

- (c) the reasons for delay in release of funds; and
 (d) the present status of the proposal and the time by which the exercise is likely to be completed ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH) : (a) to (d) : The Approach Paper to the Ninth Plan (1997-2002), approved by the National Development Council in its meeting held on 16.01.1997 states that the Centrally Sponsored Schemes should be confined to schemes of an inter-State character; matters impinging on national security; selected national priorities where Central supervision is essential for effective implementation; and multi-State externally financed projects where Central coordination is necessary for operational reasons. Except for such schemes, all other schemes should be transferred to States alongwith corresponding funds. The exact details of the Schemes which can be so transferred would have to be worked out in consultation with the Central Ministries as well as State Governments.

The exercise for implementing the proposal is presently underway in Planning Commission and the same will be incorporated in the Ninth Plan.

[Translation]

Development of Towns

1931. SHRI BHAGWAN SHANKAR RAWAT : Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state :

(a) the details of the schemes launched by the Central Government and Housing and Urban Development Corporation for the development of small and medium cities in Uttar Pradesh; and

(b) the total amount earmarked for this purpose during 1995-96 and the amount actually spent therein ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND EMPLOYMENT AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (DR. U. VENKATESWARLU) : (a) Under the Scheme of Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns (IDSMT), 76 towns of Uttar Pradesh have been covered from 1979-80 till date and a Central Assistance of Rs. 23.43 crores released. The schemes covered include markets and shopping complexes, roads drainage works, site and services, bus stands and other infrastructural facilities.

(b) For 1995-96, Central grant amounting to Rs. 3.10 crores under IDSMT was allocated to Uttar Pradesh and the entire allocated amount released to the State Government in March, 1996. Besides, further Central assistance (loan) of Rs. 0.43 crores was also released during 1995-96 for ongoing project approved under the old Scheme of IDSMT prior to 1995-96. Since the amounts

for 1995-96 were released towards the flag end of that year, accordingly expenditure details against the same have not been received so far. However, the total expenditure on IDSMT projects since inception till now is reported to be of the order of Rs. 28.06 crores as against (Central assistance + State Share + other sources).

[English]

Development of Slums

1932. SHRI V. PRADEEP DEV :
 SHIR S.D.N.R. WADIYAR :

Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state :

(a) whether slums are being developed with external assistance;

(b) if so, the details thereof, state-wise and city/town-wise;

(c) the slum improvement projects presently being executed in the country and the expenditure involved therein; and

(d) the number of projects finalised during 1996-97 upto December 31, 1996 with details thereof ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND EMPLOYMENT AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (DR. U. VENKATESWARLU) : (a) to (c) As per the Statement enclosed.

(d) No projects have been finalised during 1996-97.

Statement

*Slum Improvement Projects, with Foreign Assistance
 Overseas Development Administration (ODA)
 U.K. Assisted Projects*

1. Andhra Pradesh

- (a) Hyderabad Habitat improvement Projects.
 (b) Viskhapatanam Habitat Improvement Projects.
 (c) Vijayawada Slum Improvement Projects.

2. Kerala

- (a) Cochin Urban Poverty Reduction Project.

3. Madhya Pradesh

- (a) Indore Habitat Improvement Project.

4. Orissa

- (a) Cuttack Habitat Project.

5. West Bengal

- (a) Calcutta Slum Improvement Project
Dutch (Netherlands) Assisted Project

1. Karnataka

- (a) Bangalore Urban Poverty Alleviation Project.

Status of SLUM Improvement Projects Implemented with External Assistance

S. No.	Name of Project & Implementing Agency	Duration of the Project	Total approved cost of the Projects (Rs. in Crores)	No. of Slums proposed to be covered	Expenditure incurred (Rs. in Crores)
1.	Hyderabad SIP-III Municipal Corpn. Hyderabad	1989-90 to 12.12.96	42.75	300	42.00 (Upto Dec.95)
2.	Visakhapatnam SIP Municipal Corpn. Vizag	1988-89 to 31.3.96	28.59	190	29.28 (Upto March, 96)
3.	*Chinagadali	1993-94 to 31.3.98	6.95	—	5.36 (Upto March, 96)
4.	Vijayawada SIP Municipal Corpn. Vijayawada	1990-91 to 30.6.97	49.15	136	39.01 (Upto Dec. 96)
5.	Indore HIP Indore Dev. Authority	1990-91 to 31.3.97	60.50	183	50.95 (Upto Dec. 96)
6.	Calcutta SIP CMDA	1990-91 to 31.3.98	46.19	167	33.77 (Upto July, 96)
7.	Cuttack UPRP Phase-I Cuttack Mpl. & CDA	1995	25.70	49	0.68** (Upto Oct. 96)
8.	Cochin UPRP Phase-I Corpn. of Cochin	1995	30.00	152	0.88** (upto Oct. 96)
9.	Bangalore Urban Poverty Alleviation Project, Phase-I	Nov., 93** to March, 97	1.50**	14** (3700 hose-hold)	0.78** (upto April 96)

* This is being done as an extension of Visakhapatnam SIP and is a resettlement Projects.

** For the Phase-I only.

Non-Contribution by States

1933.SHRI I.D. SWAMI : Will the Minister of PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION be pleased to state :

(a) whether the Government are aware that most of the State Governments do not contribute their share in the Centrally sponsored welfare and poverty alleviation programmes consequent to which the plight of the poor people has not improved;

(b) if so, the names of the State Government that have not contributed to the Centrally sponsored schemes in the last three years, year-wise and State-wise; and

(c) the action the Government propose to take in the matter ?

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING AND PROGRAMME IMPLEMENTATION AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH) : (a) The State Governments do, by and large, contribute their

State share towards the implementation of the Central sponsored poverty alleviation programmes.

(b) The names of the States which have not contributed their States share to the Centrally sponsored poverty alleviation programmes during the last three year is given in the enclosed statement.

(c) The Government repeatedly reminds the State to expedite the timely release of their matching share: States which do not contribute their share are not release their subsequent instalments of Central funds. Necessary deductions are imposed while releasing the Central share to those States where the full States share is not released. Further more, funds allocated for defaulting States who do not respond positively are diverted to better performing States.

Statement

Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP)

All the States Governments are contributing the matching share against the Central share provided by the