

**SIXTEENTH REPORT**  
**STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN  
AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT**  
**(1995-96)**

**(TENTH LOK SABHA)**

**Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS FOR THE YEAR 1995-96 OF THE  
MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT AND  
DEPARTMENT OF WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT**

*Presented to Lok Sabha on.....*

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on.....*



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

*May, 1995/Vaisakha, 1917 (Saka)*

C.U. & R.D. No. 016

1995

1995

1995

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY  
Contra: Govis Publications  
Acc. No. IC. 9.19.10. (6)  
Date: 16/5/95

Price : Rs. 23.00

u  
328.3657R  
MS.16;5

© 1995 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Seventh Edition) and printed by M/s. Akashdeep Printers, 20 Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi-110002.

STANDING COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT  
(1995-96)

Corrigenda to Sixteenth Report

<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Para No.</u>	<u>Line No.</u>	<u>in place of</u>	<u>Read</u>
3	2.3	12 from the bottom	covers only	does not cover
8.	4.12	7th from the bottom	objective	target
18.	10.7	7	recommended	recommend
23.	14.4	2 from the bottom	delete and strong recommend that it should be kept under Ministry of Agriculture	
47.	(Minutes 2)	5 from the bottom	Inadequate	inadequate
48.	4	11	know	known
48.	4	7 from the bottom	the	The
50.	2	25	clarification	clarificatio
56.	Annexure		covers	cover

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE .....	(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(v)

### PART I

#### MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS & EMPLOYMENT

CHAPTER I	Introductory .....	1
CHAPTER II	Analysis of Demands for Grants & Plan Budget of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment.....	3
	(i) Plan Outlay for 1995-96 .....	3
	(ii) Jawahar Rojgar Yojana .....	4
	(iii) Integrated Rural Development Programme.....	6
	(iv) Development of Women & Children in Rural Areas .....	9
	(v) Training of Rural Youth for Self Employment....	10
	(vi) Employment Assurance Scheme.....	12
	(vii) Central Rural Sanitation Programme .....	13
	(viii) Rural Water Supply Programme.....	15
	(ix) Rural Housing .....	17
	(x) Desert Development Programme.....	18
	(xi) Drought Prone Area Programme.....	19
	(xii) Land Reforms.....	21
	(xiii) National Institute of Agricultural Marketing .....	23

### PART II

#### DEPARTMENT OF WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT

CHAPTER I	Introductory .....	32
CHAPTER II	Analysis of Demands for Grants & Plan Budget of the Department of Wastelands Development .....	35
	(i) Plan Allocations .....	35
	(ii) Implementation of various Schemes.....	38
	Minutes of the sittings of the Committee on Urban & Rural Development held on 5.4.95, 6.4.95, 18.4.95, 21.4.95, 23.4.95 and 26.4.95 .....	45

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1995-96)

PRESENT

Shri Prataprao B. Bhosale – *Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Vijayarama Raju Satrucharla
3. Shri Sobhanadreeswara Rao Vadde
4. Dr. Y.S. Rajsekhar Reddy
5. Shri Gangadhara Sanipalli
6. Shri J. Chokka Rao
7. Shri Dharmabiksham
8. Md. Ali Asraf Fatmi
9. Shri Sukhdev Paswan
10. Shri Shailendra Mehto
11. Shri Karia Munda
12. Shri K.M. Mathew
13. Shri Prithviraj D. Chavan
14. Shri Ram Singh Kashwan
15. Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava
16. Shri Prabhulal Rawat
17. Shri P.P. Kaliaperumal
18. Shri N. Murugesan
19. Shri Surendra Pal Pathak
20. Shri Devi Bux Singh
21. Shri Ram Pal Singh
22. Shri Sudbir Giri
23. Shri Rajesh Khanna
24. Shri Subrata Mukherjee
25. Shri Sajjan Kumar
26. Shri Gulam Mohammad Khan
27. Shri P.R. Kumaramangalam
28. Shri Maruti Deoram Shelke
29. Shri Kalpnath Rai

(iv)

*Rajya Sabha*

30. Shri Ram Deo Bhandari
31. Shri B.K. Hariprasad
32. Shri Nilotpal Basu
33. Shri Theennala Balkrishna Pillai
34. Shri Shiv Prasad Chanpuria
35. Shri Sangh Priya Gautam
36. Chaudhary Harmohan Singh
37. Shri Debabrata Biswas
38. Shri Jagmohan
39. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra
40. Smt. Mira Das
41. Shri Satyanarayana Dronamraju
42. Shri V. Hanumantha Rao
43. Dr. Jagannath Mishra
44. Dr. B.B. Dutta

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.N. Mishra — *Additional Secretary*
2. Smt. Roli Srivastava — *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri G.R. Juneja — *Deputy Secretary*
4. Shri C.S. Joon — *Assistant Director*

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of Standing Committee on Urban & Rural Development (1995-96) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present the Sixteenth Report on Demands for Grants (1995-96) of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment.

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

3. The Committee took evidence of the representatives of Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment and Department of Wastelands Development on 18th and 21st April, 1995.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee at their sitting held on 26th April, 1995.

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

New Delhi;  
April 26, 1995  
Vaisakha 6, 1917 (Saka)

PRATAPRAO B. BHOSALE,  
*Chairman,*  
*Standing Committee on Urban and*  
*Rural Development.*

**PART I**  
**MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT**  
**CHAPTER I**  
**INTRODUCTORY**

Being a predominantly rural economy, the development of rural areas and the rural people, particularly the vulnerable sections amongst them, continues to be the central concern of development planning in India in the Eighth Plan. The onerous task of alleviation of poverty and ushering in economic progress and social transformation has been entrusted with the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment.

1.2 The Programmes implemented by the Ministry to implement the laid-down objectives are as below:-

1. Wage Employment and Infrastructure Development
  - Jawahar Rozgar Yojana (JRY)
  - Million Wells Scheme (MWS)
  - Indira Awaas Yojana (IAY)
  - Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS)
  - Rural Housing
  - Rural Roads
2. Self Employment and Income Generation Programmes
  - Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP)
  - Institutional Finance for IRP
  - Development of Women & Children in Rural Areas (DWCRA)
  - Training of Rural Youth for Self-Employment (TRYSEM)
  - Supply of Improved Toolkits to Rural Artisans
3. Special Area Programmes
  - Development of Watershed Approach
  - Drought Prone Areas Programme (DPAP)
  - Desert Development Programme (DDP)
4. Rural Water Supply and Sanitation
  - Rural Water Supply
  - Rural Sanitation



1.3 From the year 1994-95 a new scheme has been launched namely "MPs' Local Area Development Scheme". Under this scheme, each Member of Parliament both from rural as well as urban areas will have the choice to suggest to the District Collectors/Local Authorities works to the tune of Rs. 1 crore per year to be taken up in their respective constituencies, with each individual work not exceeding Rs. 10 lakhs. On the basis of suggestions made by Members of Parliament priorities will be drawn according to the guidelines. This Scheme has been transferred to the Ministry of Planning and Programme Implementation.

1.4 The Eighth Plan emphasises human development in all its facets as the core of developmental efforts. The expanded focus on poverty alleviation programmes is aimed at giving employment and provide income avenues to rural poor through self-employment. There is also a renewed emphasis on making the people active participants in the development process with the Government playing an enabling and facilitating role.

1.5 In the present report, the Committee have restricted its examination to only major issue concerning programmes related to poverty alleviation, employment generation, water supply and sanitation, housing, land records in the context of plan budget and Demands for Grants for the ensuing year i.e. 1995-96.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **ANALYSIS OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS AND PLAN BUDGET OF THE MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT FOR THE YEAR 1995-96**

The Eighth Plan outlay for the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment has been fixed at Rs. 30,000 crores.

#### **(i) Plan Outlay for 1995-96**

2.1 The Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment have presented Demands for Grants of Rs. 7700 crores for the year 1995-96 as against Rs. 5437.87 crores (actual) in 1993-94 and Rs. 7320 crores (RE) in 1994-95. The head-wise details of the Demands for Grants of the Ministry are shown in Annexure-I.

2.2 There is the increase of around 10% in BE 1995-96 over BE 1994-95, whereas the increase in BE 1994-95 was around 39.90% over BE of the year 1993-94. The increase in BE 1995-96 comes to just around 6% if BE 1995-96 is compared to RE 1994-95.

The Ministry in the written replies furnished before the Committee have stated that the Ministry had proposed outlay of Rs. 10,500 crores for 1995-96, which was about 50% increase over the BE of 1994-95. However, after the annual Plan discussion with Planning Commission, the outlay of Rs. 7700 crores was finally approved for this Ministry. Though this Ministry had proposed outlay for 1995-96 with a substantial increase in the last year's budget provision, it is the Planning Commission which approved this outlay.

2.3 The Committee feel that the marginal increase in BE 1995-96 covers only the percentage hike due to inflationary trends. The Committee observe that Rural areas account for nearly three-fourth of the population of the country and have a much larger concentration of people below the poverty line. Rural Development which encompasses the entire gamut of improvement in the overall quality of life in the rural areas can only be achieved with the eradication of poverty of the people living there. The programmes of the Ministry provide opportunities to the poor people and enable them to participate actively in the growth process by encouraging and providing rural employment, increasing their access to institutional credit and subsidy, land reforms and development in drought prone areas etc. Considering the large activities of the Ministry and also the fact that Rural poverty alleviation has

been of primary concern in the economic planning and development process in the country, the Committee feel that the plan outlay for 1995-96 is not sufficient to meet the targets fixed for different Schemes by the Ministry. Even the Ministry in the written replies furnished before the Committee have admitted that the approved outlay of Rs. 7700 crores will not be sufficient to achieve the targets fixed under various schemes. The Committee is deeply concerned over the cut made by Planning Commission over the proposed outlay of the Ministry and recommend that the outlay for 1995-96 should be increased from Rs. 7700 crores to 10,500 crores as proposed by the Ministry.

**(ii) Jawahar Rozgar Yojana**

**Demand No. 70**

**Major Head 2501**

**Sub Head F.1(1)**

3.1 Jawahar Rozgar Yojana was launched in the year 1989-90 and the then existing Scheme of NREPs & RLEGP merged into it. It aims at generation of additional gainful employment for the unemployed men and women in rural areas. The expenditure under JRY is shared between Centre and States in the ratio of 80:20.

3.2 The VIIIth Plan outlay for Jawahar Rozgar Yojana is Rs. 18,400 crores. Financial allocation during the 1st four year of the plan is given below:

BE	-	1992-93	Rs. 2046.00 crores
BE	-	1993-94	Rs. 3306.00 crores
BE	-	1994-95	Rs. 3855.00 crores
RE	-	Rs. (3535.00 crores)	
BE	-	1995-96	Rs. 3862.00 crores

**Physical Targets & Achievements**

**EMPLOYMENT GENERATION (MILLION MANDAYS)**

1992-93	103.76%
1993-94	98.59%
1994-95	Targets-1036.55
Achievement upto December 1994	480.00
1995-96	Targets-917.23

3.3 The Ministry in the written replies furnished before the Committee have stated that the revised employment generation targets under JRY during 1994-95 is 966.55 million mandays, against which upto the month of January, 1995, the achievement was 618.23 million mandays which is 63.96%. As per the reports received (21 States/UTs—upto February, 1995 and balance States/UTs upto January, 1995, 694.76 million mandays have been generated under JRY during the current year, which 71.88% of the employment generation targets. Best months for taking up wage employment schemes are from December to May and with all the States/UTs reporting in full, it is expected that the employment generation targets will be achieved fully during the current year.

3.4 Performance under JRY from 1989-90 to 1993-94 and 1994-95 in different States is shown at Annexure II A & II B.

3.5 The Ministry in the written replies have stated that the first round of Concurrent Evaluation of JRY was conducted during Jan.-December, 1992. Subsequently, the second round of JRY evaluation was also completed during June 1993 to May 1994 in all the districts in the country covering about 4,700 villages Panchayats and around 24,000 JRY workers.

#### **Highlights from JRY Evaluation**

- (i) JRY workers were paid minimum wages in different States. Periodicity of payment of wages were weekly in 47% cases and fortnightly in 11.2% cases. The average wages rate per day for JRY workers was found to be Rs. 22.80 for men and Rs. 21.21 for women.
- (ii) Quality of foodgrains supplied was reported to be good by workers in 94% cases.
- (iii) The quality of assets created was good in about 75% cases; 90% of JRY workers interviewed opined that assets were useful to the people.
- (iv) The programmes has very much benefited the target group of people. The share of SC/ST was 53.7%, landless labourers 38.3% and women 20%.
- (v) During the reference period of 30 days preceding the date of survey, a household got on an average about 6 mandays of employment from JRY programme.

3.6 The Ministry in the written replies have stated that the first instalment of funds is released without any conditions and the second instalment under the JRY is released only when the district has utilised 50% of the available funds (i.e. the funds released during a particular year and the unspent balance from the previous year).

3.7 The Committee appreciate the Financial and Physical Performance under JRY during 1992-93 and 1993-94 which has been stated more than 100%.

**However, the Committee note with concern that the targets during 1995-96 have been reduced to 917.23 million mandays from 1036.55 million mandays during 1994-95.**

3.8 The Committee further note that in few States progressive unspent balances were more than the funds released under JRY during 1994-95 as may be seen at Annexure II A & II B which shows that the condition that the second instalment of JRY is released only when 50% of the funds have been utilised, is not being followed by the Centre. The Committee also note that although physical and financial achievement has been stated as more than 100% the accumulated unspent balances to the tune of Rs. 48190.20 lakhs as on 1.4.94 gives a different picture about the success of the programme. The Committee would like the Ministry to explain the reasons for the contradiction of mismatch between cent percent financial and physical achievement in the Centre and the underspending in different States. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the reasons for the release of funds to States where accumulated unspent balances are more than 100% of the funds released during a particular year.

3.9 The Committee recommend that monitoring of the different programmes under JRY should further be strengthened. The Committee note that there are complaints in the States about the uniform application of the guidelines issued by the Centre. As such the Committee urge that it should be ensured by the Ministry that the necessary infrastructure required for different activities related to creation of assets in the rural areas such as construction of roads is provided timely. Necessary guidelines should be issued in this regard.

3.10 The Committee further recommend that under JRY provision of construction of Senior Secondary Schools be made keeping in view the requirement of the specific area.

### **(iii) Integrated Rural Development Programme**

**Demand No. 70**

**Major Head 2501**

**Sub Head E.1**

4.1 Recognising lack of productive assets as a major cause of poverty and unemployment, the Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP) was conceived during the mid-seventies as an important anti-poverty programme aimed at providing income generating assets and self-employment opportunities for the rural poor. The programme was initially introduced on a pilot basis in selected development blocks but since 1980-81 has been extended to all the blocks of the country.

4.2 IRDP continues to be a major self-employment programme in the VIII Plan, which is aimed at alleviating rural poverty. The objectives of IRDP is to enable identified rural poor families to take up productive activities to augment the

family income on a sustained basis and to ultimately come out of the poverty syndrome.

4.3 In the identified target group, it is stipulated that 50% of the benefitted families should be Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, at least 40% women and 3% physically handicapped persons.

4.4 The programme is constantly reviewed by a Central level Coordination Committee (CLCC) and the High Level Credit Committee (HLCC) chaired by Secretary Rural Development and attended by Secretaries of various State Governments and representatives of banks.

4.5 IRDP is a centrally sponsored programme funded on 50:50 basis by the Centre and State. It is implemented through District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs).

4.6 The plan outlay for Eighth Plan has been fixed at Rs. 3350 crores with physical target of covering 116 lakh families in the plan period. The performance during the first three years of the Eighth Plan has been under:-

Year	B.E.	Financial Actual Expdr. (Rs. in crores)	% of Expdr.	Target	Physical Achievement (Lakh families)	% of Achievement
1992-93	390.20	393.62	100.88	18.75	20.69	110.33
1993-94	654.00	656.70	100.41	25.70	25.38	98.75
1994-95*	675.00			21.15		
1995-96	656.00			19.50		

\*Against the outlay of Rs. 675 crores for 1994-95, the funds to the extent of Rs. 640.00 crores have been released upto 15th March, 1995. As per reports received from the State Governments, the physical achievement upto January, 1995 was 14.37 lakh families as against the annual target of 21.15 lakh families.

4.7 As per the findings of Audit Para No. 6.1, 6.4 of C&AG Report for the year 1993, the test-check of records in various States revealed that the State Governments also continued to assist the beneficiaries with inadequate funds with the result that a large number of IRDP beneficiaries could not cross the poverty line.

The Ministry in the written replies have stated that on all India basis 80.98% have crossed poverty line of Rs. 3500/-, however only 27.81 per cent have crossed poverty lines of Rs. 6,400/-. Further the objectives of 50% SC/ST beneficiaries has been achieved. However, there is shortfall in the fulfillment of objectives of 40% women beneficiaries. Only 33% of women beneficiaries have been assisted so far.

4.8 The Ministry in the written replies furnished before the Committee have stated that in view of the recommendation of Public Accounts Committee of Parliament constant efforts are being made to ensure that the programmes implemented by the Ministry of Rural Development are being integrated/dove-tailed to provide employment, land development and minimum needy.

4.9 The guidelines of IRDP envisages preparation of a comprehensive Five Year Perspective Plan catering an inventory of local resources after identifying the development potential and major potential thrust areas which could be tapped and involving of suitable programmes for the benefit of rural poor. The Ministry in the written replies have stated that certain basic conditions have to be fulfilled at the time of release of second instalment. As a necessary condition for release of second instalment, the DRDAs are required to prepare a comprehensive annual plan which has to have the approval of the Governing Body. Since, the responsibility of implementation of the programme lies with the state governments, this also a State subject.

4.10 The Committee note that the performance of IRDP during the last two years of the VIIIth Plan is satisfactory in Financial and physical terms. However, the Committee are distressed to note that the actual number of beneficiaries assisted in absolute term i.e. to cross the poverty line, is very low. On all India basis only 27.81% of the beneficiaries could cross the poverty line of Rs. 6,400/-. The Committee feel that incidence of the rural poverty is a big challenge before the Country even after more than 40 years of planned development. In view of the seriousness of rural poverty the Committee recommend that the criterion for the success of the programme should be the number of beneficiaries assisted in absolute terms rather than statistics of number of beneficiaries assisted so far. As such the Committee recommend that such programmes started for the alleviation of poverty should benefit the rural poor qualitatively rather than quantitatively.

4.11 The Committee note with concern that banks play a very important role in the implementation of programme under IRDP. However, the attitude of banks is not very cooperative. The Committee recommend that Ministry should evaluate the performance of banks relating to the grant of loan under the Scheme.

4.12 The Committee further note with concern the shortfall in the fulfilment of the objective of 40% women beneficiaries under IRDP. The Committee urge that adequate attention should be given to benefit the rural women who constitute a bulk of our population.

4.13 The Committee appreciate that efforts are being made at the Central level to integrate allied programmes and activities. The Committee feel that earnest action is required in this regard to avoid overlapping and for the effective implementation of IRDP.

4.14 The Committee also hope that the basic condition that the DRDAs are required to prepare a comprehensive annual plan, to be fulfilled at the time of release of second instalment, is being adhered by the Centre.

4.15 The Committee also recommend that a task force should be constituted to monitor IRDP. The primary objective of the Task Force should be to have a surprise visit at different places where programmes related to IRDP are being implemented.

4.16 The Committee further recommend that the funds under IRDP should be released by Centre to States and further by States to DRDAs considering market, social, geoclimatic conditions of different activities under IRDP so as to ensure full utilisation of funds.

#### (v) Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas

5.1 DWCRA is a sub-programme of the Integrated Rural Development Programme started in the year 1992-93. It aims at socio-economic upliftment of the women members of families below poverty line through creation of opportunities for income generating activities on self sustained basis.

5.3 The Financial and Physical performance during the first three year of VIII Plan is as under:-

Year	BE	Financial		Physical		
		Actual Expdr. (Rs. in Crores)	% of Expdr.	Target	Achievement	% of Achievement (No. of Groups)
1992-93	13.00	15.30	117.69	7500	9029	120.39
1993-94	21.00	23.30	110.95	10984	15483	140.96
1994-95*	21.00 R.E. (31.00)			13400		
1995-96	65.00			30000		

5.3 The number of beneficiaries covered under DWCRA during the last three years are as under:-

1992-93	126744
1993-94	268585
1994-95	3779091



As regards the number of families, who have actually been brought above poverty line, the Ministry in the written replies have stated that no such survey has been conducted under the programme.

5.4 Explaining before the Committee about the public response of DWCRA, the representative of Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment stated:-

“The Committee would be pleased to know that the response from the rural poor women to this activity, particularly in terms of thrift and credit activity which has been generated is very substantial”.

5.5 The Committee are satisfied about the full utilisation of funds and more than 100% achievement in respect of targets. The Committee are also glad to note the popularity of the programme. However, the Committee are unhappy to note the findings of audit para No. 6.1 of the C&AG Report for the year 1993, according to which in Arunachal Pradesh out of 35970 families assisted under DWCRA during 1985-90 only 14967 and 2947 families were brought above the poverty line of Rs. 3,500 and Rs. 6,400 respectively. The Committee are also concerned to note that the figures regarding the number of beneficiaries who have actually been brought above the poverty line is not available with the Ministry. The Committee are of the opinion that the right evaluation of the programme is not to achieve the targets in numbers. The Committee recommend that the performance should be goal-oriented and the targets fixed under the programme should be realistic. As such the Committee recommend that the achievement of the programme should be judged qualitatively rather than quantitatively. The Committee also urge that Ministry should make available the data regarding the beneficiaries who have actually been brought above the poverty line.

5.6 The Committee are however dismayed to note the findings of the said audit para that out of 391 groups formed till 1992-93 for taking up economic activity, 144 groups were defunct. The Ministry in the written replies have admitted that it is fact that some of the groups are defunct. The Committee take serious note of it and would like the Ministry to examine the matter seriously and take remedial measures to avoid such happenings in future.

(v) Training of Rural Youth for Self-Employment (TRYSEM)

**Demand No. 70**

**Major Head 3606 .**

**Minor Head K.1 (2)(4)**

6.1 The scheme of Training of Rural Youth for Self-Employment was started on 15th August, 1979 as a sub-scheme of IRDP with the objective of providing

technical skills to the rural youth in the age group of 18-36 years from the families below the poverty line.

6.2 The coverage of Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes is 50% of the total youth selected for training. Similarly, the minimum coverage of women has been fixed at 40%. It has also been decided to earmark 3% resources of the programme for physically handicapped persons.

6.3 The financial and physical performance during the first three years of VIII Plan is as under:-

Year	BE	Financial		Physical		
		Actual Expdr. (Rs. in Crores)	% of Expdr.	Target	Achievement (No. of Trainees in lakhs)	% of Achievement
1992-93	8.00	5.99	74.88	3.00	2.76	92.00
1993-94	13.00	8.00	61.54	3.50	3.03	86.57
1994-95*	14.00			3.18		
1995-96	14.00			3.70		

\*Against the outlay of Rs. 14.00 crores for 1994-95, the funds to the extent of Rs. 8.84 crores have been released upto 15th March, 1995. As per the reports received from the State Governments, 1.09 lakhs trainees were trained upto December, 1994 as against the annual target of 3.18 lakhs trainees.

6.4 State/UT wise performance during 1992-93 & 1993-94 may be seen as per Annexure III. The percentage of total employment to trained youth is very low which is less than 50% in 17 States/UTs.

6.5 As per the findings of Para 6.1 of the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year ended 31st March, 1993, in Andhra Pradesh a training camp was closed without giving training to any person thus rendering the outlay infructuous. However, the Ministry in the written replies have claimed that no such information regarding the closure of any institution under TRYSEM has been received.

6.6 The Committee are unhappy to note the underspendings of outlays during 1992-93, 1993-94 & 1994-95. The Committee further note that although percentage of achievement in respect of number of trainees has been shown during 1992-93 and 1993-94 as 92% and 86.57% respectively, but the percentage of total employment to trained youth was very low which is less than 50% in 17 States/UTs. The Committee would like to recommend that it should be ensured that the funds earmarked for specific programme should

**be utilised fully. Further the success of the employment generated schemes should be seen qualitatively, i.e. number of beneficiaries employed so far. The Committee take serious note of the shortfall in the achievement in different States.**

**6.7 The Committee recommend that training under TRYSEM should be given to the beneficiaries to ensure self employment and enhance income generation. The Committee as such feel that training should be imparted considering the local material, market and local skills. Further the training should be given for economically viable techniques. The Committee also note that a lot of new technology is coming up in rural scenario and as such the Committee would like that training programme should reflect to address to these new opportunities.**

**6.8 Further the Committee are perturbed to note the findings of C&AG Para according to which in Andhra Pradesh a training Institute was closed without giving training to any person. The Committee take serious note of the fact that the Ministry had no knowledge of C&AG findings. The Committee would like the Ministry to explain the reasons for the closure of such Institute.**

**6.9 The Committee note that as per written replies furnished before the Committee, All India percentage of handicapped beneficiaries is 0.34% and 0.38% during 1992-93 and 1993-94 respectively which is very low of the targets i.e. 3% under the Scheme. The Committee would like to recommend that adequate attention should be paid to the handicapped strata of society which needs sympathetic consideration.**

#### **(vi) Employment Assurance Scheme**

**Demand No. 70**

**Major Head 2505**

**Minor Head F.2(1)**

**7.1 With a view to provide assured purchasing power to the most needy persons in backward areas of the country, the Prime Minister in his Independence Day address to the Nation on 15.8.1993 announced a new Employment Assurance Scheme (EAS).**

**7.2 The objective of the EAS is to provide gainful manual employment during the lean agricultural season to all able bodied adults in rural areas who are in need and who are desirous of work, but cannot find it, either on farm or on other allied operations or on the normal plan/non-plan works during such period.**

**7.3 During 1993-94 Rs. 183.75 crores were utilised out of the total assistance including the State share amounting to Rs. 548.77 crores. Further during 1994-95**

out of Rs. 1500 crores ~~Rs.~~ 563.64 crore has been spent upto December, 1994, the Financial Performance during the year 1993-94 is around 38% and during 1994-95, upto December, only 35% of the funds have so far been utilised.

7.4 The Ministry of Urban Affairs & Employment in the written note on Demand for Grants 1995-96 have stated that EAS is a need based programme and hence no physical targets are fixed,

7.5 As per Performance Budget 1995-96, progress under the EAS during 1994-95 in different States/UTs is very low. In 10 States/UTs, the progress ranges between 10 to 20%.

7.6 The Committee find that the utilisation of funds under EAS is very poor. The Committee regret to note that during 1994-95 upto December only 35% of funds have been utilized. The Committee would like to be informed about the reasons for steep shortfall in utilization of funds. The Committee are distressed to note the poor achievement in different States.

The Committee would also like to be informed about the reasons for the shortfall. The Committee recommend that there should be strict monitoring and it should be ensured that there is the optimum utilization of funds and realisation of targets earmarked for certain programme as under utilisation of funds leads to cost escalation and has an adverse effect on other projects/schemes.

7.7 The Committee note that in the absence of targets fixed under EAS, there is no yardstick to judge the performance of the Scheme in the given time which hampers the successful implementation of the programmes. The Committee feel that some targets should be fixed at the national level under EAS. The Committee also recommend that work under EAS should be given according to local requirements. The Committee would also like that work under this programme should be decided considering the lean period of that area.

#### (vii) Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP)

**Demand No. 70**

**Major Head 2275**

8.1 The Central Rural Sanitation Programme (CRSP) was launched in 1986 and it was decided to provide sanitary latrines to rural population with preference to SC/ST families and people below the poverty line. The total resources to be mobilized under the programme were to be shared by the State Govt. and the Centre on 50:50 basis.

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

Year	BE	Financial		Physical		
		Actual Expdr. (Rs. in Crores)	% of Expdr.	Target	Achievement	% of Achievement (No. of Groups)
1992-93	20.00	21.91	109.55	186407	20150	10.81
1993-94	30.00	32.67	108.90	212943	167186	69.45
1994-95*	60.00			627276		
1995-96	60.00			627276		

\* As against the budget provision of Rs. 60 crores for 1994-95, the funds to the extent of Rs. 56 crores have been released upto 15th March, 1995. As per report received from the State Governments. 298896 sanitary latrines have been constructed upto December, 1994 as against the target of 627276 sanitary latrines.

8.3 The Committee note that not only there was inadequate provision of funds, even the meagre funds provided under 8th Plan have not been spent judiciously. The Committee at their 6th Report on Demands for Grants had recommended the allocation of Rs. 300 crores during 1995-96. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation strongly.

8.4 The Committee are distressed to note the uneven and inadequate allocation of funds during the first four years of 8th Plan which is less than 50%. The Committee are at a loss as how the remaining more than 50% of funds would be spent during the remaining one year of the plan. The Committee are constrained to note the shortfall in the % achievement of the programme *i.e.* 10.81% in 1992-93 and 69.45% in 1993-94. Of equal concern is the achievement during 1994-95 *i.e.* less than 50% upto December, 1994. The Committee are at a loss as how the remaining targets would be achieved during the remaining three months. The Committee are also unhappy to note mismatch between the utilization of funds and achievement of targets. During 1992-93 utilization of funds is 109.55%, where as the percentage achievement in respect of sanitary latrines is 10.81%. During 1994-95, Out of 60 crores outlay, 56 crores have been released upto 15th March, 1995. However the achievement in respect of sanitary latrines is less than 50%.

8.5 The Committee note with concern the inadequate attention paid towards Rural Sanitation. With the outlay provided, only about 2.5% of the population has been covered as per the 1991 census. The concept of sanitation has been restricted to provide Sanitary Latrines to rural population, SC/ST and people below the poverty line. The Committee observe that it was unfortunate to see the rural masses living in total unhygienic conditions even after more than 40 years of planned development in the country. The poor

sanitation has caused number of communicable diseases such as malaria, plague etc. which have taken enormous lives during the last few years. The Committee do not appreciate the compartmentalisation/categorisation of this programme. The Committee strongly recommend that Rural Sanitation Programme should be launched in a holistic manner so as to benefit all categories of people/inhabitants in the rural areas. The country could not wait more to live in a hygienic condition. The Committee had recommended in their 6th Report for preparation of a time bound programme not exceeding more than 5 to 10 years to cover every habitation under Rural Sanitation Programme. The Committee reiterate their earlier recommendation strongly. The Committee also recommend that the Rural Sanitation Programme should not be taken to provide Sanitary Latrines only. Rather an integrated approach should be taken to provide total hygienic condition to rural masses *i.e.* the primary concern for human living.

8.6 The Committee recommend that the sanitary unit should be a village instead of block.

8.7 The Committee note that lack of awareness regarding sanitation is the main cause of poor sanitation in rural areas. The Committee would like that an awareness campaign should be launched on war footing and adequate funds should be given for such programmes.

#### (viii) Rural Water Supply Programme

Demand No. 70

Major Head 3602

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

9.2 The outlay for Rural Water Supply Programme in Eighth Plan is Rs. 5100 crores.

The year-wise performance from 1992-93 onwards is as under:-

Year	BE	Financial	
		Actual Expdr. (Rs. in Crores)	% of Expdr.
1992-93	460.00	459.05	99.79
1993-94	740.00	737.20	99.62
1994-95	890.00		
	RE (810.00)		
1995-96	1110.00		

As per the written replies furnished by the Ministry total Rural Population and its coverage under the ARWSP is as follows:-

	Total Rural Population as per 1991 census	Coverage based on the reports received upto 2/95	Target
Total	6286.91	5092.78	Targets under RWSP are fixed on year to year basis depending upon the availability of the funds.
SC	1128.68	828.43	
ST	627.51	562.86	

Details of spilled over problem villages targets and achievements during the year 1992-93, 1993-94, 1994-95 are as under:-

Target	1992-93		1993-94		1994-95	
	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement	Target	Achievement
2968		2218	750	472	278	91 (Upto Feb. 95)

9.3 The Ministry in the written replies have stated that some of the States received their second and last instalments of funds under ARWSP during the fag end of the year i.e. Feb/March. As such it was not possible for the States to spend the entire amount released to them.

9.4 The Committee are satisfied about the full utilization of funds during the years 1992-93 and 1993-94 and hope that the funds during 1994-95 would be utilised fully by the close of the financial year. However the Committee regret to note the achievement during 1992-93, 1993-94 and 1994-95 as regards spilled over problem villages which is not upto the mark. The Committee would like the Ministry to explain the reasons for it.

9.5 The Committee take serious note of the fact that States are getting funds during the fag end of the year. The Committee would like to recommend that funds should be released in time so as to ensure full utilization of funds and realization of targets.

9.6 The Committee further note that the allocation of Rs. 1110 crores during 1995-96 is not sufficient under Rural Water Supply Programme and are doubtful whether the provisional target for the year 1995-96 to cover 73000 habitations would be achieved. The Committee recommend that the allocation should be enhanced suitably so as to achieve the laid-down objectives.

**9.7** The Committee also recommend that under this programme the benefit of new technologies should be taken. The Committee would also like that under this programmes, new designs should be made use of to address to the specific requirement of an area.

### **(ix) Rural Housing**

#### **Demand No. 70**

#### **Major Head 3601**

**10.1** Housing is a basic human need and pre-requisite for decent human existence. It has an important role to play in poverty alleviation. However, the struggle of the poor and vulnerable sections of the society to secure affordable and adequate shelter has recently been aggravated due to spiralling prices and rents of lands and houses. Keeping in view the necessary for a viable rural housing programme for the poor, an allocation of Rs. 350 crores has been made for Rural Housing for the Eighth Five Year Plan.

**10.2** During the year 1993-94, a new scheme of Rural Housing has been launched to enhance and strengthen the ongoing programmes for rural housing of various States. Under this scheme funds are provided by the Ministry to the States to the extent of 50% of the total allocation made by them for rural housing programme including institutional finance for weaker sections and persons below the poverty line in rural areas under their Minimum Needs Programme (MNP), over and above the level of expenditure incurred by them in 1992-93. These funds are meant to be utilised only for expanding the physical programme.

**10.3** During the 1993-94, the Central Government released an amount of Rs. 11.00 crores under the new rural housing scheme to the states of Bihar, Gujarat, Orissa, Tripura and Rajasthan against Rs. 10.00 crores provided in the budget.

**10.4** The budget allocation for 1994-95 for rural housing is Rs. 30.00 crore. During the year 1994-95, an amount of Rs. 22.50 crore has been released upto 15th March, 1995. The outlay for 1995-96 is Rs. 45.00 crores to the States of Rajasthan, Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, Himachal Pradesh, Tripura, Gujarat, J&K, Orissa, Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka and Kerala.

**10.5** The Committee appreciate the allocation of funds to the tune of Rs. 350 crore during the Eighth Five Year Plan for rural housing. However the Committee are constrained to note that during the first four years of the plan only 39% of the funds have been sanctioned. Not only there is an inadequate sanction of funds for rural housing, but the meagre amount sanctioned has not even been spent fully. The Committee take serious note of it and would like the Ministry to explain the reasons for the inadequate attention paid to Rural Housing.



10.6 The Committee are of the view that rural housing has not been given due consideration although 2/3 of the population still live in Rural Areas Rural Housing qualified as a Plan Programme only during the 5th Plan under the Minimum Needs Programme (MNP). The Committee recommend that the problem of rural housing should also be considered properly under the different Plans instead of having been considered as an urban problem only.

10.7 The Committee recommended that it should be ensured by the Ministry that the funds allocated for rural housing are spent fully. Further the Committee are of the view that BE 1995-96 for Rs. 45 crores is not sufficient for the upgradation of rural housing and as such it should atleast be doubled. Further the Committee recommend that in line with the objective of National Housing Policy, the development of house sites and the upgradation of rural housing should be linked to activities under the IRDP, JRY & other programmes for the creation of assets and employment.

(x) Desert Development Programme (DDP)

Demand No. 70

Major Head 3601

Sub-Head J.1(5)

11.1 The Desert Development Programme is an area Development Programme and aims at centralizing desertification through development of areas on watershed basis. The Programme is fully funded by the Central Government. The 8th Plan outlay for this Scheme is Rs. 500.00 crores.

11.2 The financial and physical performance during the first three years of VIII Five Year Plan is as under:-

(Rs. in Crores)

Year	BE	Financial		Target	Physical	
		Actual Exptr. (Rs. in Crores)	% of Exp.r.		Achieve- ment	% of Achievement (No. of Groups)
1992-93	50.00	49.50	99.00	380.42	284.19	74.70
1993-94	75.00	75.00	100.00	438.35	378.48	86.34
1994-95*	85.00			842.85		
1995-96	100.00					

\* As against the outlay of Rs. 85.00 crores for 1994-95, the funds to the extent of Rs. 84.00 crores were released upto 15 March, 1995. As per the reports received from State Governments 36276 hectares areas been covered upto September, 1994 against the annual target of 84285 hectares.

**11.3 At present 131 blocks in 21 Districts of five States are included under this programme.**

**The Ministry in the written replies have stated that as per Dr. C.H. Hanumantha Rao Committee the number of Districts and blocks under DDP would increase from 21 to 36 and from 131 to 234 respectively.**

**11.4 The representatives of the Ministry while presenting the picture of the new strategy of DDP before the Committee stated that on the basis of Dr. Hanumantha Rao Committee Report, there has been consultations with the State Governments and voluntary organisations and after that, we had totally revamped the guidelines. This year, new guidelines have already come into operation with focus on the watershed development and also for programmes which are land based under Jawahar Rozgar Yojana.**

**11.5 The Committee appreciate the enhancement of funds to the tune of Rs. 100 crore during 1995-96 as per the recommendations of the Committee made during the last year.**

**11.6 The Committee observe that although the programme has created impact in the rural areas where it has been tried. However, as has been stated in the Annual Report 1994-95, the overall impact in the identified areas in the country was not encouraging. One of the reasons for it was that watershed approach was adopted at a few places. The Committee as such recommend that emphasis should be given to watershed approach and the activities under the programme should be integrated rather undertaken at isolated places.**

**11.7 The Committee observe that there are certain plants such as Cactus, Zetroph Curus and Jojoba which not only preserve the land from degradation but also encourage natural regeneration. Besides these plants have economic advantage also. The oil produced from Jojoba can be used as lubricant for aeroplanes. The Committee as such recommend that emphasis should be given to tree plantation activities.**

**The Committee have been apprised by the Secretary of the Ministry during evidence that Israel had a highly developed technology for desert and dry land farming. The Committee urge that Ministry should study these technologies and explore the possibilities of using in India.**

#### **(xi) Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP)**

**12.1 Drought Prone Area Programme is an Area Development Programme with the object of mitigating the adverse effect of drought on crops and human livestock population and of restoring ecological balance in the long run. The programme is under implementation in 627 blocks in 96 districts in 13 states. The**

total area covered is 553 lakhs hecets. 8th Plan outlay for this programme is Rs. 500.00 crores.

The financial and physical performance during first three years of VIII Five Year Plan is as under:-

Year	Financial			Physical		
	BE	Actual Expdr. (Rs. in Crores)	% of Expdr.	Target	Achieve- ment	% of Achieve- ment (00' hectares)
1992-93	51.26	51.26	100.00	2029.93	2094.82	103.20
1993-94	77.00	77.00	100.00	2750.86	2567.82	93.35
1994-95*	125.00	85.00	2949.66			
1995-96			—			

\*Against the outlay of Rs. 85.00 crores for 1994-95, the funds to the extent of Rs. 83.18 crores have been released upto 15th March, 1995. As per the reports received from various State Governments 103861 hectares area has been covered upto September, 1994 as against the annual target of 294966 hectares.

12.3 As per Performance Budget 1995-96, in various States, unspent balance of last year is very huge in some of the States like Bihar, M.P., U.P., W.B. and Rajasthan.

12.4 The Ministry in the written replies furnished before the Committee has stated that third and fourth installments for a district are not released unless the expenditure reaches the limit of 50% of the available funds. The districts where the pace of expenditure is slow the limit of 50% of the expenditure is achieved very late resulting in late release of the third and fourth installments. In case of States where large unspent balance has been indicated by the Committee, a considerable amount was released in the month of March, 1993 as given.

One of the reasons for excess carry over in these States is that the funds are released very late by the State Governments to the DRDAs.

12.5 The Committee appreciate the full utilisation of funds during 1992-93 and 1993-94. However, the Committee are constrained to observe the physical achievement of the programme during 1994-95 which has been shown as less than 50% upto 15th March, 1995. The Committee are doubtful about the achievement of the remaining targets during the said year.

12.6 The Committee observe that the Ministry in the written replies have also stated that the performance in some of the States was not upto the mark.

**One of the reasons was late release of funds from States to the implementing agencies i.e. DRDAs.**

**12.7 The Committee take serious note of the fact that a considerable amount under DPAP was released by the fagend of the year which accumulates in the unspent balances. Further the Committee are disturbed to note the late release of funds from States to DRDAs. The Committee strongly recommend that there should be strict monitoring of the Programmes/Schemes sponsored by Centre. States should be directed to submit quarterly progress reports. Timely evaluation of the programmes should also be made on regular basis.**

**12.8 Further the Committee observe that under watershed approach, one good technique is Artificial Water Recharge Programme which can be used in areas where density of rain is very high. The Committee would like to know whether any initiative has been taken to undertake this technique in heavy rain areas also.**

**12.9 The Committee note that under Watershed Programme the benefitted zone is a limited cluster of land and a large area remains uncovered. The Committee recommend that land development programme and other techniques such as bunding, levelling, terracing, trenching and gully plugging programmes should be introduced in such areas.**

#### **(xii) Land Reforms**

**Demand No. 70**

**Major Head 3601**

**Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Strengthening of Revenue Administration and updating of Land Records.**

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

**13.2 During the current year 1994-95 the Budget provision under the Scheme is Rs. 27.47 crores. Against this, an amount of Rs. 1.90 crores has been released upto December, 1994. The outlay for 1995-96 is Rs. 18.80 crores.**

However, the financial progress under the scheme during the Eighth Plan is as under:-

.. (Rs. in Crores)

Year	Outlay	Expenditure
1992-93	19.99	18.95
1993-94	27.47	17.07
1994-95	27.47	24.26
1995-96	18.80	

13.3 Explaining the importance of land records, the Secretary stated:-

“The land record is a basic document giving of interests in land. It should be available in every village and every block. It gives the type of land, owner of the land and also tax, land assessment. Then, for every season, Rabi and Kharif, it contains irrigation details and crop details.”

Highlighting the new technologies in the field of land reforms, Secretary of the Ministry Stated:-

When Insat-1D goes up, the land maps will be available on 1:5000 scale. From the Satellite I can get the village map and I can blow up the village map. Cheaper technologies have come in and we are promoting this in Mizoram which is a new State, an unsurveyed State on an experimental basis.”

13.4 The Centrally Sponsored Scheme of Computerization of Land Records was started during the year 1988-89 and initially 8 projects on Computerization of Land Records were sanctioned as pilot project basis. Subsequently, it was extended to more districts.

13.5 The Committee observe that adequate attention has not been paid in respect of maintenance of land Records. Land Records is a basic document for possession and percolation. The land cannot be mortgaged, credit cannot be made available unless the mutation is upto date. The Committee note that although emphasis has been given to computerization of land-records but the upgradation of technology can never substitute the importance of actual information gathering process at the ground level, The Committee are constrained to observe the decreased outlay during the year 1995-96 which was reduced from 27.47 crores to 18.80 crores.

13.6 The Committee are further unhappy to note that during 1994-95, only Rs. 1.95 crores were released upto December out of the Budget provision under the Scheme of Rs. 27.47 crores.

13.7 The Committee strongly recommend that in view of the importance of land-records, adequate attention should be paid to the updating of land-

records. The Committee also recommend that funds for this programme should be enhanced. The Committee also recommend that adequate steps should be undertaken by the Govt. for the preservation of Land record maps and village Maps which are the basic data of the country.

(xiii) National Institute of Agricultural Marketing (NIAM), Jaipur

**Demand No. 70**

**Major Head 2435**

**Minor Head D.1(3) (4)**

14.1 The National Institute of Agricultural Marketing (NIAM), Jaipur undertakes research, survey and training in agricultural marketing and consultancy services. The outlay under this programme is as below:-

BE 1994-95	3 crores
RE	1.75 crores
BE 1995-96	1.50 crores

14.2 The Committee note the underspending under NIAM. Out of 3 crores BE 1994-95, RE was reduced to 1.75 crores. Further, BE 1995-96 has been reduced to 1/2 of BE of 1994-95. The Committee would like the Ministry to explain the reasons for underspending and reduced outlay during 1995-96.

14.3 The Committee observe that Grants to National Institute of Agricultural Marketing (NIAM) has been kept under Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment and not Ministry of Agriculture. The Ministry in the written replies have stated.

“According to Government of India (Allocation of Business) Rules, 1961, *vide* entry No. 12 and 14, “Setting up of Agricultural markets in Rural Areas and the Agricultural Produce (Grading and Marking), Act, 1937 and all attached or subordinate offices or other organisations concerned with any of the subject specified in the list” under the sub-heading “Department of Rural Development.” are allocated to the Department of Rural Development. As the National Institute of Agricultural marketing (NIAM), Jaipur is concerned with matters relating to agricultural markets, it has been kept under this Ministry.

14.4 The Committee note that there is no rationale behind keeping NIAM under Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment. The Secretary, Ministry also acknowledged before the Committee that NIAM should be with the Ministry of Agriculture and not with the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment. In view of it the Committee strongly recommend that National Institute of Agricultural & Marketing should be kept under Ministry of Agriculture and strongly recommend that it should be kept under Ministry of Agriculture as the area of activity falls under the purview of that Ministry.

## ANNEXURE-I

## MINISTRY OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT

Sl. No.	Name of the Schemes	1994-95		1995-96	
		BE	RE	Actual Expdr. upto 15th March, 95	Outlay
1.	Rural Water Supply Programme	890.00	810.00	782.00	1110.00
2.	Rural Sanitation	60.00	60.00	56.00	60.00
3.	Integrated Rural Development Programme	675.00	676.00	640.00	656.00
4.	Development of Women & Children in Rural Areas	21.00	31.00	29.17	65.00
5.	Training of Rural Youth for Self-Employment	14.00	9.00	8.84	14.00
6.	Jawahar Rozgar Yojana	3855.00	3535.00	3360.97	3862.00
7.	Employment Assurance Scheme	1200.00	1140.00	1097.82	1570.00
8.	Drought Prone Areas Programme	85.00	85.00	83.18	125.00
9.	Desert Development Programme	85.00	85.00	84.00	100.00
10.	Grants to National Institute of Rural Dev.	4.00	5.00	5.00	5.00
11.	Strengthening of State Training Centre	3.25	4.50	3.86	3.25
12.	Assistance of CAPART	12.00	12.00	12.00	12.00
13.	Org. of Training Courses, Seminars & Workshop	1.00	1.00	0.30	0.50
14.	Strengthening of Ext. Training Centre	3.25	3.25	2.74	3.00
15.	Assistance to Assignees of Ceiling Surplus Land	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
16.	Grant-in-aid to Institute for Agrarian Studies & Computerisation of Land Records	12.00	10.80	10.67	20.67
17.	Strengthening of Revenue Machinery & updating of land records	27.47	16.97	16.26	18.80
18.	National Commission on Revitalisation of Rev. Adm.	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.01

Sl. No.	Name of the Schemes	1994-95		1995-96	
		BE	RE	Actual Expdr. upto 15th March, 95	Outlay
19.	Organization of Rural Poor	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.01
20.	Communication Cell	2.00	4.00	3.55	4.00
21.	Promotion of Voluntary Scheme	9.50	9.50	9.50	10.00
22.	Organization of Beneficiaries	2.50	2.50	2.50	3.50
23.	Panchayats Development and Training	5.00	1.00	0.61	3.00
24.	Roads in Special Problem Areas	2.00	2.00	2.00	2.00
25.	Rural Godowns	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00*
26.	Development of Rural Markets	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
27.	Centre for Agricultural Marketing	3.00	1.75	0.00	1.50
28.	Establishment Expenditure of DMT	7.99	2.18	1.05	5.75
29.	Building for AARRO	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
30.	Rural Housing	30.00	22.50	22.50	45.00
31.	Provision for New Scheme	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
32.	MPs Local Area Development Scheme	0.00	790.00	762.00	0.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>7010.00</b>	<b>7320.00</b>	<b>6996.53</b>	<b>7700.00</b>

\* MPs Local Area Development Scheme has been transferred to Department of Programme Implementation.



**FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE UNDER JAWAHAR ROZGAR YOJANA**  
**FROM 1989-90 TO 1993-94**

(Rs. in Lakhs)

Sl. State/ No. U.T.	Unutilised Balance as on 1.4.89	Allocation		Release		Total Availability (col. 3+9)		Utilisation	%age Utilisation		
		Centre	State	Centre	State	Total	Total				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Andhra Pradesh	3884.63	84323.42	21080.86	105404.28	85519.89	20996.99	106516.88	110401.51	105233.34	95.32	
2. Arunachal Pradesh	62.66	1290.82	322.71	1613.53	806.49	360.52	1167.01	1229.67	1036.72	84.31	
3. Assam	1046.82	24026.95	6006.74	30033.69	23710.51	6488.06	30198.57	31245.39	27396.67	87.68	
4. Bihar	8177.40	169496.93	42374.23	211871.16	166271.80	40843.25	207115.05	215292.45	213556.83	99.19	
5. Goa	39.96	1490.95	372.74	1863.69	1395.05	384.49	1779.54	1819.50	1628.22	89.49	
6. Gujarat	1629.98	34228.55	8557.14	42785.69	34127.85	9784.78	43912.63	45542.61	44489.90	97.69	
7. Haryana	124.81	8307.07	2076.77	10383.84	8721.52	2370.44	11091.96	11216.77	10585.90	94.38	
8. Himachal Pradesh	255.66	4628.80	1157.20	5786.00	4845.47	846.80	5692.27	5947.93	5797.12	97.46	
9. Jammu & Kashmir	307.35	6947.69	1736.92	8684.61	8168.90	2000.72	10169.62	10476.97	9161.87	87.45	
10. Karnataka	1330.14	53697.61	13424.40	67122.01	52578.46	11890.43	64468.59	65798.73	63018.72	95.77	
11. Kerala	1510.84	26607.97	6651.99	33259.96	26496.65	6970.76	33467.41	34978.25	35292.38	100.90	
12. Madhya Pradesh	7411.17	112875.62	28218.91	141094.53	108701.85	28658.68	137360.53	144771.70	142067.47	98.13	
13. Maharashtra	3080.91	91598.79	22899.70	114498.49	83228.93	22168.94	105397.87	108478.78	102712.13	94.68	
14. Manipur	87.18	1860.79	465.20	2325.99	1563.49	482.20	2045.69	2132.87	1730.89	81.15	
15. Meghalaya	78.35	2109.76	527.44	2637.20	1517.31	758.38	2275.69	2354.04	1765.67	75.01	

16. Mizoram	2.30	842.71	210.68	1053.39	1562.58	431.27	1993.85	1996.15	1845.96	92.48
17. Nagaland	0.00	2234.23	558.56	2792.79	2506.45	758.07	3264.52	3264.52	3162.16	96.86
18. Orissa	2787.72	59884.18	14971.05	74855.23	58351.50	14473.78	72825.28	75613.00	69973.68	92.54
19. Punjab	247.06	6861.44	1715.36	8576.80	6527.86	1851.75	8379.61	8626.67	8510.35	98.65
20. Rajasthan	3851.41	53070.50	13267.63	66338.13	52494.67	13120.88	65615.55	69466.96	67435.96	97.08
21. Sikkim	18.68	804.51	201.13	1005.64	1017.79	315.24	1333.03	1351.71	1258.88	93.13
22. Tamil Nadu	1640.97	75930.89	18982.72	94913.61	75174.89	31806.63	106981.52	108622.49	107582.83	99.04
23. Tripura	66.10	2266.50	566.63	2833.13	2422.94	576.07	2999.01	3065.11	2994.71	97.70
24. Uttar Pradesh	8804.42	219926.28	54981.57	274907.85	210166.21	54290.69	264456.90	273261.32	268659.62	98.32
25. West Bengal	6972.57	90536.86	22634.22	113171.08	81845.48	17875.77	99721.25	106693.82	101780.67	95.40
26. A&N Islands	11.56	783.32	0.00	783.32	438.10	0.00	438.10	449.66	459.04	102.09
27. Chandigarh	0.00	79.58	0.00	79.58	68.91	0.30	69.21	69.21	39.29	56.77
28. D&N Haveli	15.21	427.69	0.00	427.69	407.81	5.69	413.50	428.71	415.84	97.00
29. Daman & Diu	12.45	250.20	0.00	250.20	122.61	0.00	122.16	134.61	106.24	78.92
30. Delhi	0.00	371.60	0.00	371.60	279.51	0.00	279.51	279.51	147.23	52.67
31. Lakshadweep	1.53	393.86	0.00	393.86	311.15	8.73	319.88	321.41	301.23	93.72
32. Pondicherry	31.06	846.15	0.00	846.15	835.65	149.74	985.39	1016.45	813.87	80.07
<b>Total</b>	<b>53490.90</b>	<b>1139002.22</b>	<b>283962.46</b>	<b>1422964.68</b>	<b>1102187.83</b>	<b>290669.75</b>	<b>1392857.58</b>	<b>1446348.48</b>	<b>1400961.99</b>	<b>96.86</b>

00 - Nil/Not Reported.

ANNEXURE II-B

PERFORMANCE UNDER JRY DURING 1994-95

Sl. State/ No. UTs	Month Code	Unutilised Balance As on 1.4.94	Resources Allocated		Resources Released		Resources Available (Unutilised Balance + Released)		Resources Utilised	%age Utilisation (Col 10/9)	Employment Generation (Lakh Mandays)				
			Centre	State	Centre	State	Total	Total			Target	Achieve- ment	%age Ach.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Andhra Pradesh	11	5168.17	21679.97	5419.99	27099.96	17023.67	4255.92	21279.59	26447.76	19970.29	60.38	946.90	382.47	40.39	
2. Arunachal Pradesh	11	192.95	258.01	64.50	322.51	80.55	20.14	100.69	293.64	108.07	36.80	9.38	2.82	30.06	
3. Assam	11	3848.72	7136.97	1784.24	8821.21	5660.52	1415.13	7075.65	10924.37	5153.04	47.17	211.97	132.45	62.49	
4. Bihar	11	1735.62	42524.45	10631.11	53155.56	34456.75	8614.19	43070.95	44806.57	24245.68	54.11	1035.22	470.49	45.45	
5. Goa	11	191.28	278.77	69.69	348.46	209.09	52.27	261.36	457.64	212.85	47.02	7.84	2.52	32.14	
6. Gujarat	11	1052.71	7958.29	1989.57	9947.86	6683.75	1670.94	8354.69	9407.40	4473.24	47.57	177.45	91.01	51.29	
7. Haryana	11	467.75	1911.69	477.92	2389.61	1433.70	358.43	1792.13	2259.88	1173.29	51.92	33.29	14.33	43.05	
8. Himachal Pradesh	11	190.80	885.81	221.45	1107.26	689.19	172.50	861.69	1012.29	636.33	61.57	28.68	15.28	53.28	
9. Jammu & Kashmir	11	2307.21	1800.00	450.00	2250.00	1189.73	297.43	1487.16	2794.37	1316.16	34.69	86.36	30.99	35.88	
10. Karnataka	11	2955.46	14557.15	3639.29	18196.44	12976.09	3244.02	19220.11	19175.57	8767.82	45.72	415.72	180.23	43.35	
11. Kerala	11	0.00	5296.09	1324.02	6620.11	4879.69	1219.92	6099.61	6099.61	3678.89	60.31	97.10	49.23	50.70	

12. Madhya Pradesh	11	2704.23	27471.67	6867.92	34339.59	20949.72	5237.43	26187.15	28891.38	11449.54	39.63	723.33	243.46	33.66
13. Maharashtra	11	5766.05	23634.14	5908.54	29342.68	18107.60	45265.90	22634.50	28400.55	11564.28	40.72	1231.45	334.75	27.18
14. Manipur	11	406.57	330.69	82.67	413.36	248.01	62.00	310.01	716.58	277.95	38.79	5.78	5.24	90.66
15. Meghalaya	11	537.94	386.94	96.74	483.68	290.20	72.55	362.75	900.69	211.50	23.48	7.82	5.39	68.93
16. Mizoram	11	150.18	163.00	40.75	203.75	162.70	40.68	203.38	353.56	233.58	66.07	4.08	4.01	94.28
17. Nagaland	11	112.65	414.77	103.69	518.46	103.69	25.92	129.61	242.26	Nil	0.00	11.51	0.00	0.00
18. Odisha	11	5639.31	17587.54	4396.89	21984.43	13581.31	3395.33	16976.64	22615.95	8337.08	36.86	572.34	198.76	34.05
19. Punjab	11	116.32	1339.42	339.86	1699.28	1019.49	254.87	1274.36	1390.68	664.47	47.78	25.39	12.73	90.14
20. Rajasthan	11	3708.00	11413.49	2833.37	14266.86	8881.65	2270.41	11102.06	14810.06	6038.02	40.77	385.21	169.32	43.96
21. Sikkim	11	92.83	151.01	37.75	188.76	113.26	28.32	141.38	234.41	140.68	60.02	6.19	4.89	79.00
22. Tamil Nadu	11	1039.66	19396.35	4899.59	24497.94	15367.50	3841.88	19209.38	20249.04	15504.36	76.57	777.58	463.00	63.91
23. Tripura	11	70.40	429.52	107.38	536.90	429.52	107.38	536.90	607.30	291.91	48.07	13.19	7.82	99.29
24. Uttar Pradesh	11	4601.70	52833.41	13208.35	66041.76	46397.30	11599.33	57996.63	62598.33	26993.30	43.12	1165.44	523.50	44.92
25. West Bengal	11	4909.56	19428.42	4857.11	24285.53	15757.08	3939.27	19696.35	24605.91	11741.85	47.72	498.98	234.21	46.94
26. A&N Islands	11	0.00	152.70	0.00	152.70	152.70	0.00	152.70	152.70	44.63	29.23	3.05	0.84	27.54
27. D & N Haveli	11	11.87	82.89	0.00	82.89	62.16	0.00	62.16	74.03	23.94	32.34	2.29	0.55	24.02
28. Daman & Diu	11	28.37	48.83	0.00	48.86	12.19	0.00	12.19	40.56	4.57	11.27	1.48	0.09	6.08
29. Lakshadweep	11	20.18	76.55	0.00	76.55	57.42	0.00	57.42	77.60	43.05	55.48	1.38	0.90	65.22
30. Pondicherry	11	203.71	149.47	0.00	149.47	112.09	0.00	112.09	315.80	81.03	25.66	3.08	3.52	114.29
<b>Total</b>	11	48190.20	280000.00	69872.39	349872.39	227088.33	56672.94	283761.27	331951.47	159373.34	48.01	8389.48	3586.80	42.75

## ANNEXURE-III

**TRYSEM—STATE/U.T.-WISE PERFORMANCE DURING  
1992-93 & 1993-94**

Sl. No.	Name of the States/UTs	1992-93		1993-94		1994-95
		Total No. of Youth Trained	% of Total Employment to Trained Youth	Total No. of Youth Trained	% of Total Employment to Trained Youth	Total No. of Youth to be Trained
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.	Andhra Pradesh	17340	52.83	18047	52.73	24461
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	487	66.12	669	76.38	1829
3.	Assam	8026	28.06	9970	28.35	8050
4.	Bihar	32649	24.81	28566	23.55	45516
5.	Goa	2552	57.21	275	253.09	416
6.	Gujarat	11209	49.23	12037	38.46	8976
7.	Haryana	7067	55.09	6536	56.73	2157
8.	Himachal Pradesh	1581	72.42	810	90.37	707
9.	Jammu & Kashmir	855	37.89	343	3.21	5000
10.	Karnataka	13407	32.88	15171	36.59	16422
11.	Kerala	7919	68.30	5549	73.94	5974
12.	Madhya Pradesh	22156	78.94	54111	59.95	30998
13.	Maharashtra	21418	25.86	23063	52.86	26665
14.	Manipur	218	0.00	336	25.89	1319
15.	Meghalaya	316	27.53	358	31.84	1401
16.	Mizoram	1186	21.25	1348	41.10	592
17.	Nagaland	247	96.36	567	61.73	985
18.	Orissa	15585	82.62	9985	91.01	19847
19.	Punjab	4237	82.25	3870	63.07	1538
20.	Rajasthan	12549	33.13	10813	34.94	12875
21.	Sikkim	161	0.00	184	0.00	164
22.	Tamil Nadu	18985	58.98	16082	34.52	22115
23.	Tripura	2502	34.21	1689	32.27	1881
24.	Uttar Pradesh	57645	51.25	63649	55.78	59611

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25.	West Bengal	15223	89.36	17421	47.51	21922
26.	A & N Islands	361	12.74	476	11.13	419
27.	Chandigarh	—	—	—	—	—
28.	D & N Haveli	0	0.00	30	0.00	88
29.	Daman & Diu	74	0.00	25	0.00	165
30.	Delhi	—	—	—	—	—
31.	Lakshadweep	28	53.57	4	0.00	41
32.	Pondicherry	0	0.00	184	94.02	179
	All India	275993	51.30	302168	49.72	322311

**PART II**  
**DEPARTMENT OF WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT**  
**CHAPTER I**

**INTRODUCTORY**

1.1 Land degradation has already created serious ecological and socio-economic problems in the country. Growing demand for fuel, wood, fodder and food has extensively depleted or even eliminated protective vegetative cover and exposed surface soils to the process of degradation which has resulted in partial to complete loss of productivity.

1.2 India, which is predominantly a land of agriculture, has a large part of its total land-mass as wastelands. It is assessed to be around 1,295 lakh hectares in the country, out of which 936.90 lakh hectares is non-forest wastelands.

1.3 If the survival of millions of people is to be ensured we must realise that the wasteland Development is an urgent task and the bulk of country's land should be made fertile and productive. As a matter of fact, we cannot afford to allow our valuable land to remain wasteland, so we must protect our precious land from being wasted. Hence, the dire need is to zealously guard it against depletion and degradation to meet the growing demands of our increasing population because once the good land is depleted or degraded, even after spending lakhs and crores of rupees, it cannot be revived. Precisely, the development of Wasteland would not only generate fertility of soil but also food and gainful employment for the rural poor.

1.4 Estimates indicate that nearly half of the total land area is suffering from degradation of some form or the other. On the national scale, a comprehensive programme to tackle such degraded lands was first attempted in 1985 with the establishment of the National Wastelands Development Board under the Ministry of Environment and Forests. During the Seventh Five Year Plan period, the strategy adopted by the National Wastelands Development Board for the development of wastelands was somewhat uni-dimensional with predominant emphasis on tree-planting activities.

1.5 Realising the gravity of the ecological and socio-economic problems arising out of land degradation and the urgency of evolving and implementing integrated strategies for development of the vast areas of wastelands, Government

of India set up a new Department of Wastelands Development under the Ministry of Rural Development in July, 1992.

1.6 Wastelands Development is being looked after by two Departments, one is for degraded forest lands under the Ministry of Environment and Forests and other is for non-forest wastelands which is a part of Ministry of Rural Development.

1.7 With the setting up of the Department of Wastelands Development, the National Wastelands Development Board (NWDB) was reconstituted in August, 1992. The NWDB under the Ministry of Rural Development has been made responsible for the development of wastelands in non-forest areas aimed at checking land degradation, putting such wastelands in the country to sustainable use and increasing bio-mass availability specially fuelwood and fodder.

1.8 The NWDB will be mainly responsible for regeneration and development wastelands in non-forest areas aimed at checking land degradation, putting such wastelands to sustainable use and increasing biomass availability, specially fuelwood and fodder. The Board will adopt a mission approach for enlisting people's participation, harnessing science and technology for the planning and implementation of wastelands development. To this, end, it will:

- (a) formulate, in collaboration with the National Land-use and Conservation Board, a perspective plan for the management and development of wastelands in the non-forest areas in the country in a sustainable manner;
- (b) identify such wastelands, create a reliable data base and collaborate with the concerned Central and State Departments/Agencies, local bodies, voluntary agencies and other non-governmental organisations to mobilise the resources and support required for development of wastelands in non-forest areas;
- (c) evolve mechanisms for integrated development of such wastelands through systematic planning and implementation, in a cost effective manner, specially to meet the need of the people in the rural areas in respect of fuelwood and fodder;
- (d) raise fuelwood, fodder and timber on non-forest and private wastelands in order to reduce the pressure on the forest areas and to meet the needs of industry and market;
- (e) sponsor research and extension of research findings to disseminate new and appropriate technologies for wastelands development;
- (f) create general awareness and help foster a people's movement for wastelands development in non-forest areas with the assistance of



voluntary agencies, non-governmental organisations, Panchayati Raj institutions and others, and promote participatory and sustainable management of community/public lands and other similar degraded common property resources;

- (g) coordinate and monitor the Action Plans for activities related to such wastelands in order to upgrade land quality in a systematic and cost-effective manner; and
- (h) undertake all other measures necessary for promoting wastelands development in non-forest areas in the country.

## CHAPTER II

### ANALYSIS OF DEMANDS FOR GRANTS AND PLAN BUDGET OF THE DEPARTMENT OF WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT FOR THE YEAR 1995-96

#### (i) Plan Allocations

2.1 The Department of Wastelands Development was given a budget of Rs. 26.41 crores for 1992-93 of which Rs. 24.10 crores was spent. The DWD had requested the Planning Commission to make provision of Rs. 1165.00 crores for various schemes/projects to be taken up during the Eighth Five Year Plan. According to the Department, the Planning Commission has not yet indicated the funds available to the Department for the Eighth Five Year Plan. However, the Planning Commission allocated Rs. 50 crores for the year 1993-94 for the Department of Wastelands Development.

2.2 The Department of Wastelands Development in the third year of its formation i.e. 1994-95, implemented the following schemes:

- i. Integrated Wastelands Development Scheme
- ii. Grants-in-Aid Scheme

2.3 The following tables give an overall view of the physical and financial targets and achievements of all the programme during 1993-94 and 1994-95 (up to 31.12.1994):

#### Schemes Operational in 1994-95

Name of the Programme & Year	Physical Targets	Achievements #	%age	Financial requirements	Achievements ##	%age
	(Area in Hectares)			(Rs. in lakhs)		
<b>1. Integrated Wastelands Development Project Scheme#</b>						
1993-94	57,956#	28,925	50	44.45	44.45	100
1994-95	65,000#	46,250	71	51.48	37.00	71.87
<b>2. Grant-in-Aid Scheme</b>						
1993-94	4,300	n.a.	—	300.00	300.00	100
1994-95	4,300	4,300	100	300.00	128.00	42.66

## Expenditure relating to 1994-95 is up of to 31.12.1994.

# Information tentative.

n.a. : Not Available.

