

26

**STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1998-99)**

TWELFTH LOK SABHA

**MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT
(DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(1999-2000)**

TWENTY-SIXTH REPORT



2
8.3657R

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

Corrigenda to the 26th Report (12th Lok Sabha) of the
Standing Committee on Urban & Rural Development on
'Demands for Grants 1999-2000' of Department of Rural
Development

<u>Page</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
1	11	Demand	Demands
1	13	Demand for Grants	Demands for Grants
1	15	Demand	Demands
1	23	Demand	Demands
2	2	DEMAND	DEMANDS
5	5	adequately	adequately

TWENTY SIXTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT
(1998-99)

(TWELFTH LOK SABHA)

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

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(1999-2000)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 22 April, 1999

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 23 April, 1999



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 1999/Chaitra, 1921 (Saka)

C.U. & R.D. No. 076

Price : Rs. 33.00

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY
Central Govt Publications
Acc. No. RC.102.100.....
Date..17.8.99.....

(15)

LC
328.3657
N8.26

© 1999 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of
Business in Lok Sabha (Ninth Edition) and Printed by Jainco Art India,
13/10, W.E.A., Saraswati Marg, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110 005.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE	(iii)
ACRONYMS	(v)
INTRODUCTION	(vii)

REPORT

CHAPTER I	Introductory	1
CHAPTER II	Analysis of Demands for Grants & Plan Budget for the year 1999-2000 of the Department of Rural Development	2
CHAPTER III	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme	6
CHAPTER IV	Central Rural Sanitation Programme	16
CHAPTER V	National Social Assistance Programme	20
CHAPTER VI	Land Reforms	25
CHAPTER VII	CAPART	29
CHAPTER VIII	Panchayati Raj	32
CHAPTER IX	Training	34
CHAPTER X	Roads in Special Problem Areas	36

APPENDICES

I.	Physical target and coverage of habitation under ARWSP during 1997-98	38
II.	Physical target and coverage of habitation under ARWSP during 1998-99	42
III.	State-wise details of Habitations affected by Water Quality Problems	46

	PAGE
IV. Statement indicating the total amount of funds sanctioned to States/UTs on the basis of the proposals sent by them during the last three years for the development of Panchayats & Training	50
V. Minutes of Thirty-Sixth Sitting held on 26.3.99 ...	54
VI. Minutes of Thirty-Seventh Sitting held on 26.3.99	57
VII. Minutes of the Forty-Fifth Sitting of the Committee held on 9.4.99	60
VIII. Statement of Recommendations/Observations	66

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1998-99)

Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri D.S. Ahire
- *3. Shri Tariq Anwar
4. Dr. Shafiqur Rahman Barq
5. Shri Padmanava Behera
6. Shri Sriram Chauhan
7. Shri Shivraj Singh Chouhan
8. Shrimati Malti Devi
9. Shri Ramkrushna Suryabhan Gavai
10. Shri Mitha Lal Jain
11. Shri Akbar Ali Khandokar
12. Shri Vinod Khanna
13. Shri Subhash Maharia
14. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
15. Shri Subrata Mukherjee
16. Shrimati Ranee Narah
17. Shri Chandresh Patel
18. Shri Rameshwar Patidar
19. Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik
20. Shri Mullappally Ramachandran
21. Shri Gaddam Ganga Reddy
22. Dr. Y.S. Rajasekhar Reddy

*Nominated *w.e.f.* 18.3.1999.

23. Shri Ramjidas Rishidev
24. Shri Chatin Singh Samaon
25. Shri Nikhilaranda Sar
26. Shri I.M. Jayaram Shetty
27. Shri Daya Singh Sodhi
28. Shri Vithal Baburao Tupe
29. Dr. Ram Vilas Vedanti
30. Shri K. Venugopal

Rajya Sabha

31. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
32. Shrimati Vijayantimala Bali
33. Shri Nilotpal Basu
34. Shri Jhumaklal Bhendia
- *35. Dr. M.N. Das
36. Shri N.R. Dasari
37. Shri John F. Fernandes
38. Shri C. Apok Jamir
39. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
40. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
41. Shri Jagdambi Mandal
42. Shri O.S. Manian
43. Dr. Mohan Babu
44. Shri N. Rajendran
45. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri G.C. Malhotra | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri S.C. Rastogi | — | <i>Director</i> |
| 3. Smt. Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Under Secretary</i> |
| 4. Shri A.K. Srivastava | — | <i>Committee Officer</i> |

ACRONYMS

A.E.	—	Actual Expenditure
A.R.W.S.P.	—	Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme
B.E.	—	Budget Estimate
B.P.L.	—	Below Poverty Line
C&AG	—	Comptroller and Auditor General of India
C.R.S.P.	—	Central Rural Sanitation Programme
D.W.C.R.A.	—	Development of Women & Children in Rural Areas
E.S.A.	—	Employment Assurance Scheme
E.T.C.	—	Extension Training Centre
J.R.Y.	—	Jawahar Rozgar Yojana
M.N.P.	—	Minimum Needs Programme
N.S.A.P.	—	National Social Assistance Programme
N.R.E.P.	—	National Rural Employment Programme
N.C.	—	Not Covered
N.F.B.S.	—	National Family Benefit Scheme
N.G.O.	—	Non-Governmental Organisation
N.I.C.	—	National Informatics Centre
N.M.B.S.	—	National Maternity Benefit Scheme
NIRP	—	National Institute of Rural Development
NOAPS	—	National Old Age Pension Scheme
OB	—	Opening Balance
PC	—	Partially Covered
RE	—	Revised Estimate
RGNDWS	—	Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission
RLEGP	—	Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme
SIRD	—	State Institute of Rural Development
SRA & ULR	—	Strengthening of Revenue Administrative and Updation of Land Records
TSC	—	Total Sanitation Campaign
UT	—	Union Territories

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of Standing Committee on Urban & Rural Development (1998-99) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Twenty-Sixth Report on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment).

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

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment) on 26th March, 1999.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 9th April, 1999.

5. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the officers of the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment) for placing before them the requisite material in connection with the examination of the subject. They also wish to express their thanks to the officers of the Ministry/Department who appeared before the Committee and placed their considered views.

6. The Committee would like to place on record their sense of deep appreciation for the invaluable assistance rendered to them by the officials of the Lok Sabha Secretariat attached to the Committee.

NEW DELHI;
April 19, 1999
Chaitra 29, 1921 (Saka)

KISHAN SINGH SANGWAN,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban & Rural Development.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY

1.1 The Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment consists of three Departments (i) Department of Rural Development; (ii) Department of Rural Employment and Poverty Alleviation; and (iii) Department of Wastelands Development.

1.2 The Department of Rural Development deals with Centrally Sponsored Programmes/Schemes like Rural Water Supply and Sanitation Programme, Land Records, National Social Assistance Programme, Roads in Special Problem Areas, Training & CAPART.

1.3 The overall Demand for Grants of the Department for 1999-2000 are for Rs. 2765.67 crore.

1.4 The Demand for Grants of the Department are presented to Parliament under Demand No. 70.

The detailed Demand for Grants of the Department were laid in Parliament on 10th March, 1999.

1.5 In the present Report the Committee have examined Centrally Sponsored Schemes/Programmes viz. (i) Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme, (ii) Central Rural Sanitation Programme, (iii) National Social Assistance Programme, (iv) Land Reforms, (v) Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology, (vi) Panchayati Raj, (vii) Training and (viii) Roads in Special Problem Areas in the context of the budgetary allocation in Demand for Grants for the year 1999-2000.

CHAPTER II

AN OVERALL ANALYSIS OF DEMAND FOR GRANTS FOR THE YEAR 1999-2000 OF THE DEPARTMENT OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT (MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT)

2.1 Comparative position of the outlay during 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000

Plan Schemes	(Rs. in crore)
BE 1997-98	2195
BE 1998-99	2530
% increase over 1997-98	15.26%
BE 1999-2000	2750
BE 1998-99	2522.75
(Excluding BE for Agricultural Marketing as per Preliminary material, the subject has been transferred to the Ministry of Agriculture).	
% increase over 1998-99	9%

2.2 As per the data furnished by the Department in their written note the increase/decrease scheme-wise is as under:—

(Rs. in crore)			
Sl. No.	Name of the Scheme	1999-2000	% increase over last year.
1	2	3	4
<i>Department of Rural Development</i>			
1.	Rural Water Supply Programme	1800.00	10.63
2.	Rural Sanitation	110.00	10.00

1	2	3	4
3.	National Institute of Rural Development (NIRD)	6.00	20.00
4.	Council for Advancement of People's Action & Rural Technology (CAPART).	13.00	8.33
5.	Establishment/Strengthening of State Centres of Training and Research (SIR)	3.25	0.00
6.	Establishments/Strengthening of Extension Training Centres (ETC)	3.0	0.00
7.	Organisation of Training Courses, Seminars & Workshops.	1.25	150.00
8.	Promotion of Voluntary Action in Rural Development	26.00	30.00
9.	Organisation of Beneficiaries	4.00	14.29
10.	LAND REFORMS		
	(a) Computerisation of Land Records	33.00	10.07
	(b) Strengthening of Revenue Machinery & Updating of Land Records.	10.00	13.64
	(c) Others	0.00	100.00
11.	Publicity & Communications	10.00	150.00
12.	Roads in Special Problem Areas	0.50	66.67
13.	Panchayats Development & Training	3.00	0.00
14.	Monitoring Mechanism	2.00	0.00
15.	National Social Assistance Programme	725.00	3.67
16.	Agricultural Marketing	0.00	0.00
TOTAL		2750.00	8.70

2.3 When asked how 9% increase in BE 1999-2000 over BE 1998-99 will meet the targets fixed under different Schemes/ Programmes during Ninth Plan, the Department in thier written note have stated that the targets under each Programme are fixed by the Planning Commission and they are fixed in proportion to the funds allocated. As the 9th Plan outlay has been approved by the Planning Commission very recently, the targets for the 9th Plan period are being fixed. However, greater increase in allocation will be required under Rural Water Supply Programme if all the Not-Covered and Partially Covered villages/habitations are to be covered in a time bound manner. The provision of Rs. 725 crore under National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP) is also inadequate. This is because of the fact that as per the projected population for 1998 and New Poverty Ratio indicated by the Planning Commission, the requirement of funds under NSAP has gone up to Rs. 1586 crore. Even if the population of 1995 (first year of the launching of the Programme) and the old poverty ratio indications are adopted, the requirement of funds under NSAP comes to Rs. 932.00 crore.

