

29

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

**TWELFTH LOK SABHA**

**MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND EMPLOYMENT  
(DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS  
(1998-99)**

**TWENTY-NINTH REPORT**



सत्यमेव जयते

१. 3657R

१. 29.1.

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

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

**(TWELFTH LOK SABHA)**

**MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND EMPLOYMENT**  
**(DEPARTMENT OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS**  
**(1998-99)**

*[Action Taken Report on the First Report of the  
Committee on Urban & Rural Development (1998-99)]*



*Presented to Lok Sabha on 22nd April, 1999*  
*Laid in Rajya Sabha on 23rd April, 1999*

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**  
**NEW DELHI**

*April, 1999/Chaitra, 1921 (Saka)*

**C.U. & R.D. No. 079**

*Price : Rs. 17.00*

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY

Central Govt. Publications

Acc. No. LC 101319..... (5)

Date 22/4/99.....

LC

328.365-18

N 8.29.4

© 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 (1998-99) .....	(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(v)
CHAPTER I      Report .....	1
CHAPTER II      Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government .....	10
CHAPTER III      Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies .....	25
CHAPTER IV      Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee .....	26
CHAPTER V      Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited .....	28

### APPENDICES

I.	Extracts of the Minutes of the 36th sitting of the Committee on Urban & Rural Development held on 26.3.99 .....	30
II.	Analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the First Report (12th Lok Sabha) .....	35

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.* 18.3.99 *vice* Shri Sudip Bandyopadhyay.

23. Shri Ramjidas Rishidev
24. Shri Chatin Singh Samaon
25. Shri Nikhilananda 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 Vyjayantimala Bali
33. Shri Nilotpal Basu
- \*34. Shri Jhumuklal 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>      |

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Urban & Rural Development (1998-99) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Twenty-Ninth Report on Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the First Report of the Standing Committee on Urban & Rural Development (1998-99).

2. The First Report was presented to Lok Sabha on 7th July, 1998. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 30th September, 1998. The replies of the Government were examined and the Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 26th March, 1999.

3. An analysis of the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the First Report of the Committee (Twelfth Lok Sabha) is given in Appendix-II.

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

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

## **CHAPTER I**

### **REPORT**

**This Report of the Committee on Urban & Rural Development (1998-99) deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in their First Report on Demands for Grants for the year (1998-99) of the Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment (Department of Urban Development) which was presented to Lok Sabha on 7th July, 1998.**

**2. Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 22 recommendations which have been categorised as follows:**

- (i) Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by the Government:**

**Para Nos. 2.7, 2.8, 2.10, 3.13, 3.14, 3.16, 3.22, 3.23, 3.28, 3.29, 3.30, 3.33, 3.47, 3.55, 4.13, 4.21, 5.3 and 6.6**

- (ii) Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue:**

**-Nil-**

- (iii) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee:**

**Para Nos. 2.9 and 3.15**

- (iv) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited:**

**Para Nos. 3.39 and 4.14**

**.**

**3. The Committee require that final replies in respect of the recommendations for which only interim replies have been given by the Government should be furnished to Committee within three months of the presentation of the Report.**



**4. The Committee will now deal with action taken by the Government on some of these recommendations in the succeeding paragraphs.**

**A. Budgetary allocation for 9th Plan**

**Recommendation (Para 2.8)**

**5. The Committee had recommended:**

“It is observed from the broad analysis of the budgetary allocation that the tentative outlay of Rs. 2300 crore for 9th Plan as agreed to by the Planning Commission against the proposed outlay of Rs. 11795 crore is very much on the lower side. The Committee note with concern the observation of the Officials of the Department during their evidence before them that the targets sets during 9th Plan would have to be reduced keeping in view the lesser allocation of funds by the Planning Commission. Further disturbing is the fact that the Government would not be able to take up new programmes/schemes which they have planned for the 9th Plan. The whole exercise of planning for urban sector would be futile without sufficient funds. The Committee would, therefore, like to recommend that keeping in view the broad activities of the Department sufficient funds should be provided.”

**6. The Government in their reply have stated as follows:**

“Planning Commission has been apprised of the above observation of the Parliamentary Standing Committee. It was brought to the notice of Planning Commission that the tentative outlay of Rs. 2300 crore allotted to the Ministry for the Department of Urban Development for the 9th Plan is inadequate to meet the priorities and targets set under different schemes of the Urban Development for 9th Plan. It was also mentioned that New Housing Policy known as “National Housing & Habitat Policy 1998” through the National Agenda declared Housing for All as a priority area lays greater focus on the housing needs of citizens in general and that of the poor and the deprived in particular. New National Housing and Habitat Policy—1998 sets a target of construction of 2 million houses every year with emphasis on the poor and deprived. We have requested the Planning Commission to enhance the 9th Plan outlay for this Ministry”.

7. While noting the reply of the Government that Planning Commission have been requested to enhance the 9th Plan outlay of the Ministry, the Committee would like to be apprised of the response of the Planning Commission in this regard.

**B. Underutilisation of funds allotted for different schemes/programmes**

**Recommendation (Para 2.9)**

8. The following is the recommendation of the Committee:

“The Committee further note with concern the variation between BE, RE and actuals during 1997-98. The outlay for Rs. 529.00 crore which was reduced at RE stage to Rs. 510.00 crore even that could not be fully utilised by the Department. While recommending for higher outlay during 9th Plan, they would like that the Government should ensure the proper execution and implementation of the projects/ schemes undertaken by the Department so that the resources allocated are utilised fully.”

9. The Ministry in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“The divisional Heads in the Deptt. of Urban Development have been advised to take appropriate steps to ensure full utilisation of the funds allotted to them. They have also been requested to take appropriate steps to overcome the constraints faced in utilisation of resources and implementation of scheme.”

10. The Committee are not inclined to accept the reply furnished by the Government that Divisional Heads had been advised to take appropriate steps to ensure full utilisation of the funds allocated to them. The Committee would like to be apprised of this specific steps taken or proposed to be taken not only by the Divisional Heads but by the Department as a whole.

**C. Enhanced allocation during IX Plan for IDSMT**

**Recommendation (Para 3.13)**

11. In the recommendation it has been stated as below:

“The Committee note that the main objective of the IDSMT scheme is to develop selected regional growth centres with infrastructure and service facilities so as to enable such towns

to emerge as regional centres of economic growth and employment opportunities and arrest migration from rural areas and small towns to large and metropolitan cities. However, they are unable to understand as to how this laudable objective could be achieved by a meagre allocation of Rs. 35 crore during 1998-99. While due to resource crunch, the Planning Commission reduces the allocation meant for this scheme, at the same time has released a sum of Rs. 330 crore under NSDP. The Committee feel that by reducing outlay for IDSMT the Government indirectly encourage the growth of slums in large and metro towns. The development of slums further acts as an incentive to people of towns lacking in basic facilities to migrate to large and metro towns and adding to the slum population in those towns. The Committee, therefore, recommend that while considering the proposal of the Ministry for outlay under IDSMT. The Government should not reduce the outlay and should keep in view the fact that any reduction in this outlay will induce more expenditure under NSDP."

12. The Ministry in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

"The need for enhanced allocation for the IDSMT Scheme has already been taken up with the Planning Commission from time to time during VIII Plan. Enhanced allocation of Rs. 300 crore during IX Plan has been proposed for consideration of the Planning Commission. However, as compared to the Annual Plan proposals, the actual budget allocation made available during each of the last three years was very much inadequate and the same was further reduced at RE stage as would be seen from the details given below:

(Rs. in crore)			
Year	Annual Plan Proposal	Budget Allocation (BE)	Revised Allocation (RE)
1995-96	100.00	35.00	30.00
1996-97	62.50	35.00	28.26
1997-98	60.00	35.00	26.02

However, enhanced allocation of Rs. 55 crore has been made available for 1998-99. Keeping in view the observations of the Committee, the matter has again been taken up with the Planning Commission regarding enhanced allocation for IDSMT during the IX Plan."

**13. The Committee appreciate the efforts made by the Government for getting higher outlay under IDSMT during Ninth Plan, as per their recommendation. They would like to be apprised of the response of the Planning Commission in this regard.**

**D. Submission of Proposals under different schemes by UT Administration under IDSMT Scheme**

**Recommendation (Para 3.14)**

**14. The Committee in their earlier recommendation had stated:**

"The Committee note that due to non-receipt of eligible proposals from Union Territories Administration, a sum of Rs. 2.8 crore could not be utilised during 8th Plan period. With a view to utilise the funds properly during 9th Plan, they would urge upon the Government to impress upon the UT Administrations to submit their proposals under this scheme well in time so that they could also avail of the benefit of the IDSMT Scheme."

**Reply of the Government**

**15. The Government in their reply have further stated:**

"The Union Territories concerned are being addressed to submit their proposals under IDSMT well in time."

**16. While noting the reply of the Government that UT Administrations are being addressed to submit their proposals under IDSMT in time, the Committee would like to be informed of the response of the UT Administration in this regard.**

**E. Implementation of Pilot Project for capacity building of local bodies launched by the Government**

**Recommendation (Para 3.15)**

17. The Committee had recommended as under:

“The Committee recommend that the pilot project launched by the Government to build the capacity of certain local bodies should be implemented vigorously and its effect would be watched. They would like to be informed of the impact of the project on the local bodies covered under the Project.”

**Reply of the Government**

18. The Ministry in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

“The Ministry has proposed among other, following three New Schemes for inclusion in the 9th Five Year Plan:

(i) Municipal Capacity Building Scheme	— Rs. 10.00 cr.
(ii) Technical Support for District Metropolitan and City Development Plan	— Rs. 24.00 cr.
(iii) New Delhi Pilot Project to promote barrier-free environment for the elderly & Physical handicapped	— Rs. 1.00 cr.
<hr/>	
Rs. 35.00 cr.	

The approval has been given for inclusion of Scheme “Urban/Municipal Capacity Building in the context of 74th Amendment—Assistance for District Metropolitan & City Development Plan—computerisation and other Technical Support only” with a provision of Rs. 1.00 crore. The approval for incurring expenditure for this Scheme is still not received. Therefore, said scheme is yet to be launched. It is also informed that no pilot project was proposed under this Scheme.”

19. On the recommendation of the Committee to implement the pilot project launched by the Government to build the capacity of certain local bodies, the Government in their action taken reply have stated that no pilot project was proposed under this scheme. The attention of the Government is drawn to para 3.12 of the 1st report (1998-99) whereby the representative of the Ministry of

**Urban Affairs & Employment had explained before the Committee about a pilot SD project launched by the Government for the said purpose. The Committee concerned to note the way the Government have taken their recommendations. They would like to reiterate their earlier recommendation.**

**F. Study on Traffic and Transportation Policies and strategies in Urban Areas in India**

**Recommendation (Para 3.39)**

20. The Committee had noted as below:

“The Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment have conducted a study on “Traffic and Transportation Policies and Strategies in Urban Areas in India” and have sent copies of the report to the State Governments. The Committee would like to know the general reaction of the State Governments in the said study. They would also like to know whether any proposal for Central Assistance has come from any State Government as a result of this study.”

21. The Committee have replied as below:

“The response of the State Government is still awaited, who have been reminded in this regard. The State Governments have been given time upto July end to respond.”

22. The Committee find that as per the Government’s reply, the response of the State Governments on the study ‘Traffic and Transportation Policies and Strategies in Urban Areas in India’ was expected by July end. They would like to know about the response of the State Governments when received.

**G. Data regarding demand and availability of water in all the cities/towns**

**Recommendation (Para 4.14)**

23. The Committee had observed:

“Central Government have not procured so far, the data with regard to the demand and availability of water in each town/city. The Government took initiative for procuring data only with regard to cities having population above 5 lakhs and that too is not complete. The Committee recommend that the Central

Government should conduct a survey to procure the data for demand and availability of water in all the total 3768 cities/towns as the same is an essential requirement for making future planning."

24. The Government have replied as below:

"The Central Public Health & Environmental Engineering Organisation (CPHEEO), the technical wing of the Ministry, has been entrusted the task of monitoring collection of data in respect of the 3768 cities/towns. The State Governments have been requested *vide* letter No. Z-22011/1/97-CPHEEO dated 6th June, 1997 to furnish data on the status of urban water supply and sanitation facilities in cities and towns. This point was also stressed upon during a meeting convened on 17th August, 1998 by the Secretary, Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment to review the performance of the Centrally sponsored schemes of Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme and the Low Cost Sanitation. The State Secretaries/Chief Engineers were impressed upon the urgency and importance to furnish the data in the prescribed proforma already circulated by CPHEEO. They were requested to expedite the matter."

25. The Committee are lost to understand as to why the Department could not procure the data regarding the demand and availability of water in the total 3768 cities/towns as recommended by the Committee even after the lapse of more than one and a half year. In view of the importance of the data for future planning, the Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation and would like to be informed about the States/UTs who have since furnished the requisite data. They would like the Government to persuade the remaining States/UTs Governments/Administrations to supply the data without further delay.

#### H. Restructuring of Govt. Presses

##### Recommendation (Para 6.6)

26. The Committee had observed as below:

"The Committee note that though the decision to close down the Presses was taken by the Government as long back in 1990, the Government was neither closing the presses nor was modernising them so as to increase their productivity. The

Government also stated that they were trying to restructure the Government Presses. The Committee regret to observe that though a period of about 8 years has elapsed when Government took decision to close down the Government of India Presses, they were neither closing down nor restructuring them. As the Presses have been meeting the printing requirement of Government of India for the last several decades, the Committee recommend that these be modernised/restructured in consultation with labour unions without any further loss of time. They will like to be informed of action taken by the Government in this regard."

27. The Department in their Action Taken Reply have stated:

"The question of closure/modernisation/restructuring of some Govt. of India Presses/Units has been under consideration of Government for some time. The Cabinet, in June, 1997 had desired that the Cabinet Secretary should look into the issues and make appropriate recommendations. Accordingly, he considered the issues in consultation with the Secretaries of Departments concerned in October, 1997 and made certain observations/recommendations. The recommendations include transfer of certain Presses to other Departments, transfer of Text-Books Presses to the respective State Governments, clubbing/restructuring of some Presses—conversion of one press to a training-cum-production unit after modernisation, phasing out of one press, closure of some units etc. Each of these issues are being examined in consultation with concerned Ministries/Departments/State Governments wherever necessary. The matter is being pursued with them for taking a decision.

Out of twenty-one Govt. of India Presses, eight are fully modernised, seven are partially modernised and one press is under process of modernisation. The question of further modernisation of the presses having old technology, will depend on their capacity utilisation, the work-load available with them, the demand from the identifying Ministries/Departments and availability of resources."

28. The Committee are concerned to note that out of twenty-one printing Presses, no action has been taken so far to modernise or close 5 Presses. As the matter of modernisation/closing of Presses is pending long, they would urge the Government to give priority to the matter and to fix a time limit by which the decision in the matter would be taken. They would like to be apprised in this regard.



## **CHAPTER II**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS THAT HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT**

#### **Recommendation (Para 2.7)**

The Committee note that the Government have furnished the tentative data with regard to the 9th plan allocation. They hope that the 9th plan would be finalised soon particularly in view of the fact that more than a year's period of 9th Five Year Plan is already over.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The Planning Commission has allocated tentative 9th Plan outlay of Rs. 3800 crore for the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment—Rs. 2300 crore for the Deptt. of Urban Development and Rs. 1500 crore for the Deptt. of Urban Employment and Poverty Alleviation. The Planning Commission is in the process of finalising the 9th Five Year Plan.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment, OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., dated 28.9.1998]

#### **Recommendation (Para 2.8)**

It is observed from the broad analysis of the budgetary allocation that the tentative outlay of Rs. 2300 crore for 9th Plan as agreed to by the Planning Commission against the proposed outlay of Rs. 11795 crore is very much on the lower side. The Committee note with concern the observation of the Officials of the Department during their evidence before them that the targets set during 9th Plan would have to be reduced keeping in view the lesser allocation of funds by the Planning Commission. Further disturbing is the fact that the Government would not be able to take up new programmes/schemes which they have planned for the 9th Plan. The whole exercise of planning for urban sector would be futile without sufficient funds. The Committee would, therefore, like to recommend that keeping in view the broad activities of the Department sufficient funds should be provided.

