, most of the latrines constructed under the programme were not fit for human use as no superstructure was constructed.

5.11 It is disturbing to note that the meagre funds allocated for the programme have not been spent fully. The financial achievement during 1994-95 and 1995-96 has been stated by the Department as 99 & 93% leading to the corresponding shortfall in physical achievement of 88.27% and 85% respectively. Of equal concern is the huge unspent balances in States which are increasing steeply. The Committee would like the explanation of the Government with regard to shortfall in

physical and financial achievement. It is recommended that endeavour should be made to ensure 100% implementation of funds.

5.12 The Committee are distressed to note the inadequate allocation of funds during 8th Plan out of Rs. 380 crores Budget outlay Rs. 230 crores has been sanctioned so far. As per the information furnished by the Department there is likely to be a shortfall of coverage of 53 lakh rural population with sanitation facilities. The Committee note that with the outlay provided only 14.62% of total population has been covered under the programme. They observe that it is unfortunate to see the rural masses living in total unhygienic conditions even after more than four and a half decades of planned development in the country. It is disturbing to note that Government have not paid any attention to the recommendations of the Committee to enhance the outlay from Rs. 60 crores to Rs. 300 crores during 1995-96. Even during 1996-97 the outlay is same, i.e. Rs. 60 crores. It is needless to point out here that Rural Sanitation Programme needs priority specifically to break the vicious circle of disease, and poor health resulting from insanitary conditions. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation to enhance funds under the programme suitably so as to cover the entire population within 5-10 years.

5.13 The Committee note with distress the various irregularities in the implementation of the programme as pointed out in the audit para of 1993-94. They would like to be informed about the corrective action taken so far. The Committee would like to recommend that monitoring under the programme should be further strengthened. It should be ensured that there are no diversion of funds. Further the quality of the latrines constructed should be improved. The Committee would like to be informed about the outcome of the review of the programme made in the meeting of Secretaries, Incharge of Rural Sanitation Programme on 5.8.96. The evaluation should be expedited.

The Committee note that in line with the objective of holistic approach to Rural Sanitation Programme, the Members of the previous Standing Committee 1995-96 had recommended certain names for Model Villages. They are not happy with the performance in these model villages. It is recommended that progress in the model villages should be monitored to achieve better results. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation made in the 16th Report that Rural Sanitation Programme should be launched in a holistic manner so as to benefit all categories of people.

5.14 The Committee urge that more attention should be paid towards the awareness campaign through media. More and more NGOs and Panchayats should be involved helping thereby to create sanitary latrines with lesser dependence on Government subsidy.

5.15 The Committee urge that to cover more and more population under the programme thrust should be given on community latrines besides individual latrines.

CHAPTER VI

LAND RECORDS

A. Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Strengthening of Administration and Updating of Land Records (SRA & ULR)

DEMAND NO. 71

MAJOR HEAD 2506

6.1 The Scheme was started in the 7th Plan to provide financial assistance to States for early completion of survey and settlement operations, pre-service and in-service training of revenue, survey and settlement staff, induction of new technology in the work of preparation, maintenance and updating of land records, selective strengthening of revenue machinery at various levels etc.

6.2 The Plan outlay for the Scheme is Rs. 175 crores.

The financial achievement under the Scheme

In Rs. crores		
Year	Outlay	Expenditure
1992-93	19.90	18.95
1993-94	27.47	24.26
1994-95	27.47	17.07
1995-96	18.80	18.80

6.3 When asked about the reasons for shortfall between budget estimates on 8th plan period and actual expenditure during 1992-97 the Department in the written notes have stated that the actual expenditure under SRA&ULR depends on receipt of suitable proposals, ability of the State Governments to provide and release State share timely, submission of utilisation certificate of certain percentage of outstanding balance etc., and since most of the States occasionally defaulted to fulfil the aforesaid criteria for release of funds or asking for additional funds, hence, there was shortfall during 1992.

The Secretary during the course of oral evidence while explaining the unsatisfactory performance of the scheme stated:

'I must confess the performance is not satisfactory at all. The States have not made the necessary contribution towards their matching grants. Except in two or three States there are large unspent balances.'

6.4 It is noted with concern that the outlay allocated has declined from Rs. 27.47 crores in 1993-94 to Rs. 18.80 during 1995-96 and outlay for 1996-97 has been pegged at the outlay of 1995-96. The position is noted to be worse in States where more than 60% unspent balance has been reported. In some of the States 100% amount has been reported as unspent balance. The Committee take serious view of the poor performance of the Scheme. They observe that adequate attention has not been paid towards the Scheme by Centre and States. The Secretary, Rural Development has acknowledged the poor performance of the Scheme in various States. The Committee would like an explanation of the Government in this regard.

6.5 Considering the huge unspent amount the Committee would like to recommend that the Scheme should be reviewed and restructured during the Ninth Plan. They urge that instead of spreading the amount throughout the country, the Department should choose some of the model districts/villages where performance has been very good. The best performance should be circulated to the poor performing villages/Districts to make them conscious about the importance of updation of Land Records.

6.6 The Committee note that the Parliamentary Standing Committee 1995-96 carried out a detailed review and made field visits to various States and found that the upgraded maps had several discrepancies. The earlier Committee in their 26th Report had made an in-depth analysis concerning major issues of the said scheme and made recommendations with regard to outlay, monitoring, standardisation, completing survey, re-survey and settlement in State where it has not been done, monitoring, training etc. etc. The Committee urge that the recommendations of the earlier Committee should be considered and implemented in letter and spirit while formulating the policy and guidelines during Ninth Plan.

B. Computerisation of Land Records

DEMAND NO. 71

MAJOR HEAD 2506, 3601, 3602

6.7 As a programme, during 1988-89, pilot project for Computerisation of Land Records were taken up as a sub-scheme of Agrarian Studies. Upto the year 1992-93, 21 projects on Computerisation of Land Records were taken up. Since 1993-94, the programme was separated from the Scheme of Institution for Agrarian Studies and came under the category of a Central Sector Scheme.

6.8 Under the Scheme one-third of the estimated project cost is being released as first instalment and the release as well as quantum of funds for second and subsequent instalments depend on the utilisation position of the earlier releases.

Eighth Plan Outlay	—	65 crores
BE 1992-93	—	5 crores
Actual Expenditure	—	0.09 crores (1.80%)
BE 1993-94	—	8 crores
Actual Expenditure	—	9.02 crores (112.75%)
BE 1994-95	—	12 crores
Actual Expenditure	—	10.70 crores (89.17%)
BE 1995-96	—	20.67 crores
Actual Expenditure	—	20.25 crores
BE 1996-97	—	20.67 crores

6.9 When asked about the performance of the Scheme the Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated :—

“As far as computerisation is concerned, we have, so far, sanctioned schemes in 223 districts. The most difficult component of this is the entering of data. In this the entire expenditure is met by the Government of India and as far as hardware is concerned, we give 80 per cent and the State has to contribute 20 per cent. This

is a very attractive Scheme and the States are also coming forward. But again the progress so far of completing the entry of records on computers is really not very satisfactory."

6.10 The Committee strongly recommend that adequate attention should be paid to the programme of Computerisation of Land Records. The monitoring of the programme should be strengthened specifically when it is a 100% Centrally sponsored programme. It should be ensured that the amount sanctioned for a specific project is spent fully.

6.11 The Committee also urge that the Computerisation Programme should be continued in Ninth Plan. They also urge that while formulating the strategy of 9th Plan, the recommendations made by the Committee at their 26th Report with regard to enhancing of outlay, implementation, training etc. should be considered and implemented.

CHAPTER VII

NATIONAL SOCIAL SECURITY PROGRAMME

DEMAND NO. 71

MAJOR HEAD 2235

7.1 The National Social Assistance Programme was conceived to provide a national minimum level of social assistance to the destitutes and those below the poverty line throughout the country. The programme is meant to supplement the expenditure incurred by the States/UTs on social protection schemes. The introduction of the programme at National level is a significant step towards fulfilling the directive principles enshrined in Articles 41 and 42 of the constitution recognising the concurrent responsibility of the Central and State Governments in the matter. The Programme at present provides (i) old age pension to destitute persons of 65 years and above under National Old Age Pension Scheme (NOAPS), (ii) Family benefit to households below poverty line on the death of the principal breadwinner of the family under National Family Benefit Scheme (NFBS) and (III) maternity benefit to women of 19 years and above who belong to households below poverty line upto the first two live births under National Maternity Benefit Scheme (NMBS).

7.2 As per NSAP guidelines, the programme is to be implemented through Gram Panchayats/Municipalities. The State Government had already been implementing their own old age pension scheme prior to the introduction of NSAP and the process of identification of beneficiaries was generally at village/block level. Applications are received and the verification and identification of beneficiaries done by Panchayat/block authorities.

