

THIRTY-SECOND REPORT

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE (1985-86)

(EIGHTH LOK SABHA)

HOUSING FOR LANDLESS RURAL LABOUR

Ministry of Urban Development



Presented to Lok Sabha on 24-4-1986

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

April, 1986/Vaisakha, 1908 (Saka)

Price Rs. : 2.80

**LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF LOK
SABHA SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS—1985**

Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Sl. No.	Name of Agent
ANDHRA PRADESH		9.	M & J Services, Publishers, Representative Accounts & Law Book Sellers, Mohan Kunj, Ground Floor, 68, Jyotiba Fuele Road, Nalgaum Dadar, Bombay- 400014.
1.	M/s Vijay Book Agency, 11/1/477, Mylargadda Secunderabad-500361.	10.	Subscribers Subscription Services India, 21, Raghunath Dadaji Street, 2nd Floor, Bombay-400001.
BIHAR		TAMIL NADU	
2.	M/s. Crown Book Depot, Upper Bazar, Ranchi, Bihar.	11.	The Manager, M.M. Subscription Agencies, 1st Lay Out Sivananda Colony, [Coimbatore-641012
GUJARAT		UTTAR PRADESH	
3.	The New Order Book Company. Ellis Bridge, Ahemedabad-380006. (T. No. 79065)	12.	Law Publishers, Sardar Patel Marg, P. B. No. 77, Allahabad-U.P.
MADHYA PRADESH		WEST BENGAL	
4.	Modern Book House, Shiv Villas Palace, Indore City.	13.	Mrs. Manimala, Buys & Seles, 123, Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta-12
MAHARASHTRA		DELHI/NEW DELHI	
5.	M/s. Sunderdas Gianchand, 601, Girgaum Road, near Princess Street, Bombay-400002.	14.	Jain Book Agency, Connaught Place. New Delhi (T. No. 351663)
6.	The International Book Service Deccan Gymkhana, Poona-4.	15.	J. M. Jain & Brother Mori Gate, Delhi (T. No. 225064)
7.	The Current Book House, Maruti lane, Raghunath Dadaji Street. Bombay-400001.		
8.	M/s. Usha Book Depot, Law Book, Seller and Pub- lishers' Agent Government Publi- cations 585, Chira Bazar, Khan House, Bombay-400002.		

CORRIGENDA
TO
THIRTY SECOND REPORT OF ESTIMATES COMMITTEE
ON HOUSING FOR LANDLESS RURAL LABOUR.

.....

<u>Page</u>	<u>Para</u>	<u>Line</u>	<u>For</u>	<u>Read</u>
1	1.3	6	non	non
4	1.10	22	go away	go awry
4	1.11	5	Six Plan	Sixth Plan
16	2.10	3	religins	religious
17	3.2	2	connected	concerned
21	3.15	2	want	went
26	4.1	Statement Col.3, Line.15	19,40,000	18,40,400
28	4.3	4	For	For

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF ESTIMATES COMMITTEE (1985-86)	iii
INTRODUCTION	v
CHAPTER I <i>Introduction</i>	
A. Genesis	1
B. Magnitude of Housing Problem	4
C. Housing in the Five Year Plans	5
CHAPTER II <i>Housing Schemes</i>	
A. Scheme for landless Rural Labour/ Artisan etc.	9
Scheme for SCs/STs	12
C. Scheme of Ministry of Agriculture	42
CHAPTER III <i>(Finances for Housing)</i>	
A. Plan Provisions	17
B. HUDCO and Rural Housing	19
C. Assistance through Financial Institutions.	21
D. Subsidy.	23
CHAPTER IV <i>Implementation</i>	
A. