

5

STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

(1999-2000)

THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF PLANNING

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS

(2000-2001)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 26 May, 2000

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 26 May, 2000

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

April, 2000/Chaitra, 1921(Saka)

CONTENTS

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE
INTRODUCTION

REPORT

STATEMENT OF CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Appendix

- I. Minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 29 March, 2000
- II Minutes of the sitting of the Standing Committee On Finance held on 19 April, 2000

COMPOSITION OF STANDING COMMITTEE
ON FINANCE (1999-2000)

Shri Shivraj V. Patil — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Raashid Alvi
3. Shri Sudip Bandyopadhyay
4. Shri Ajoy Chakraborty
5. Shri Rattan Lal Kataria
6. Shri Krishnamraju
7. Shri Brahmanand Mandal
8. Shri M.V. Chandrashekhara Murthy
9. Shri M.V.V.S. Murthy
10. Shri Kamal Nath
11. Shri Rupchand Pal
12. Shri M. Padmanabham
13. Shri Prakash Paranjpe
14. Shri Raj Narain Passi
15. Dr. Sanjay Paswan
16. Shri Annasaheb M.K. Patil
17. Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan
18. Shri Pravin Rashtrapal
19. Shri Ram Singh Rathwa
20. Shri G. Ganga Reddy
21. Shri S. Jaipal Reddy
22. Shri T.M. Selvaganpathi
23. Mohammad Shahabuddin
24. Shri Ajit Singh

(iv)

25. Shri C.N. Singh
26. Shri Kirit Somaiya
27. Shri Kharebela Swain
28. Shri Narayan Dutt Tiwari
29. Shri Braja Kishore Tripathy
- *30. Smt. Renuka Chowdhury

Rajya Sabha

31. Dr. Manmohan Singh
32. Shri N.K.P. Salve
33. Shri Krishna Kumar Birla
34. Shri Narendra Mohan
35. Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu
36. Shri P. Prabhakar Reddy
37. Shri Ranjan Prasad Yadav
38. Prof. M. Sankaralingam
39. Shri Amar Singh
40. Shri Vijay Darda
- *41. Shri Suresh A. Keswani
- @42. Vacant
- @43. Vacant
- @44. Vacant
- @45. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Dr. A.K. Pandey | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri Harnam Singh | <i>Joint Secretary</i> |
| 3. Dr. (Smt.) P.K. Sandhu | <i>Director</i> |
| 4. Shri S.B. Arora | <i>Under Secretary</i> |
| 5. Shri D.R. Shekhar | <i>Executive Officer</i> |

*Nominated *w.e.f.* 14 February, 2000

#Nominated *w.e.f.* 24 February, 2000

@Vacant consequent upon the retirement of S/Shri K. Rahman Khan, Dr. Biplab Dasgupta, Prafull Goradia, Gurudas Das Gupta from Rajya Sabha *w.e.f.* 2 April, 2000.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Finance having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Fifth Report on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Planning.

2. The Demands for Grants of the Ministry of Planning were laid on the Table of the House on 15 March, 2000. Under Rule 331E of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, the Standing Committee on Finance is required to consider the Demands for Grants of the Ministries/Departments under its jurisdiction and make Reports on the same to both the Houses of Parliament.

3. The Committee took oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Planning at their sitting held on 29 March, 2000 in connection with examination of the Demands for Grants.

4. The Committee considered and adopted the Report at their sitting held on 19 April, 2000.

5. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the Officers of the Ministry of Planning for co-operation extended by them in furnishing written replies and for placing their considered views and perceptions before the Committee.

NEW DELHI;
19 April, 2000
30 Chaitra, 1922(Saka)

(SHIVRAJ V. PATIL)
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Finance.

REPORT

The Budgetary proposals of the Ministry of Planning are contained in the Demand No. 68.

2. While examining the Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Planning, the Committee examined demands under the following Heads:-

MINISTRY OF PLANNING

- (i) Foreign Travel Expenses
- (ii) Island Development Authority
- (iii) Grants-in-Aid
- (iv) Grants-in-Aid to Non-Govt. Organisation(NGO)
- (v) Payment for Professional and Special Services
- (vi) Human Development Report
- (vii) Ninth Five year plan
- (viii) Perspective Planning

Demand No. 68

PLANNING COMMISSION

3. The Budgetary allocations for Planning Commission for 1998-99, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 is shown as under :-

Section	Budgeted Estimates 1998-99		Revised Estimates 1998-99		Actuals 1998-99		Budgeted Estimates 1999-2000		Revised Estimates 1999-2000		Budgeted Estimates 2000-2001	
	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP	P	NP
Revenue	1,13,38,00	26,00,00	1,10,51,00	25,90,00	1,07,96,19	23,30,48	1,28,90,00	26,87,00	1,15,70,00	26,55,00	11,06,00	30,00,00
Capital	46,62,00	43,50,00	43,24,54	81,10,00	27,04,00	8,94,00
Total	1,60,00,00	26,00,00	1,54,01,00	25,90,00	1,51,20,73	23,30,48	2,10,00,00	26,87,00	1,42,74,00	26,55,00	20,00,00	30,00,00

P Plan
NP Non-Plan

Demand No. : 68
Planning Commission
Object Head : 12

FOREIGN TRAVEL EXPENSES

4. Foreign Travel expenses of Planning Commission are met from the Non-Plan Budget. 'Foreign Travel Expenses' is a primary Unit of Appropriation (Object Head), which covers all expenses on account of travel on duty outside India. The expenditure under this Head is incurred on attending training Programmes/Seminars/Workshops etc. abroad as also on delegations sent abroad.

5. Budget allocations and Actuals under the head since 1997-98 are as follows :-

Year	Budget Estimates		Revised Estimates		Actuals	
	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan
1997-98	10,00,000	12,00,000	20,00,000	12,00,000	15,36,000	9,13,000
1998-99	35,00,000	17,00,000	35,00,000	52,00,000	6,80,000	46,79,000
1999-2000	10,00,000	32,00,000	10,00,000	32,00,000	---	29,83,000
2000-2001	---	42,00,000	---	---	---	---

6. When asked about the reasons for steep rise in estimates at revised estimate stage (non-plan) during 1998-99, and higher budgetary (non-plan) allocation for 2000-2001, Ministry in their reply have stated as under :-

“The steep rise in RE is due to frequent foreign visits of the then Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission (Shri Jaswant Singh) as a special envoy of the Prime Minister to hold discussions with the representatives of the US Government. Statement showing the foreign tours undertaken by the officers of the Planning Commission during the year 1998-99 is enclosed as in Annexure.

7. The main reasons for higher budgetary allocation (non-plan) for 2000-2001 are :-

- (a) Enhanced number of Members appointed in the Planning Commission
- (b) As decided by the Ministry of External Affairs, Planning commission would be involved in the preparations for the review of the social summit for which a delegation is required to be sent abroad twice or thrice
- (c) To offset rise in international travel costs.

8. The Committee note that there has been steep rise in the allocation of funds at the Revised Estimates stage during the year 1998-99 which has been explained on account of the foreign visits of the then Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission who acted as a special envoy to the Prime Minister to hold discussions with the representatives of the US Government. The Committee are of the view that since the then Dy. Chairman, Planning Commission acted as a special envoy to the Prime Minister, the expenditure incurred on such foreign visits should not have been borne by the Ministry of Planning but by the Ministry of External Affairs. Even if this expenditure had been incurred by the Planning Commission, the same should have been got reimbursed from the Ministry of External Affairs. The Committee expect that the Ministry of Planning will take up the matter with the Ministry of External Affairs.

Demand No. :68

Major Head : 3451

Minor Head : 00.101

ISLAND DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

9. The Island Development Authority (IDA) was set up in August 1986 under the Chairmanship of the Prime Minister to formulate policies and programmes for an ecologically sound, sustainable and integrated development of the Andaman & Nicobar and Lakshadween group of Islands. It was recognised that the requirements of these Islands and their background are very different from those of the mainland and new approaches are necessary to tackle them. There is also a Standing Committee of the IDA under the Chairmanship of Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission. The IDA is not an implementing agency but an advisory body. Both IDA and its Standing Committee have been recently reconstituted in January 2000. Under the IDA Head, expenditure is made for salaries; domestic travel and other office expenses, etc. and no grants are released.

10. The Island Development Authority is supposed to meet once in every year and its standing committee twice in a year.

Budget allocations under this head are as under :-

Year	Budget Estimates	Revised Estimates	Actuals
1993-94	10,00,000	10,00,000	2,92,000
1994-95	10,00,000	4,00,000	1,69,000
1995-96	10,00,000	10,00,000	4,04,000
1996-97	10,00,000	10,00,000	5,82,000
1997-98	10,00,000	10,00,000	5,15,000
1998-99	11,00,000	10,00,000	4,63,000
1999-2000	11,00,000	11,00,000	
2000-2001	12,00,000		

11. When asked about the explanatory note for consistent under-utilisation of budgetary allocations since 1993-94, Ministry in their reply have stated as follows :-

“The main reasons for consistent under-utilisation of budgetary allocations under the IDA Head are (A) Decline in the frequency of the meeting of IDA and its Standing Committee. No meeting of the IDA was held in 1994, 1995 and after 1996. Due to frequent changes of the Government at the Centre, the IDA was reconstituted in 1996, 1998 and recently in 2000. (B) A few posts under IDA Cell remained vacant resulting in under-utilisation of the allocations. Composition of the Island Development Authority is enclosed as Annexure-I. Nine sittings of the Island

Development Authority have been held so far. Details about the sittings of Island Development Authority are furnished at Annexure-II”

12. Earlier in reply to the recommendation of the Committee contained in their First Report on Demands for Grants (1996-97) regarding holding of meetings of the Standing Committee of Island Development Authority, the Government as far back as January, 1997 had stated as follows:

“The Island Development Authority and its Standing Committee have been reconstituted. Efforts would be made to hold meetings of the Standing Committee under Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission at regular intervals. The next meeting of the Standing Committee is proposed to be held in the Andaman and Nicobar Islands in the near future at the convenience of the Deputy Chairman.”

13. **The Committee note that Island Development Authority was set up in August, 1986 to formulate policies and programmes for an ecologically sound, sustainable and integrated development of the Andaman & Nicobar and Lakshadweep Group of Islands and to review progress of implementation and impact of the programmes of development. A Standing Committee has also been constituted to suggest ways and means to tackle the special requirements of these Islands. The budgetary allocation under the IDA Head is meant for holding meetings of IDA, Standing Committee as well as to meet the expenditure on salaries, domestic travel and other office expenses etc. Consistent under-utilisation of budgetary allocation has been explained due to decline in the frequency of the meetings of the IDA and its Standing Committee and not filling up of some of the vacant posts under the IDA Cell.**

The Committee find that the last meeting of IDA was held as far back as on 22.1.1996, after which no meeting has been convened. They opine that in the absence of any deliberations which ought to have taken place periodically in the meetings of IDA and its Standing Committee, any worthwhile policy or programme for bringing about the improvement in the overall integrated development of these islands can hardly be expected.

In view of the fact the Authority and its Standing Committee have now been reconstituted in January, 2000, the Committee desire that the meetings should be held more often with a view to suggesting policies and programmes which would help these Islands to overcome their developmental problems. The Authority should also conduct regular review meetings in order to assess the progress of implementation and impact of the programmes undertaken.

DEMAND NO. 68

PLANNING COMMISSION

Object Head : 31

Grants-in-Aid

14. Grants-in-Aid under the plan sanction of Institute of Applied Man Power Research (IAMR) is for the purpose of building a new campus at Narela. Grants-in-aid to universities and Research Institutes is provided for carrying our research in order to encourage an informed debate on social and economic development issues and role of planning. Under UNDP assistance grants-in-aid is provided to State Governments for conducting work shops in connection with the preparation of State Human Development Report. Grants-in-Aid under the non plan expenditure is meant for the establishment of Institute of Applied Manpower Research and for welfare activities of Planning Commission.

15. Budget allocation under this Head are as follows :-

Year	Budget Estimates		Revised Estimates		Actuals	
	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan	Plan	Non-Plan
1995-96	23,26,00,000		12,16,00,00		3,39,73,00	
1996-97	14,22,00,000	1,66,00,000	10,99,50,000	1,66,00,000	3,29,00,000	1,65,18,000
1997-98	13,08,00,000	1,71,00,000	22,47,00,000	2,26,00,000	20,42,98,000	2,25,67,000
1998-99	13,45,00,000	2,87,50,000	9,93,00,000	3,15,50,000	5,85,76,000	3,15,45,000
1999-2000	10,47,00,000	3,19,00,000	3,54,00,000	3,15,00,000	86,41,995*	3,14,25,000*
2000-2001	10,08,00,000	3,81,00,000				

* upto February, 2000

16. Explaining the reasons for consistent under-utilisation of the budgetary allocation, the Ministry have stated as under :-

“Reasons for under-utilisation of the budgetary allocation (Plan) in `96-97` were mainly on account of :-

- (i) A budgetary provision of Rs. 30.00 lakh was made for six universities which was to be released during `96-97` on appointment of a Professor. As these universities did not complete the necessary formalities during the year, money could not be released;
- (ii) A budgetary provision of Rs. 200.00 lakh to Institute of Economic Growth was made but could not be released on account of the inability of the Institute to meet the requirement of grants;
- (iii) A provision of Rs. 9.0 lakh to Centre for Research in Planning and Development, Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economics, Pune could not

be released as certain information required was not received from the Institute;

- (iv) Very few research studies could be completed during this year and hence the last instalment of grant could not be released in several cases resulting savings in expenditure; and
- (v) Very few new cases for research studies, seminars, institution development and activities were taken up during this year;

The budget provision for grants in aid to IAMR for building a new campus at Narela during '96-97' could not be utilised as the project had not started as expected.

Reasons for under-utilisation of the budgetary allocation (Plan) in '98-99' was mainly on account of :

- (i) A budgetary provision of Rs. 30.00 lakh was made for six universities which was to be released during '1998-99' on appointment of a Professor. As these universities did not complete the necessary formalities during the year, money could not be released;
- (ii) As against the budgetary provision, less grant was released to Centre for Research in Planning and Development, Gokhale Institute of Politics and Economic as they could not fulfil their obligation to obtain the entire grant; and
- (iii) Budgetary allocations could not be used fully and had to be scaled down in R.E. since the construction activity for building of new Campus of I.A.M.R. could not be started pending approval of plans by D.D.A. Approval of the plan has been received and the actual construction started only in December, '99."

17. The Committee are concerned to note that there has always been under-utilisation of the budgetary allocations (Plan) since 1995-96. Even when the budget estimates were reduced drastically at the Revised Estimates stage except in 1997-98, the actual expenditure was nowhere near the Revised Estimates.

It has been stated that a sum of Rs. 200 lakhs meant for the Institute of Economic Growth as grants-in-aid could not be released on account of the inability of the Institute to meet the requirement of grants. The Committee are at a loss to understand that when the detailed guidelines have already been prescribed for identification of the eligible Institutions, how an Institute could be selected which failed to meet the eligibility criteria laid down under such guidelines with the result the amount remained unutilised.

The Committee are also unable to understand as to why it took about five years to get the plan for building a new Campus of Institute of Applied Manpower Research (IAMR)

at Narela, approved by DDA which resulted in surrender of allocated funds year after year. The matter should have been taken up at an appropriate high level to get the plan approved well in time and construction work started in order to avoid the under-utilisation of funds.

In view of the foregoing, the Committee conclude that no serious efforts are being made by the Ministry of Planning (Planning Commission) either in projecting a realistic demand or in making a judicious selection of Institutes for providing grants. The Committee, therefore, desire that realistic approach should invariably be adopted by the Ministry while projecting a demand. The actual utilisation should be as near the budgetary allocation as possible. It is all the more important that only those Institutes should be selected for the grants which fit in within the framework of the guidelines already prescribed.

Demand No. 68

Grants-in-Aid to NGOs

18. The Socio-Economic Research (SER) Unit in the Planning Commission implements the scheme of grant-in-aid to Universities/Research Institutions for encouraging the activities of Planning and Development.

The Scheme of Socio Economic Research (SER) has been in operation for nearly 47 years. The objective is to promote research for a better understanding of planning process. Grant-in-aid is provided to universities and research institutions for carrying out research studies. The programme has also sponsored Seminars, Workshops and Conferences to stimulate an informed debate on research themes/topics relevant to development planning.

Planning Commission allocates grants-in-aid to NGOs for studies/seminars under Socio-Economic Research Scheme. The detailed guidelines prescribed for identification, sanction and release of grants-in-aid under this Scheme are given at Annexure I.

19. The amount released by the Planning Commission to Universities/Research Institutions during the years 1996-97, 1997-98 and 1998-99 is as follows:

Year	Amount Released
1996-97	Rs. 43,55,211
1997-98	Rs. 1,40,65,210
1998-99	Rs. 1,33,75,996

20. When pointed out that there is mushroom growth of NGOs and unemployed, unemployable racketeers are becoming NGOs, the Secretary, Ministry of Planning in his oral evidence, submitted :

“I entirely agree that there is a mushroom growth of NGOs. Many people who have no concern for the people or for poverty are joining the bandwagon because they think that they can get funds from the Government or from other bodies. If we look at the overall picture of the funds that one gives to the NGOs, it does not show that the NGOs are totally replacing the Government as a delivery machinery. The overall picture is that roughly, today, counting both State Government and the Government of India, we are spending something like Rs. 2 lakh crore on development and only Rs. 200 crore to Rs. 400 crore is spent through NGOs. It would come to about 0.2 per cent of what is being spent on them. Therefore, 99.8 per cent of funds are being spent by the Government.”

21. As regards misappropriation and embezzlement of funds by a large number of NGOs funded by CAPART, the representative during evidence, stated :

“I am aware that they are funding a large number of NGOs. Some of them were certainly found to be bogus. We advised CAPART that they should reduce the number of NGOs they are funding. If you look at the number of NGOs that they have funded in 1998-99 and 1999-2000, as compared to 1992-93 and 1993-94, it is heartening to note that the total number is much less. The early 1990 period was a very bad period for CAPART where anyone who had some source or influence in the office of CAPART was able to get grants. There are stories that project reports were being sold saying that this is the project report, you can fill up your name and you can get the grant. All these problems have now been sorted out in CAPART and the number has come down to just about half or one-third of what they were funding then. They are concentrating more on quality, on interaction, on monitoring, on impact studies in order to ensure that the benefit goes to the right quarters. The Planning Commission has recently been declared as a nodal agency for all voluntary agencies and we would certainly take our role very seriously.”

22. On the question of identification of genuine NGOs, it was suggested that those organisations who cater to public charity and whose income is exempted from taxation, should be considered as genuine NGOs. In this connection, the Secretary, Ministry of Planning deposed before the Committee :-

“We have created a Voluntary Action Cell which was asked only last fortnight by the Government to be the nodal agency and this is one of the issues which concerns us and we would discuss in detail as to what kind of procedures such as income-tax exemption, etc. should be prescribed.”

23. The Committee note that about Rs. 200 crore to 400 crore are being spent on Non-Government Organisation (NGOs). They express their anxiety over the mushroom growth of NGOs in the recent past, many of them they apprehend may not be genuine entities. This stands further corroborated from the experience of CAPART which had spent money through thousands of NGOs, some of which, as admitted by the Government, were found to be bogus.

The Committee note with satisfaction that the Planning Commission has been declared nodal agency for all the voluntary organisations and it has started working on establishing a data bank in this regard.

The Committee desire that the selection of NGOs should be made in a very objective and judicious manner and those NGOs who are doing commendable work should be helped to the extent possible.

**Demand No. : 68
Planning Commission
Major Head : 3475
Minor Head : 06**

Expertise for Planning Process

Payment for Professional and Special Services (PPSS)

Consultancy Scheme of the Planning Commission

24. The Planning Commission is, inter-alia operating a Plan Scheme named – “Payment for Professional and Special Services (PPSS)”. Under the Scheme, outside experts as also the retired Government officials are engaged by the Planning Commission for undertaking specific studies of complex nature and of current interest to the Commission which cannot otherwise be carried out by the Planning Commission with the help of its regular staff strength. The guidelines issued by the Department of Personnel & Training are invariably followed. The consultants appointed by the Planning Commission are paid the consolidated monthly fees (all inclusive) and are allowed the tenures of appointment as per the guidelines of the DOPT. Apart from engaging the services of these Experts on Whole Time and Part Time basis as provided under the guidelines of the DOPT, persons of high repute who want to work for free for the Commission and to contribute for the development of the Country, are being engaged by the Planning Commission in an Honorary capacity, without any remuneration. Besides, the Planning Commission has been allowed to assign the job of conducting some time bound studies for the Commission to Institutes/individual) on a pre-determined lumpsum amount basis. This amount is released in

suitable number of instalments linked to the progress of the job and/or submission of interim/final report by them.

Agro Climatic Regional Planning Unit (ARPU)

The Agriculture Division of the Planning Commission some time in Mid 1988 had set up a Plan Project – “Agro-Climatic Regional Planning Unit (ARPU)” at Sardar Patel Institute of Economic and Social Research (SPIESR), Ahmedabad, being the main Centre of its activity and with 15 other Zonal Centres located at various State Agricultural Universities. The objective of the Project was to provide technical and scientific support to Agriculture and allied sector initially during the 8th Five Year Plan which is now being continued during the current plan period also. The expenditure on this Project is also being met from the above named Plan Scheme and all releases etc. to the SPIESR or the Zonal Centres are being made centrally by the Planning Commission, who also monitors the progress of activities, the expenditure and the utilization certificates etc.

25. The Break-up of B.E., R.E. and Actuals during the last 3 years i.e. 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000 is as under:-

(Rs. in Crores)

	1997-98			1998-99			1999-2000			2000-01
	B.E.	R.E.	Actuals	B.E.	R.E.	Actuals	B.E.	R.E.	Actuals	
ARPU	4.40	3.08	1.85	3.46	3.18	1.22	3.16	0.64	0.51	1.45
PC	1.95	0.80	0.05	2.27	0.08	0.06	0.13	0.16	0.12	0.55
Total	6.35	3.88	1.90	5.73	3.26	1.28	3.29	0.80	0.63	2.00

26. In regard to under-utilisation of funds, Ministry in their reply have stated as under :-

“As and when the Planning Commission feels that there is a need for engaging the services of such Experts, the requirement and the expenditure goes up. For the ensuing Year, the Budget allocation is proposed at Rs. 2 Crore which is less than the Budget Estimate 1999-2000 by 39.21% but is higher than the Revised Estimates 1999-2000 by 150%. In view of the type of the Scheme, it is not possible to maintain any regular increase or decrease in the budget allocations or the actual expenditure but it depends on the need in a particular year. The Planning Commission proposes to assign some impact Studies to Experts/Institutes during 2000-2001. However, on the ARPU side, most of its activity and objective with which it was set up has already been completed and the pace of expenditure is not as much as it was in the initial years of the launching of the Scheme. Therefore, the proposed Budget allocation for 2000-2001 for ARPU (out of a total proposed allocation of Rs. 2 Crore for the Scheme) is Rs. 1.45 Crore (72.5%) against the corresponding figure for the previous year (1999-2000) being Rs. 3.16 Crore out of a total of Rs. 3.29 Crore.”

27. From the figures made available to them, the Committee are constrained to find that there is a wide gap between Budget Estimates, Revised Estimates and actual utilisation of funds meant for Expertise for Planning Process. The Committee are not inclined to accept the viewpoint of the Ministry that it was not possible to maintain any regular increase or decrease in the budget allocation or the actual expenditure, but it depended on the need in a particular year. The Committee are of the considered view that since it is not difficult to assess the type or number of studies requiring the services of Experts, which are going to be undertaken during a particular year, it should be possible to project a reasonably realistic demand. The Committee, therefore, desire that the budgetary exercise should be taken up with due seriousness so that the gap between Budget Estimates, Revised Estimates and actuals get minimised.

Demand No. 68

Human Development Report

28. Human development is a process of enlarging people's choices. The most critical of these wide-ranging choices are to live a long and healthy life, to be educated and to have access to resources needed for a decent standard of living. Additional choices include political freedom, guaranteed human rights, and personal self-respect. Development enables people to have these choices... Human development thus concerns more than the formation of human capabilities such as improved health or knowledge. It also concerns the use of these capabilities.