### **Reply of the Government**

Planning Commission has been apprised of the above observation of the Parliamentary Standing Committee. It was brought to the notice of Planning Commission that the tentative outlay of Rs. 2300 crore allotted to the Ministry for the Deptt. of Urban Development for the 9th Plan is inadequate to meet the priorities and targets set under different schemes of the Urban Development for 9th Plan. It was also mentioned that New Housing Policy known as "National Housing & Habitat Policy 1998" through the National Agenda declared Housing for all as a priority area, lays greater focus on the housing needs of citizens in general and that of the poor and the deprived in particular. New National Housing and Habitat Policy-1998 sets a target of construction of 2 million houses every year with emphasis on the poor and deprived.

We have requested the Planning Commission to enhance the 9th Plan outlay for this Ministry.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment, OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., dated 28.9.1998]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para 6 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para 2.10)**

While noting the constraints on resources in the Centre, the Committee cannot but reiterate their recommendation made by them in their 11th report (1997-98) that the State Governments should give a thinking to generate resources through other sources. They hope that the Central Government will impress upon the State Governments that they should appreciate the resource position of the Centre and should rise to the occasion.

### **Reply of the Government**

The matter has been taken up with Planning Commission to apprise the State Govts. of the above observations of the Parliamentary Standing

Committee and impress upon the State Governments to enhance their resources so as to allocate adequate outlay for Urban Development sector under their State Plan Sector.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment, OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., dated 28.9.1998]

### **Recommendation (Para 3.13)**

The Committee note that the main objective of the IDSMT scheme is to develop selected regional growth centres with infrastructure and service facilities so as to enable such towns to emerge as regional centres of economic growth and employment opportunities and arrest migration from rural areas and small towns to large and metropolitan cities. However, they are unable to understand as to how this laudable objective could be achieved by a meagre allocation of Rs. 35 crore during 1998-99. While due to resource crunch, the Planning Commission reduces the allocation meant for this scheme, at the same time has released a sum of Rs. 330 crore under NSDF. The Committee feel that by reducing outlay for IDSMT, the Government indirectly encourage the growth of slums in large and metro towns. The development of slums further acts as an incentive to people of towns lacking in basic facilities to migrate to large and metro towns and adding to the slum population in those towns. The Committee, therefore, recommend that while considering the proposal of the Ministry for outlay under IDSMT, the Government should not reduce the outlay and should keep in view the fact that any reduction in this outlay will induce more expenditure under NSDP.

### **Reply of the Government**

The need for enhanced allocation for the IDSMT Scheme has already been taken up with the Planning Commission from time to time during VIII Plan. Enhanced allocation of Rs. 300 crore during IX Plan has been proposed for consideration of the Planning Commission. However, as compared to the Annual Plan proposals, the actual budget allocation made available during each of the last three

years was very much inadequate and the same was further reduced at RE stage as could be seen from the details given below:

(Rs. in crore)			
Year	Annual Plan proposal	Budget Allocation (BE)	Revised Allocation (RE)
1995-96	100.00	35.00	30.00
1996-97	62.50	35.00	28.26
1997-98	60.00	35.00	26.02

However, enhanced allocation of Rs. 55 crore has been made available for 1998-99. Keeping in view the observations of the Committee, the matter has again been taken up with the Planning Commission regarding enhanced allocation for IDSMT during the IX Plan.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., dated 28.9.1998]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para 12 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para 3.14)**

The Committee note that due to non-receipt of eligible proposals from Union Territories Administrations, a sum of Rs. 2.8 crore could not be utilised during 8th Plan period. With a view to utilise the funds properly during 9th Plan, they would urge upon the Government to impress upon the UT Administrations to submit their proposals under this scheme well in time so that they could also avail of the benefit of the IDSMT Scheme.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The Union Territories concerned are being addressed to submit their proposals under IDSMT well in time.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., dated 28.9.1998]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para 15 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **Recommendation (Para 3.16)**

The Committee note that due to higher cost of raising money from the market, HUDCO which is the main source of institutional finance under the IDSMT, was not able to give loans to local bodies at lower rate of interest. With a view to encourage local body to rely more on institutional finance than on Government's grants-in-aid, it is essential that institutional finance is made available to them at a lower rate of interest. The Committee, are therefore, inclined to agree with the suggestion of the HUDCO that like telecom and power sector, the town infrastructure sector should also be extended the benefit of sections 10(23) (G), 81A of the Income-tax Act, 1961. They therefore, recommend that the Government should consider to extend the same benefits to town infrastructure as are available to the power and telecom sector.

### **Reply of the Government**

During 1996, the matter was taken up at Minister's level for grant of fiscal concessions for development of Urban infrastructure (including tax concessions under the Income-tax Act, 1961). So far no positive response in this regard has been received from the Finance Ministry.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., dated 28.9.1998]

### **Recommendation (Para 3.22)**

The Committee while appreciate that the tentative outlay of Rs. 400 crore as agreed to by the Planning Commission against proposed allocation for Rs. 600 crore is better than the position in regard to other schemes of the Department but are constrained to observe that as seen in para 3.20 above, there is a tendency on the part of the Government to reduce the sanctioned amount at later stage. It has also been observed that many a times the Government does not release even the amount already sanctioned by them. They feel that this approach of the Government not only affect the implementation of future programmes under a scheme but also adversely affect the implementation of projects already under progress. They, therefore, recommend that funds already sanctioned for Mega City Scheme should not be reduced so that the ongoing projects under the scheme do not suffer for want of funds.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Financial Allocation to Mega City Scheme is decided by the Planning Commission and due to Budgetary constraints, allocation for Mega City Scheme were reduced at Revised Estimates stage by the Planning Commission. As far as release of Sanctioned Amount under Mega City Scheme is concerned, the final budget allocation have always been fully utilised (released to Nodal Agencies). The Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment has also requested to Planning Commission to enhance allocations for Mega City Scheme for the Ninth Five Year Plan Period.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., dated 28.9.1998]