### Schemes Proposed During 1993-94 and Operational in 1994-95

Name of the Programme & Year	Physical Targets	Achievements #	%age	Financial requirements	Achievements ##	%age
	(Area in Hectares)			(Rs. in lakhs)		
<b>1. Investment Promotional Scheme</b>						
1993-94	4000	-	-	100.00	-	-
1994-95	4000	-	-	100.00	-	-
<b>2. Wastelands Development Task Force</b>						
1993-94	270	-	-	100.00	-	-
1994-95	270	-	-	100.00	-	-

2.4 As regards the Financial Progress of the Deptt. of Wastelands Development the following statement gives the Budget Estimates for the year 1994-95, the Expenditure incurred upto 31.12.1994 and the Budgetary Estimates for 1995-96:—

Sl. No.	Scheme	Budget Estimate 1994-95	Revised Estimate 1994-95	Expenditure upto 31.12.94	Budget Estimate 1995-96
(Rs. in lakhs)					
<b>Plan</b>					
1.	IWDP	4920.00	5148.00	3058.47	4950.00
2.	Technology Extension	200.00	200.00	108.99	200.00
3.	Grant-in-Aid	300.00	300.00	132.31	300.00
4.	Communication	150.00	137.00	82.51	140.00
5.	Investment Promotional Scheme	200.00	100.00	-	200.00
6.	Wastelands Developments Task Force	150.00	100.00	-	150.00
7.	Promotional & Critical Support Services	50.00	10.00	-	-
8.	Monitoring & Evaluation	30.00	5.00	0.39	60.00
<b>Non-Plan</b>					
9.	MOS Office and other non-plan posts in DoWD	26.00	26.00	19.27	28.00
<b>Total</b>		<b>6026.00</b>	<b>6026.00</b>	<b>3401.94</b>	<b>6028.00</b>

2.5 The following table gives an overall view of the Budget Estimates and the Revised Estimates of 1994-95 including the BE for 1995-96 under the various major heads/sub-heads:-

### Financial Requirements

#### Part-B

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	Name of the Scheme	Major Head	Minor Head of Account	B.E. 1994-95	R.E. 1994-95	B.E. 1995-96
<b>Plan</b>						
1.	IWDP Scheme	*2406	B.1(1)(2)	3420.00	3648.00	3500.00
		3601	C.1(1)(1)	1400.00	1400.00	1400.00
		3602	D.1(1)(1)	100.00	100.00	50.00
2.	Grant-in-Aid Scheme	*2406	B.1(1)(1)(5)	300.00	300.00	300.00
3.	Communication including Administration	*2406	B.1(1)(1)(1)	120.00	107.00	110.00
			B.1(1)(1)(2)	30.00	30.00	30.00
4.	Investment Promotional Scheme	*2406	B.1(1)(1)(4)	200.00	100.00	200.00
5.	Wastelands Development Task Force	*2406	B.1(1)(5)	150.00	100.00	150.00
6.	Promotional & Critical Support Services	*2406	B.1(1)(4)	50.00	10.00	
7.	Monitoring and Evaluation	*2406	B.1(1)(1)(3)	30.00	05.00	60.00
8.	Technology Development, Extension & Training	*2406	B.1(1)(3)	150.00	150.00	150.00
		3601	C.1(1)(2)	45.00	45.00	45.00
		3602	D.1(1)(2)	5.00	5.00	5.00
<b>Sub Total:</b>				<b>6000.00</b>	<b>6000.00</b>	<b>6000.00</b>
<b>Non-Plan</b>						
1.	MOS Office and other non-plan posts in DoWD	3451	A.1(Sectt.)	26.00	26.00	28.00
<b>Grand Total:</b>				<b>6026.00</b>	<b>6026.00</b>	<b>6028.00</b>

\* Major Head "2406" -Forestry & Wildlife has been replaced by Major Head "2501" -Special Programmes for Rural Development w.e.f. 1995-96.

## (ii) Implementation of Various Schemes

2.6 The scheme/activities which are being implemented/ to be implemented by the Department of Wastelands Developments/National Wastelands Development Board in 1994-95 are given in the following two separate groups;

### (a) On-going Schemes:

- i. Integrated Wastelands Development Project Scheme
- ii. Grant-in-Aid Schemes

### (b) New Schemes:

- i. Technology Development, Extension and Training
- ii. Investment Promotion Scheme
- iii. Wastelands Development Task Force

### **Integrated Wastelands Development Project Scheme**

2.7 This scheme is under implementation since 1989-90. The basic objective of the scheme is to enable the start of projects all over the country ensuring integrated approach to land management and wasteland development, at the foundation of which would be a village level or micro-watershed level which has been prepared taking into account land capabilities, site conditions and local needs, and thus promote optimal land use providing biomass, fuelwood and fodder to the people. It is also the objective of the scheme to create such planning capability at the lowest possible level and promote a project approach to the work that is planned for. This scheme would endeavour to considerably enhance the quality of public participation in such wasteland development programme through mechanisms for people's involvement at all stages and especially by providing clearly the modalities for equitable and sustainable sharing of benefits of such projects.

2.8 This scheme, being multi-faceted and multi-disciplinary would have the following main components:

- i. Preparation of microplans in those districts where the extent of wastelands justifies the need of a project for regeneration of these lands.
- ii. Regeneration and development of non-forest wasteland on watershed basis/any operationally feasible unit through soil and water conservation, water harvesting structures for biomass production natural regeneration or afforestation, and appropriate species with focus on providing fuelwood fodder, small timber, minor forest produce, fruit and fibre to the local village community.

- iii. Soil conservation activities like gully plugging, construction of small check dams and water harvesting and distribution structures.
- iv. Levelling and terracing of eroded lands.
- v. Planting and seed sowing of trees, grasses, shrubs and legumes.
- vi. Fodder production and pasture development.
- vii. Promotion of land based activities like agro-forestry, farm forestry, horticulture, pisciculture, duckery, etc. keeping in view the land capability.

2.9 The Ministry of Rural Development have formulated a set of Guidelines for Development of Watershed for all area Guidelines will be applicable to the projects under the IWDP Scheme also.

2.10 For 1994-95, an allocation of Rs. 5148 lakhs had been earmarked for this scheme. The Committee have been informed that this plan allocation would develop 50,000 hectares of wastelands. The Department has posed a demand of Rs. 4950 lakhs for 1995-96.

2.11 The Background Note furnished by the Deptt. of Wastelands Development reveals that in 1992-93, 27000 hectares of land was covered under the Integrated Wastelands Development Scheme against an allocation of Rs. 1673 lakhs. This Scheme is under implementation since 1989-90 with the erstwhile National Wastelands Development Board. In 1993-94 the financial allocation was Rs. 4448 lakhs and 50000 hectares of land was covered under the scheme. As regards 1994-95 as many as 55000 hectares of land was covered against the budget allocation of Rs. 4920 lakhs.

2.12 However, the Performance Budget of the Deptt. (1995-96) gives a different picture. It states that in 1993-94 actual achievement was 28925 hectares of land against the physical target of 57956 hectares against the Budgetary allocations of Rs. 4445 lakhs which comes to 50%. In 1994-95 as many as 46250 hectares of land was covered under the scheme against the physical targets of 65000 hectares with an allocation of Rs. 5148 lakhs and only 3700 lakhs rupees were spent which comes to 71% of the target. In 1993-94 there was cent per cent utilization of funds but in 1994-95 only Rs. 3700 lakhs were utilised upto 31.12.1994 out of a provision of Rs. 5148 lakhs. The information furnished by the Deptt. of Wastelands Development in the Background Note in respect of the physical and Financial targets and the achievements made thereon is even less than the previous two years whereas the cost escalation is increasing rapidly. It is contradictory to the information furnished in the Performance Budget for the year 1995-96. The Committee would, therefore, like to be apprised of the reasons for this contradiction.

**2.13** Secondly, the Committee are not satisfied with the performance of the Deptt. of Wastelands Development under the Integrated Wastelands Development Scheme and they urge the Deptt. to fully utilize the funds allocated under the scheme. As a new Deptt., it has to face the growing challenges of regeneration of wastelands in the country and chalk out a strategy for speedy implementation of the scheme. In addition, the Committee desire to know as to how and by what time, the remaining unspent amount of Rs. 1448 lakhs would be utilised by the Deptt. of Wastelands Development.

**2.14** The Deptt. has demanded only Rs. 4950 lakhs for 1995-96. This provision seems to be low compared to the huge task before them. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department of Wastelands Developments should take up the matter regarding reasonable enhancement of the allocation of amount under this head.

**2.15** The Committee observe that India has a large part of its total landmass as wasteland. It is assessed to be around 1295 lakh hectares in the country out of which 936.90 lakh hectares is non-forest wastelands for which the Department of Wastelands Development would be responsible for the sustainable development. The Department of Wastelands Development was established in 1992 in the Ministry of Rural Development. The Committee note that as per the Performance Budget of the Ministry for the year 1995-96 planwise, yearwise targets and allocations of funds have not been indicated. The Committee further note that with the meagre allocation of funds the existing pace of development will take a century to develop the existing known forest wasteland for sustainable use. The Committee as such strongly recommend that the Performance Budget should clearly indicate allocation of funds and targets planwise and yearwise so as to arrive at any meaningful conclusion. Besides, the Committee also recommend that an action plan should be chalked out to complete the challenging task of the development of wastelands within limited time period that may be 10-15 years. The Committee also feel that the existing stringency of funds for the task of Development of wastelands can be achieved with the help of such private agencies. For this, public awareness of the utility of agricultural land is necessary. The Committee, therefore, needs hardly emphasise that a public awareness programme should be launched in this regard. The Committee further urge that the viability of involving private agencies in this task should be examined and the Committee be apprised of the action taken in the matter.

**2.16** The Committee note that the Ministry of Rural Development have formulated a set of Guidelines for development of Watershed for all areas development schemes of the Ministry. From 1.4.95, these Guidelines will be applicable to the projects under the IWDP Scheme also. The Committee

**recommend that a set of the guidelines formulated for the Watershed areas be furnished for the information of the Committee.**

#### **Grant-in-Aid Scheme**

2.17 During the Seventh Five Year Plan a Grants-in-Aid Scheme was in operation in NWDB. Under this scheme, 100% central grant is made available to registered voluntary agencies, cooperatives mahila mandals, yuva mandals and other similar organizations for undertaking work directly or indirectly encouraging afforestation and wasteland development. The work could include actual implementation of small programmes like awareness raising, training and extension, organization of people for protection etc.

2.18 It has been stated in a written note furnished to the Committee that the scheme is proposed to be enlarged. Land based activities will be included for funding instead of nursery raising and tree planting activity alone. Projects meant for awareness raising, appropriate technology application, training, extension and publicity will also be considered under this scheme.

2.19 An amount of Rs. 3.00 crores had been earmarked for the year 1994-95 and a similar provision has been made for 1995-96.

2.20 The Committee note that an amount of Rs. 3 crores was allocated for the year 1994-95 under the Grant-in-Aid Scheme. Out of this the Deptt. of Wastelands Development could utilize only Rs. 1.28 crores upto 31.12.1994 which comes to 42.66% only and Rs. 1.72 crores still remains unutilised. A similar provision is proposed to be made for 1995-96. The Committee have been informed through a written note that the work of all the 53 projects which were implementing the Grants-in-Aids Scheme was evaluated and the evaluation report is available upto 31.3.1995. It was found after evaluation that 21 NGOs have done excellent work and their % survival was between 70-90. 5 NGOs have done very good work with the % survival of 60-70. 17 NGOs are stated to have done good work and their survival percentage is 50-60. 3 NGOs have done average work only with a % of 40-50 whereas 7 NGOs have done poor work with a survival percentage below 40. The Committee would like to be apprised of the steps proposed to be taken against those NGOs whose performance has been either poor or average. The Committee should also be apprised whether the Department of Wastelands Development proposes to put some sort of restrictions on such NGOs like putting them in blacklist, stopping financial aid to them and taking any other punitive action against those whose performance is far from satisfaction.

#### **Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme**

2.21 The main objectives of the scheme are to establish technical data base and to provide assistance to such projects which are required for filling the gaps existing in the present technology. To begin with, the scheme would aim at



compilation of important technical data base on the wastelands development techniques and models. This is done through active collaborations with the various institutions, universities and departments. Based on compilation or available data, the existing technology gaps would be identified and pilot projects are initiated through various institutions, departments, universities, etc. for evolving suitable techniques to fill these gaps. The scheme also envisages setting up of demonstration centres for the reclamation of problematic lands like saline, ravine, water logging etc.

2.22 The scheme will be a 100% Centrally Sponsored/Central sector scheme. The projects are implemented mainly by the State Agriculture Universities, ICAR institutes, State Forest Departments, NGOs and other similar organizations.

2.23 An amount of Rs. 2.00 crores was earmarked for the year 1994-95. The Department of Wastelands Development has asked for an amount of Rs. 2.00 crores for 1995-96.