2.4 It was further stated by them that considering the fact that the provision of safe drinking water to the rural population is one of the priority areas of the Government, the Planning Commission had approved an additional outlay of Rs. 325 crore in BE 1998-99 for the Rural Water Supply Programme thereby increasing the outlay for this Programme from Rs. 1302 crore to Rs. 1627 crore and the outlay for the Department of Rural Development to Rs. 2530 crore in BE 1998-99. The provision of safe drinking water to the rural poor continues to be priority sector of the Government. However, the Planning Commission has approved an additional outlay of Rs. 173 crore only in BE 1999-2000 for Rural Water Supply Programme. The Planning Commission has also approved a marginal increase of Rs. 10 crore under Rural Sanitation Programme, Rs. 25 crore under National Social Assistance Programme, Rs. 6 crore under Promotion of Voluntary Schemes and Rs. 3.50 crore under Land Reforms.

2.5 The Committee note that around 9% increase in BE 1999-2000 over BE 1998-99 will hardly be able to cover the increase in cost due to inflation. They also find that due to the inadequate allocation the targets for the different Programmes specifically the priority

Programmes like Rural Water Supply Programme and National Social Assistance Programme would have to be spilled over. They therefore, would like to recommend that the allocation for the different programmes/specifically the programmes under the priority sector should be adequately enhanced so as to cover the targets fixed for these programmes during 9th Plan.

CHAPTER III

ACCELERATED RURAL WATER SUPPLY PROGRAMME (ARWSP)

Demand No. 70

Major Head 2215, 3601, 3602

Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP)

3.1 The Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) aims at providing safe and adequate drinking water facilities to the rural population by supplementing the efforts made by the State Governments/UTs under the State Sector Minimum Needs Programme (MNP). Keeping in view the different kinds of problems arising while providing potable water in the rural areas, 56 Mini-Missions (pilot projects) were identified covering all States/UTs. These pilot projects helped to evolve models that are replicable and can be incorporated in the on-going programmes.

3.2 Comparative data of BE outlay during 1996-97, 1997-98 and 1999-2000.

Outlay under ARWSP	(Rs. in crore)
BE 1996-97	1110
BE 1997-98	1302
% increase over 1996-97	17.30%
BE 1998-99	1627
% increase over 1997-98	24.96%
BE 1999-2000	1800
% increase over 1998-1999	10.63%

3.3 When asked about the adequacy of the allocation made during 1999-2000, the Department in their written note have stated that the Planning Commission was requested to allocate an amount of Rs. 3000 crore for Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP) for the year 1999-2000. However, due to resource constraint they have allocated an amount of Rs. 2750 crore only for the whole of the Department of Rural Development. ARWSP being one of the programmes under the Department an amount of Rs. 1800 crore, out of the total allocation of Rs. 2750 crore, has been provided for ARWSP.

3.4 Performance during 1997-98 and 1998-99

(Rs. in crore)

Year	Outlay/Provision	Release	Expenditure
1997-98			
ARWSP	1302.00	1299.91	1210.48
1997-98			
MNP	1778.82	1778.88	1608.37
1998-99			
ARWSP	1627.00	1388.71	775.52
1998-99			
MNP	1951.99	—	1018.14

3.5 When asked about the reasons for underspending under ARWSP & MNP during the last two years, the Department in their written note have stated that during 1997-98 out of Rs. 1300 crore released, the State Governments reported an expenditure of Rs. 1210.48 crore. The underspending during 1997-98 is mainly due to the fact that the Finance Departments of the State Governments of Assam, Bihar, J & K, Nagaland and West Bengal released the funds meant for ARWSP and MNP very late to the implementing agencies. As regards 1998-99, the latest information furnished by the State Governments indicates an expenditure of Rs. 811.82 crore under ARWSP and Rs. 1132.22 crore under MNP for the implementation of rural water supply programme

upto January 1999. The expenditure figures will go up during the remaining months of the financial year.

3.6 The Committee note that the percentage increase in allocation during 1999-2000 over the allocation of previous year is quite less as compared to the position in 1997-98 & 1998-99. Further, out of the estimated outlay for the scheme to the tune of Rs. 3,000 crore, Planning Commission has allocated only Rs. 1800 crore during 1999-2000. They feel that in view of the inadequate outlay, the targets would have to be spilled over.

It is strongly recommended that sufficient funds should be provided for the programme specially when it is the most priority programme under the National Agenda for governance. They would like that Planning Commission should be pursued further for enhancing the allocation for ARWSP.

3.7 The Committee further find that not only there was inadequacy of allocation but the scarce resources allocated to State Governments were not utilised fully by the implementing agencies. They are disturbed to find that one of the reasons for underspending as mentioned in the written note is late release of funds to the implementing agencies. They, therefore, recommend that monitoring of the programme should further be strengthened and State Governments should be impressed upon to release the funds timely to the implementing agencies to ensure 100% utilisation of funds.

Status of covered habitation (NC & PC) habitations in the country and the physical and financial achievement during 1997-98 & 1998-99.

3.8 The States-UTs-wise data in respect of rural NC & PC habitations is given at Appendix. The over-all position of NC & PC habitations in the country is as below:

Total habitation	—	14,30,663
Fully covered	—	10,60,921
Not covered	—	42,993
Partially covered	—	2,52,988

State-wise Physical Targets and coverage of habitations during 1997-98 and 1998-99 under ARWSP & MNP

3.9 As per the statement in Performance Budget (Appendices II & III) the physical achievement of 'Not Covered & Partially Covered habitations' was upto/less than 50% in J & K, Kerala, Nagaland, Tripura during 1997-98 and during 1998-99 in Arunachal Pradesh, Bihar, Goa, J & K, Kerala, Maharashtra, Manipur, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Punjab, Tripura, West Bengal and A & N Island. In Nagaland and Delhi the achievement during 1998-99 is reported as nil.

3.10 When asked about the reasons for the low achievement in the above-mentioned States/UTs, during the last two years, the Department in their written note have stated that in J & K, Kerala, Nagaland and Tripura, the low achievement was due to civil disturbances, difficult terrain and late release of funds by the respective State Finance Departments. As regards 1998-99, the final figures regarding achievement are still being received. It may take some more time to analyse the final achievements.

3.11 The representative of the Department during the course of oral evidence stated that total target for the last year was 1,05,902 (NC-31935 and PC-73967). He further stated that number of 'Partially Covered' habitations are 2,52,998 and 'Not Covered' are 42,993. It was also stated by him that except for the Western part of Rajasthan, where the source is just not available, they would be covering all these NC habitations by the turn of 2000 A.D., subject to availability of funds.

When further asked by the Committee to verify the figures, the representative of the Ministry stated as under :—

"It is possible that some of the water sources that they have created could be having the problem of unsafe drinking water and must have got into these figures. Over a period of time we want to remove them and we will be striking them off from the figure that is maintained by us here."

Advance Planning for Ninth Five Year Plan

3.12 As per the written note of the Department the salient features of the planning for the Ninth Five Year Plan are likely to be as under:—

- (a) Coverage of all the remaining not covered habitations and partially covered habitations in the next five years.

- (b) Tackling the problem of quality of drinking water for the habitations seriously affected with excess fluoride and arsenic in drinking water.
- (c) Conservation of water and recharge of aquifers including rejuvenation, construction and improving the well tried successful traditional structures like dug wells, tankas, oornies, etc. with appropriate innovation of improve the supply of quality water.
- (d) Transfer of ownership of the assets and responsibility for maintenance and repairs to the local community and Panchyati Raj Institutions.

The requirement of funds to achieve the said objectives during the 9th Plan.

3.13 As per the Action Plans prepared by the State Governments, Central assistance to the tune of Rs. 9149.12 crore would be required for covering all the not covered and partially covered rural habitations of the country during 9th Plan Period. The 9th Plan Working Group estimated a requirement of Rs. 10,560 crore for providing safe water to quality affected habitations, Rs. 9240 crore for major and routine repairs and replacements and Rs. 150 crore for rejuvenation of aquifers for the 9th Plan Period.

3.14 When asked how the Government propose to mobilise resources keeping in view the budgetary constraints, the Government in their written note submitted as under:—

“Budgetary support is the only major source to provide safe drinking water to rural habitations. The target will be achieved depending upon the availability of funds. State Governments like Tamil Nadu, are also availing financial support from LIC. The Cabinet in its meeting held on 16.3.99 has approved revamping of Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP). The new policies *inter-alia* include partial capital cost sharing by the users as well as 100% Operation and Maintenance cost. When implemented, this is bound to bring down the budgetary sources.”

3.15 While noting the laudable objective of coverage of all the remaining not covered and partially covered habitations in the 9th Plan, the Committee express their doubts in view of the lower

budgetary allocation than required. They appreciate the efforts of Tamil Nadu Government by availing financial support from LIC and the revised policy of the Government to involve the user for sharing the cost of the resources and shifting of 100% operation & maintenance cost on the user.

3.16 To achieve the laudable objective of providing water to each and every habitation during 9th Plan, the Committee would like to recommend that the budgetary allocation should be adequately enhanced. The Committee urge that State Governments should also be requested to involve the users in the implementation of the programme and bearing of capital and Organisation and Management cost to the extent possible. But where the user belong to the poorest of the poor category, the subsidy should be ensured.

3.17 To bring the improvement in the operation and maintenance of the assets, the Committee feel that as envisaged in the objective of 9th Plan, the best alternative is Panchayat. To enable the Panchayats to fulfil these obligations, the Committee would like to recommend that Government should think of strengthening the capacity of Panchayats.

3.18 While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee note with concern the underspending in some of the States/UTs.

3.19 The Committee have their doubts about the coverage of rural habitations *i.e.* 1060921 out of the total habitations 1430663. Keeping in view the ground reality, they feel that while calculating the number of covered habitations, the number of habitations having contaminated water supply are included. Further in most of the habitations, the minimum requirement of 40 litre of safe drinking water per capita is not fulfilled throughout the year. In some areas the source could have dried due to the water-table going down. The Committee feel that if all these factors are taken into consideration, the actual coverage would be lesser than as claimed by the Government as per their data. The Committee therefore, strongly recommend that a habitation should be considered as being covered habitation only if safe drinking water is provided as per the minimum required norms. It is further urged that Government should verify the data from respective States/UTs to have a realistic picture about the position of water supply in the rural areas of the country.

The position of the schools covered under the scheme

3.20 According to Annual Report 1998-99 provision of safe drinking water in every rural primary school is one of the priorities under Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission. As per the report of Tenth Finance Commission the total number of Rural Primary Schools in the country has been indicated as 6,36,827, out of which 3,55,647 have drinking water facilities. It has been stated by the Department in their written statement that the number of primary schools without drinking water facilities is estimated to be about 2,81,180. The number of rural primary schools to be covered by the Tenth Finance Commission is 2,44,500. It has been further stated that the Union Cabinet's meeting held on 16-3-99 has *inter-alia* approved undertaking coverage of remaining rural primary schools with drinking water facilities during 9th Plan Period.

3.21 The Committee are concerned to know that around 50% of the Primary Schools in the country do not have access to safe drinking water inspite of the fact that safe drinking water in every rural primary school is one of the priorities under Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission. They strongly recommend that State Governments should be impressed upon to give the priority to schools and sufficient funds should be provided for the purpose. It is also desired that the Government should monitor the position of supply of safe drinking water in the Primary Schools in rural areas and the Not Covered Schools should be covered within the minimum possible time.

Quality Problem

3.22 A statement showing the State-wise details of habitations affected by water quality problems has been given at Appendix III.

The category-wise data is as below:

Total habitations affected	—	145804
Flourene	—	27845
Arsenic	—	9003
Salinity	—	32552
Iron	—	76404

3.23 When asked about the measures taken to supply safe water, the Department in their written note have stated that adequate priority is given to deal with the quality problem of drinking water like excess flouride, arsenic etc. The States have also been requested to enact legislation for control on ground water and consevation of water on the lines of the Model Bill circulated in June, 1996 by the Ministry of Water Resources and the Maharashtra Act, 1993. Emphasis is also laid on Human Resource Development, training of grass root level functionaries and professionals of Implementing Departments and Information, Education & Communication activities for use of safe water, sanitary aspect of water and sanitation.

Various projects are taken up under the sub-Mission programme to tackle the quality problems in the States. The expenditure for implementation of these projects is shared by the Central and State Governments in the ratio 75:25. The powers to plan, sanction and implement the sub-Mission projects have been delegated to the State Governments so as to ensure early solution to the problem.

3.24 When asked whether the quality related habitations have included in the data of covered habitations, the representative of the Department during the course of oral evidence stated that in 1991 during the State Government survey, the quality problem was not given importance. It is a fact that the quality problem habitations have been included in the data furnished by the Department.

3.25 The Committee note that as per the written information made available to the Committee, out of the total 1430663 habitations in the country, 145804 habitations *i.e.* around 10% are affected by the quality problem. They feel that the data given by the Government is not realistic as admitted by the representatives of the Department during the course of oral evidence, the quality problem villages have actually been included in the covered habitations. They are, therefore, constrained to note that even after 50 years of independence, the Government have not given adequate importance to the quality aspect and would like that States/UTs Government should be requested to accord adequate priority to this aspect and adequate funds should be provided to tackle the problem.

Over exploitation of ground water resulting in lowering the water table.

3.26 As per the written note of the department, the States/UT Governments of Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Pondicherry and Lakshadweep have enacted necessary legislation for control and conservation of ground water.

3.27 As per the written information made available to the Committee, significant areas in States like Punjab, Haryana, Gujarat, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Rajasthan and Utter Pradesh (144 districts) have been declared dark and grey Zones.

3.28 When asked about the steps being taken to recharge the water table, it has been mentioned in the written note that the State Governments have been instructed to take up Micro Watershed Development Programmes in areas facing drinking water scarcity. Efforts are made to assist the States to take up artificial recharge structures under the submission on sustainability. Projects worth Rs. 28.222 crore were approved for conservation of water and water harvesting structures. The total amount released so far is Rs. 24.637 crore. Expenditure reported so far is Rs. 20.67 crore.

3.29 As per the results of the Monitoring and Evaluation Studies Commissioned by the Mission in 13 States the studies could not arrive at any conclusion on the issue of sustainability of drinking water resources as the States could not provide the sufficient information.

3.30 The representative of the Department during the course of oral evidence while explaining the position of over-exploitation of ground water resources stated as under:

“extraction of water is going at a high speed and the recharge is not equal to that. There are two aspects involved. As far as extraction is concerned, that has to be regulated and as I had mentioned, we have prepared a model legislation which we have sent to the State Governments. Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Pondicherry and Lakshadweep have enacted this legislation and passed the law. But how far it is being implemented is again another question. Other States have not even enacted any legislation to control or regulate extraction of water. It is a source which is not inexhaustible. On the positive side, where the Government and the Ministry can do a lot is the recharging of this ground water resources.”

3.31 The Committee find that adequate attention has not been paid towards the issue of sustainability of drinking water resources. They appreciate that a few States have enacted legislation for control and conservation of ground water. They however, feel that merely enacting legislation is not sufficient. The Committee would like that the position of the implementation of the Act should also be monitored by the Government. It is also desired that the remaining States should be requested to enact such legislation.

3.32 The Committee feel that to stop the over exploitation of ground water resources, some policy initiative needs to be taken. They in their 4th Report (1998-99) on Demand for Grants of the Department had recommended for a National Water Policy. Since various Ministries like Water Resources, Agriculture and Science & Technology etc. are involved in the issue; they would like that there is a need for a coordinated approach to solve this problem. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation to chalk out a National Water Policy in consultation with the other Ministries/Departments and States/UTs involved.

3.33 The Committee note that adequate attention has not been paid to store the rain water. It is recommended that Government should think of launching some scheme to provide subsidy to individuals for conservation of rain water. They would also like that different methods for conservation of rain water should be publicised by the media to disseminate the information.

CHAPTER IV

CENTRAL RURAL SANITATION PROGRAMME (CRSP)

Demand No. 70

Major Head 2215, 3601 & 3602

4.1 The Centrally sponsored Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) was launched in the year 1986 with the objective of improving the quality of life of the rural people and to provide privacy and dignity to the women. The concept of sanitation includes safe disposal of solid and liquid waste including human excreta, personal, domestic and environmental hygiene. The Central funds allocated under the CRSP supplement the state sources made available under the State Sector MNP.

4.2 Objectives

- (i) Accelerate coverage of rural population, specially among households below poverty line (BPL), with sanitation facilities, complementing the efforts in Rural Water Supply;
- (ii) Generate felt need through awareness creation and health education involving voluntary Organisations (VOs) and Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs);
- (iii) Eradicate manual scavenging by converting all existing dry latrines into low cost sanitary latrines; and
- (iv) Encourage cost effective and appropriate technologies to support other objectives.

4.3 Comparative figures in respect of Budget Estimate-Revised Estimate and Actual Expenditure during 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000.

		(Rs. in crore)
BE 1997-98	—	100
RE 1997-98	—	100

Actual Expenditure	—	96.73
BE 1998-99	—	100
RE 1998-99	—	67
Expenditure upto		
January, 1999	—	57.27
BE 1999-2000	—	110

4.4 The Department in their written note have stated that cut in the outlay at RE Stage during 1998-99 was done due to the resource constraint.

4.5 The Department as per their written note have stated that as per the report of the Expert Committee of RSP, the results of the National Sample Survey (44th round 1989) indicated that around 11% rural households had access to latrines while according to the reports available with Government it is not more than 3%. After taking into account the non-governmental and private initiatives, the total coverage in rural areas as on date may not be more than 14%. In other words 86% of the rural households don't have any access to sanitary latrines.

4.6 When asked about the planning made by the Government to provide sanitation to total rural population, the Department in their written note have stated that it is a fact that the sanitation coverage remains at 16-20% of the rural population inspite of acceleration in coverage during 8th Plan. The Working Group set up by the Planning Commission had worked out the financial requirement to be around Rs. 8000 crore, by way of pure subsidy for achieving 75% coverage level. However, since it would be hard to locate such a huge amount, it has been decided to achieve atleast 50% coverage under the Rural Sanitation during 9th Plan. It has been estimated that atleast Rs. 330 crore per annum would be required to achieve 50% target. During 9th Plan period, a comprehensive policy review is contemplated. The review envisages a major policy shift from "high subsidy to low subsidy", with special emphasis on the creation of demand for sanitation services, increased awareness generation, a much higher degree of beneficiary participation, etc. The subsidy structure is being changed to target the poorer segment and to ensure that the States extend right incentives

to explore low cost sanitation through campaign approach, as has been successfully employed in Literacy and Immunization Missions involving NGOs & Private Sector. It is also proposed to adopt "vertical upgradation" concept. Increased technological options would also pave way for increased acceptance and coverage.

4.7 On the issue of community latrines, the representatives of the Department during the course of oral evidence submitted as under:

"We have got complex separately for women and community toilets. Our experience has not been very good. They start off all right but the maintenance has become a very big problem. Then, there is problem of water availability. In certain areas, where even water is just not available, those units are not cleaned properly so, they are now going to do is to see where it is feasible, where communities have come forward and proper mechanism has been built in for cleaning."

4.8 The Committee note that inspite of their recommending strongly in their earlier reports for enhancement of outlay and take other measures to improve the sorry state of affairs, nothing substantial has been made on this account. It is really pathetic to note that even today when the nation have celebrated 50 years of Independence so gloriously, 86% of the rural households don't have access to sanitary latrines, not to talk of the total sanitation. It is again strongly recommended that Government should pay more attention to this issue.

4.9 They urge that substantial funds should be earmarked for the programme. Whatever meagre allocation is made, it should not be reduced at RE stage at any cost.

4.10 It is further felt that allocating more funds is not sufficient. The need is to make the people aware of the need for sanitation. They find that the worst sufferers, due to the lack of the sanitation, are women. It is therefore recommended that the Sanitation Programme should be linked with other women related Programmes like DWCRA. Further rural people have to be made aware of the need of sanitation through various mediums. A community based approach on this account is required.

4.11 The Committee further note that in some countries, good work on this account has been done. They recommend that the Department should study such programmes and launch a micro-credit

movement with the involvement of women. Besides, it is also found that very good work has been done in many districts in our country. They urge that such districts should be considered as model and other districts in different States should be encouraged to make improvement on this account.

Sanitation in schools

4.12 When asked by the Committee about schools Sanitation, the representative of the Department during the course of oral evidence submitted as under:

“By the end of the Ninth Plan, there should not be even a single school in this country which should be having these problems. There should be separate toilets for girls and boys, and there should be, at least, one latrine unit in each school.”

4.13 The Committee would like that to improve the position of sanitation in the country, more stress need to be given to school sanitation. It is felt that the children are the best to be trained in this regard. It is urged that more steps should be given to school sanitation and sufficient funds should be allocated for the purpose.