### **Recommendation (Para 3.23)**

It is observed from the status of projects in five Mega Cities where the scheme is in operation that the implementation of projects in Hyderabad and Bangalore is quite slow. They would therefore, like to recommend that the Government should review the implementation of projects in such Mega Cities and initiate measures for the timely implementation of the projects under the scheme in all cities particularly in Hyderabad and Bangalore.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment holds Review Meetings to monitor implementation of Projects under Mega City Scheme. Besides, at the Regional Level Meetings, Centrally Sponsored Schemes of the Ministry are reviewed. In addition, at the State Level Project Sanctioning Committee Meetings, the Projects being implemented by each City are reviewed by the representatives of the Government of India.

The last Review Meeting under Mega City Scheme was held on 21-5-98 during which the Nodal Agencies including those of Hyderabad and Bangalore were urged to speed up the implementation of Projects.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., dated 28.9.1998]

### **Recommendation (Para 3.28)**

The Committee when making a comparative study of the allocation during 8th and 9th Plan find that in comparison to the approved outlay of Rs. 200 crore during 8th Plan, the actual release has been of Rs. 135 crore. They further note that as against the proposal of Board to allocate an outlay of Rs. 800 crore the Government has proposed an outlay of Rs. 400 crore. Even the reduced outlay as suggested by the Ministry is yet to be approved by the Planning Commission.

### **Reply of the Government**

Statement of Facts.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., dated 28.9.1998]

### **Recommendation (Para 3.29)**

The Committee will like to be informed as to how the Government/NCR Planning Board propose to bridge the gap in budgetary support sought by the Board and as recommended by the Ministry.

### **Reply of the Government**

The NCR Planning Board has proposed an outlay of Rs. 800 crore for budgetary allocation for the Ninth Plan period. Besides this, the NCRPB has also proposed to raise funds through Extra Budgetary Sources like line of Credit from HUDCO, raising of Bonds (Both tax free and taxable) from capital market and borrowing from financial institutions. Against the proposed outlay of Rs. 800 crore, the M/o Urban Affairs and Employment has proposed an outlay of Rs. 400 crores. This 50% reduction in the outlay can be bridged only by allowing to raise money from the capital market through tax free and taxable bonds.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., dated 28.9.1998]

### **Recommendation (Para 3.30)**

They will also like to impress upon the Government that while making allocation for the NCR Planning Board during the 9th Plan, care must be taken to ensure that sufficient funds are available for completion of MRTS project of Delhi as per schedule, so as to avoid any cost overrun of the project due to paucity of funds.

### **Reply of the Government**

The implementation of Delhi MRTS Project is being taken care of directly by the Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment and not by the NCR Planning Board.

2. The project was approved 'in principle' by the Govt. of India in July, 1994. However, the investment decision were taken by the Union Cabinet only in September, 1996. As per this decision the project is to be implemented by Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Ltd. — a joint venture of Govt. of India & Govt. of NCT of Delhi. Both the Govts. were requested to contribute equally towards the equity of the company @ Rs. 103.60 crore per annum for ten years from 1996-97.

3. The decision to contribute in equal amounts throughout the project implementation period was taken keeping in view the difficulties envisaged in releasing very large sums of money during the middle of the project implementation phase, when all the international contracts would have been awarded and the works will be in full swing. Besides this, the Cabinet had also approved the release of Rs. 202 crore as Govt. of India's share of the land acquisition cost. The cost towards land has to be released by 1998-99 in full.

4. At the instance of OECF, the project implementation period has been reduced from 10 years to 9 years. The target date of completion of the project is 31st March, 2005. Considering the funds already made available by the Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment till 1996-97, towards equity, it is necessary that for the remaining 8 years equity @ Rs. 122.90 crore per annum be released by Govt. of India.

5. Against the requirement of Rs. 122.90 crore during the year 1997-98, an amount of Rs. 50 crore only has been released, resulting in the shortfall of Rs. 72.90 crore. Thus the fund requirement towards equity of Govt. of India in 1998-99 is Rs. 122.90 plus Rs. 72.90 i.e. Rs. 195.8 crore.

6. Similarly, during the year 1997-98, only an amount of Rs. 50 crore only has been released by the Govt. of India towards the land acquisition cost for the project. Thus the fund required towards cost of land during 1998-99, from Govt. of India is Rs. 152 crore.

7. During 1998-99 a budget provision of Rs. 65 crore towards the land acquisition cost and Rs. 100 crore towards equity contribution by Govt. of India for Delhi Metro Rail Corporation Ltd. This allocation is



against the total requirement of Rs. 152 crore & Rs. 195.80 crore respectively. The need for release balance amounts through Supplementary Grants has already been taken up with Planning Commission. The issue was also raised during the meeting of the Empowered Committee of Delhi MRTS Project, held on 28.8.98 under the Chairmanship of Cabinet Secretary which was attended by Secretary, Expenditure and Adviser (HUD), Planning Commission.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., Dt. 28.9.1998]

### **Recommendation (Para 3.33)**

The Committee note from the Statement at Appendix II that out of a total amount of Rs. 241.5 crore a sum of Rs. 140.6 crore i.e. 58.2% was sanctioned by NCR Planning Board during the month of March, 1998. They are unable to comprehend the reasons which prevailed upon NCRPB to sanction projects at the fag end of the financial year. They also note that some of the projects were sanctioned during the period March, 1991 to March 1997. They would like to be apprised of the present status of these projects.