2.24 When asked during evidence why the Department did not ask for enhancement in the Budget Estimate for 1995-96, the Secretary stated as follows:—

“On technology development, 57 projects were given small amount including some good projects in Rajasthan and for multi-layered plantation project at Hissar. These projects also include experiments and evaluations conducted by agricultural universities and leading institutions for identifying region specific technologies applicable for requirements wasteland. We have provided an allocation of Rs. 2 crore for this.”

2.25 The Committee note that an allocation of Rs. 2 crores was given to the Department of Wastelands Development under the Technology Development, Extension and Training Scheme and the Department has posed same amount for the year 1995-96. During 1994-95 the Deptt. could utilise only about Rs. 1 crores and 9 lakhs. The Committee fail to understand as to why the allocation of Rs. 2 crores during 1995-96 can be justified when only 50% of the Budgetary Allocations could be utilized over the past two years. The Committee hope that the amount allocated for 1995-96 will be fully utilised for this very scheme and there will not be any diversion of funds to any other scheme being implemented by the Department.

2.26 The Committee feel that not only there was inadequate allocation of funds under this scheme but the meagre amount sanctioned have not been utilised fully. The Committee would like to be informed about the scope of technology development and extension scheme.

#### **Investment Promotional Scheme**

2.27 A Scheme by the title ‘Margin Money Assistance’ was launched in the year 1988-89 for encouraging flow of institutional finance to farm forestry projects

by extending central assistance to project which need to be brought within the economic viability criteria of NABARD. Under the scheme, up of 25% of project cost was given as grant (margin) by the Central Government (NWDB), provided:

- i. An equal matching contribution was given by eligible institutions/State.
- ii. At least 50% of the total cost was financed by a financial institution.
- iii. The grant amount was based on need to make a project bankable.

2.28 Keeping in view the mandate of the reconstituted NWDB the revised scheme will now be called the 'Investment Promotional Scheme'.

2.29 The objective of the Scheme, that so far covered farm forestry alone, would now cover other land-based activities as may be appropriate for a given area.

2.30 The principal objective of the scheme is to facilitate/attract resources from financial institutions, corporate bodies, user industries, for the development of wastelands in the non-forest areas.

Financial assistance under this scheme can be availed by:

- (a) User industries
- (b) Corporate bodies
- (c) Cooperatives
- (d) Public Sector Undertakings of the Central and State Governments
- (e) NGOs
- (f) Any other suitable institution

2.31 Under this scheme the implementing agencies as listed above can formulate projects for the development of wastelands particularly private wastelands. The scheme would provide financial assistance up to 25% of the total project cost. Such projects will be assisted by NWDB after they have been appraised, costs firmed up and cleared for the bank loan by the concerned banks/financial institutions. Based on the recommendation of the financial institution the required central assistance would be released to the concerned implementing agency. There is also provision to grant one per cent as project formulation charges to the agencies. Financial institutions will assist in the preparation of bankable projects for NABARD financing. An EFC memo for this scheme has been prepared and is in the process of finalization.

2.32 An amount of Rs. 1.00 crore was allocated for the scheme for the year 1994-95. However, the Department of Wastelands Development has posed a demand of Rs. 3.00 Crores for 1995-96 for implementation of the Scheme.

### **Wastelands Development Task Force**

2.33 Under this scheme, non-forest wastelands in inaccessible and inhospitable terrains like deserts, mountains, ravines, mine areas, etc. will be developed for sustainable use. It is proposed to enlist the services of a disciplined force of ex-servicemen, which will have the incidental benefit of providing avenues to resettle ex-servicemen.

The Ministry of Defence will help in raising the Wastelands Development Task Force, repair of vehicles etc. through the Territorial Army Directorate.

2.34 An amount of Rs. 1.00 crores had been earmarked for the year 1994-95. This plan allocation would develop 390 hectares of wastelands. The Budget Estimate for 1995-96 is Rs. 1.5 crores.

2.35 The Committee find that during 1994-95, an allocation of Rs. 1 crore was made for the Investment Promotional Scheme and the Wastelands Development Task Force respectively. However, not even a single penny was spent under these schemes. Similarly, an amount of Rs. 10 lakhs was allocated for Promotional and Critical Support Services but the entire amount remained unspent. More so, only Rs. 39,000 were spent against a budgetary allocation of Rs. 5 lakhs under the Monitoring & Evaluation. When enquired as to why the budgetary allocations made under these schemes could not be utilised, the Secretary, Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment (Department of Wastelands Development) informed the Committee:

“I have not lapsed the amount in the BE. I have moved it to other items. Up to one crore of rupees, with the approval, I can divert the money from one head to the other.”

2.37 The Committee strongly recommend that the funds should be utilised only for those schemes for which they have been actually allocated in the Budget Estimates/Revised Estimates. The Committee further recommend that the allocation of funds should be made realistically and there should not be any diversion of the funds from one head to the other. The Committee desire the Ministry/Department of Wastelands Development to review the allocations made against Item Nos. 5 to 8 of the Performance Budget (Chapter IV, Page 92) of the Ministry/Department for the year 1995-96. In addition, these schemes should be restructured so that they are implemented in letter and spirit.

NEW DELHI;  
26 April, 1995  
*Vaisakha 6, 1917 (Saka)*

PRATAPRAO B. BHOSALE,  
*Chairman,*  
*Standing Committee on Urban and*  
*Rural Development.*

## MINUTES OF THE 36TH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1994-95)

The Committee met on Wednesday, the 5th April, 1995 from 1100 hrs. to 13.20 hrs. in Committee Room No. 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

### PRESENT

Shri Prataprao B. Bhosale - *Chairman*

### MEMBERS

#### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Karia Munda
3. Shri P.D. Chavan
4. Shri Ram Singh Kashwan
5. Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava
6. Shri Prabhulal Rawat
7. Shri P.P. Kaliaperumal
8. Shri Surendra Pal Pathak
9. Shri Sudhir Giri
10. Shri Gulam Mohammad Khan
11. Shri P.R. Kumaramangalam
12. Shri Maruti Deoram Shelke

#### *Rajya Sabha*

13. Shri B.K. Hariprasad
14. Shri Thennalal Balkrishna Pillai
15. Shri Sangh Priya Gautam
16. Shri Jagmohan
17. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra
18. Dr. Jagannath Mishra
19. Dr. B.B. Dutta

### SECRETARIAT

1. Shri G.R. Juneja - *Deputy Secretary*
2. Shri C.S. Joon - *Assistant Director*

2. The Committee at the outset welcomed the Members of the Committee present at the sitting. The Committee then considered and discussed the Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment for the year 1995-96. The Committee observed that the Ministry had presented Plan Outlay for 1995-96 as Rs. 7700 crores as against Rs. 5437.87 crores (actual) in 1993-94 and Rs. 7320 crores (R.E.) in 1994-95. The Committee noted that the increase in Budget

Estimates for 1995-96 was just around 6% if the BE 1995-96 was compared to R.E. 1994-95.

3. The Committee then discussed Budget Estimates 1995-96 for the main Schemes/Programmes viz. Jawahar Rozgar Yojana, Employment Assurance Scheme, Integrated Rural Development Programme, Rural Housing, Development of Women and Children in Rural Areas, Land Records, Training of Rural Youth for Self-Employment, Rural Water Supply and Sanitation, Rural Roads, etc.

4. The Committee felt that considering the wide gamut of programmes/schemes under Ministry the Plan Outlay for 1995-96 would not be sufficient to meet the targets fixed for different schemes by the Ministry. The marginal increase in Budget Estimates 1995-96 does not cover the percentage hike due to inflationary trends. The Committee feel that the Plan Outlay for 1995-96 should be adequately enhanced. The Committee then adjourned to continue the discussion on Demands for Grants, 1995-96 for the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment/Department or Wastelands Development.

**MINUTES OF THE 37TH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN &  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1995-96)**

**The Committee met on Thursday, the 6th April, 1995 from 11.00 hrs. to 12.45 hrs. in Committee Room 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.**

**PRESENT**

**Shri Partaprao B. Bhosale – *Chairman***

**MEMBERS**

***Lok Sabha***

2. **Shri V. Sobhanadreeswara Rao**
3. **Shri S. Gangadhara Sanipalli**
4. **Md. Ali Asraf Fatmi**
5. **Shri Shailendra Mehto**
6. **Shri Ram Singh Kashwan**
7. **Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava**
8. **Shri Prabhulal Rawat**
9. **Shri P.P. Kaliaperumal**
10. **Shri Surendra Pal Pathak**
11. **Shri Sudhir Giri**
12. **Shri Gulam Mohammad Khan**
13. **Shri Maruti Deoram Shelke**

***Rajya Sabha***

14. **Shri B.K. Hariprasad**
15. **Shri Sangh Priya Gautam**
16. **Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra**
17. **Dr. Jagannath Mishra**

**SECRETARIAT**

1. **Shri G.R. Juneja – *Deputy Secretary***
2. **Shri C.S. Joon – *Assistant Director***

2. The Committee resumed discussion on Demands for Grants (1995-96) of Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment/Department of Wastelands Development. The Committee noted with concern the Inadequate attention paid towards the Rural Sanitation Programmes. The Committee did not appreciate compartmentalisation/categorisation of this programme and desired that Rural Sanitation Programme should be launched in a comprehensive manner so as to benefit all categories of people/inhabitants in the rural areas.

3. The Committee then discussed demands for Grants for Desert Development Programme (DDP) and Drought Prone Area Programme (DPAP). The Committee observed that further emphasis should be given to watershed approach and tree plantation.

4. The Committee then discussed Demands for Grants 1995-96 of the department of Wastelands Development. The Committee observed that India had a large Part of its total landmass as wastelands. The Committee noted that Department of wastelands Development was a new Department created in 1992. The committee also observed that with the meagre allocation i.e. 6028.00 lakhs to this Department and with the existing pace of development it would take a century to develop the existing know forest wasteland for sustainable use. The Committee felt that an action plan should be chalked out to complete the challenging task of the development of Wastelands within a specified time. The committee observed that adequate funds should be given for development of Wastelands. Further, the involvement of private agencies to this task should be explored. the Scope of technology extension should also be studied and its scope should be explored in Indian conditions.

5. The committee desired that the detailed list of points on various issues related to the Demands for grants 1995-96 should be forwarded to the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment/Department of Wastelands Development and replies should be placed before the Committee.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

**MINUTES OF THE 3RD SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON URBAN &  
RURAL DEVELOPMENT**

The committee met on Tuesday, the 18th April, 1995 from 10.30 hrs. to 14.00 hrs. in Committee Room 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

**Shri Prataprao B. Bhosale – Chairman**

**MEMBERS**

*Lok Sabha*

2. **Shri S. Gangadhara Sanipalli**
3. **Shri Sukhdeo Paswan**
4. **Shri Karia Munda**
5. **Shri Ram Singh Kashwan**
6. **Shri P.D. Chavan**
7. **Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava**
8. **Shri Prabhulal Rawat**
9. **Shri Surendra Pal Pathak**
10. **Shri Devi Bux Singh**

*Rajya Sabha*

11. **Shri Ram Deo Bhandari**
12. **Shri B.K. Hariprasad**
13. **Shri Nilotpāl Basu**
14. **Shri Sangh Priya Gautam**
15. **Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra**
16. **Smt. Mira Das**
17. **Dr. Jagannath Mishra**
18. **Dr. B.B. Dutta**

**SECRETARIAT**

1. **Shri G.R. Juneja** – *Deputy Secretary*
2. **Shri C.S. Joon** – *Assistant Director*



**REPRESENTATIVES OF MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT**

1. **Shri B.N. Yugandhar, Secretary**
2. **Shri Ashok Jaitly, Addl., Secretary**
3. **Shri Palat Mohandas, JS**
4. **Shri Shivraj Singh, JS**
5. **Smt. P. Jyoti Rao, JS**
6. **Smt. Sushma Singh, JS**
7. **Shri P.K Sivanandan, JS**
8. **Shri R.N. Bansal, AMA**
9. **Dr. M.K. Ranjitsing, DG (CAPART)**
10. **Shri B.K. Sinha, DDG (CAPART)**
11. **Shri Kuldeep Rai, Director**
12. **Shri Jagdish Chandra, Consultant**
13. **Shri Sukumar Dass, Director**
14. **Shri K.S. Dagar, Dy. Secretary**
15. **Shri M. Chaturvedi, Dy. Secretary**
16. **Shri M. Neelakantan, Director**
17. **Shri A.K. Dubey, Dy. Secretary**
18. **Shri Sanjay Mitra, Dy. Secretary**
19. **Smt. Lata Krishna Rao, Dy. Secretary**
20. **Shri S.P. Chauhan, Jt. Director**
21. **Shri P. Bhatnagar, DS**
22. **Shri D.K. Bazzaz, US**

2. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment. Thereafter, The Committee sought clarification on Demands for Grants (1995-96) of the Ministry on the different programmes/activities relating to poverty alleviation, employment generation, water supply and sanitation, housing, land-records in the context of the plan budget and demands for Grants for the said year.

3. A verbatim record of the evidence was kept.

4. The committee then adjourned to meet on 21st April, 1995 to take further evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment/ Department of wastelands Development.