7.3 At the District level, the District Level Committee on NSAP and at the State level, the State Level Committee on NSAP are required to monitor the implementation of the programme. At the Centre, the Ministry has prescribed periodical progress reports to be sent by the States/UTs, on the progress of implementation of the programme. The progress of the programme may be seen at Annexure.

Outlay for 1995-96	550 crores
Actual Expenditure	143.04 crores
Outlay for 1996-97	932 crores

Number of beneficiaries in States

NOAPS	(Rs. in lakhs)
Expenditure	9692.39 lakhs
Beneficiaries	20032112
NFBS	
Expenditure	2640.23
Beneficiaries	48537
NMBS	
Expenditure	1971.083
Beneficiaries	650580

7.4 The Committee was informed in the written note that 10 States/UTs have not reported for the number of beneficiaries.

7.5 Under Old Age Pension Scheme the beneficiaries are more than the other two Schemes, Family Benefit Scheme and Maternity Benefit Scheme. The number of beneficiaries as given by the Department in the written note is very small except few States like Andhra Pradesh. The Statement has been given at Annexure-III.

7.6 Scheme-wise ceiling of number of beneficiaries under NSAP is at Annexure-IV.

7.7 When asked about the basis of ceiling, Secretary during the course of oral evidence stated :—

“Numerical ceiling has been worked out with reference to the basic parameters of each State. This is based on the report of the Standing Committee of Experts on Population Projection.”

7.8 When asked about the criteria for certifying a person entitled for Old Age Pension Scheme like certifying that he is destitute or age, the Secretary stated :—

“We have left it to the State Governments to make their own definition. We have prescribed in each State the qualifying ceiling

numbers as well as amount depending upon the state of poverty of that State."

7.9 The Committee appreciate the launching of National Social Security Scheme on 15th August, 1995 and observe that it is a significant step towards the fulfilment of the Directive Principles in Articles 41 and 42 of the Constitution of India.

7.10 The Committee are however concerned about the implementation of the Scheme. Not only there was shortfall in expenditure during 1995-96 but the number of beneficiaries as reported by the Department in each of the Scheme was quite low. They are dismayed to note that 10 States/UTs have not reported so far about the utilisation and number of beneficiaries. It is observed that although Old Age Pension Scheme had picked up the performance was poor in other two Schemes, Maternity Benefit Scheme and Family Benefit Scheme. The Committee feel that there is a need for more information dissemination and more awareness generation. They strongly recommend that the Scheme should be advertised on TV, Radio and Regional Newspaper and displaying at important places in the village like Panchayat office.

7.11 The Committee express their apprehension regarding the victimisation of beneficiaries on account of certifying age, destitute or below poverty line. They have been informed that the matter has been left to the State Government. The Committee urge that some standardised guidelines should be issued by Centre with regard to the criteria of age, a person being destitute or below poverty line so as to avoid harassment of beneficiaries.

7.12 The Committee observe that for the lack of initiative/Coordination between Department in the Centre and State Governments, the poorest of the poor suffer. They would like to recommend that Centre should issue the necessary guidelines to States for the effective implementation and should also ensure that funds allocated for the specific scheme are spent fully.

7.13 As regards Maternity Benefit Scheme and Family Benefit Scheme the Committee observe that benefit given for maternity and on the death is fruitful if given at the appropriate time. They would like to recommend that such benefit should be accorded timely and to ensure that certain additional funds should be available with the State Government so as to release the money as and when the demand comes from the beneficiary.

7.14 The Committee note the prescribed ceiling with regard to number of beneficiaries in each of the State as given at Annexure-IV. They would like to recommend that the number of ceiling in each of the States should be fixed considering the specific requirement of that State that would be depending on the pattern of the population. It is urged that guidelines issued by the Centre should be reviewed accordingly.

CHAPTER VIII

TRAINING & RESEARCH

8.1 The implementation of various poverty alleviation programmes is a very challenging task which calls for an efficient and motivated stream of Government as well as Non-Government functionaries. Further for establishing Panchayati Raj as per Constitution 73rd Amendment it is imperative to empower the elected representatives at all levels with the necessary knowledge and skills so as to enable them to perform their Constitutional obligations.

8.2 To handle the stupendous challenging task there is National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD) at the apex (Centre Level), 25 State Institutes of Rural Development (SIRD) at the State level, and 85 Extension Training Centres (ETCs) at the sub-regional level.

Outlay for 1996-97

NIRD	5 crores
SIRD	4.50 crores
ETC	4 crores
OTC	1 crore
Total	14.50 crores

8.3 The Committee observe that to meet the challenging task of poverty alleviation more and more programmes are being launched by the Centre. Besides as per 73rd Amendment Panchayati Raj is being established. They also note that besides to take the benefit of latest global technology, there is need to modernise the training Institutes like satellite and other modes of communication. The training of Panchayat Raj Functionaries should be a continuous programme. The Committee would also like that the resources at National level, State Level or the District level should be pooled together to impart knowledge and skill.

8.4 The Committee note that in view of the big challenges of poverty eradication programme, the outlay of Rs. 14.50 crores for

various component of training would not be sufficient. It should be enhanced substantially.

8.5 The Committee would also like to recommend that the training by these institutions should be imparted keeping in view the practical difficulties in the implementation of various rural programmes such as JRY, IAY, IRDP, etc.

8.6 The Committee note that there is no section of Rural Technology in the National Institute of Rural Development. They would like to recommend that Government should take the necessary steps for setting up such Sections for the effective implementation of various Programmes/Schemes launched for the upliftment of rural masses.

8.7 The Committee would also like to recommend that a specific part of the funds provided for administrative expenses of each Schemes should be provided for imparting training to village functionaries and elected representatives in Panchayats.

CHAPTER IX

ROADS IN SPECIAL PROBLEM AREAS

DEMAND NO.	71
MAJOR HEAD	3601

9.1 The Scheme for construction of roads in dacoity prone areas of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan was started in 1985-86. The main thrust of the Scheme is to provide better communication and help economic development of the dacoity infested areas. The Scheme is funded by the Government of India and the concerned State Government in the ratio of 50:50.

Outlay	1992-93	2 crores
	1993-94	2 crores
	1994-95	2 crores
	1995-96	2 crores

9.2 As per written note furnished by the Department, during 1995-96 outlay, Government of Rajasthan demanded for the release of funds to the tune of Rs. 52 lakhs. Other States have not demanded for funds. Since 1992-93 funds were released to Rajasthan only on this basis no funds could be released to the other two States during 1995-96.

9.3 The Department have further stated that in view of the slow progress of the programme and the fact that the problem of dacoity has more or less been eliminated, Government will review the matter with a view to decide whether to continue this Scheme in the Ninth Plan or not.

9.4 The Committee note with constraint the unsatisfactory performance of the Scheme in three States *viz.*, UP, MP and Rajasthan. They feel that construction of roads to connect all unconnected villages of such nature in the country should be given priority. Observing the poor performance they would like to recommend that the Scheme should be reviewed and restructured without any further delay.

CHAPTER X

PANCHAYAT DEVELOPMENT & TRAINING

DEMAND NO. 71

MAJOR HEAD 2575

10.1 During 8th Plan an amount of Rs. 13.00 crores was allocated under the Head 'Panchayat Development & Training'. The details regarding outlay for 1992-97 and actual expenditure is as below:

(Rs. in crores)		
1992-93	BE	1.00
	Actual	0.40
1993-94	BE	1.00
	Actual	1.40
1994-95	BE	5.00
	Actual	1.00
1995-96	BE	3.00
	Actual	3.00
1996-97	BE	3.00

10.2 As per written note furnished by the Department, Panchayats have been constituted in all the States except Bihar and Tamil Nadu. In Orissa, Panchayats were dissolved in August, 1995 and fresh elections are to be held to constitute Panchayats. Panchayats have also to be constituted in the hilly Districts of Uttar Pradesh and at the Zila Parishad level in Manipur and Goa. Among the UTs elections are due to Lakshadweep and Pondicherry.

10.3 The Department in the written note have also stated that almost all the States have constituted Finance Commissions to review the financial position of the local bodies and to recommend the

principles of sharing of revenues as between the State and the local bodies as also between the PRIs at the three levels as also the grants-in-aid to them from the consolidated funds of the State.

The State Finance Commissions (SFCs) of Punjab, Rajasthan, Kerala, Assam and West Bengal have submitted their recommendations to the respective State Governments. The SFC of Madhya Pradesh has submitted a report in respect of rural local bodies and that of Karnataka for urban local bodies. The Tenth Finance Commission has already recommended grants-in-aid to the States to the tune of Rs. 4381 crores for the year 1996-2000. The funds will start flowing to States in four equal instalments from the current financial year. The Ministry, in collaboration with the Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment, had set up a cell in the National Institute of Public Finance and Policy with two supportive units at the National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD) and the National Institute of Urban Affairs and an Advisory Group under Dr. Raja Chelliah to assist the SFCs in the task. A number of workshops were organised for the Chairman and Members of the State Finance Commissions for assisting them in their tasks.