### **Reply of the Government**

Reasons for sanctioning of funds in the month of March, 1998 were as under:

1. Receipt of Development Projects in the month of Feb-March from the participating States inspite of repeated reminder to submit their projects early.
2. Bond issues for tax free and taxable bonds were opened in the third week of March for raising funds from the capital market. Before this the market condition was not favourable for raising funds at affordable cost.
3. Consequently the meeting of the Project Sanctioning and Monitoring Group was held in the month of March, 1998.
4. Present status of projects sanctioned during March, 1991 to March, 1997 is given Annexure-I.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., Dt. 28.9.1998]

### **Recommendation (Para 3.47)**

The Committee hope that the DMRTS Project would get the priority which it deserves and adequate funds will be released for the project so that all its stages including acquisition of land etc. are completed on time and within the estimated amount.

### **Reply of the Government**

Keeping in view the worsening traffic & transportation situation in the capital city of India, it has been the endeavour of the Govt. to accord the highest priority to the Delhi MRTS Project. Every effort is made to provide adequate funds for the project and wherever there was a shortfall in the releases, the matter was taken up at the appropriate levels for additional allocation of funds. The land acquisition process for the project is underway and private land required for the project has already been notified for acquisition. The process of acquisition of land is scheduled to be completed by March, 1999.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment, OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., Dt. 28.9.1998]

### **Recommendation (Para 3.55)**

The Committee hope that the final allocation by the Planning Commission under 9th Plan for Urban Mapping Scheme, would be made soon so that the Ministry could achieve the target of covering the 25 more towns under Urban Mapping Scheme during 9th Plan.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment has proposed an allocation of Rs. 10 crore for Urban Mapping Scheme for the Ninth Five Year Plan Period to Planning Commission. Further action in the matter is required to be taken by the Planning Commission.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment, OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., Dt. 28.9.1998]

### **Recommendation (Para 4.13)**

The Committee will like to be informed of the reaction of the Planning Commission to the Department's proposed new scheme for supply of drinking water. As the drinking water is the basic need of every living being, they hope that the scheme will receive a favourable reaction from the Planning Commission.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Planning Commission vide D.O. Letter No. PC/WS/10(6)/2/96 dated 29th June, 1998 have stated that it may be difficult to support the new schemes in view of the fact that the continuance of on-going Centrally sponsored schemes themselves are yet to be decided upon. However a token provision of Rs. 1. lakh has been provided by the Planning Commission during the 9th Five Year Plan for a new Centrally sponsored programme for providing water supply in the State capitals, excluding mega cities.

We are grateful to the Hon'ble Committee and appreciate the concern shown by it. The matter will be taken up once again with the Planning Commission.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment, OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., Dt. 28.9.1998]

### **Recommendation (Para 4.21)**

The Committee observe that the problem of sanitation has become a national problem today and has to be tackled as such. It is really unfortunate to see the masses in cities/towns living in unhygienic conditions even when the country is celebrating its 50th year of Independence. The critical scenario is reflected in the figures according to which out of 3768 towns/cities in the country, only about 200 towns/cities have the sewerage facilities. No doubt the sanitation is a State subject, but they feel that the Central Government could always issue guidelines to State Governments to give due importance and priority to tackle this problem. Further State efforts can be supplemented by providing funds for schemes launched by the Centre. They would like to recommend that more attention should be paid towards the urban sanitation problem. Adequate funds should be provided for the new schemes proposed by the Ministry. Besides some scheme for cities not covered by the said scheme should also be launched and funds provided for the same. It is needless to say that every paisa invested in the sector of sanitation particularly in sewerage system not only help in a healthy environment but also goes a longway in liberating a person who has to earn his livelihood as a scavenger.

### **Reply of the Government**

The suggestion of the Committee to issue guidelines to the State Governments to give due importance and priority to tackle the problem of sanitation is being followed. A National Conference on Urban Water Supply & Sanitation was held in March, 1993 at New Delhi to decide about the Urban Water Supply & Sanitation Sector Policy Guidelines. The recommendations of the Conference *inter-alia* included the following:

1. Low cost on-site sanitation should be encouraged in unsewered part of the cities, in small and medium towns and other areas where locations permit. Conventional sewage treatment systems may be unavoidable in bigger cities and congested localities. Policy selection should therefore be made judiciously.
2. Re-use of sewage after the desired degree of treatment for horticulture, flushing of sewers and toilets, air-conditioning, cooling and several other industrial uses must be introduced extensively to conserve fresh water and to reduce pollution load in the receiving water body.
3. Industries and commercial establishments must be persuaded to adopt re-use of treated sewage and recycle their treated trade effluents to the maximum extent possible to cut down their fresh water demand.
4. Innovative technologies for low/medium installations like UASB, LEMNA, Wetlands and Karnal systems should be encouraged as they ensure less energy inputs. Conventional sewage treatment plants should have infrastructure additions for cost realisation through gas utilisation, pisciculture or forestry.
5. CPHEEO Manual will be treated as design guidelines. Individual projects would, however, be designed with relevance to factors of source potential and affordability.

The State Governments have been requested by the Ministry from time to time to adopt the policies of the Conference while implementing Urban Water Supply & Sanitation Programme. Recently in a meeting convened by the Secretary, Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment to review the progress of the Centrally sponsored schemes of Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme and Low Cost Sanitation, the need to adopt the policies of the Conference was stressed upon.