India, the second most populous country in the world, has no more than 2.5% of global land but is the home of 1/6th of the world's population. Living in a resource poor country with high population density, planners perceived in the figures of 1951 census the potential threat posed by rapid population growth to the developmental activities, efforts to improve per capita income, availability of food, clothing, education and employment, prevention of environmental deterioration and enhancement of the quality of life.

While in India there has been a net increase in national wealth both in absolute and per capita terms, it is nonetheless necessary to investigate whether this type of economic prosperity has contributed to human development and the welfare of the masses.

29. The Committee in their Nineteenth Report on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Ministry in regard to preparation of the Human Development Report recommended as under:-

“The Committee are distressed to note that even after more than 50 years of independence, the country has not been able to bring out a National Human Development Report to improve status of human development i.e. Infant mortality,

primary education, health and employment etc. The Committee are further pained to note that Planning Commission have yet to decide about the modality and time frame in this regard. Committee note that in pursuance of the Report prepared by Madhya Pradesh some more States have also shown interest in preparation of National Human Development Report and Dy. Chairman, Planning Commission in the recent meeting of the NDC has announced to prepare a human development Report for the entire country in addition to allocating funds to State Governments in this regard.

The Committee keeping in view the vital importance of the Human Development Report, desire that Planning Commission should take up the matter in the right earnest and prepare Report for the entire country on top priority without further delay.”

30. During the evidence of the Ministry held on 13 March, 2000 about the reasons for delay in preparation of HDR, the representative of the Ministry of Planning stated as under :-

“First of all, I must admit that there has been some delay in the preparation of the National Human Development Report. The reason is this. I am thinking the indices that should be part of the national Human Development Report. We were very happy to see the India Human Development Report prepared by the NCEAR, the National Council of Economic and Applied Research. It is based on samples of 33,000 households and covers a very large number of points. This Report was out only in August, 1999 and we thought that this Report should be discussed amongst intellectuals and academicians so that people would point out the main shortcomings in the Report.

This is a Report prepared by NCEAR and it is called the India Human Development Report. It covers almost all important points like poverty, literacy, health, electricity coverage, pipe water, access to public distribution system, etc. and it compares the position in the States.”

31. When asked whether the Ministry is going to depend on the reports prepared by the NCEAR and State Governments or they are going to have their own methodology and prepare a report, the representative of the Ministry of Planning stated :-

“Firstly, let me say that the report that we have got from the NCEAR did not make us complacent. In fact, it has encouraged us because there is this methodology given there with which we could relate. We have to decide as to whether we are going to follow this or whether we are going to follow different methodology and we decided that this report which is based on a thin sample of 33,000 families, we are not going to adopt. We have also decided that we are not going to do a primary survey ourselves. We depended on the reports and census reports, survey reports and the national sample survey reports which are available.”

32. As regard data for preparation of HDR, representative of the Ministry stated as under:-

“The data is already available in the NSS Report or the Census Report. The whole issue is to examine that data and to see as to what extent this data is compatible with various reports that we get from the field and the data has been used by various State Governments also. Therefore, as I said, I have admitted that there has been some delay.”

33. On the question of reliability of data and the methodology which was used by the NCEAR, representative of the Ministry stated as under :-

“I did not say that I am not accepting the findings of the NCEAR. The findings of the NCEAR are quite valid. But their methodology was different.”

34. However during the course of evidence, on 13 March, 2000, the Secretary, Ministry of Planning submitted as under :-

“Now, about the timetable, there is a feeling in the Planning Commission, I must share this with you, that the best time to complete our report would be after the Census report is available. The logic is that there is a report available to us in 1999 which gives all that has answered most of the questions. It has told us which States are very backward in electricity, which States are backward in PDS or in piped water supply and so on and so forth. Whatever lessons we wanted to draw for the purpose of planning and for the purpose of allocation of funds are already available with us. Therefore, there is no such urgency to produce a report within six months. Our report may be slightly difference from this but, by and large, the conclusions would be the same. Therefore, it would be much better and our report would be of higher value if we can wait till the results of the Census are ready. On the other hand, there is another view that, look, we have waited enough and perhaps we can think of second edition of that Report.

I must admit that within the Planning Commission, the issue will not resolve. Therefore, I would not be in a position to commit that within a year, we would be able to deliver the report unless this position is sorted out.”

35. Subsequently, the Ministry in a written reply stated as under :-

“The work related to the preparation of National Human Development Report was initiated by convening a National Workshop on Key Concerns and Core Indicators for National and State Human Development Reports in July, 1999. The Workshop was coordinated by the UNDP India Office and the Planning Commission. In this Workshop, discussions were held on issues related to the data, methodology and the key indicators to be included in the National Human Development Report as also the State Human and Development Reports.

The Planning Commission is constituting a Steering Committee to oversee the preparation of the NHDR by a team of Officers to be identified to undertake this task.

A commitment has been made to the Standing Committee to have this Report ready by the end of fiscal year 2000-2001.”

36. Keeping in view the vital importance of Human Development Report, the Committee in their Nineteenth Report on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) had desired the Planning Commission to take up the matter in right earnest and prepare Human Development Report for the entire country without any further delay. They are however distressed to note that it was only in July, 1999 that the work relating to the preparation on Human Development Report was initiated by convening a National Workshop on Key Concern and Core Indicators for National and States Human Development Reports.

The matter regarding the preparation of Human Development Report was discussed at length by the Members in the Standing Committee on Finance and they were of the considered opinion that in the absence of such a report which provides important parameters relating to poverty, literacy, health, water, electricity, etc., the planning itself is likely to remain a futile exercise.

The Committee now desire that the Planning Commission shall prepare the much awaited National Human Development Report by the end of fiscal year 2000-2001 as already committed.

Demand No. 68

Ninth Five Year Plan

37. The principal task of the Ninth Plan is to usher in a new era of people-oriented planning in which not only the Governments at the Centre and the States, but also of the people at large, particularly the poor, can fully participate. The Ninth Plan recognises that a participatory planning process is an essential pre-condition for ensuring equity as well as accelerating the rate of growth of the economy.