Further, it has been stated that the process of devolution of powers, functions and authority on Panchayats is on in all the States. The States have made provisions in the legislation to devolve functions and responsibilities on Panchayats in line with the Constitutional Amendment, including the 29 subjects contained in the 11th Schedule. The States like Gujarat, Maharashtra, West Bengal, Karnataka and Madhya Pradesh are ahead of other States in this regard. The Central Government has been guiding the States in this regard from time to time and suggestive framework was prepared and circulated to them. A National Committee of State Panchayats Ministers has been constituted to review the implementation of the provision of the Constitution and render advice to States.

10.4 The Committee note that with the system of Panchayat Raj as per 73rd Amendment of the Constitution, Panchayats have an important role in the Poverty Alleviation Programme. They urge that elections of Panchayats should be expedited in the States/UTs where elections are not held or are due. Further, they would also like that Panchayats should be associated with the maximum number of Poverty Alleviation Programmes. The Panchayats should be involved in the process of identification of beneficiaries and reviewing and monitoring of such programmes.

10.5 The Committee feel that maintenance of assets created under the different programmes is the major area of concern. They would like that Panchayats should be equipped with necessary infrastructure to ensure the maintenance of such assets.

10.6 The Committee would also like that the elected representatives should be given appropriate training to enable them to discharge the multiple constitutional responsibilities.

10.7 The Committee further stress that the BE 1996-97 of Rs. 3 crores is not sufficient in view of the multiple Constitutional obligations to be performed by Panchayats as given above. They would like that the outlay should be substantially stepped up.

CHAPTER XI

COUNCIL FOR ADVANCEMENT OF PEOPLE'S ACTION & RURAL TECHNOLOGY

11.1 Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART) came into existence in September, 1986 by merging People's Action for Development (India) PADI and Council for Advancement of Rural Technology (CART) for the promotion of voluntary action in the field of rural development and propagation of rural technologies. With this end in view, CAPART provides financial assistance to VOs for taking up need-based rural development projects on certain prescribed norms. Since inception till 31.3.96, CAPART has funded 14406 projects to 5582 VOs in the country. The amount sanctioned and released to these VOs are Rs. 349.68 crores and Rs. 197.52 crores respectively.

11.2 During the last three years the amount of funds released by this Ministry to CAPART and the amount of funds utilised by CAPART are as under:

(Rs. in crores)

Year	Amount released by Ministry to CAPART	Amount spent by CAPART
1993-94	62.01	62.54
1994-95	72.50	49.54
1995-96	48.73	57.10

The current year (1996-97) proposed budget allocation for CAPART is Rs. 75.01 crores.

S. No.	Particulars	No. of projects sanctioned	Amount sanctioned	Prominent recipient States
11.3				
1.	H.Q.	456	76.14 crores	
2.	Ahmedabad	189	5.01 crores	Guj. & Mah.
3.	Bhubaneswar	38	0.32 crores	W.B. & Orissa
4.	Guwahati	61	1.38 crores	Man. & Assam
5.	Hyderabad	389	10.36 crores	A.P. & T.N.
6.	Jaipur	25	0.75 crores	Raj.
7.	Lucknow	230	4.16 crores	U.P. & Bihar
	Total	1388	98.12 crores	

11.4 The Committee note that with the increased involvement of voluntary organisations in rural development the workload of CAPART is bound to increase manifold in the coming years. As such they would like to recommend that the allocation for CAPART should be substantially increased.

11.5 In order to provide greater accountability, transparency and coordination between voluntary organisations and the district administration as well as the Panchayati Raj Institutes needs to be developed.

11.6 The Committee have been informed during the course of oral evidence that 376 NGOs have been blacklisted. They note that almost 50% of the funds allocated to NGOs are being misused. It is therefore strongly recommended that there should be appropriate monitoring and proper evaluation of NGOs by the concerned agency.

CHAPTER XII

NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF AGRICULTURAL MARKETING

DEMAND NO. 71

MAJOR HEAD 2435

12.1 The National Institute of Agricultural Marketing (NIAM), Jaipur undertakes research, survey and training in agricultural marketing and consultancy services. The Standing Committee in their 16th report had recommended that NIAM should be kept under Ministry of Agriculture as the area of activity falls under the purview of that Ministry.

12.2 The Department in the written notes have stated that the decision is being taken shortly. The Committee would like to reiterate their recommendation, made in the 16th Report.

CHAPTER XIII

REVIEW OF EIGHTH FIVE YEAR PLAN AND STRATEGY FOR NINTH FIVE YEAR PLAN

DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

13.1	8th Plan Outlay	6116 crores
	Likely amount sanctioned	6071.09 crores

During the 8th Plan 92-97 (includes outlay of Rs. 1482 crores on National Social Security Programme launched on 15th August, 1995)

As per written note furnished by the Department the main objectives of 8th Plan have been given as :

- (i) Poverty Alleviation in rural areas;
- (ii) Provision of basic amenities of water supply and sanitation;
and
- (iii) Democratic Decentralisation.

13.2 The detailed analysis of different Schemes under the Department have been given in the preceding Chapters of the Report.

So far as the allocation of outlay is concerned, Centre and States share in the major programmes is as below:

National Social Security Programme	100%
rural Water Supply & Sanitation Programme	Equal matching share has to be provided under the States MNP.

Land Records

Scheme of Strengthening of Revenue Administration (SRA) & Updating of Land Records (ULR)	50:50 basis
---	-------------

Computerisation of Land Records.	100% Centrally sponsored
-------------------------------------	--------------------------

13.3 After detailed and indepth examination of the implementation of various Schemes/Programmes during 8th Plan in the light of the information furnished by the Department, the main observation/recommendation of the Committee are as noted below.

- (a) The Committee observe that actual allocation during the 8th Plan for the various Schemes/Programmes is far less than the 8th Plan outlay.**

Out of the outlay of Rs. 6166 crores, the actual allocation as per the data furnished by the Department is Rs. 4647.09 crores after excluding the outlay of Rs. 1482 crores for newly started National Social Assistance Programme. Thus there is net underspending of Rs. 1519 crores under different planned Schemes during the 8th Plan. It is needless to say here that due to the underspending in different Projects/Schemes, the poorest of the poor in the country is suffering. The Committee would like that during Ninth Five Year Plan, there should be proper planning and financial projection should be realistic for each programme and the scheme so that there is 100% utilisation. They urge that there should not be diversion of funds from one Scheme to the other. The Committee urge that the backlog of 8th Plan outlay should be appropriately allocated in the different Schemes/Programmes.

- (b) Not only there is underspending in 8th Plan outlay for different Projects/Schemes, but releases to States are lesser than the allocation. Further alarming feature is that there are huge unspent balances with the States. In some of the States, the utilisation is marginal in specific programmes. The Committee also observe that under different programmes of the Department, States are not allocating the matching share. They would like that while chalking out the strategy for Ninth Plan, Government should reconsider and review the programmes. If needed, the schemes/programmes should be restructured.**
- (c) The various factors responsible for the non-implementation of the various Schemes/Programmes of the Department are**
- (i) the monitoring of the scheme is not adequate. States are not furnishing the Utilisation Certificate and unspent balances**

are increasing year by year (ii) States are not contributing the matching share as per the guidelines (iii) the financial allocation is not adequate (iv) there is lack of linkages which results into the blocking of funds with State Governments and with local bodies in the States (v) Identification of beneficiaries is not proper (vi) There is not adequate provision for the maintenance of assets created under the different programmes.

13.4 The Committee would like to recommend that

- (a) Government should consider to enhance the Central's share in the respective Schemes where the implementation of the Scheme is poor due to the fact that States are not providing the matching share.**
- (b) Monitoring of the programme should further be strengthened. It should be ensured that States furnish the Utilisation Certificate timely. It should also be ensured that quarterly, monthly and annual report are submitted in time by States. There should be timely review of the programme. It is noted that C&AG cover selective Scheme for review. In most of the Schemes no review has been made. The Committee would like to suggest that timely evaluation by some independent agencies should be made. Further there should be concurrent evaluation of the programmes. District level monitoring Committees should be constituted to monitor the programme. Further, monitoring by the Centre should be strengthened. There should be surprise visits by the officials of the Committee to the various sites where programmes are being implemented.**
- (c) To ensure proper identification of beneficiaries and implementation Panchayats should more be involved in keeping with the spirit of 73rd Amendment. There should be standard guidelines by the Centre to involve the Panchayats in identification and implementation of the various Programmes and Schemes.**
- (d) There should set guidelines regarding the maintenance of assets created under different programmes. Block Development Officers and Panchayats should be equipped with more infrastructure to ensure the proper maintenance of assets. The problem of supervisory/technical staff might**

be solved by placing officials of the State Departments *viz.*, Public Works Department, Irrigation, PHE, E&D and Health Department etc. on deputation basis. Sufficient supervisory technical staff to maintain the accounts and perform Secretarial duties should be provided to Panchayats to enable them to ensure proper maintenance of assets. To cater to the need of infrastructure Panchayats/BDOs should be provided adequate funds.