CHAPTER V

NATIONAL SOCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMME

Demand No. 70

Major Head 2235

5.1 The National Social Assistance Programme (NSAP) which came into effect from 15th August 1995 represents a significant step towards the fulfilment of the Directive Principles enshrined in Article 41 and 42 of the Constitution. It introduces a National Policy for social assistance benefit to poor households in the case of old age, death of primary bread-winner and maternity. The Programme has three components, namely:—

- (1) National Old Age Pension Scheme (NOAPS)
- (2) National Family Benefit Scheme (NFBS)
- (3) National Maternity Benefit Scheme (NMBS)

5.2 Comparative figures in respect of BE, RE and Actual Expenditure during the last two years.

	(Rs. in crore)
BE 1997-98	700.00
Subsequently reduced Budgetary provision	560.00
Expenditure incurred by the Ministry	553.47
Expenditure reported by States	542.05
BE 1998-99	700.00
Subsequently reduced allocation	640.00

Expenditure incurred by the Ministry	578.00
Expenditure reported by the States	494.00
BE 1999-2000	725.00

5.3 When asked about the main reasons for underspending of the reduced BE during 1997-98 and 1998-99, the Department in their written note have stated as under:

“There are prescribed conditionalities for releasing funds to the districts. These are—

- (a) Release of the 1st instalment during a year is automatic if the districts lifted the 2nd instalment during the previous year. Otherwise, atleast 50% utilisation of the available fund needs to be reported.
- (b) To be eligible for the 2nd instalment, at least 60% utilisation of the available funds is to be reported; and
- (c) Release of the 2nd instalment is also subject to the submission of audited Accounts and Utilisation Certificate pertaining to the fund released in the year preceding the previous year.

Many districts failed to comply with these conditions during 1997-98 and consequently funds could not be released to them.

There were also cases where funds could not be released due to discrepancies between the Utilisation Certificate (UC) and Audit Reports (AR). It may be noted that while the Utilisation Certificate are to be submitted by the district implementing authorities the Audit Reports are prepared by the Chartered Accountants.”

5.4 With regard to the position during 1998-99, the Department submitted in their written note that the release position during 1998-99 has further improved and stands at Rs. 633.15 crore as on 22nd March, 1999. The remaining amount of the allocation (RE) shall be released within a couple of days. A compilation made on 19th March, 1999 shows that 47 more districts have already become eligible for the 1st instalment during 98-99. This involves an amount of

Rs. 4.85 crore. The number of districts becoming eligible for the 2nd instalment on the other hand is 146 involving an amount of Rs. 30.04 crore. Progress Reports/UCs and ARs from some other districts have also been received. More such documents are likely to come during the remaining days of the last month of the financial year. On compilation of these documents, more districts are likely to emerge eligible for the 1st and/or the 2nd instalment during the year. There is therefore, no underspending of the reduced BE for 1998-99. On the other hand, inspite of being eligible, many districts cannot be released the 1st/2nd instalment during the year due to shortage of funds.

As per the written note, around 50.27 lakh, 1.80 lakh and 15.421 lakh beneficiaries, respectively, have been covered under National Old Age Pension Scheme, National Family Benefit Scheme and National Maternity Benefit Scheme. The data indicate that the implementation of NFBS and MNBS is very poor.

5.5 When asked for the steps taken to improve the implementation of the said two programmes, the Department in their written note stated that the information given on coverage of beneficiaries is as per the reporting of the States during 97-98 and are provisional since the reporting was not complete and States' reporting of progress is often found defective in as much as they do not match with their expenditure figures. The funds earmarked for both NFBS and NMBS in the Revised Estimate for 1998-99 have been completely utilised. It may be mentioned here that though the demand for NFBS is very high we could not reflect it in terms of release and beneficiaries covered because the budgetary provision for the scheme was reduced from Rs. 700 crores to Rs. 640.20 crore.

5.6 The representative of the Department during the course of oral evidence submitted as under:

"Barring Andhra Pradesh, the performance of all other States on the Maternity Benefit Scheme is less than desirable and we have been having very detailed discussions with each State Government. We are, more or less, at the take off stage. We were supposed to have had a seminar entirely on maternity benefit in the month of March but we were not able to do so because of other pressing engagements. In all the three schemes, we have had very intensive exercises, as a result of which the other two schemes have now come to a stage where we can say

that they are satisfactory. But I get a feeling that enough importance is not attached by the State Governments to this particular scheme. This is what I have been observing, when we discuss the matter with the State Governments, we find that they make changes even in the implementing agencies. For instance, in Uttar Pradesh, they took it away from the Social Welfare Department and gave it to a newly formed Department. That Department is the Department for Women and Child Development, but without any arrangement.

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

We are now actually working to cover up the administrative gaps and are trying to ensure that in this particular year we should be in a position to really do justice to this scheme. At the moment, we have got a lot of critical input and we know exactly what the diagnosis is. So, we will be working to correct those.

5.7 When asked by the Committee about the steps taken by the Government for the dissemination of all the three Components under NSAP the representatives of the Department has admitted that public are not aware about the Scheme. Though some publicity has been done in this regard, the main reason for this was attributed to illiteracy.

5.8 The Committee find that whatever allocation was made under NSAP it was further reduced at RE stage. As indicated at para No. 2.3 of the Report, the requirement of funds under NSAP has gone up to Rs. 1586 crore with the projected population for 1998 and New Poverty Ratio indicated by the Planning Commission whereas the allocation made during 1999-2000 is Rs. 725 crore only. It is strongly recommended that the allocation for the scheme should be substantially stepped up. Further whatever allocation is made, it should not be reduced at RE Stage.

5.9 While recommending for higher outlay the Committee would like that Government should try to find out the reasons for the slow implementation of the Programme specifically the NFBS & NMBS components and take remedial measures.

5.10 It is felt that the main reason for the slow progress of the scheme as admitted by the Government is inadequate publicity. The Committee in their 4th Report 1998-99 had recommended to publicise the scheme through print and electronic media and by fixing bill boards in local language at the important public places like Village Panchayats, railway stations, bus stops etc. They would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation.

5.11 The Committee feel that to make the schemes really successful, the Government should think of implementing the Scheme through Panchayats and Gram Sabha.

CHAPTER VI

LAND REFORMS

Demand No. 70

Major Head 2506

A. Centrally Sponsored Scheme for Strengthening of Administration and updating of land records.

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, inclusion 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 Comparative figures during 8th Plan, 9th Plan, 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000.

	(Rs. in crore)
8th Five Year Plan	175.00
Actual allocation	98.85
made during 8th Plan	
Total released	98.23
9th Plan Allocation	not yet finalised
1997-98 BE	18.80
RE	18.80
Funds released	18.83
1998-99 BE	8.80
RE	8.80
Funds released	8.02
BE 1999-2000	10.00

6.3 When asked as to how far the reduced outlay has affected the implementation of scheme in respective States/UTs, the Department in their written reply have stated as below:—

“The reduced outlay under the Scheme has not affected its implementation much as the outlay was sufficient to meet the requirement towards committed expenditure against the on-going schemes relating to construction activities of Training Institutes, record rooms and patvarkhanas in various States and to provide some small assistance to specific States Schemes. However, major schemes for taking up survey and settlement operations in the States could not be financed.”

The achievement of the programme since inception

6.4 As per the written note the Scheme was started during the 7th Plan with the objective of assisting the States/UTs in strengthening their survey and settlement organisations for early completion and preparation of land records, setting up of survey and settlement organisations especially in the North-Eastern region, pre-service and in-service training of revenue survey and settlement staff including strengthening of training infrastructure for this purpose, facilities for modernization of survey and settlement operations, printing of survey maps, storage, copying of land and crop records using among other things science and technology inputs etc.

With the above objectives in view, financial assistance under the Scheme has been provided to the States/UTs for purchase of modern survey equipments viz. EDM, Theodolites, Total Stations, GPs etc., printing of survey maps, training of revenue, survey and settlement staff including construction of State, regional and District level survey training institutes and construction of record rooms. To improve the delivery system, funds have been provided to the States/UTs for purchase of photostat machines, essential items like racks, bastas, polythene containers for record rooms and for construction of office-cum-residence of Patwaris in tribal as well as remote areas.

The achievement under the programme has been that some of the States like Jammu & Kashmir, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh have taken up survey and settlement operations by adopting modern technology and the States like Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal have either

constructed new training institutes or improved the facilities in the existing training institutes for training their revenue, survey and settlement staff. Some States have provided office-cum-residential accommodation to the functionary at grass-root level. Almost all the States/UTs are now having copying facilities as photocopiers have been provided upto the Tehsil level. Further, by construction of record rooms and providing necessary facilities for storage of land records, the maintenance of land records has improved. All these facilities have definitely helped the States in preparation & maintenance of land records and in improving the delivery system.

As may be seen from the above, the Ministry does not provide funds for all activities relating to survey & settlement operations and updating of land records. The type of financial assistance provided by this Ministry is for inducing the State Governments to improve the existing quality of the delivery system and hence a total monitoring of actual updating of village maps in the States has not so far been taken up under the Scheme as this is a bigger issue and falls within the exclusive jurisdiction of the State Governments.

6.5 The Committee note that a good start by way of the Centrally Sponsored Scheme for upgradation of rural maps was made but the reduced allocation over the years show that not much importance is being imparted to the Scheme. They feel that land records are the basic document for planning and other purposes and the lack of land records is the basic reason for high number of land related court cases. It is recommended that serious attention should be paid to the Scheme and sufficient funds allocated for its implementation.

6.5 (a) While appreciating budgetary constraints, the Committee note that the scheme should be implemented by selecting field areas during a particular year so as to make an impact rather than spreading the resources so thinly.

(B) Computerisation of Land Records

6.6 As a programme, during 1998-99, pilot project for Computerisation of Land Records was 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.

6.7 Outlay during 1996-97, 1997-98 and 1998-99.

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Expenditure
1997	20.00	20.00	20.19
1998-99	30.00	25.00	22.29 (upto Feb. 10, 1999)
1999-2000	33.00		

6.8 When asked whether the allocation of Rs. 33 crore during 1999-2000 will be sufficient keeping in view the extended scope for Digitisation of Cadastal Maps, it has been submitted in the written note that the allocation will be sufficient during 1999-2000. However when the Pilot phase of the Scheme is to be extended to cover the whole country, more funds will be required in the subsequent years.

Physical Achievement under the scheme

6.9 As per the written note of the Department till now 1100 Tehsils/ Talukas have been covered under the programme. Gradually all the Tehsils/Talukas of the country shall be covered. As per the data made available to the Committee approximately 34 Districts in the North-Eastern States are not maintaining the land records.