The Ninth Plan recognises the integral link between rapid economic growth and the quality of life of the mass of the people. It also recognises the need to combine high growth policies with the pursuit of our ultimate objective of improving policies which are pro-poor and are aimed at the correction of historical inequalities. Thus the focus of the Ninth Plan can be described as : “Growth with Social Justice and Equity”.

38. The specific objectives of the Ninth Plan as approved by the National Development Council are as follows :

- i) Priority to agriculture and rural development with a view to generating adequate productive employment and eradication of poverty
- ii) Accelerating the growth rate of the economy with stable prices;
- iii) Ensuring food and nutritional security for all, particularly the vulnerable section of society;
- iv) Providing the basic minimum services of safe drinking water, primary health care facilities, universal primary education, shelter, and connectivity to all in a time bound manner;
- v) Containing the growth rate of population;
- vi) Ensuring environmental sustainability of the development process through social mobilisation and participation of people at all levels;
- vii) Empowerment of women and socially disadvantaged groups such as Scheduled Casts, Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes and Minorities as agents of socio-economic change and development;
- viii) Promoting and developing people's participatory institutions like Panchayati Raj institutions, co-operatives and self-help groups;
- ix) Strengthening efforts to build self-reliance.

39. The Approach paper to the Ninth Five Year Plan envisaged a base line growth scenario of 6.2 per cent per annum on the average for the Ninth Plan period. It was also indicated that an accelerated growth scenario of 7 per cent per annum was feasible provided certain policy decisions were adopted by the Centre and States. In its meeting held on January, 16, 1997, the NDC approved the Approach Paper and directed the Planning Commission to formulate the Ninth Five Year Plan with a target growth rate of 7 per cent per annum. A Draft Ninth Five Year Plan was prepared by the Planning Commission on the basis of the approved Approach Paper. It was released to the public by the then Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission on 1.3.1998.

With the formation of the new Government in March, 1998, the work of re-drafting the Ninth Five Year Plan was taken up. The process of re-drafting the Plan was guided by three broad directions laid out by the Government. These are : (a) The Approach Paper as approved by the NDC in January, 1997 would continue to form the basis of the Ninth Plan; (b) The Plan would take into account the priorities of the Government as laid down in the National Agenda for Governance (NAG) and the directions of the Prime Minister; and (c) The annual

performance of the economy in 1997-98 and the emerging trends for 1998-99 would be taken into account in formulating the Plan.

In order to incorporate the priorities of the Government, Special Action Plans (SAP) were drawn up for the identified sectors with committed fund allocations and performance milestones, which were integrated into the overall Plan approved by the full Planning Commission and by the Union Cabinet for being placed before the NDC at its next meeting.

The Ninth Five Year Plan (1997-2002) obtained the final approval of National Development Council (NDC) on 19th February, 1999 and the same was tabled in Lok Sabha on 1 December, 1999 and in Rajya Sabha on 9 December, 1999.

40. During the evidence of the Ministry held on 29.03.2000, the Committee desired to know about the reason for delay in preparation and getting clearance of Ninth Plan (1997-2002) from NDC overall growth targets, investible resources etc. for the plan period, the representative of the Ministry stated as under :-

“It is a fact that there was a delay in approval by the NDC of the Ninth Five Year Plan. We must apologise and accept that there was change of government and therefore, it did take sometime for the NDC to meet; and the whole process did suffer a little bit because approval came only in February 1999, almost after two years of the plan period. In the first draft that we have prepared, the rate of growth was shown as seven per cent – that is, the GDP growth would be seven per cent. After the experience of the first two years, especially in 1997-98, GDP grew only by five per cent. We decided to scale down and we said that in the Ninth Five Year Plan, it would be more realistic to peg our growth at 6.5 per cent. Even to achieve 6.5 per cent, now that three years have passed would be difficult and in these three years of the Ninth Five Year Plan, the GDP has grown by five per cent, 6.8 per cent and 5.9 per cent. Therefore, if we wish to achieve a growth rate of 6.5 per cent, our growth rate in the next two years would be 7.4 per cent and 7.4 per cent. Then only we will be able to get 6.5 per cent growth rate. It will be very difficult for me to assert that we would achieve 7.4 per cent. But the past experience showed that whatever targets were fixed by the Planning Commission from the Fifth Plan onwards, the actual rate of growth of the economy was always better than that.

The other point that we have to remember is that the structure of investment in our economy has undergone a great deal of change in the last 30 years. In the 70s, 70 per cent of investment came from the Government and only 30 per cent came from private sources. Today, it is just the other way round – 70 per cent from private sources and only 30 per cent from the Government.”

Therefore the Government can only create conditions in which private investment and external aid can flow. It is not always in the hands of the Government to increase investment; if we have to look at our macro policies and policies which will increase investment, then the investment output has to be more. Therefore, we have to maximise the return from that investment. So, 6.5 per cent, personally speaking, I feel, it is a reasonable target which is within our means to achieve in the Ninth Plan Period.”

41. In reply to a question about the progress of Mid-Term Appraisal, the representative of the Ministry submitted :

“The Mid-Term Appraisal (MTA) exercise for the Ninth Plan has been initiated by the Planning Commission. The primary objective of this appraisal is to assess the performance of the Plan for the years it has been implemented and to take corrective action, with a view, to effectively achieve the objectives laid out for the Plan period as a whole. In addition, the appraisal would focus on identifying areas of significant shortfall and the reasons, therefor, so as to arrive at a basis for evolving appropriate Policy Package/Plan Strategies for mid-term corrections in the implementation of the Plan.

The draft Mid Term document is currently being edited by the Editorial Committee of the Planning Commission constituted for this purpose. The document is expected to be ready shortly“

42. The Committee are pained to note that although the Ninth Plan had commenced from 1 April, 1997, the Plan document was accorded final approval only on 19 February, 1999 with the delay of almost two years. The Committee also express their displeasure over the fact that after the formation of the new Government in March, 1998, the Ministry almost took one year in redrafting the Ninth Five Year Plan and getting the same approved from NDC. Besides, even though it was finally approved in the month of February, 1999 the same was not placed in the Parliament till December, 1999. The Committee are, therefore, not inclined to accept the explanation adduced by the Ministry that the delay took place on account of the change in the Government. It is distressing to note that neither the Approach Paper to Ninth Five Year Plan nor the Plan itself was discussed in Parliament.