- (e) The Committee note that in some of the States, Secretary, Panchayats have been posted on adhoc basis. The Committee would like to recommend that the adhoc Secretaries should be regularised.
- (f) Rural water Supply & Sanitation Programme should be accorded priority. It is very unfortunate that only 14.62% of the Rural population has so far been covered by the Rural Sanitation programme. There should not be copartmentalisation of the programme. To give the proper meaning to sanitation, this programme should be launched in a holistic manner. There should be sufficient thrust to publicity campaign through media to motivate the masses to construct individual latrine without subsidy by the Centre. Contaminated water is another area of concern. Government should accord the adequate priority to ensure the safe drinking water to rural masses.
- (g) Linkages amongst the various agencies of implementation *viz.*, Centre, State and local bodies should be strengthened to have coordination and 100% implementation of funds.
- (h) The implementation of the respective Schemes by best performing States should be circulated to the other States to motivate them. Further, there should be some sort of incentives to the best performing States.
- (i) So far as National Social Security Scheme is concerned, the Committee note that adequate publicity has not been given to the programme. To ensure the success of the programme there should be coverage by TV, Radio and Newspapers. Further the Scheme should be popularised by displaying at the important places in the villages like Panchayat office.
- (j) MPs and MLAs should be associated with the implementation of various Schemes/Programmes launched by the Department.

There should be standard guidelines by the Centre in this regard.

13.5 The Committee would like to recommend that while formulating strategies for Ninth Plan. Government should consider the various observations and recommendations of the Committee as given in the preceding paragraphs of the Report. As regards outlay for different Schemes/Programmes during Ninth Plan, they urge that there should be appropriate enhancement of outlay in view of the recommendations of the Committee with regard to each of the Scheme/Programme.

NEW DELHI;
August 25, 1996
Bhadra 3, 1918 (Saka)

SONTOSH MOHAN DEV,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Urban
& Rural Development.

STATEMENT I

**Brief Summary of the Detail Demands for Grants of the
Department of Rural Development**

(In thousands of Rupees)

Sl. No.	Name of the Scheme	Major Head of Account	Budget Estimates, 1995-96	Revised Estimates, 1995-96	Budget Estimates 1996-97		
					Revenue	Capital Loan	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
PLAN/SCHEMES							
WATER SUPPLY AND SANITATION :							
1	Rural Water Supply Programme	2215 3601 3602	3243500 7850500 6000	3003500 8090500 6000	3003500 8090500 6000	— — —	3003500 8090500 6000
			11100000	11100000	11100000	—	11100000
2	Rural Sanitation	2215 3601 3602	231500 367500 1000	122000 477000 1000	12000 477000 1000	— — —	122000 477000 1000
			600000	600000	600000	—	600000
TOTAL-RURAL WATER SUPPLY & SANITATION			11700000	11700000	11700000	—	11700000
LAND REFORMS :							
3	Assistance to Assignees of Ceiling Surplus Land	3601	100	100	100	—	100
4	Grants-in-aid for Agrarian Studies	2506	4800	4800	4800	—	4800
5	Computerisation of Land Records	2506 3601 3602	2500 194600 2500	2500 194600 2500	1500 196800 1500	— — —	1500 196800 1500
			199600	199600	199800	—	199800
6	Strengthening of Revenue Machinery and Updating of Land Records	2506 3601 3602	7500 175500 5000	7500 175500 5000	2500 183000 2500	— — —	2500 183000 2500
			188000	188000	188000	—	188000

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7	National Committee on Revitalisation of Land Records	2506	100	100	100	—	100
8	Organisation of Rural Poor	2506	100	100	100	—	100
9	Lal Bahadur Shastri National Academy of Administration	2506	900	900	900	—	900
10	Other Administrative Expenses	2506	1400	1400	1200	—	1200
TOTAL-LAND REFORMS			395000	395000	395000	—	395000
11	Grants to National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)	2515	50000	50000	50000	—	50000
12	Assistance to Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology	2515	120000	120000	120000	—	120000
13	Organisation of Training Courses, Seminars & Workshops	2515	5000	5000	5000	—	5000
14	Strengthening of Extension Training Centres	3601	30000	30000	30000	—	30000
15	Strengthening of Regional Centres for Research & Training	2515 3601	— 32500	— 32500	12500 20000	— —	12500 20000
16	Communication Cell	2515	40000	90000	40000	—	40000
17	Promotion of Voluntary Schemes and Social Action Programme	2515	100000	60000	100000	—	100000
18	Organisation of Beneficiaries	2515	35000	35000	35000	—	35000
19	Roads in Special Problem Areas	3601	20000	20000	20000	—	20000
20	Panchayat Development and Training	2515	30000	70000	30000	—	30000
TOTAL-OTHER RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMMES		462500	512500	462500	—	462500	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

OTHER AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMMES :

21 Agriculture Marketing

(a) Strengthening of Agmark Grading Facilities	2435	7000	6500	11500	—	11500
(b) Export Quality Control	2435	8000	3500	8500	—	8500
(c) Research	2435	5000	3000	10000	—	10000
(f) National Instt. of Agril. Mktg.	2435	15000	9900	20000	—	20000
(g) Market Survey & Investigation	2435	10000	10000	12500	—	12500
(j) Extension and Training	2435	2500	100	5000	—	5000
(n) Development of Rural Hats at Panchayat Level	2435	25000	100	5000	—	5000

TOTAL-OTHER AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMMES

—	72500	33100	72500	—	72500
---	-------	-------	-------	---	-------

SOCIAL SECURITY AND WELFARE :

22 National Social Assistance Programme	2235	—	5500000	9320000	—	9320000
---	------	---	---------	---------	---	---------

TOTAL-PLAN

12630000	18140600	21950000	—	21950000
----------	----------	----------	---	----------

NON-PLAN SCHEMES

1. Headquarters Establishment of Department of Rural Development	3451	45000	55400	57400	—	57400
2. Market Survey & Investigation	2435	26290	29303	28904	—	28904
3. Strengthening of Agmark Grading Facilities	2435	44150	46684	48237	—	48237
4. Export Quality Control	2435	16570	18610	19310	—	19310
5. Cold Storage Order	2435	1405	1631	1643	—	1643
6. Dte. of Marketing & Inspection	2435	585	472	606	—	606
7. Grants to National Institute of Rural Development	2515	30000	30000	30800	—	30800

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8.	Production of Literature for Rural Development	2515	2390	2390	2390	—	2390
9.	Grants to Other Organisation	2515	10	10	10	—	10
10.	Exhibitions and Trade Fairs	2515	200	200	200	—	200
11.	Contribution to International Bodies	2515	6600	6900	6900	—	6900
12.	Rural Water Supply Programme	2215	7400	8400	8600	—	8600
TOTAL-NON-PLAN			180600	200000	205000	—	205000

ANNEXURE-II

SCHEME-WISE OUTLAY-PROPOSED, AGREED AND BUDGETARY
SUPPORT FOR 1996-97 DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

(Rs. in crores)

S. No.	Scheme	Proposed by	Allocation sanctioned during Plan Discussion	Fund Allocation
1	2	3	4	5
1.	A.R.W.S.P.	2500.00	1495.64	1110.00
2.	C.R.S.P.	300.00	100.00	60.00
3.	Strengthening of State Training Centre	10.00	5.00	3.25
4.	Strengthening of Extension Training Centre	10.00	4.00	3.00
5.	Organisation of Training Courses/Seminars/Workshops	3.00	0.50	0.50
6.	Grants in Aid to NIRD	5.00	7.00	5.00
7.	Promotion of Voluntary Action in Rural Development	50.00	10.00	10.00
8.	Assistance to CAPART	50.00	14.00	12.00
9.	Organisation of Beneficiaries	5.00	2.00	3.50
10.	Agricultural Marketing	20.00	6.00	7.25
11.	Publicity & Communication	10.00	4.00	4.00
12.	Assistance to Assignees of C.S. Land	—	0.01	0.01

1	2	3	4	5
13.	Grants in Aid to Institute of Agrarian Studies	10.00	2.00	0.67
14.	Strengthening of Revenue Machinery & Updating of Land Records	30.00	20.00	18.80
15.	National Commission on Revi- talisation of Land Records	—	0.01	0.01
16.	Organisation of Rural Poor	2.00	0.01	0.01
17.	Computerisation of L.A.	30.00	30.00	20.00
18.	Roads in Special Problem Areas	13.00	2.00	2.00
19.	Development of Panchayats	100.00	10.00	3.00
20.	N.S.A.P.	927.00	932.00	932.00
21.	Village & Country Planning	20.00	1.00	—
Total		4098.00	2645.37	2195.00