The Manual on Sewerage & Sewage Treatment has been revised and updated by the Central Public Health & Environmental Engineering Organisation (CPHEEO), the technical wing of the Ministry, with the help of experts in the field. It is a guide for practicing engineers for planning and designing of sewerage systems. The updated Manual has been circulated to all State implementing agencies and is also available as a priced publication in the market.

As regards initiating the new schemes to provide the Central Assistance to the State Governments for implementing Urban Sewerage Scheme, it may be mentioned that the recommendations of the Working Group on Urban Water Supply & Sanitation for formulation of 9th Five Year Plan (1997-2002) were submitted to the Planning Commission for their consideration. However, the Planning Commission have indicated that:

“Sanitation and drainage are programmes which require to be encouraged and the existing sewerage/drainage arrangements in big cities certainly require upgradation. However, in order to rejuvenate/upgrade/augment the existing systems, it may first be necessary to have the city/town profiles of the selected places along with the exact programme of action. It is difficult to appreciate how uniform approach can take care of all these cities whose infrastructure facilities are different from each other. In view of the increasing demand of urban resources, it is also very necessary that Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment may request the cities to generate funds from their internal resources and/or raise institutional finance in addition the States budgetary support.”

The Planning Commission has, however, provided a token amount of Rs. 1 lakh for a new Centrally sponsored programme for providing sewerage, sewage treatment and drainage facilities in State capitals excluding mega cities.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., Dt. 28.9.1998]

### **Recommendation (Para 5.3)**

The Committee recommend that more funds should be provided for construction of houses for Govt. Employees during 9th plan so as to improve the satisfaction level in different cities.

### Reply of the Government

The allocation during the 8th and 9th plans are given below:—

Year	8th Plan Allocation			9th Plan Allocation		
1st Year	92-93	=	19.00	97-98	=	61.35
2nd Year	93-94	=	29.00	98-99	=	70.00
3rd Year	94-95	=	49.00	99-2000	=	*
4th Year	95-96	=	39.00	2000-01	=	*
5th Year	96-97	=	41.90	2001-02	=	*

\*Allocation yet to be made.

From above it is seen that there is an increase in allocation during the 1st two years in 9th Plan, though not to the required extent. The matter is being taken up with the Planning Commission for allocation of more funds for G.P.R.A.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., Dt. 28.9.1998]

### Recommendation (Para 6.6)

The Committee note that though the decision to close down the Presses was taken by the Government as long back as in 1990, the Government was neither closing the presses nor was modernising them so as to increase their productivity. The Government also stated that they were trying to restructure the Government Presses. The Committee regret to observe that though a period of about 8 years has elapsed when Government took decision to close down the Government of India Presses, they were neither closing down nor restructuring them. As the Presses have been meeting the printing requirement of Government of India for the last several decades the Committee recommend that these be modernised/restructured in consultation with labour unions without any further loss of time. They will like to be informed of action taken by the Government in this regard.

### **Reply of the Government**

The question of closure/modernisation/restructuring of some Govt. of India Presses/Units has been under consideration of Government for some time. The Cabinet, in June, 1997 had desired that the Cabinet Secretary should look into the issues and make appropriate recommendations. Accordingly he considered the issues in consultation with the Secretaries of Departments concerned in October 1997 and made certain observations/recommendations. The recommendations include transfer of certain Presses to other Departments, transfer of Text Books Presses to the respective State Governments, clubbing/restructuring of some Presses, conversion of one press to a training-cum-production unit after modernisation phasing out of one press closure of some units etc. Each of these issues are being examined in consultation with the concerned Ministries/Departments/State Governments wherever necessary. The matter is being pursued with them for taking a decision.

Out of twenty-one Govt. of India Presses, eight are fully modernised, seven are partially modernised and one press is under process of modernisation. The question of further modernisation of the presses having old technology, will depend on their capacity utilisation, the work-load available with them, the demand from the indenting Ministries/Departments and availability of resources.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98  
Bt., Dt. 28.9.1998]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para 27 of Chapter I of the Report)

### **CHAPTER III**

**RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT  
DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF THE GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES**

**—Nil—**



## **CHAPTER IV**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE**

#### **Recommendation (Para 2.9)**

The Committee further note with concern the variation between BE, RE and actuals during 1997-98. The outlay for Rs. 529.00 crore which was reduced at RE stage to Rs. 510.00 crore even that could not be fully utilised by the Deptt. While recommending for higher outlay during 9th Plan, they would like that the Government should ensure the proper execution and implementation of the projects/schemes undertaken by the Department so that the resources allocated are utilised fully.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The Divisional Heads in the Deptt. of Urban Development have been advised to take appropriate steps to ensure full utilisation of the funds allotted to them. They have also been requested to take appropriate steps to overcome the constraints faced in utilisation of resources and implementation of scheme.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98-  
Bt., Dt. 28.9.1998]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para 9 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para 3.15)**

The Committee recommend that the pilot project launched by the Government to build the capacity of certain local bodies should be implemented vigorously and its effect would be watched. They would like to be informed of the impact of the project on the local bodies covered under the project.