**MINUTES OF THE 4TH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1995-96)**

The Committee met on Friday, 21st April, 1995 from 10.30 hrs. to 13.45 hrs. and 15.00 hrs. to 17.20 hrs. in Committee Room 'C', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

**Shri Prataprao B. Bhosale – Chairman**

**MEMBERS**

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri J. Chokka Rao
3. Shri Dharmabiksham
4. Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava
5. Shri Surendra Pal Pathak
6. Shri Ram Pal Singh
7. Shri Gulam Mohammad Khan

*Rajya Sabha*

8. Shri Ram Deo Bhandari
9. Shri Nilotpal Basu
10. Shri Sangh Priya Gautam
11. Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra
12. Smt. Mira Das
13. Dr. B.B. Dutta

**SECRETARIAT**

- |                         |   |                      |
|-------------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1. Shri S.N. Mishra     | – | Additional Secretary |
| 2. Smt. Roli Srivastava | – | Joint Secretary      |
| 3. Shri G.R. Juncja     | – | Deputy Secretary     |
| 4. Shri C.S. Joon       | – | Assistant Director   |

**REPRESENTATIVES OF MINISTRY OF RURAL AREAS AND EMPLOYMENT**

1. Shri B.N. Yugandhar, Secretary
2. Shri Ashok Jaitley, Addl. Secretary
3. Shri Palat Mohandas, JS
4. Shri Shivraj Singh, JS
5. Smt. P. Jyoti Rao, JS
6. Smt. Sushma Singh, JS
7. Shri P.K. Sivanandan, JS

8. Shri R.N. Bansal, A.M.A.
9. Dr. M.K. Ranjitsinh, DG(CAPART)
10. Shri B.K. Sinha., D.D.G. (CAPART)

REPRESENTATIVES OF DEPARTMENT OF WASTELANDS DEVELOPMENT

1. Shri B.N. Yugandhar, Secretary (RA&E)
2. Shri Ashok Jety, Additional Secretary (RAE&WD)
3. Shri Ranjit Issar, J.S. (WD)
4. Shri S. Subramaniam, Director (T.E.)
5. Shri R.K. Goel, D.I.G.F.
6. Shri A.R. Subbaih, Deputy Secretary

2. The Chairman welcomed the representatives of Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment/Department of Wastelands Development. Thereafter the Committee sought further clarification from the representatives of Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment. The representatives of the Ministry explained the position in response to the queries made by Hon'ble Members. The Committee thereafter sought clarifications on the Demands for Grants, 1995-96 of the Department of Wastelands Development from the representative of that Department.

3. A verbatim record of the evidence was kept.

*The Committee then adjourned.*

**MINUTES OF THE 5TH SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON  
URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1995-96)**

The Committee met on Sunday, the 23rd April, 1995 from 10.30 hrs. to 13.10 hrs. in Committee Room Main, Parliament House Annex, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

**Shri Prataprao B. Bhosale – Chairman**

**MEMBERS**

*Lok Sabha*

2. **Shri S. Gangadhara**
3. **Shri J. Chokka Rao**
4. **Shri Dharmabiksham**
5. **Shri P.D. Chavan**
6. **Shri Gulam Muhammad Khan**

*Rajya Sabha*

7. **Shri Nilotpal Basu**
8. **Shri Thennala Balkrishna Pillai**
9. **Shri Sangh Priya Gautam**
10. **Shri Debabrata Biswas**
11. **Prof. Vijay Kumar Malhotra**
12. **Smt. Mira Das**
13. **Dr. B.B. Dutta**

**SECRETARIAT**

1. **Shri S.N. Mishra – Additional Secretary**
2. **Smt. Roli Srivastava – Joint Secretary**
3. **Shri G.R. Juneja – Deputy Secretary**
4. **Shri C.S. Joon – Assistant Director**

2. The Committee then took up for consideration, the draft Report on Demands for Grants (1995-96) of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment/Department of Wastelands Development and suggested some additions/modifications.

3. The Committee then adjourned to continue consideration and adoption of the Report at the sitting of the Committee on 26.4.95.

**EXTRACT OF THE MINUTES OF THE 6TH SITTING OF THE  
COMMITTEE ON URBAN & RURAL DEVELOPMENT (1995-96)**

The Committee met on Wednesday the 26th April, 1995 from 15.00 hrs. to 17.20 hrs. in Committee Room 'E', Parliament House Annexe, New Delhi.

**PRESENT**

**Shri Prataprao B. Bhosale – Chairman**

**MEMBERS**

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri J. Chokka Rao
3. Shri Dharmabiksham
4. Shri Karia Munda
5. Shri K.M. Mathew
6. Shri P.D. Chavan
7. Shri Ram Singh Kashwan
8. Shri Girdhari Lal Bhargava
9. Shri P.P. Kaliaperumal
10. Shri Surendra Pal Pathak
11. Shri Ram Pal Singh
12. Shri Sudhir Giri
13. Shri Subrata Mukherjee

*Rajya Sabha*

14. Shri B.K. Hariprasad
15. Shri Nilotpal Basu
16. Shri Thennala Balkrishna Pillai
17. Shri Shiv Prasad Chanpuria
18. Smt. Mira Das
19. Dr. Jagannath Mishra
20. Dr. B.B. Dutta

**SECRETARIAT**

- |                         |   |                           |
|-------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Smt. Roli Srivastava | – | <i>Joint Secretary</i>    |
| 2. Shri G.R. Juneja     | – | <i>Deputy Secretary</i>   |
| 3. Shri C.S. Joon       | – | <i>Assistant Director</i> |

**2. The Committee then resumed consideration of the draft report on Demands for Grants (1995-96) of the Ministry of Rural Areas & Employment/Department of Wastelands Development and adopted the same with some additions/modifications as indicated in the ANNEXURE.**

**3. Thereafter, the Committee authorised the Chairman to finalise and present/lay the report in both the Houses of Parliament.**

*The Committee then adjourned.*

Page No.	Para No./Line	Additions/Modifications
		<b>PART I</b>
3	2.2/Line 2	Substitute 'does not covers' for 'hardly covers'.
7	3.8	Substitute the following Para for Para No. 3.8 'The Committee note that in few States progressive unspent balances were more than the funds released under JRY during 1994-95 as may be seen at Annexure II- A and II- B which shows that the condition that second instalment of JRY is released only when 50% of the funds have been utilised, is not being followed by the Centre. The Committee also note that although physical and financial achievement has been stated as more than 100%, the accumulated unspent balances to the tune of Rs. 48190.20 lakhs as on 1.4.94 gives a different picture about the success of the programme. The Committee would like the Ministry to explain the reasons for the contradiction of mismatch between cent percent financial and physical achievement in the centre and the underspending in different States. The Committee would also like to be apprised about the reasons for the release of funds to States where accumulated unspent balances are more than 100% of the funds released during a particular year.'
7	3.9 5th line from the bottom	Add the following after 'being strengthened'. 'The Committee note that there are complaints in the States about the uniform application of the guidelines issued by the Centre.'
7	3.10	Add at the end 'The Committee further recommend that under JRY provision for construction of Senior Secondary Schemes be made keeping in view the requirements of the specific area.'

Page No.	Para No./Line	Additions/Modifications
10	4.10 & 4.11	<p>Substitute Para No. 4.10 as follows for Para Nos. 4.10 &amp; 4.11 'The Committee note that the performance of IRDP during the last two years of the VIII Plan is satisfaction in financial and physical terms. However, the Committee are distressed to note that the actual number of beneficiaries assisted in absolute term <i>i.e.</i> to cross the poverty line is very low. On All India basis only 27.81% of the beneficiaries could cross the poverty line of Rs. 6,400/-. The Committee feel that incidence of the rural poverty is a big challenge before the country even after more than 40 years of planned development. In view of the seriousness of rural poverty the Committee recommend that the criterion for the success of the programme should be the number of beneficiaries assisted in absolute terms rather than statistics of number of beneficiaries assisted so far. As such the Committee recommend that such programmes started for the alleviation of poverty should benefit the rural poor qualitatively rather than quantitatively'.</p>
10	4.11	<p>Add new Para No. 4.11 as follows 'The Committee note with concern that banks play a very important role in the implementation of programme under IRDP. However, the attitude of banks is not very cooperative. The Committee recommend that Ministry should evaluate the performance of banks relating to the grant of loan under the scheme.'</p>
11	4.12	<p>For 'objective' read 'target'.</p>
15	6.7	<p>Substitute the following for Para No. 6.7 'The Committee recommend that training</p>



Page No.	Para No./Line	Additions/Modifications
		under TRYSEM should be given to the beneficiaries to ensure self employment and enhance income generation. The Committee as such feel that training should be imparted considering the local material, market and local skills. Further the training should be given for economically viable techniques. The Committee also note that a lot of new technologies is coming up in rural scenario and as such the Committee would like the training programme should reflect to address to these new opportunities'.
19	8.5	Add the following after 'in the country.' 'The poor sanitation has caused number of communicable diseases such as malaria, plague etc. which have taken enormous lives during the last few years'.
20	8.6	Substitute the following Para for Para No. 8.6 'The Committee recommend that the sanitary unit should be a village instead of block'.
20	8.7	Substitute the following Para for Para No. 8.7 'The Committee further note that lack of awareness regarding Sanitation is the main cause of poor sanitation in rural areas. The Committee would like that an awareness campaign should be launched on warfooting and adequate funds should be given for such programmes'.
23	9.7	Substitute the following Para for Para No. 9.7 'The Committee also recommend that under this programme the benefit of new technologies should be taken. The Committee would also like that under this programme new designs should be made use of to address to the specific requirement of an area'.

Page No.	Para No./Line	Additions/Modifications
27	11.6	Omit the following 'Further the Committee observe that under watershed approach, one good technique is Artificial Water Re-charge Programme. The Committee would like to know whether any initiative has been taken to undertake this technique. The Committee also recommend that the programme should be undertaken in maximum number of places to produce the demand impact'.
27	11.7	Substitute the following Para for Para No. 11.7 'The Committee observe that there are certain plants such as Cactus, Zetroph Curus and Jojoba which not only preserve the land from degradation but also encourage natural regeneration. Besides these plants have economic advantages also, the oil produced from Jojoba can be used lubricant for aeroplanes. The Conunittee as such recom-mend that emphasis should be given to tree plantation activities.  The Committee have been apprised by the Secretary, Ministry during evidence that Israel had a highly develop technology for desert and dry land farming. The Commit-tee urge that Ministry should study these technologies and explore the possibilities of using in India'.
31	13.5	Add the following after basic document 'for possession and percolation'.
31	13.5	Substitute the following for 'The Commit-tee note that although emphasis has been given to computerization of land-records and latest technologies, without updating the land-records at the field level, advan-tage cannot be taken of the latest technolo-gies.' 'The Committee note that although

Page No.	Para No./Line	Additions/Modifications
32	14.4	<p>emphasis has been given to computerization of land-records but the upgradation of technology can never substitute the importance of actual information gathering process at the ground level'.</p> <p>Add the following after the word Employment 'the Secretary, Ministry also acknowledged before the Committee that NIAM should be with the Ministry of Agriculture and not with the Ministry of Rural Areas &amp; Employment'.</p>
47	2.20	<p><b>PART II</b></p> <p>Substitute Para No. 2.20 as follows for 2.20 and 2.21 'The Committee note that an amount of Rs. 3 crores was allocated for the year 1994-95 under the Grant-in-aid-scheme. Out of this the Deptt. of Wastelands Development could utilize only Rs. 1.28 crores upto 31.12.1994. Which comes to 42.66% only and Rs. 1.72 crores still remains unutilised, a similar provision is proposed to be made for 1995-96. The Committee have been informed through a written note that the work of all the 53 projects which were implementing the Grants-in-aid-scheme was evaluated and the evaluation report is available upto 31.3.1995. It was found after evaluation that 21 NGOs have done excellent work and their percentage survival was between 70-90. 5 NGOs have done very good work with the percentage survival of 60-70. 17 NGOs are stated to have done good work and their survival percentage is 50-60. 3 NGOs have done average work only with a percentage survival of 40-50 whereas 7 NGOs have done poor work with a survival percentage below 40. The Committee would</p>

Page No.	Para No./Line	Additions/Modifications
51	2.35	<p>like to be apprised of the steps proposed to be taken against those NGOs whose performance has been either poor or average. The Committee should also be apprised whether the Department of Wastelands Development proposes to put some sort of restrictions on such NGOs like putting them in blacklist, stopping financial aid to them and taking any other punitive action against those whose performance is far from satisfaction'.</p>
		<p>Substitute the following for Para No. 2.35 and add Para No. 2.36 'The Committee find that during 1994-95, an allocation of Rs. 1 crore was made for the Investment Promotional Scheme and the Wastelands Development Task Force respectively. However, not even a single penny was spent under these schemes. Similarly, an amount of Rs. 10 lakhs was allocated for Promotional and Critical Support Services but the entire amount remained unspent. More so, only Rs. 39,000 were spent against a budgetary allocation of Rs. 5 lakhs under the Monitoring &amp; Evaluation. When enquired as to why the budgetary allocations made under these schemes could not be utilised, the Secretary, Ministry of Rural Areas and Employment (Department of Wastelands Development) informed the Committee:</p>
		<p>"I have not lapsed the amount in the BE. I have moved it to other items. Upto one crore of rupees, with the approval, I can divert the money from one head to the other."</p>
		<p>The Committee strongly recommend that the funds should be utilised only for those schemes for which they have been actually</p>

---

Page No.	Para No./Line	Additions/Modifications
		<p>allocated in the Budget Estimates/Revised Estimates. The Committee further recommend that the allocation of funds should be made realistically and there should not be any diversion of the funds from one head to the other. The Committee desire the Ministry/Department of Wastelands Development to review the allocations made against Item Nos. 5 to 8 of the Performance Budget (Chapter IV, Page 92) of the the Ministry/ Department for the year 1995-96. In addition, these schemes should be restricted so that they are implemented in letter and spirit'.</p>

---