NSAP

FINANCIAL AND PHYSICAL ACHIEVEMENT

YEAR-1995-96

Rs. in lakh

Sl. No.	States/UTs	NOAPS		NFBS		NMBS	
		Exp.	Beneficiaries	Exp.	Beneficiaries	Exp.	Beneficiaries
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.	Andhra Pradesh	2593.54	4660.00	106.35	9.67	533.18	1533.93
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	0.35	155.00	0.10	1	NR	NR
3.	Assam	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
4.	Bihar	9.75	NR	2.46	3.98	1.53	11.48
5.	Goa	0.67	447	1.10	17	0.003	.1
6.	Gujarat	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
7.	Haryana	100.09	377.00	NR	NR	NR	NR
8.	Himachal Pradesh	17.50	65.10	NR	NR	NR	NR
9.	J & K	53.67	139.11	18.79	2.92	16.67	50.57
10.	Karnataka	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
11.	Kerala	120.90	450.37	5.47	1.01	0.52	1.60
12.	Madhya Pradesh	772.71	1818.14	NR	NR	NR	NR
13.	Maharashtra	18.73	73.64	4.76	.80	0.89	2.76
14.	Manipur	8.91	NR	3.33	NR	3.63	NR
15.	Meghalaya	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
16.	Mizoram	3.86	13.00	1.70	1.00	1.58	16.00
17.	Nagaland	6.60	NR	1.74	NR	2.77	NR

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
18.	Orissa	375.60	1829.14	1.85	.18	4.91	15.24
19.	Punjab	194.94	355.14	33.61	5.79	11.47	36.69
20.	Rajasthan	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
21.	Sikkim	2.12	8.00	NR	NR	NR	NR
22.	Tamilnadu	1080.53	NR	560.06	NR	276.86	NR
23.	Tripura	29.00	53.00	10.21	3.00	12.34	66.00
24.	Uttar Pradesh	3414.00	6476.19	1435.02	269.28	904.06	3011.58
25.	West Bengal	888.25	3539.00	450.60	186.43	200.00	1707.33
26.	A & N Islands	NR	NR	NR	NR	0.018	.6
27.	Chandigarh	NR	11.87	0.10	.1	0.15	.5
28.	D&N Haveli	0.23	3.00	1.61	.88	0.26	.23
29.	Daman & Diu	0.44	8.6	1.30	.24	0.08	.24
30.	NCT Delhi	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
31.	Lakshadweep	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
32.	Pondicherry	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR	NR
Total		9692.39	20032.12	2640.23	485.37	1971.083	6505.80

NR = Not Reported

**SCHEME-WISE CEILING OF NUMBER OF
BENEFICIARIES UNDER NSAP.**

		NSAP Ceiling of Number of Beneficiaries		
		NOAPS	NFBS	NMBS
Sr. No.	States/Uts.	Ceiling	Ceiling	Ceiling
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	466000	39300	388200
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	1700	100	2100
3.	Assam	70100	11300	93700
4.	Bihar	774400	63300	602800
5.	Goa	2200	200	2800
6.	Gujarat	160100	13200	124600
7.	Haryana	37700	2700	38200
8.	Himachal Pradesh	11600	700	14500
9.	J&K	26600	1600	33200
10.	Karnataka	316200	22700	251500
11.	Kerala	144500	5900	75100
12.	Madhya Pradesh	489800	49100	488800
13.	Maharashtra	501700	35900	381400
14.	Manipur	3500	200	4400

1	2	3	4	5
15. Meghalaya		3400	200	4200
16. Mizoram		1400	100	1700
17. Nagaland		2400	100	3000
18. Orissa		283400	30500	253400
19. Punjab		36500	2200	26900
20. Rajasthan		200000	15800	217100
21. Sikkim		800	100	100
22. Tamilnadu		891900	33300	290500
23. Tripura		5300	300	6600
24. Uttar Pradesh		1027500	92800	927700
25. West Bengal		353900	31600	289400
Union Territories				
1. A&N Islands		600	100	700
2. Chandigarh		1300	100	1700
3. D&N Haveli		300	100	300
4. Daman & Diu		200	100	200
5. Delhi		19000	1100	23700
6. Lakshadweep		100	100	100
7. Pondicherry		1500	100	1900
All India		5335600	454900	4551400

MINUTES OF THE FIRST SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1996-97)

The Committee met on 2nd August, 1996 from 1500 Hrs. to 1600 Hrs. in Committee Room No. 'E', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev— *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Nand Kumar Sai
3. Shri Lalmuni Chaubey
4. Smt. Ketki Singh
5. Shri Kishanlal Diler
6. Shri J. P. Aggarwal
7. Shri T. Govindhan
8. Shri Surjit Singh Barnala
9. Shri Jai Parkash

Rajya Sabha

10. Shri Nilotpal Basu

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri G.R. Juneja — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Assistant Director*

2. The Chairman welcomed the members of the Committee at the first sitting and asked to introduce themselves to the Committee. Thereafter, the Chairman explained the purpose for convening the meeting at the short notice. He further stated that the Committee would examine the Demands for Grants 1996-97 of Ministries of Rural Areas

& Employment and Urban Affairs & Employment and present the Report to the Committee before 26th August, 1996 when the Session of Parliament will be convened to discuss the Demand for Grants 1996-97. Deputy Secretary, Lok Sabha then explained in brief the procedure regarding examination of Demands for Grants 1996-97 and preparing Report thereto. It was decided that the next sittings of the Committee may be convened on 5th & 6th August, 1996 and the Secretaries of the respective Departments of Ministries of Rural Areas & Employment and Urban Affairs & Employment may also be invited for an informal discussion on the Demands for Grants 1996-97.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE SECOND SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1996-97)

The Committee met on 5th August, 1996 from 10.45 Hrs. to
13.15 Hrs. in Committee Room No. 'E', Parliament House
Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Shivraj Singh Chauhan
3. Shri Lalmuni Chaubey
4. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
5. Shri Chitrasen Sinku
6. Shri Sankar Prasad Jaiswal
7. Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria
8. Shri Maruti Patil D. Shelke
9. Shri Basavaraj Rayareddi

Rajya Sabha

10. Shri O.P. Kohli
11. Shri Nilotpal Basu
12. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri G.R. Juneja — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Assistant Director*

REPRESENTATIVES OF DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

1. Shri Vinay Shankar — *Secretary*
2. Shri M. Shankar — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri R.K. Mishra — *Joint Secretary*

2. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of Department of Rural Development and asked them to introduce themselves to the Committee. He further explained that they had been invited at the sitting to have an informal discussion on the various programmes/schemes of that Department and asked them to give an overall view of the various activities of the Department before the Committee. Then representatives of the Department placed before the Committee the brief regarding outlay and performance of different programmes and schemes of the Department. He further clarified to the various queries posed by the Members of the Committee regarding the Demands for Grants of that Department. It was decided that the sitting of the Committee convened in the afternoon on 5th August, 1996 and in the morning of 6th August, 1996 may be cancelled.

The Committee then adjourned.

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1996-97)

The Committee met on 16th August, 1996 from 1100 Hrs. to 1330 Hrs. in Committee Room No. 62 Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Lalmuri Chaubey
3. Shri Chitrasen Sinku
4. Shri Kishanlal Diler
5. Shri J.P. Aggarwal
6. Shri Sarat Pattanayak
7. Shri Joyanta Bhattacharya
8. Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria
9. Shri C. Narayanaswamy
10. Shri T. Govindhan
11. Shri L. Balaraman
12. Shri Anant G. Geete
13. Shri Surjit Singh Barnala
14. Shri Jai Parkash

Rajya Sabha

15. Shri Thennala Balakrishna Pillai
16. Shri Ajit P.K. Jogi
17. Shri Radhakrishnan Malviya
18. Shri Sitaram Kesri
19. Shri O.P. Kohli
20. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
21. Shri Jagdambi Mandal

22. Shri Nilotpal Basu
23. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy
24. Shri Joy Nadukkara

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|--------------------|
| 1. Smt. Roli Srivastava | — | Joint Secretary |
| 2. Shri G.R. Juneja | — | Deputy Secretary |
| 3. Smt. Sudesh Luthra | — | Assistant Director |

REPRESENTATIVES OF MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS & EMPLOYMENT DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

- | | | |
|------------------------|---|-----------------|
| 1. SHRI VINAY SHANKAR | — | Secretary (RD) |
| 2. SHRI ASHOK JAITLEY | — | D.G. CAPART |
| 3. SHRI R.C. CHOUDHARY | — | D.G., NIRD |
| 4. SHRI R.N. BANSAL | — | A.M.A. |
| 5. SHRI M. SHANKAR | — | Joint Secretary |
| 6. SMT. SUSHMA SINGH | — | Joint Secretary |
| 7. SHRI R.K. MISHRA | — | Joint Secretary |

2. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of Department of Rural Development at the sitting of the Committee and asked them to introduce themselves to the Committee. The Committee then sought further clarifications from the representatives of the Department on the various Programmes and Schemes *viz.*, Rural Water Supply Programme and Land Records. The representatives of the Department explained the position in response to the queries made by Hon'ble Members. The representative from CAPART explained that he would not be able to attend the sitting of the Committee in the afternoon session. The Chairman, Committee directed that he should be present at the sitting of the Committee convened on 19th August, 1996 at 1100 Hrs.