6.10. The Committee feel that the basic land Records are the main input for the Computerisation of Land Records. The Programme cannot be implemented successfully unless the country is ready with the correct updated basic maps. It is regretted to note that even Districts in North Eastern States do not even have the basic land records. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that more attention should be paid to have the correct and updated map of every District in the country.

CHAPTER VII

COUNCIL FOR ADVANCEMENT OF PEOPLE'S ACTION AND RURAL TECHNOLOGY

Demand No. 70

Main Head 2515

7.1 Funds to voluntary agencies, under various schemes are routed through the Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural Technology (CAPART), a registered society under the aegis of the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment.

7.2 Budget outlay during 1998-99 and 1999-2000.

(Rs. in crore)

Year	BE	RE	Actuals
1998	19.00	19.00	10.00 (upto 15.2.1999)
1999-2000	25.00	—	—

In the written reply it has been stated that the balance amount of Rs. 9 crore has been released to CAPART on 10.3.99.

7.3 When asked to justify the utilisation of remaining Rs. 9 crore in just 21 days, the Department in their written reply stated that out of the remaining Rs. 9.00 crore, Rs. 2.00 crore will be utilised by 31.03.1999, and the balance of Rs. 7.00 crore would be utilised immediately thereafter for meeting the commitments of sanctions issued during 1998-99.

7.4 The Committee express their concern over the release of substantial amount of outlay at the fag end of the year. They strongly recommend that outlay should be released in a phased manner throughout the year to ensure proper utilization.

The revised strategy of CAPART

7.5 The representatives of CAPART during the course of oral evidence submitted as under:—

“In this year two major decisions have been taken by the Government. One is to decentralise the work of CAPART and another is to de-bureaucratise the work of CAPART. In 1994, for the first time, we constituted regional Committees. Earlier, everything was centralised. From 1st April, 1998, we have, in fact, delegated the powers of sanctioning of schemes to our eight regional Committees. The schemes up to Rs. 10 lakh for all schemes in all the sectors the voluntary Organisations could submit them directly to the regional Committees and obtain sanctions. If the total outlay exceeds Rs. 10 lakh, the Voluntary Organisations proposals will come to Head Office.

At the same time, at the national level we have nine national Standing Committees for nine sectors. Earlier these Committees were chaired by the Director-General. Now, these Committees were chaired by the non-officials and eminent persons in the voluntary sector and the Director General works as Vice Chairman of this Committee. Now, our regional Committees have started functioning. One such Committee which is called, Committee for Western Zone is chaired by Shri Anna Hazare a very eminent social activist.

We are also trying to see that we have an effective system of monitoring and evaluating our schemes. That is our major thrust. Supervising the work of so many Voluntary Organisations was not an easy job on our hand.”

It has further been stated:

“Based on our experience in the last 10 years, we found that if we merely replicate the schemes like Indira Awaas Yojana, Water Supply Scheme, etc. which are being implemented by the State Governments, it may not have the desired result. Therefore, we have now decided that in future the CAPART's strategy would be to primarily deal with the three major sectors. One is rural technology. Sir, I would submit that this is an area where a lot can be done. We have not been able to achieve the desired level of success. The second area where we will put a lot of emphasis

is public cooperation. This is really the omnibus kind of sector. Any activity that can bring people around would be qualified for support under public cooperation. For example, Rural Sanitation, Water Supply Scheme, Rural Housing, etc. could be taken for public cooperation. We would emphasise on effectiveness of this Scheme. That is most important. Now, CAPART will take only those Schemes which will address to those special technical problems. We would like to put in maximum science and technology inputs in these schemes which will be taken under public cooperation.

The third sector where we will be moving is the other beneficiaries sector (OBS). All those things which have been so far brought within the ambit of development and programmes and planning, they should be organised. They should be improved to develop conscience and awareness about their rights, about their obligations and what they could get from the system."

7.6 While appreciating the efforts made by the Government to revise the strategy of CAPART, the Committee hope that substantial improvement would be made in the funding of different NGOs. Further to bring more transparency, they would like to recommend that some sort of coordination should be maintained between CAPART and Panchayats.

7.7 The Committee further urge that with the revised strategy, it should be ensured that the different programmes reach to the poorest of the poor in the country. This can be achieved by providing training to the poor people.

7.8 The Committee note that the poorest of the poor in the country are not literate and they do not know how to get benefits of the different Rural Development Schemes. In view of it, they would like that CAPART should earmark some specific outlay to educate the people about different programmes being implemented for their betterment.

7.9 The Committee find that while some reputed NGOs are getting grants regularly over the years, no weightage is being given to fresh applicants. They would like that CAPART should consider and encourage new NGOs who want to do some good work for the rural poor.

CHAPTER VIII

PANCHAYATI RAJ

Demand No. 70

Major Head 2515 & 3601

8.1 Panchayati Raj Institutions have been in existence for a long time in India, but these Institutions, on the whole, have not been able to acquire the status of viable and responsive people's bodies for various reasons such as absence of regular elections, prolonged supersessions, inadequate representations of weaker sections such as Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and women, inadequate devolution of powers and lack of financial resources. There was, therefore, an imperative need to enshrine certain basic and essential features of Panchayati Raj Institutions in the Constitution itself to provide them certainty, continuity and strength. Accordingly, it was decided to bring forward legislation to accord to Panchayati Raj bodies constitutional status.

The Constitution (73rd Amendment) Act, 1992, which came into force with effect from 24 April 1993 lays the foundation of strong and vibrant Panchayati Raj Institutions in the country.

8.2 The statement indicating the total amount of funds sanctioned to States/UTs on the basis of the proposals sent by them during the last three years has been given at *Appendix-IV*. As per the statement no allocation has been made in respect of Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, J & K, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tripura, A & N Island, Daman & Diu, NCT Delhi, Lakshadweep and Pondicherry for all the three years.

It has further been mentioned in the written note that some of the North—Eastern States and Sikkim lack in infrastructural facilities for training.

Capacity Building of Panchayat

8.3 The representative of the Department during the course of oral evidence submitted as under:

"The Eleventh Finance Commission, for the first time, has been given directions by the President to look into this and suggest a certain formula by which more finances could be devolved upon the Panchyati Raj bodies. I am very happy to report that the Eleventh Finance Commission has given the task to NIRD to make a nationwide study and suggest a certain normative approach how this could be strengthened. This is the first time an effort has been made. As you have rightly said, unless and until the finances of the panchyati raj bodies are really strengthened, there is a general reluctance on the part of the State Governments to devolve more finances. There is no doubt about that. Many of the State Finance Commissions have submitted their reports and we have seen that either those reports have not been placed in the State Legislatures or where they have been placed in the State Legislatures, they have not been implemented so far. This has happened in many States."

8.4 While appreciating the above mentioned efforts made by the Government for the capacity building of Panchayats, the Committee feel that the reports submitted by the various State Finance Commissions need to be implemented expeditiously. For this purpose, they would urge the Central Government to persuade the State Governments to implement the recommendations made by their own State Finance Commissions.

CHAPTER IX

TRAINING

Demand No. 70

Major Head 2515 & 3601

Objectives of the Programme

9.1 The massive thrust to a diverse range of rural development programmes aimed at rural employment and rural infrastructure development has generated a concomitant demand for trained personnel. More so since such programmes routinely call for very complex tasks requiring high levels of specialised skills in a considerable number of field personnel, be they officials or elected functionaries. Hence, training forms a very important part of nation-wide emphasis on accelerated rural development.

9.2 Budget outlay for NIRD, SIRD, ETC. and Organisations of Training Camps, Seminars and Workshops.

	BE 97-98	Actuals 97-98	BE 98-99	Total upto Jan. 1999-2000	BE
NIRD	5.00	5.00	5.00	2.50	5.00
SIRD	3.25	4.06	3.25	3.25	4.25
ETC	3.00	3.45	3.00	0.11	3.00
Organisation of Training camps, Seminars and workshops	0.50	0.27	0.50	0.13	1.25

9.3 Keeping in view the big challenge before the Department to impart training to Panchyati Raj Institutions the Committee in their

4th Report on Demand for Grants 1998-99 had recommended to enhance the outlay under training. However as per BE 1999-2000 *status quo* has been maintained excepting SIRD where the outlay has been marginally enhanced from Rs. 3.25 crore to Rs. 4.25 crore. Further under SIRD the outlay for Rs. 3.25 crore has already been exhausted upto January, 1999.

9.4 The Committee note that the outlay provided to the national state level Institutes for training is very meagre. They recommend that it should be enhanced suitably.

CHAPTER X

ROADS IN SPECIAL PROBLEM AREAS

Demand No. 70

Major Head 2515 & 3601

10.1 The Centrally Sponsored Scheme for construction of roads in dacoity prone areas of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan is being implemented since 1985-86 on the basis of the recommendations of Ramanathan Committee, which was set up by the Planning Commission in 1983. The main thrust of the scheme is to accelerate economic development of dacoity infested areas by development of roads to provide better communication.

The Central funds available in each year are allocated to the three States in the ratio of 48% to Uttar Pradesh and 26% each to Madhya Pradesh and Rajasthan.

10.2 It has been stated by the Department that the progress in respect of works under the scheme was not satisfactory. The States of UP, MP and Rajasthan were requested not to take up any new works as on 1.2.1992. It has also been stated that the funds available for each year are being released to the three States only to meet Central liability for the on-going works.

It has also been stated by the Department in their written reply that projects were planned and executed by the State Governments through their Public Works Department and it is difficult for the Central Government to anticipate the date by which the pending works would be completed. It has also been stated by the Government that the position will be reviewed by them after the ongoing projects are completed by the State Governments.

10.3 When asked by the Committee as to why the State Governments have not been impressed upon to complete the ongoing work at the earliest and why the Central Government have not reviewed the scheme so far, the Department in their written reply stated as below:—

“A preliminary review of the scheme “Roads in Special Problem Areas” was made in 1991-92. This review revealed that the

progress of works under the scheme was not satisfactory and that the problem of dacoity had almost been eradicated. The decision not to take up any new works and to ensure completion of only the ongoing works was taken based on this review. The question of dispensing with the Scheme is a major decision that merits a comprehensive review as soon as the ongoing works are completed and a final decision whether or not to continue with the scheme will be taken thereafter."

10.4 The Committee note that the Government on the basis of a review of the schemes made in 1991-92, came to a conclusion that 'the progress of works under the scheme was not satisfactory.' On the basis of the same review, it was decided not to take up any new work under the Scheme. The Committee will like to be informed:—

- (i) How many projects were sanctioned under the scheme in the States of U.P., M.P. and Rajasthan;
- (ii) What was the total length of the roads which was to be constructed in each State;
- (iii) When these projects were sanctioned and the target, fixed if any for their completion;
- (iv) What is the present status of each road under construction in each of these States;
- (v) The amount spent so far and the amount which will be required to complete the work.