The Committee have been informed that the Planning Commission has already completed midterm appraisal for the Ninth Five Year Plan with the objective to assess the performance of the Plan for the years it has been under implementation and the document is expected to be ready shortly.

The Committee strongly emphasise that the Approach Paper should be ready well before the start of the plan and placed before Parliament so that a full-fledged discussion could be held thereon. Based on the discussion, the final plan document may be prepared reflecting the popular wishes and aspirations. The Committee recommend that the final plan document as well as the mid term appraisal report should be placed before the Parliament well in time. All efforts should be made to see that these documents are discussed in the Parliament.

The Committee are also constrained to note that due to the abnormal delay in getting the Ninth Plan approved the growth target had to be revised downwards from 7% to 6.5%. During the evidence, the Secretary was candid enough to admit that in order to achieve even the growth rate of 6.5%, the percentage of the growth during the remaining two years will have to be 7.4%. He has also expressed an apprehension that since three vital years of the Plan have already passed during which the GDP has grown by 5%, 6.8% and 5.9% only, it may be difficult even to achieve a growth rate of 6.5%. In view of the fact that valuable time has already been lost, concerted efforts need to be made at all levels to achieve at least the revised targets now fixed in the Ninth Five Year Plan.

Demand No. 68

PERSPECTIVE PLANNING

43. The work of Perspective Planning relates to the overall integration of the plan into macro-economic framework delineating possibilities and constraints; and projecting a long term vision of development in terms of potentials, constraints and critical issues.

The Perspective Planning Division assists the Commission in planning and policy issues which span across multiple sectors of the economy such as agriculture, industry, infrastructure, financial resources, foreign trade, balance of payments, social services, demography, poverty and employment. To bring about inter-sectoral consistency in the plans, a system of plan models, sub-models and material balances is used. The exercises done in the Division help in evolving the overall macro framework, projecting the needs of consumption, investment and production structure as well as Social Development.

44. Explaining the perspective time horizon of the five year plans, a representative of the Ministry of Planning, submitted before the Committee :

“The Indian Five Year Plan right from inception have been embedded within the perspective of 15-year time horizon. We continue that tradition. The nature of the Perspective Plan has changed over time. If we go back to the 50s, the major issue of perspective was how to bring about right industrialisation based on our own resources which were then in short supply. In recent years, the perspective itself has had to change because issues have changed very dramatically. At the moment, if you look at the first chapter of 9th Five Year Plan, it recognises that the perspectives is the single biggest challenge on our planning system and to the economic decision-making system in the country. The single biggest challenge is creation of employment... As a corollary to this a couple of issues come up. The first is that this problem of population growth is not uniformly disbursed all over the country. It is fixed in specific regions of the country.... Following from that, what the perspective says is that the sector which has the highest potential in these specific geographical areas is agriculture.. Following from that you get the other issues that come up, which is to talk about agriculture without talking about water

management, etc. So, the entire perspective is drawn up but normally what we do report is what we recognise as the single agriculture problem that we see in the long run. From that follows a whole series of measures.”

45. When pointed out that there was no use of having annual plans or the Five Year Plans unless a long term perspective plan is kept in mind, a representative of the Ministry submitted :

“What we are proposing now is a process which would not be really reflected in the Five Year Plan itself, but it would have a rolling kind of a system by which the Planning Commission would develop a plan of, say, 20 years which would lay out the national problems as we see it and to the extent to our capabilities the regional dimensions of that.”

46. A representative of the Ministry added :

“We have started taking initiatives in terms of developing vision documents. In the S&T field, I feel that capabilities will have to be strengthened in the Planning Commission. In terms of our interaction about our being able to protect the long-term developments in the rest of the world, we have to really start. We have never done that but that movement is already on.

We are organising a Seminar at the Institute of Economic Growth about a week from today to essentially study the issues of long term planning, and how does one go about it. The normal kind of planning methodologies that exist have been for immediate term and they have been really for five to seven years, within which things are fairly predictable. When we are talking about planning for 20 years or 50 years, even in the rest of the world these methodologies are a little fuzzy. And in this Seminar, we are trying to take that forward and then we will have to decide how best we can incorporate into the way that we do business.”

47. Having been drawn the attention of the Ministry of Planning to the perspective plan for the development of technology, economic zone, space knowledge based industry etc., the Secretary, Ministry of Planning has inter-alia stated as under :-

“I am very grateful for your suggestions and for pointing out these areas where perhaps the Planning Commission is not thinking as much as it should be doing..... I would only say that on knowledge based-industry, we have only recently set up a Group in the Planning Commission with the idea of making India into a knowledge-based industry. I think on 22 and 23 June, we are going to have a workshop in which we will be inviting the best people on this who would tell us as to how best we could promote knowledge-based industry which may make India knowledge based. We have made allocations. We are doing resources mapping of economic zones for the Department of Ocean Development. But that may not be enough. I certainly will talk to them. Some of the Ministries, the so-called small Ministries are interested. Their priorities often do not get reflected because we often are busy in tackling the day to day problems of larger Ministries with the result the small Ministries suffer. We should give much more emphasis on science and

technology and oceanography because these are the areas where there is a lot of potential which needs to be specified. They remain to be tapped.”

48. One of the most important functions of the Planning Commission is to have proper perspective and vision for the years to come and plan accordingly. However, the Committee observe that Planning Commission since its inception has basically concentrated on formulation of Annual and Five Year Plans etc. and the perspective planning which relates to the overall integration of the plan into macro framework delineating possibilities and constraints and projecting a long term vision, has remained, more or less, an ignored area. The representatives of the Ministry (Planning Commission) conceded that there is lot of potential available in other areas such as oceanography, space research, science and technology, economic zone, knowledge based industry etc. which requires to be further explored and tapped. They also acknowledged the fact that the desired attention in this regard has not been paid so far. However, the Committee were informed that the Ministry have recently set up a group in the Planning Commission with the idea of making India into knowledge based industry and a workshop is proposed to be convened on 22 and 23 June, 2000 to find out ways as to how knowledge based industry could be promoted.