The verbatim record of the proceeding has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

EXTRACTS OF SIXTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE
ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The Committee met on 19th August, 1996 from 1100 Hrs. to 1330 Hrs. in Committee Room No. 'D', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Shivraj Singh Chauhan
3. Shri Lalmuni Chaubey
4. Shri Chintaman Vanaga
5. Shri Kishanlal Diler
6. Shri Sarat Pattanayak
7. Shri Joyanta Battacharya
8. Shri B.N. Reddy
9. Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria
10. Shri Maruti Patil D. Shelke
11. Shri C. Narayanaswamy
12. Shri Basavaraj Rayareddi
13. Shri T. Govindhan
14. Shri Anant G. Geete
15. Shri Ram Sajivan
16. Shri Jai Parkash

Rajya Sabha

17. Shri Sitaram Kesri
18. Shri O.P. Kohli

19. Shri Jagdambi Mandal
20. Shri Nilotpal Basu
21. Shri Solipetta Ramachandra Reddy
22. Shri Joy Nadukkara

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri G.R. Juneja — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Assistant Director*

REPRESENTATIVES OF MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS & EMPLOYMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)

1. Shri Vinay Shankar — *Secretary*
2. Shri Ashok Jaitley — *Additional Secretary*

2. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of Council for Advancement of People's Action & Rural Technology (CAPART) and Department of Rural Employment & Poverty Alleviation at the sitting of the Committee. The Committee first took for consideration the Demands for Grants 1996-97 of CAPART. The Members of the Committee took various queries with regard to the respective activities of CAPART. The representatives from the CAPART explained to the queries. The Representatives from CAPART then withdrew from the sitting.

** ** ** ** ** ** **

3. A verbatim record of the proceedings has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

EXTRACTS OF FIFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN
AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1995-96)

The Committee met on 16th August, 1996 from 1500 Hrs. to
1800 Hrs. in Committee Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Shivraj Singh Chauhan
3. Shri Kishanlal Diler
4. Shri Joyanta Bhattacharya
5. Shri C. Narayanaswamy
6. Shri T. Govindhan
7. Shri L. Balaraman
8. Shri Anant G. Geete
9. Shri Ram Sajivan
10. Shri Jai Parkash

Rajya Sabha

11. Shri Thennala Balakrishna Pillai
12. Shri Radhakrishnan Malviya
13. Shri O.P. Kohli
14. Shri Jagdambi Mandal
15. Shri Nilotpal Basu
16. Shri Joy Nadukkaraa

SECRETARIAT

1. Smt. Roli Srivastava — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri G.R. Juneja — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Assistant Director*

REPRESENTATIVES OF MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS & EMPLOYMENT

DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

1. Shri Vinay Shankar — *Secretary*
2. Shri Ashok Jaitley — *D.G. CAPART*
3. Shri R.C. Choudary — *D.G., NIRD*
4. Shri R.N. Bansal — *A.M.A.*
5. Shri M. Shankar — *Joint Secretary*
6. Smt. Sushma Singh — *Joint Secretary*
7. Shri R.K. Mishra — *Joint Secretary*

2. The Committee continued discussion of the remaining activities of Department of Rural Development *viz.*, Rural Sanitation, Training, National Institute of Agriculture Marketing, Land Records. The representatives of the Department explained to the queries made by Hon'ble Members with regard to outlay and implementation of the various programmes.

** ** ** ** **

3. A verbatim record of the proceedings has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

** Verbatim proceeding relating to other subject has been kept separately.

MINUTES OF NINTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE
ON URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

The Committee met on 23rd August, 1996 at 11.00 Hrs. to
13.30 Hrs. in Committee Room No. 53, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Sontosh Mohan Dev—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Shivraj Singh Chauhan
3. Shri Prahlad Singh Patel
4. Shri Sankar Prasad Jaiswal
5. Shri J.P. Aggarwal
6. Shri B.N. Reddy
7. Shri Dilip Singh Bhuria
8. Shri C. Narayanaswamy
9. Shri Anant G. Geete
10. Shri Ram Sajivan
11. Shri Surjit Singh Barnala

Rajya Sabha

12. Shri Thennala Balakrishna Pillai
13. Shri Sitaram Kesri
14. Shri O.P. Kohli
15. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane
16. Shri Nilotpal Basu
17. Shri Solipeta Ramachandra Reddy

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|-----------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Shri G.R. Juneja | — | <i>Deputy Secretary</i> |
| 2. Smt. Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Assistant Director</i> |

2. The Committee considered and adopted the draft report on Demands for Grants 1996-97 of Department of Rural Development of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment.

3. The Committee also authorised the Chairman to finalise the Report and present the same to the Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX

STATEMENT OF CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Sl. No.	Para No.	Recommendation
1	2	3
1.	2.3	It is observed by the Committee that the recent reorganisation of Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment has mainly been effected in order to provide sharper focus on formulation of policies and strategies of sustained attack on rural poverty. The Committee are of the opinion that despite launching of so many Schemes to eradicate rural poverty, the performance seems to be quite far from expectation. They feel that the recent reorganisation would help in the effective implementation of the programmes of the Ministry and ensure upliftment of the rural from poverty line.
2.	3.5	The Committee are very perturbed to note the outlay for 1996-97 which has been pegged at the outlay for 1995-96 except for the one programme 'National Social Security Programme' launched on 15th August, 1995 under which there is substantial increase of 69.45%. They note that the outlay for 1996-97 doesn't cover even the percentage hike due to inflationary trends.
3.	3.6	It is noted that one third of India's population live below the defined poverty line. Rural Development which encompasses the entire gamut of improvement in the overall quality of

1

2

3

life in the rural areas can only be achieved with the eradication of poverty. They further note that an ambitious programme 'National Social Security Programme' has recently been launched by the Government. Considering the large activities of the Department and also the fact that providing minimum required necessity of life has been of primary concern in the economic planning and development process in the country, the Committee feel that the plan outlay for 1995-96 is not sufficient to meet the targets fixed for different Schemes by the Department. Further they observe that the Standing Committee in their 16th Report had recommended to increase the outlay for 1995-96 from Rs. 7700 crore to Rs. 10,500 crores. However, no increase was made during 1995-96. Further BE 1996-97 has also been pegged at the outlay of 1995-96.

4.

3.7

The Committee are equally dismayed to note that the allocation of Rs. 2195 crores under 'plan head' could not be utilized fully by the Department. The unspent amount is Rs. 255 crores which is equivalent to 11% of the total plan allocation. Expressing their concern about it Hon'ble Chairman during the course of oral evidence stated:—

"The Ministry of Rural Development as well as the State Governments are responsible for not getting higher allocation. The claim of a Department to have an increase depends on its performance. In many areas, the money have been unspent. Not only that, I am surprised and rather shocked to see that

1	2	3
		<p>in your note you have not given a satisfactory reply to this point. You have to elaborate. After giving Rs. 100 crore to a State on a specific Head of Account, you cannot wash your hands saying that we have given the money. State is supposed to give you utilisation certificate."</p>
5.	3.8	<p>The Committee would like to have an explanation of the Department in this regard. They urge that the Department should ensure 100% utilisation of funds to get the sufficient outlay for their different activities commensurating with the targets. The Committee feel that due to ineffective implementation, the poorest of the poor should not suffer for no fault of theirs. To achieve the laudable objectives set-forth by the Department there is an urgent need to take corrective steps for the effective implementation of the Programmes/ Schemes.</p>
6.	3.9	<p>The Committee note that during 1996-97 under Non-Plan head not only there was hike of around 33% over BE of 1995-96, but there was 100% utilisation of funds which is indicative of the effective infrastructure provided for the implementation of the Programme/Schemes of the Department. In spite of getting the adequate infrastructure there is lack of proper planning & co-ordination. The Committee hope that the sufficient infrastructure would help in the 100% utilisation of funds under the 'Plan-heads' and effective implementation of the Schemes.</p>