On the basis of the material available with them, the Committee feel that the Scheme is being carried on unnecessarily and the Government should take the 'major decision to dispense with the Scheme' without any further delay.

NEW DELHI;
April 19, 1999
Chaitra 29, 1921 (Saka)

KISHAN SINGH SANGWAN,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on
Urban & Rural Development.

APPENDIX I

PHYSICAL TARGET AND COVERAGE OF HABITATION UNDER ARWSP DURING 1997-98

Sl. No.	State/UT	Month	Target	No. of Habitations/villages)									
				ARWSP					MNP				
				NC	PC	Total	NC	PC	Total	NC	PC	Total	Total (ARWSP + MNP)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	3/98	380	2817	3197	192	1259	1451	188	1258	1446	2897	
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	3/98	199	135	334	160	64	224	37	56	93	317	
3.	Assam	3/98	1550	125	1675	769	192	961	723	68	791	1752	
4.	BIHAR	3/98	3663	12804	16467	829	3718	4547	1749	5075	6824	11371	
5.	GOA	3/98	13	23	36	0	0	0	3	15	18	18	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
6.	Gujarat	3/98	800	700	1500	373	310	683	360	350	710	1393
7.	Haryana	3/98	60	750	810	0	219	219	45	386	431	650
8.	Himachal Pradesh	3/98	1100	0	1100	498	102	600	494	313	807	1407
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	3/98	630	1037	1667	380	3	383	65	52	117	500
10.	Karnataka	3/98	2864	6129	8993	837	4506	5343	0	4164	4164	9507
11.	Kerala	3/98	574	652	1226	5	205	210	153	167	320	530
12.	Madhya Pradesh	3/98	2289	6122	8411	4784	5512	10296	4243	4888	9131	19427
13.	Maharashtra	3/98	173	5434	5607	128	617	745	2098	3648	5746	6491
14.	Manipur	3/98	393	183	576	76	95	171	97	70	167	338
15.	Meghalaya	3/98	338	185	523	174	57	231	95	156	251	482
16.	Mizoram	3/98	54	131	185	10	102	112	20	53	73	185

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
17.	Nagaland	3/98	70	0	70	6	8	14	10	3	13	27
18.	Orissa	3/98	6000	2000	8000	3224	2915	6139	475	736	1211	7350
19.	Punjab	3/98	353	0	353	178	0	178	90	0	90	268
20.	Rajasthan	3/98	4673	600	5273	3773	275	4048	1150	238	1388	5436
21.	Sikkim	3/98	0	126	126	0	58	58	0	63	63	121
22.	Tamil Nadu	3/98	0	3000	3000	0	1772	1772	0	2759	2759	4531
23.	Tripura	3/98	982	1085	2067	0	256	256	94	92	186	442
24.	Uttar Pradesh	3/98	2451	21821	24272	998	12999	13997	1069	22222	23291	37288
25.	West bangal	3/98	932	3116	4048	466	1619	2085	466	1643	2109	4194
26.	A & N Islands	3/98	11	3	14	0	0	0	0	11	11	11
27.	Dadra Nagar Haveli	3/98	0	50	50	0	0	0	0	45	45	45

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
28.	Daman Diu	3/98	0	4	4	0	0	3	0	3	3	6
29.	Delhi	3/98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30.	Lakashdweep	3/98	0	3	3	0	0	3	0	3	3	6
31.	Pondicherry	3/98	0	26	26	0	0	10	0	10	10	20
TOTAL			30552	69061	99613	17860	36863	54723	13724	48547	62271	116994

* Includes the following N-Cat. PV's of 1985 list

State	Target	Coverage
Assam	3	1
Gujarat	9	
J&K	12	
Maharashtra	12	8
Meghalaya	30	(16 under progress & 6 disputed)
Rajasthan	4	
Total	70	9

APPENDIX II

PHYSICAL TARGET AND COVERAGE OF HABITATION UNDER ARWSP DURING 1998-99

Sl. No.	State/UT	Month	(No. of Habitations/villages)												
			Target	Coverage											
				ARWSP						MNP					
				NC	PC	Total	NC	PC	Total	NC	PC	Total	NC	PC	Total (ARWSP + MNP)
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13			
1.	Andhra Pradesh	12/98	0	3400	3400	0	1700	1700	0	1700	1700	3400			
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	12/98	333	182	515	2	3	5	0	2	2	7			
3.	Assam	1/99	1885	615	2500	1001	487	1488	184	63	247	1735			
4.	Bihar	12/98	2522	7596	10118	127	1514	1641	416	2695	3111	4752			
5.	Goa	12/98	3	33	36	0	0	0	0	13	13	13			

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
6.	Gujarat	1/99	1008	792	1800	158	362	520	158	362	520	1040
7.	Haryana	12/98	60	650	710	3	148	151	2	222	224	375
8.	Himachal Pradesh	1/99	1200	1000	2200	365	121	486	356	250	606	1092
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	12/98	600	400	1000	30	150	180	52	142	194	374
10.	Karnataka	12/98	1265	7728	8993	354	2786	3140	0	2153	2153	5293
11.	Kerala	12/98	100	796	896	14	38	52	3	100	103	155
12.	Madhya Pradesh	12/98	6855	6519	13374	1130	4329	5459	1130	4329	5459	10918
13.	Maharashtra	12/98	2985	7015	10000	295	412	707	1236	1485	2721	3428
14.	Manipur	8/98	220	131	351	30	20	50	25	20	45	95
15.	Meghalaya	12/98	210	340	550	4	42	46	2	82	84	130
16.	Mizoram	12/98	24	256	280	0	37	37	0	4	4	41

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
17.	Nagaland	11/98	86	0	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18.	Orissa	1/99	7136	1000	8136	3127	1428	4555	195	172	367	4922
19.	Punjab	12/98	281	0	281	68	0	68	26	0	26	94
20.	Rajasthan	12/98	4500	1000	5500	1272	2047	3319	778	920	1698	5017
21.	Sikkim	11/98	0	130	130	0	35	35	0	50	50	85
22.	Tamil Nadu	12/98	0	6000	6000	0	1489	0	0	3403	3403	4892
23.	Tripura	11/98	210	600	810	0	112	112	21	17	38	150
24.	Uttar Pradesh	12/98	384	22978	23362	0	9666	9666	0	8026	8026	17692
25.	West Bengal	11/98	0	4713	4713	0	890	890	0	836	836	1726
26.	A & N Islands	11/98	11	3	14	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
27.	Dadra Nagar Haveli	12/98	57	0	57	0	0	0	0	35	35	35

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
28.	Daman & Diu	11/98	0	3	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0
29.	Delhi	1/99	0	62	62	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30.	Lakshadweep	1/99	0	3	3	0	0	3	0	2	2	5
31.	Pondicherry	12/98	0	22	22	0	0	10	0	8	8	18
Total			31935	73967	105902	7980	27816	35796	4584	27092	31676	67472

* Includes the following N-Cat. PVs of 1985 list

State	Target	Coverage
Assam	2	
Gujarat	9	
J&K	12	
Maharashtra	12	
Meghalaya	22	
Rajasthan	3	
Total	60	

APPENDIX III

STATE-WISE DETAILS OF HABITATIONS AFFECTED BY WATER QUALITY PROBLEMS

S.No.	States/UTs	No. of Habitations Affected with					Total
		Flour	Arsenic	Salinity	Iron		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1.	Andhra Pradesh	4852	0	4138	441	9431	
2.	Arunchal Pradesh	0	0	0	0	0	
3.	Assam	0	0	0	0	0	
4.	Bihar	12	0	0	18669	18681	
5.	Goa	0	0	2	2	4	
6.	Gujarat	2413	0	677	0	3090	
7.	Haryana	0	0	0	0	0	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	Himachal Pradesh	738	0	106	450	1294
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	0	0	0	0	0
10.	Karnataka	860	0	769	274	1903
11.	Kerala	237	0	26	422	685
12.	Madhya Pradesh	207	0	87	1928	2222
13.	Maharashtra	0	0	0	0	0
14.	Manipur	0	0	0	157	157
15.	Meghalaya	33	0	0	315	348
16.	Mizoram	0	0	0	52	52
17.	Nagaland	0	0	0	0	0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	Orissa	1138	3	304	42830	44275
19.	Punjab	1113	0	580	15	1708
20.	Rajasthan	14643	0	14415	440	29498
21.	Sikkim	0	0	0	0	0
22.	Tamil Nadu	527	0	300	173	1000
23.	Tripura	0	0	0	0	0
24.	Uttar Pradesh	1072	0	3426	3720	8218
25.	West Bengal	0	9000	7722	6516	23238
26.	A&N Islands	0	0	0	0	0
27.	D&N Haveli	0	0	0	0	0

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28.	Daman & Diu	0	0	0	0	0
29.	Delhi	0	0	0	0	0
30.	Lakshadweep	0	0	0	0	0
31.	Pondicherry	0	0	0	0	0
32.	Chandigarh	0	0	0	0	0
Total		27845	9003	32552	76404	145804

APPENDIX IV

STATEMENT INDICATING THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF FUNDS SANCTIONED TO STATES/UTs
ON THE BASIS OF THE PROPOSALS SENT BY THEM DURING THE LAST THREE YEARS
FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF PANCHAYATS AND TRAINING

Sl.	State/UTs	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Rs. 50,00,000	Rs. 1,62,040	—
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	—	—	—
3.	Assam	Rs. 16,86,300	Rs. 13,56,960	—
4.	Bihar	—	—	—
5.	Goa	—	Rs. 3,70,000	—
6.	Gujarat	—	—	—

1	2	3	4	5
8.	Himachal Pradesh	—	—	—
9.	J & K	—	—	—
10.	Karnataka	—	Rs. 36,70,633	—
11.	Kerala	Rs. 23,35,000	—	—
12.	Madhya Pradesh	Rs. 28,12,050	Rs. 64,43,188	—
13.	Maharashtra	Rs. 25,93,415	—	—
14.	Manipur	—	Rs. 6,30,000	—
15.	Meghalaya	—	—	—
16.	Mizoram	—	—	—
17.	Nagaland	—	—	Rs. 5,92,00

1	2	3	4	5
18.	Orissa	—	—	—
19.	Punjab	—	—	—
20.	Rajasthan	—	—	—
21.	Sikkim	—	—	Rs. 3,35,300
22.	Tamilnadu	—	Rs. 27,48,519	—
23.	Tripura	—	—	—
24.	Uttar Pradesh	—	Rs. 39,23,700	—
25.	West Bengal	—	—	Rs. 90,82,700
26.	A & N Islands	—	—	—
27.	Chandigarh	—	—	—

1	2	3	4	5
28.	D & N Haveli	—	—	—
29.	Daman & Diu	—	—	—
30.	NCT Delhi	—	—	—
31.	Lakshadweep	—	—	—
32.	Pondicherry	—	—	—

APPENDIX V

COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1998-99)

EXTRACT OF THE MINUTES OF THE THIRTY SIXTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT HELD ON FRIDAY, 26TH MARCH, 1999.