The Committee are of the view that in the perspective plan, development of science and technology has to remain one of the main focal point for overall integrated development of various facets of the economy including Agriculture, Industry, Trade and Allied sectors because in the absence of research and advanced technology, natural resources will always remain untapped.

The Committee, therefore, desire that the Ministry of Planning should without losing further time, initiate formulation of perspective plan for the future. They expect that the Planning Commission will come out with a long term vision document and release the same to the public for open discussion.

NEW DELHI;
April, 2000
Chaitra, 1922(Saka)

(SHIVRAJ V. PATIL)
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Finance.

APPENDIX I

MINUTES OF THE EIGHTH SITTING OF STANDING
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE (1999-2000)

The Committee sat on Wednesday, 29 March, 2000 from 1100 hrs.
to 1345 hrs. and again 1425 hrs. to 1630 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri Shivraj V. Patil — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Raashid Alvi
3. Shri Sudip Bandyopadhyay
4. Shri Rattan Lal Kataria
5. Shri Krishnamraju
6. Shri Brahmanand Mandal
7. Shri Rupchand Pal
8. Shri Prakash Paranjpe
9. Shri Raj Narain Passi
10. Dr. Sanjay Paswan
11. Shri Annasaheb M.K. Patil
12. Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan
13. Shri Pravin Rashtrapal
14. Shri Ram Singh Rathwa
15. Shri S. Jaipal Reddy
16. Shri T.M. Selvaganpathi
17. Shri Kirit Somaiya
18. Shri Kharebela Swain
19. Shri Braja Kishore Tripathy

Rajya Sabha

20. Dr. Manmohan Singh
21. Shri N.K.P. Salve
22. Shri Narendra Mohan
23. Shri P. Prabhakar Reddy
24. Shri Gurudas Das Gupta
25. Shri Vijay Darda

SECRETARIAT

- | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 1. Dr. A.K. Pandey | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Dr. (Smt.) P.K. Sandhu | <i>Director</i> |
| 3. Shri S.B. Arora | <i>Under Secretary</i> |

WITNESSES

MINISTRY OF PLANNING

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------|
| 1. Dr. N.C. Saxena | Secretary |
| 2. Shri A.K. Kundra | Principal Adviser |
| 3. Shrimati Jyotsna Khanna | Principal Adviser |
| 4. Shri R.P. Sinha | Principal Adviser |
| 5. Shrimati Krishna Singh | Principal Adviser |
| 6. Shri K.K. Baksi | Principal Adviser |
| 7. Shri M.L. Majumdar | Principal Adviser |
| 8. Dr. Ahmed Masood | Adviser (PAMD) |
| 9. Shri Shailendra Sharma | Adviser (LEM) |
| 10. Dr. Pronab Sen | Adviser (PP) |
| 11. Dr. N.J. Kurian | Adviser (FR) |
| 12. Dr. (Smt.) Rohini Nayyar | Adviser (RD) |
| 13. Shri S.P. Pal | Adviser (PEO) |
| 14. Dr. (Mrs.) Prema
Ramachandran | Adviser (H&FW) |
| 15. Shri B.N. Navalawala | Adviser (I&CAD) |
| 16. Shrimati T.K. Sarojini | Adviser (SW) |

17. Shri S.S. Meenakshisundram — Adviser (Mont.)
 18. Shri R. Srinivasan — Eco. Adviser (DP)
 19. Shri D. Hethra — Adviser (I&R)
 20. Shri B.N. Puri — Add. Adviser (Transport)
 21. Dr. Rajan S. Katoch — JS (SP)
 22. Shri T.K. Das — JS & FA
 23. Shrimati Firoza Mehrotra — Addl. Adviser (PC&Admn.)
 24. Mrs. Vibha Pandey — Director (Finance)
 25. Shri Arvind Kumar — Dir. (Adm.)
 26. Dr. Amarnath — Director (State Plan)
 27. Shri Rajeev Malhotra — Deputy Adviser (PC)
 28. Shri P.S. Natrajan — Dy. Adv. (PC)
 29. Shri A.K. Chanana — TD (NIC)
 30. Shri J.C. Prasad — SRO

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Hon'ble Members of the Committee and the representatives of the Ministry of Planning to the sitting of the Committee.

3. The Committee then took oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Planning on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry and matters relating to the Ninth Five Year Plan.

4. The evidence was concluded.

5. A verbatim record of proceedings has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX II

MINUTES OF THE THIRTEENTH SITTING OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON FINANCE (1999-2000)

The Committee sat on Wednesday, 19 April, 2000 from 1500 hrs.
to 1700 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri Shivraj V. Patil — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Rattan Lal Kataria
3. Shri Krishnamraju
4. Shri M.V.V.S. Murthy
5. Shri Kamal Nath
6. Shri Rupchand Pal
7. Shri Prakash Paranjpe
8. Dr. Sanjay Paswan
9. Shri Varkala Radhakrishnan
10. Shri Kirit Somaiya
11. Shri Kharebela Swain

Rajya Sabha

12. Dr. Manmohan Singh
13. Shri N.K.P. Salve
14. Shri Krishna Kumar Birla
15. Shri P. Prabhakar Reddy
16. Shri Amar Singh
17. Shri Viiav Darda

SECRETARIAT

1. Dr. A.K. Pandey — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri Harnam Singh — *Joint Secretary*
3. Dr. (Smt.) P.K. Sandhu — *Director*
4. Shri S.B. Arora — *Under Secretary*
5. Shri N.S. Hooda — *Assistant Director*

2. At the outset, the Chairman welcomed the Hon'ble Members of the Committee. The Committee then took up for consideration of the following draft Reports:—

- | | | | | |
|-------|---|----|----|----|
| (i) | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| (ii) | ** | ** | ** | ** |
| (iii) | Draft Report on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Planning. | | | |
| (iv) | ** | ** | ** | ** |

3. The Committee after deliberations adopted the above draft Report subject to the following:—

	Subject				Remarks
(i)	**	**	**	**	**
(ii)	**	**	**	**	**
(iii)	Report on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Planning				Without any modification
(iv)	**	**	**	**	**

4. The Committee authorised the Chairman to finalise the draft Reports in the light of modifications as also to make verbal and other consequential changes arising out of the factual verification and present the same to both the Houses of Parliament.

The Committee then adjourned.