1	2	3
7.	4.15	The Committee are dismayed to note the underspending of 6.24% under Rural Water Supply Programme. Of equal concern is the position in States viz. Andhra Pradesh, Kerala, U.P. where outstanding balances have almost doubled from 1994-95 to 1995-96. They would like an explanation of the Department in this regard.
8.	4.16	The Committee appreciate the laudable objectives as expressed at the Conference of Chief Ministers on 4th & 5th July, 1996 to cover entire population by 2000 A.D. and to cover totally uncovered or very poorly covered (upto 10 lpcd) habitations by 1997-98.
9.	4.17	They would like to recommend that funds for the programme should be substantially stepped up so as to achieve the target set at the Chief Minister's Conference. They urge that the Department should ensure 100% utilization of funds allocated for the programme.
10.	4.18	The Committee note with concern the achievement with regard to the coverage of problem villages which declined from 472 in 1993-94 to 132 and further 132 in 1994-95 to 26 in 1995-96. They would like an explanation of the Government in this regard. They would also like to recommend that priority should be given to the problem villages.
11.	4.19	The Committee are dismayed to note the meagre allocation of Rs. 300 lakh

1	2	3
		<p>during 1996-97 on R&D under the programme. They would like to recommend that the allocation for R&D should be substantially stepped up under this programme so that the benefit of new technology should be taken to address the specific requirement of an area. Besides more and more attention should be paid towards R&D in the specific areas to improve the quality of drinking water as contaminated water is one of the major area of concern in the country.</p>
12.	4.20	<p>The Committee note that sufficient attention has not been paid towards the maintenance of assets <i>i.e.</i> pumps, tubewells under the programme. Necessary infrastructure should be provided to the Block Development Officer/Panchayats to ensure the maintenance of assets created under the programme.</p>
13.	4.21	<p>The Committee would also like to recommend that monitoring of the programme should be strengthened for the effective implementation of the programmes. They urge that there should be some sort of guidelines issued to the States under the specific programme to involve MPs & MLAs in the monitoring process.</p>
14.	4.22	<p>The Committee would like to recommend that Government should take appropriate steps for recharging the ground water in the dark zone areas in the country in respective States where water level is going down.</p>

1	2	3
15.	4.23	It is urged that trainees under Training of Rural Youth for Self Emploment (TRYSEM) should be trained for the proper maintenance of assets like pumps, tubewells, etc. under the Scheme so as to ensure their proper maintenance.
16.	5.11	It is disturbing to note that the meagre funds allocated for the programme have not been spent fully. The financial achievement during 1994-95 and 1995-96 has been stated by the Department as 99 and 93% leading to the corresponding shortfall in physical achievement of 88.27% and 85% respectively. Of equal concern is the huge unspent balances in States which are increasing steeply. The Committee would like the explanation of the Government with regard to shortfall in physical and financial achievement. It is recommended that endeavour should be made to ensure 100% implementation of funds.
17.	5.12	The Committee are distressed to note the inadequate allocation of funds during 8th Plan. Out of Rs. 380 crores Budget outlay Rs. 230 crores has been sanctioned so far. As per the information furnished by the Department there is likely to be a shortfall of coverage of 53 lakh rural population with sanitation facilities. The Committee note that with the outlay provided only 14.62% of total population has been covered under the programme. They observe that it is unfortunate to see the rural masses

1

2

3

living in total unhygienic conditions even after more than four and a half decades of planned development in the country. It is disturbing to note that Government have not paid any attention to the recommendations of the Committee to enhance the outlay from Rs. 60 crores to Rs. 300 crores during 1995-96. Even during 1996-97 the outlay is same, i.e. Rs. 60 crores. It is needless to point out here that Rural Sanitation Programme needs priority specifically to break the vicious circle of disease, and poor health resulting from insanitary conditions. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation to enhance funds under the programme suitably so as to cover the entire population within 5-10 years.

18.

5.13

The Committee note with distress the various irregularities in the implementation of the programme as pointed out in the audit para of 1993-94. They would like to be informed about the corrective action taken so far. The Committee would like to recommend that monitoring under the programme should be further strengthened. It should be ensured that there are no diversion of funds. Further the quality of the latrines constructed should be improved. The Committee would like to be informed about the outcome of the review of the programme made in the meeting of Secretaries, Incharge of Rural Sanitation Programme on 5.8.96. The evaluation should be expedited.

1	2	3
		<p>The Committee note that in line with the objective of holistic approach to Rural Sanitation Programme, the Members of the previous Standing Committee 1995-96 had recommended certain names for Model Villages. They are not happy with the performance in these model villages. It is recommended that progress in the model villages should be monitored to achieve better results. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation made in the 16th Report that Rural Sanitation Programme should be launched in a holistic manner so as to benefit all categories of people.</p>
19.	5.14	<p>The Committee urge that more attention should be paid towards the awareness campaign through media. More and more NGOs and Panchayats should be involved helping thereby to create sanitary latrines with lesser dependence on Government subsidy.</p>
20.	5.15	<p>The Committee urge that to cover more and more population under the programme thrust should be given on community latrines besides individual latrines.</p>
21.	6.4	<p>It is noted with concern that the outlay allocated has declined from Rs. 2747 crores in 1993-94 to Rs. 18.80 during 1995-96 and outlay for 1996-97 has been pegged at the outlay of 1995-96. The position is noted to be worse in States where more than 60% unspent balance has been reported. In some of the States 100% amount has been reported as</p>

1	2	3
		<p>unspent balance. The Committee take serious view of the poor performance of the Scheme. They observe that adequate attention has not been paid towards the Scheme by Centre and States. The Secretary, Rural Development has acknowledged the poor performance of the Scheme in various States. The Committee would like an explanation of the Government in this regard.</p>
22.	6.5	<p>Considering the huge unspent amount the Committee would like to recommend that the Scheme should be reviewed and restructured during the Ninth Plan. They urge that instead of spreading the amount throughout the country, the Department should choose some of the model districts/villages where performance has been very good. The best performance should be circulated to the poor performing villages/districts to make them conscious about the importance of updation of Land Records.</p>
23.	6.6	<p>The Committee note that the Parliamentary Standing Committee 1995-96 carried out a detailed review and made field visits to various States and found that the upgraded maps had several discrepancies. The earlier Committee in their 26th Report had made an in-depth analysis concerning major issues of the said scheme and made recommendations with regard to outlay, monitoring, standardisation, completing survey, re-survey & settlement in State where it has not</p>

1	2	3
		<p>been done, monitoring, training etc. The Committee urge that the recommendations of the earlier Committee should be considered and implemented in letter and spirit while formulating the policy and guidelines of during Ninth Plan.</p>
24.	6.10	<p>The Committee strongly recommend that adequate attention should be paid to the programme of Computerisation of Land Records. The monitoring of the programme should be strengthened specifically when it is a 100% Centrally sponsored programme. It should be ensured that the amount sanctioned for a specific project is spent fully.</p>
25.	6.11	<p>The Committee also urge that the Computerisation Programme should be continued in Ninth Plan. They also urge that while formulating the strategy of 9th plan, the recommendations made by the Committee at their 26th Report with regard to enhancing of outlay, implementation, training etc. should be considered and implemented.</p>
26.	7.9	<p>The Committee appreciate the launching of National Social Security Scheme on 15th August, 1995 and observe that it is a significant step towards the fulfilment of the Directive Principles in Articles 41 and 42 of the Constitution of India.</p>
27.	7.10	<p>The Committee are however concerned about the implementation of the Scheme. Not only there was shortfall in expenditure during 1995-96 but the</p>

1

2

3

number of beneficiaries as reported by the Department in each of the Scheme was quite low. They are dismayed to note that 10 States/UTs have not reported so far about the utilisation and number of beneficiaries. It is observed that although Old Age Pension Scheme had picked up the performance was poor in other two Schemes, Maternity Benefit Scheme and Family Benefit Scheme. The Committee feel that there is a need for more information dissemination and more awareness generation. They strongly recommend that the Scheme should be advertised on TV, Radio and Regional Newspaper and displaying at important places in the village like Panchayat office.

28.

7.11

The Committee express their apprehension regarding the victimisation of beneficiaries on account of certifying age, destitute or below povertyline. They have been informed that the matter has been left to the State Government. The Committee urge that some standardised guidelines should be issued by Centre with regard to the criteria of age, a person being destitute or below poverty line so as to avoid harassment of beneficiaries.

29.