### Reply of the Government

The Ministry has proposed among other, following three New Schemes for inclusion in the 9th Five Year Plan:

(i) Municipal Capacity Building Scheme	—	Rs. 10.00 cr.
(ii) Technical Support for District Metropolitan and City Development Plan	—	Rs. 24.00 cr.
(iii) New Delhi Pilot Project to promote Barrier-free environment for the elderly & Physically handicapped	—	Rs. 1.00 cr.
Total :		<hr/> Rs. 35.00 cr. <hr/>

The approval has been given for inclusion of Scheme "Urban/ Municipal Capacity Building in the context of 74th Amendment— Assistance for District Metropolitan & City Development Plan— Computerisation and other Technical Support only" with a provision of Rs. 1.00 crore. The approval for incurring expenditure for this Scheme is still not received. Therefore, said scheme is yet to be launched. It is also informed that no pilot project was proposed under this Scheme.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98-Bt., Dt. 28.9.1998]

### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para 18 of Chapter I of the Report)

## **CHAPTER V**

### **RECOMMENDATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED**

#### **Recommendation (Para 3.39)**

The Committee note that the Ministry of Urban Affairs and Employment have conducted a study on "Traffic and Transportation Policies and Strategies in Urban Areas in India" and have sent copies of the report to the State Governments. The Committee would like to know the general reaction of the State Governments to the said study. They would also like to know whether any proposal for Central assistance has come from any State Government as a result of this study.

#### **Reply of the Government**

The response of the State Government is still awaited, who have been reminded in this regard. The State Governments have been given time upto July end to respond.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98-  
Bt., Dt. 28.9.1998]

#### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para 21 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation (Para 4.14)**

They (the Committee) further observe that Central Government have not procured so far, the data with regard to the demand and availability of water in each town/city. The Government took initiative for procuring data only with regard to cities having population above 5 lakhs and that too is not complete. The Committee recommend that the Central Government should conduct a survey to procure the data for demand and availability of water in all the total 3768 cities/towns as the same is an essential requirement for making future planning.

### Reply of the Government

The Central Public Health & Environmental Engineering Organisation (CPHEEO), the technical wing of the Ministry, has been entrusted the task of monitoring collection of data in respect of the 3768 cities/towns. The State Governments have been requested *vide* letter No. Z-22011/1/97-CPHEEO dated 6th June, 1997 to furnish data on the status of urban water supply and sanitation facilities in cities and towns. This point was also stressed upon during a meeting convened on 17th August, 1998 by the Secretary, Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment to review the performance of the Centrally sponsored schemes of Accelerated Urban Water Supply Programme and the Low Cost Sanitation. The State Secretaries/Chief Engineers were impressed upon the urgency and importance to furnish the data in the prescribed proforma already circulated by the CPHEEO. They were requested to expedite the matter.

[Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment OM No. H-11013/2/98-Bt., Dt. 28.9.1998]

### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para 24 of Chapter I of the Report)

NEW DELHI;  
April 19, 1999  

---

Chaitra 29, 1921 (Saka)

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

## APPENDIX I

### EXTRACTS 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. Raneer 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 | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri S.C. Rastogi  | — | <i>Director</i>             |
| 3. Smt. Sudesh Luthra | — | <i>Under Secretary</i>      |

\*\*\*                      \*\*\*                      \*\*\*                      \*\*\*                      \*\*\*

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

3. Thereafter, the Committee took up for consideration of Memorandum No. 15 regarding Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the First Report (Twelfth Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (1998-99) of the Department of Urban Development (Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment). The Committee considered the Action Taken Report appended thereto and adopted it with certain modifications as indicated in Annexure.

- |    |     |     |     |
|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 4. | *** | *** | *** |
| 5. | *** | *** | *** |

---

\*\*\*Relevant portions of minutes not related to the subject have been kept separately.

- |    |     |     |     |
|----|-----|-----|-----|
| 6. | *** | *** | *** |
| 7. | *** | *** | *** |
| 8. | *** | *** | *** |

9. A verbatim record of the proceedings was kept.

The Committee then adjourned to meet again at 1430 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.

---

\*\*\*Relevant portions of minutes not related to the subject have been kept separately.

(See Para No. 3 of Minutes)

STATEMENT SHOWING MODIFICATIONS MADE BY THE  
COMMITTEE IN THEIR DRAFT ACTION TAKEN REPORT

<i>Page No.</i>	<i>Para No.</i>	<i>Modifications</i>
1	2	3
3	9	In para 9, line 6 after the words "steps taken or proposed to be taken" insert "not only by the Divisional Heads but by the Department as a whole".
10	24	<p><i>For para 24 substitute the following:</i></p> <p>"The Committee are at a loss to understand as to why the Department could not procure the data regarding the demand and availability of water in the total 3768 cities/towns as recommended by the Committee even after the lapse of more than one and a half year. In view of the importance of the data for future planning, the Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation and would like to be informed about the States/UTs who have since furnished the requisite data. They would also like the Government to persuade the remaining States/UTs Governments/Administrations to supply the data without further delay."</p>



---

1	2	3
12	27	<p>For para 27 <i>substitute</i> the following:</p> <p>"The Committee are concerned to note that out of twenty one printing presses, no action has been taken so far to modernise or close 5 presses. As the matter of modernisation/closing of presses is pending since long, they would urge the Government, to give priority to the matter and to fix a time limit by which the decision in the matter would be taken. They would like to be apprised in this regard."</p>

---

## APPENDIX II

[Vide Para 3 of the Introduction]

### ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE FIRST REPORT (12TH LOK SABHA)

I	Total number of recommendations	22
II	Recommendations that have been accepted by the Government	18
	(Para Nos. 2.7, 2.8, 2.10, 3.13, 3.14, 3.16, 3.22, 3.23, 3.28, 3.29, 3.30, 3.33, 3.47, 3.55, 4.13 4.21, 5.3 and 6.6)	
	Percentage to the total recommendations	81.82%
III	Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	Nil
	(Para Nos. Nil)	
	Percentage to the total recommendations	Nil
IV	Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	2
	(Para Nos. 2.9 and 3.15)	
	Percentage to the total recommendations	9.09%
V	Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	2
	(Para Nos. 3.39 and 4.14)	
	Percentage to the total recommendations	9.09%