The Committee sat from 1115 hrs. to 1330 hrs. in Room No. 62,
Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Tariq Anwar
3. Dr. Shafiqur Rahman Barq
4. Shri Sriram Chauhan
5. Shri Ramkrushna Suryabhan Gavai
6. Shri Vinod Khanna
7. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
8. Shri Subrata Mukherjee
9. Smt. Ranee Narah
10. Shri Rameshwar Patidar
11. Smt. Jayanti Patnaik
12. Shri Mullappally Ramachandran
13. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
14. Shri Vithal Baburao Tupe
15. Dr. Ram Vilas Vedanti
16. Shri K. Venugopal

Rajya Sabha

17. Smt. Shabana Azmi
18. Shri Nilotpal Basu
19. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
20. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
21. Shri Jagdambi Mandal
22. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri G.C. Malhotra — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Director*
3. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

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

1. Shri M. Shankar, Additional Secretary & F.A.
2. Shri Palat Mohandas, Joint Secretary
3. Shri Sukumar Das, Joint Secretary
4. Smt. Sudha Pillai, Joint Secretary
5. Shri P.S. Rana, Joint Secretary
6. Shri Rangan Dutta, D.G.
Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural
Technology
7. Shri R.C. Choudhary, D.G.
National Institute of Rural Development

2. At the outset the Chairman welcomed Shri Tariq Anwar nominated as a member of the Committee, with effect from 18th March, 1999.

3.	**	**	**
	**	**	**
4.	**	**	**
	**	**	**
5.	**	**	**
	**	**	**

6. The Committee thereafter took up for consideration the Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Department of Rural Development (Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment). The Chairman welcomed the representatives of the said Ministry to the sitting. He drew the attention of the witnesses to the provisions of directions 55 (1) of the Directions by the Speaker.

7. The additional Secretary, Department of Rural Development then briefed the Committee about the various programmes and schemes of the Department.

8. The Committee then took evidence of the representatives of the Department on the Demands for Grants of the said Department as a whole and on the Demands for Grants pertaining to Accelerated Rural Water Supply Programme (ARWSP).

9. A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again at 14.30 hrs. to consider and take evidence of the representatives of the Department of Rural Development on the Demands for Grants in respect of the remaining schemes of the Department.

APPENDIX VI

COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1998-99)

MINUTES OF THE THIRTY SEVENTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT HELD ON FRIDAY, 26TH MARCH, 1999.

The Committee sat from 1430 hrs. to 1700 hrs. in Room No. 62,
Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Tariq Anwar
3. Dr. Shafiqur Rahman Barq
4. Shri Sriram Chauhan
5. Shri Ramkrushna Suryabhan Gavai
6. Shri Vinod Khanna
7. Shri Bir Singh Mahato
8. Shri Subrata Mukherjee
9. Smt. Ranee Narah
10. Shri Rameshwar Patidar
11. Smt. Jayanti Patnaik
12. Shri Mullappally Ramachandran
13. Shri Nikhilananda Sar
14. Shri Vithal Baburao Tupe
15. Dr. Ram Vilas Vedanti
16. Shri K. Venugopal

Rajya Sabha

17. Smt. Shabana Azmi
18. Shri Nilotpal Basu
19. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
20. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
21. Shri Jagdambi Mandal
22. Shri Suryabhan Patil Vahadane

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Director*
2. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

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

1. Shri. M. Shankar, Additional Secretary & F.A.
2. Shri Palat Mohandas, Joint Secretary
3. Shri Sukumar Das, Joint Secretary
4. Smt. Sudha Pillai, Joint Secretary
5. Shri P.S. Rana, Joint Secretary
6. Shri Rangan Dutta, D.G.
Council for Advancement of People's Action and Rural
Technology
7. Shri R.C. Choudhary, D.G.
National Institute of Rural Development

2. The Committee resumed consideration of the remaining schemes of the Department of Rural Development viz. Land Reforms, National Social Assistance Programme, Central Rural Sanitation Programme, Panchayati Raj and CAPART and took evidence of the representatives on the concerned Demands for Grants.

3. A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX VII

COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1998-99)

MINUTES OF THE FORTY FIFTH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT HELD ON FRIDAY, 9TH APRIL, 1999.

The Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1315 hrs. in Committee Room No. 62, Parliament House, New Delhi.

PRESENT

Shri Kishan Singh Sangwan — *Chariman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Tariq Anwar
3. Shri Ramkrushna Suryabhan Gavai
4. Shri Vinod Khanna
5. Shrimati Ranee Narah
6. Shri Remeshwar Patidar
7. Shrimati Jayanti Patnaik
8. Shri Mullappally Ramachandran
9. Shri Vithal Baburao Tupe

Rajya Sabha

10. Shrimati Shabana Azmi
11. Shri Nilotpal Basu
12. Shri N.R. Dasari
13. Shri C. Apok Jamir

14. Shri Onkar Singh Lakhawat
15. Prof. A. Lakshmisagar
16. Shri Jagdambi Mandal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.C. Rastogi — *Director*
2. Smt. Sudesh Luthra — *Under Secretary*

2. The Committee took up for consideration the Draft Report on Demands for Grants 1999-2000 of the Department of Rural Development of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment.

3. The Committee adopted the Report on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Department of Rural Development with certain modifications as indicated in Annexure.

4.	**	**	**
	**	**	**
5.	**	**	**
	**	**	**

6. The Committee then authorised the Chairman to finalise both the Reports after getting the same factually verified from the concerned Department/Ministry and present the same to the Houses of Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.

** Minutes regarding consideration and adoption of Draft Report on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Department of Rural Employment & Poverty Alleviation one kept separately.

(See Para 3 of the Minutes dated 9.4.1999)

Sl. No.	Para No.	Modifications
1	2	3
1.	3.20	<p><i>For Para No. 3.20 substitute the following:</i></p> <p>“The Committee have their doubts about the coverage of rural habitations <i>i.e.</i> 1060921 out of the total habitations 1430663. Keeping in view the ground reality, they feel that while calculating the number of covered habitations, the number of habitations having contaminated water supply are included. Further in most of the habitations, the mainimum requirement of 40 litre of safe drinking water per capita is not fulfilled throughout the year. In some areas the source could have dried due to the water-table going down. The Committee feel that if all these factors are taken into consideration, the actual coverage would be lesser than as claimed by the Government as per their data. The Committee therefore, strongly recommend that a habitation should be considered as being covered habitation only if safe drinking water is provided as per the minimum required norms. It is further urged that Government should verify the data from respective States/ UTs to have a realistic picture about the position of water supply in the rural areas of the country.”</p>

1	2	3
2.	3.22	<p>At the <i>end</i> of Para 3.22 <i>add</i> the following:</p> <p>"It is also desired that the Government should monitor the position of supply of safe drinking water in the Primary Schools in rural areas and the Not Covered Schools should be covered within the minimum possible time".</p>
3.	3.24	<p>After Para 3.24 <i>add</i> the following:</p> <p>"3.24A When asked whether the quality related habitations have included in the data of covered habitations, the representative of the Department during the course of oral evidence stated that in 1991 during the State Government survey, the quality problem was not given importance. It is a fact that the quality problem habitations have been included in the data furnished by the Department."</p>
4.	3.25	<p>For Para 3.25 <i>substitute</i> the following:</p> <p>"The Committee note that as per the written information made available to the Committee, out of the total 1430663 habitations in the country, 145804 habitations <i>i.e.</i> around 10% are affected by the quality problem. They feel that the data given by the Government is not realistic as admitted by the representatives of the Department during the course of oral evidence, the quality problem villages have actually been included in the covered habitations. They are therefore constrained to note that even after 50 years of independence, the Government have not given adequate</p>

1

2

3

importance to the quality aspect and would like that States/UTs Government should be requested to accord adequate priority to this aspect and adequate funds should be provided to tackle the problem."

5.

3.32

After para 3.32 add the following:

"3.33 The Committee note that adequate attention has not been paid to store the rain water. It is recommended that Government should think of launching some scheme to provide subsidy to individuals for conservation of rain water. They would also like that different methods for conservation of rain water should be publicised by the media to disseminate the information."

6.

6.5

After para 6.5 add the following:

"6.5(a) While appreciating budgetary constraints, the Committee note that the scheme should be implemented by selecting field areas during a particular year so as to make an impact rather than spreading the resources so thinly."

7.

7.7

After para 7.7 add the following:

"7.8 The Committee note that the poorest of the poor in the country are not literate and they do not know how to get benefits of the different Rural Development Schemes. In view of it, they would like that CAPART should earmark some specific outlay to educate the people about different programmes being implemented for their betterment."

1

2

3

"7.9 The Committee find that while some reputed NGOs are getting grants regularly over the years, no weightage is being given to fresh applicants. They would like that CAPART should consider and encourage new NGOs who want to do some good work for the rural poor."