7.12

The Committee observe that for the lack of initiative/co-ordination between Department in the Centre and State Governments, the poorest of the poor suffer. They would like to recommend that Centre should issue the necessary guidelines to States for the effective implementation and should also ensure

1	2	3
		that funds allocated for the specific scheme are spent fully.
30.	7.13	As regards Maternity Benefit Scheme and Family Benefit Scheme the Committee observe that benefit given for maternity and on the death is fruitful if given at the appropriate time. They would like to recommend that such benefit should be accorded timely and to ensure that certain additional funds should be available with the State Government so as to release the money as and when the demand comes from the beneficiary.
31.	7.14	The Committee note the prescribed ceiling with regard to number of beneficiaries in each of the State as given at Annexure IV. They would like to recommend that the number of ceiling in each of the States should be fixed considering the specific requirement of that State that would be depending on the pattern of the population. It is urged that guidelines issued by the Centre should be reviewed accordingly.
32.	8.3	The Committee observe that to meet the challenging task of poverty alleviation more and more programmes are being launched by the Centre. Besides as per 73rd Amendment Panchayati Raj is being established. They also note that besides to take the benefit of latest global technology, there is need to modernise the training Institutes like satellite and other modes of communication. The training of

1	2	3
		Panchayati Raj Functionaries should be a continuous programme. The Committee would also like that the resources at National level, State level or the District level should be pooled together to impart knowledge and skill.
33.	8.4	The Committee note that in view of the big challenges of poverty eradication programme, the outlay of Rs. 14.50 crores for various component of training would not be sufficient. It should be enhanced substantially.
34.	8.5	The Committee would also like to recommend that the training by these institutions should be imparted keeping in view the practical difficulties in the implementation of various rural programmes such as JRY, IAY, IRDP etc.
35.	8.6	The Committee note that there is no section of Rural Technology in the National Institute of Rural Development. They would like to recommend that Government should take the necessary steps for setting up such Sections for the effective implementation of various Programmes/Schemes launched for the upliftment of rural masses.
36.	8.7	The Committee would also like to recommend that a specific part of the funds provided for administrative expenses of each Schemes should be provided for imparting training to village functionaries and elected representatives in Panchayats.

1	2	3
37.	9.4	<p>The Committee note with constraint the unsatisfactory performance of the Scheme in three States <i>viz.</i>, UP, MP and Rajasthan. They feel that construction of roads to connect all unconnected villages of such nature in the country should be given priority. Observing the poor performance they would like to recommend that the Scheme should be reviewed and restructured without any further delay.</p>
38.	10.4	<p>The Committee note that with the system of Panchayati Raj as per 73rd Amendment of the Constitution, Panchayats have an important role in the Poverty Alleviation Programme. They urge that elections of Panchayats should be expedited in the States/UTs where elections are not held or are due. Further, they would also like that Panchayats should be associated with the maximum number of Poverty Alleviation Programme. The Panchayats should be involved in the process of identification of beneficiaries and reviewing and monitoring of such programmes.</p>
39.	10.5	<p>The Committee feel that maintenance of assets created under the different programmes is the major area of concern. They would like that Panchayats should be equipped with necessary infrastructure to ensure the maintenance of such assets.</p>
40.	10.6	<p>The Committee would also like that the elected representatives should be given appropriate training to enable them to</p>

1	2	3
		discharge the multiple constitutional responsibilities.
41.	10.7	The Committee further stress that the BE 1996-97 of Rs. 3 crores is not sufficient in view of the multiple Constitutional obligations to be performed by Panchayats as given above. They would like that the outlay should be substantially stepped up.
42.	11.4	The Committee note that with the increased involvement of voluntary organisations in rural development the workload of CAPART is bound to increase manifold in the coming years. As such they would like to recommend that the allocation for CAPART should be substantially increased.
43.	11.5	In order to provide greater accountability, transparency and coordination between voluntary organisations and the district administration as well as the Panchayati Raj Institutes needs to be developed.
44.	11.6	The Committee have been informed during the course of oral evidence that 376 NGOs have been blacklisted. They note that almost 50% of the funds allocated to NGOs are being misusing. It is therefore strongly recommended by the Committee that there should be appropriate monitoring and proper evaluation of NGOs by the concerned agency.
45.	12.2	The Department in the written notes have stated that the decision is being

1	2	3
		taken shortly. The Committee would like to reiterate their recommendation.
46.	13.3	After detailed and indepth examination of the implementation of various Schemes/Programmes during 8th Plan in the light of the information furnished by the Department, the main observation/recommendation of the Committee are as noted below.
	(a)	<p>The Committee observe that actual allocation during the 8th Plan for the various Scheme/Programmes is far less than the 8th Plan outlay.</p> <p>Out of the outlay of Rs. 6166 crores, the actual allocation as per the data furnished by the Department is Rs. 4647.09 crores after excluding the outlay of Rs. 1482 crores for newly started National Social Assistance Programme. Thus there is net underspending of Rs. 1519 crores under different planned Schemes during the 8th Plan. It is needless to say here that due to the underspending in different Projects/Schemes, the poorest of the poor in the country is suffering. The Committee would like that during Ninth Five Year Plan, there should be proper planning and financial projection should be realistic for each programme and the scheme so that there is 100% utilisation. They urge that there should not be diversion of funds from one Scheme to the other. The Committee urge that the backlog of 8th Plan outlay should be appropriately allocated in the different Schemes/Programmes.</p>

1	2	3
	(b)	Not only there is underspending in 8th Plan outlay for different Projects/ Schemes, but releases to States are lesser than the allocation. Further alarming feature is that there are huge unspent balances with the States. In some of the States, the utilisation is marginal in specific programmes. The Committee also observe that under different programmes of the Department, States are not allocating the matching share. They would like that while chalking out the strategy for Ninth Plan, Government should reconsider and review the programmes. If needed, the schemes/programmes should be restructured.
	(c)	The various factors responsible for the non-implementation of the various Schemes/Programmes of the Department are (i) the monitoring of the scheme is not adequate. States are not furnishing the Utilisation Certificate and unspent balances are increasing year by year (ii) States are not contributing the matching share as per the guidelines (iii) the financial allocation is not adequate (iv) there is lack of linkages which results into the blocking of funds with State Governments and with local bodies in the States (v) Identification of beneficiaries is not proper (vi) There is not adequate provision for the maintenance of assets created under the different programmes.
47.	13.4	The Committee would like to recommend that

1	2	3
		<p>(a) Government should consider to enhance the Central's share in the respective Schemes where the implementation of the Scheme is poor due to the fact that States are not providing the matching share.</p> <p>(b) Monitoring of the programme should further be strengthened. It should be ensured that States furnish the Utilisation Certificate timely. It should also be ensured that quarterly, monthly and annual report are submitted in time by States. There should be timely review of the programme. It is noted that C&AG cover selective Scheme for review. In most of the Schemes no review has been made. The Committee would like to suggest that timely evaluation by some independent agencies should be made. Further there should be concurrent evaluation of the programmes. District level monitoring Committees should be constituted to monitor the programme. Further, monitoring by the Centre should be strengthened. There should be surprise visits by the officials of the Committee to the various sites where programmes are being implemented.</p> <p>(c) To ensure proper identification of beneficiaries and implementation Panchayats should more be involved in keeping with the spirit of 73rd Amendment. There should be standard guidelines by the Centre to involve the Panchayats in identification and implementation of the various Programmes and Schemes.</p>

1	2	3
	(d)	<p>There should be set guidelines regarding the maintenance of assets created under different programmes. Block Development Officers and Panchayats should be equipped with more infrastructure to ensure the proper maintenance of assets. The problem of supervisory/technical staff might be solved by placing officials of the State Departments viz., Public Works Department, Irrigation, PHE, E&D and Health Department etc. on deputation basis. Sufficient supervisory technical staff to maintain the accounts and perform Secretarial duties should be provided to Panchayats to enable them to ensure proper maintenance of assets. To cater to the need of infrastructure Panchayats/BDOs should be provided adequate funds.</p>
	(e)	<p>The Committee note that in some of the States, Secretary, Panchayats have been posted on adhoc basis. The Committee would like to recommend that the adhoc Secretaries should be regularised.</p>
	(f)	<p>Rural water Supply & Sanitation Programme should be accorded priority. It is very unfortunate that only 14.62% of the Rural population has so far been covered by the Rural Sanitation programme. There should not be copartmetalisation of the programme. To give the proper meaning to sanitation, this programme should be launched in a holistic manner. There should be sufficient thrust to publicity compaign through media to motivate</p>

1	2	3
		the masses to construct individual latrine without subsidy by the Centre. Contaminated water is another area of concern. Government should accord the adequate priority to ensure the safe drinking water to rural masses.
	(g)	Linkages amongst the various agencies of implementation <i>viz.</i> , Centre, State and local bodies should be should strengthened to have coordination and 100% implementation of funds.
	(h)	The implementation of the respective Schemes by best performing States should be circulated to the other States to motivate them. Further, there should be some sort of incentives to the best performing States.
	(i)	So far as National Social Security Scheme is concerned, the Committee note that adequate publicity has not been given to the programme. To ensure the success of the programme there should be coverage by TV, radio and Newspapers. Further the Scheme should be popularised by displaying at the important places in the villages like Panchayat office.
	(j)	MPs and MLAs should be associated with the implementation of various Schemes/Programmes launched by the Department. There should be standard guidelines by the Centre in this regard.
48.	13.5	The Committee would like to recommend that while formulating strategies for Ninth Plan Government

1

2

3

should consider the various observations and recommendations of the Committee as given in the preceding paragraphs of the Report. As regards outlay for different Schemes/ Programmes during Ninth Plan, they urge that there should be appropriate enhancement of outlay in view of the recommendations of the Committee with regard to each of the Scheme/ Programme.