APPENDIX VIII

STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS

Sl. No.	Para No.	Recommendations/Observations
1	2	3
1.	2.5	<p>The Committee note that around 9% increase in B.E. 1999-2000 over B.E. 1998-99 will hardly be able to cover the increase in cost due to inflation. They also find that due to the inadequate allocation the targets for the different Programmes specifically the priority Programmes like Rural Water Supply Programme and National Social Assistance Programme would have to be spilled over. They therefore, would like to recommend that the allocation for the different programmes/ specifically the programmes under the priority sector should be adequately enhanced so as to cover the targets fixed for these programmes during 9th Plan.</p>
2.	3.6	<p>The Committee note that the percentage increase in allocation during 1999-2000 over the allocation of previous year is quite less as compared to the position in 1997-98 & 1998-99. Further, out of the estimated outlay for the scheme to the tune of Rs. 3,000 crore, Planning Commission has allocated only Rs. 1800 crore during 1999-2000. They feel that in view of the inadequate outlay, the targets would have to be spilled over.</p> <p>It is strongly recommended that sufficient funds should be provided for the programme</p>

1	2	3
		<p>specially when it is the most priority programme under the National Agenda for governance. They would like that Planning Commission should be pursued further for enhancing the allocation for ARWSP.</p>
3	3.7	<p>The Committee further find that not only there was inadequacy of allocation but the scarce resources allocated to State Governments were not utilised fully by the implementing agencies. They are disturbed to find that one of the reasons for underspending as mentioned in the written note is late release of funds to the implementing agencies. They, therefore, recommend that monitoring of the programme should further be strengthened and State Governments should be impressed upon to release the funds timely to the implementing agencies to ensure 100% utilisation of funds.</p>
4	3.15	<p>While noting the laudable objective of coverage of all the remaining not covered and partially covered habitations in the 9th Plan, the Committee express their doubts in view of the lower budgetary allocation than required. They appreciate the efforts of Tamil Nadu Government by availing financial support from LTC and the revised policy of the Government to involve the user for sharing the cost of the resources and shifting of 100% operation & maintenance cost on the user.</p>
5.	3.16	<p>To achieve the laudable objective of providing water to each and every habitation during 9th Plan, the Committee would like to recommend that the budgetary allocation</p>

1	2	3
		<p>should be adequately enhanced. The Committee urge that State Governments should also be requested to involve the users in the implementation of the programme and bearing of capital and Organisation and Management cost to the extent possible. But where the user belong to the poorest of the poor category, the subsidy should be ensured.</p>
6.	3.17	<p>To bring the improvement in the operation and maintenance of the assets, the Committee feel that as envisaged in the objective of 9th Plan, the best alternative is Panchayat. To enable the Panchayats to fulfil these obligations, the Committee would like to recommend that Government should think of strengthening the capacity of Panchayats.</p>
7.	3.18	<p>While recommending for higher outlay, the Committee note with concern the underspending in some of the States/UTs.</p>
8.	3.19	<p>The Committee have their doubts about the coverage of rural habitations i.e. 1060921 out of the total habitations 1430663. Keeping in view the ground reality, they feel that while calculating the number of covered habitations, the number of habitations having contaminated water supply are included. Further in most of the habitations, the mainimum requirement of 40 litre of safe drinking water per capita is not fulfilled throughout the year. In some areas the source could have dried due to the water-table going down. The Committee feel that if all these factors are taken into consideration, the actual coverage would be lesser than as claimed by the Government as per their data. The</p>

1

2

3

Committee therefore, strongly recommend that a habitation should be considered as being covered habitation only if safe drinking water is provided as per the minimum required norms. It is further urged that Government should verify the data from respective States/UTs to have a realistic picture about the position of water supply in the rural areas of the country.

9.

3.21

The Committee are concerned to know that around 50% of the Primary Schools in the country do not have access to safe drinking water inspite of the fact that safe drinking water in every rural primary school is one of the priorities under Rajiv Gandhi National Drinking Water Mission. They strongly recommend that State Governments should be impressed upon to give the priority to schools and sufficient funds should be provided for the purpose. It is also desired that the Government should monitor the position of supply of safe drinking water in the Primary Schools in rural areas and the Not Covered Schools should be covered within the minimum possible time.

10.

3.25

The Committee note that as per the written information made available to the Committee, out of the total 1430663 habitations in the country, 145804 habitations i.e. around 10% are affected by the quality problem. They feel that the data given by the Government is not realistic as admitted by the representatives of the Department during the course of oral evidence, the quality problem villages have actually been included in the covered

1

2

3

habitations. They are, therefore, constrained to note that even after 50 years of independence, the Government have not given adequate importance to the quality aspect and would like that States/UTs Government should be requested to accord adequate priority to this aspect and adequate funds should be provided to tackle the problem.

11.

3.31

The Committee find that adequate attention has not been paid towards the issue of sustainability of drinking water resources. They appreciate that a few States have enacted legislation for control and conservation of ground water. They however, feel that merely enacting legislation is not sufficient. The Committee would like that the position of the implementation of the Act should also be monitored by the Government. It is also desired that the remaining States should be requested to enact such legislation.

12.

3.32

The Committee feel that to stop the over exploitation of ground water resources, some policy initiative needs to be taken. They in their 4th Report (1998-99) on Demand for Grants of the Department had recommended for a National Water Policy. Since various Ministries like Water Resources, Agriculture and Science & Technology etc. are involved in the issue; they would like that there is a need for a coordinated approach to solve this problem. The Committee would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation to chalk out a National Water Policy in consultation with the other Ministries/Departments and States/UTs involved.

1	2	3
13.	3.33	<p>The Committee note that adequate attention has not been paid to store the rain water. It is recommended that Government should think of launching some scheme to provide subsidy to individuals for conservation of rain water. They would also like that different methods for conservation of rain water should be publicised by the media to disseminate the information.</p>
14.	4.8	<p>The Committee note that inspite of their recommending strongly in their earlier reports for enhancement of outlay and take other measures to improve the sorry state of affairs, nothing substantial has been made on this account. It is really pathetic to note that even today when the nation have celebrated 50 years of Independence so gloriously, 86% of the rural households don't have access to sanitary latrines, not to talk of the total sanitation. It is again strongly recommended that Government should pay more attention to this issue.</p>
15	4.9	<p>They urge that substantial funds should be earmarked for the programme. Whatever meagre allocation is made, is should not be reduced at RE stage at any cost.</p>
16.	4.10	<p>It is further felt that allocating more funds is not sufficient. The need is to make the people aware of the need for sanitation. They find that the worst sufferers, due to the lack of the sanitation, are women. It is therefore recommended that the Sanitation Programme should be linked with other women related Programmes like DWCRA. Further rural people have to be made aware of the need of</p>

1	2	3
		sanitation through various mediums. A community based approach on this account is required.
17.	4.11	The Committee further note that in some countries, good work on this account has been done. They recommend that the Department should study such programmes and launch a micro-credit movement with the involvement of women. Besides, it is also found that very good work has been done in many districts in our country. They urge that such districts should be considered as model and other districts in different States should be encouraged to make improvement on this account.
18.	4.13	The Committee would like that to improve the position of sanitation in the country, more stress need to be given to school sanitation. It is felt that the children are the best to be trained in this regard. It is urged that more steps should be given to school sanitation and sufficient funds should be allocated for the purpose.
19.	5.8	The Committee find that whatever allocation was made under NSAP it was further reduced at RE stage. As indicated at para No. 2.3 of the Report, the requirement of funds under NSAP has gone up to Rs. 1586 crore with the projected population for 1998 and New Poverty Ratio indicated by the Planning Commission whereas the allocation made during 1999-2000 is Rs. 725 crore only. It is strongly recommended that the allocation for the scheme should be substantially stepped up. Further whatever allocation is made, it should not be reduced at RE Stage.

1	2	3
20.	5.9	While recommending for higher outlay the Committee would like that Government should try to find out the reasons for the slow implementation of the Programme specifically the NFBS & NMBS components and take remedial measures.
21.	5.10	It is felt that the main reason for the slow progress of the scheme as admitted by the Government is inadequate publicity. The Committee in their 4th Report 1998-99 had recommended to publicise the scheme through print and electronic media and by fixing bill boards in local language at the important public places like Village Panchayats, railway stations, bus stops etc. They would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation.
22.	5.11	The Committee feel that to make the schemes really successful, the Government should think of implementing the Scheme through Panchayats and Gram Sabha.
23.	6.5	The Committee note that a good start by way of the centrally Sponsored Scheme for upgradation of rural maps was made but the reduced allocation over the years show that not much importance is being imparted to the Scheme. They feel that land records are the basic document for planning and other purposes and the lack of land records is the basic reason for high number of land related court cases. It is recommended that serious attention should be paid to the Scheme and sufficient funds allocated for its implementation.

1	2	3
24.	6.5 (a)	While appreciating budgetary constraints, the Committee note that the scheme should be implemented by selecting field areas during a particular year so as to make an impact rather than spreading the resources so thinly.
25.	6.10	The Committee feel that the basic land Records are the main input for the Computerisation of Land Records. The Programme cannot be implemented successfully unless the country is ready with the correct updated basic maps. It is regretted to note that even Districts in North Eastern States do not even have the basic land records. The Committee therefore strongly recommend that more attention should be paid to have the correct and updated map of every District in the country.
26.	7.4	The Committee express their concern over the release of substantial amount of outlay at the fag end of the year. They strongly recommend that outlay should be released in a phased manner throughout the year to ensure proper utilization.
27.	7.6	While appreciating the efforts made by the Government to revise the strategy of CAPART, the Committee hope that substantial improvement would be made in the funding of different NGOs. Further to bring more transparency, they would like to recommend that some sort of coordination should be maintained between CAPART and Panchayats.
28.	7.7	The Committee further urge that with the revised strategy, it should be ensured that the different programmes reach to the poorest of the poor in the country. This can be achieved by providing training to the poor people.

1	2	3
29.	7.8	The Committee note that the poorest of the poor in the country are not literate and they do not know how to get benefits of the different Rural Development Schemes. In view of it, they would like that CAPART should earmark some specific outlay to educate the people about different programmes being implemented for their betterment.
30.	7.9	The Committee find that while some reputed NGOs are getting grants regularly over the years, no weightage is being given to fresh applicants. They would like that CAPART should consider and encourage new NGOs who want to do some good work for the rural poor.
31.	8.4	While appreciating the above mentioned efforts made by the Government for the capacity building of Panchayats, the Committee feel that the reports submitted by the various State Finance Commissions need to be implemented expeditiously. For this purpose, they would urge the Central Government to persuade the State Governments to implement the recommendations made by their own State Finance Commissions.
32.	9.4	The Committee note that the outlay provided to the national state level Institutes for training is very meagre. They recommend that it should be enhanced suitably.
33.	10.4	The Committee note that the Government on the basis of a review of the scheme made in 1991-92, came to a conclusion that 'the progress of works under the scheme was not satisfactory.' On the basis of the same review, it was decided not to take up any new work

1

2

3

under the Scheme. The Committee will like to be informed:

- (i) How many projects were sanctioned under the scheme in the States of U.P., M.P. and Rajasthan,
- (ii) What was the total length of the roads which was to be constructed in each State,
- (iii) When these projects were sanctioned and the target, fixed if any for their completion.
- (iv) What is the present status of each road under construction in each of these States,
- (v) The amount spent so far and the amount which will be required to complete the work.

On the basis of the material available with them, the Committee feel that the Scheme is being carried on unnecessary and the Government should take the 'major decision to dispense with the Scheme' without any further delay.
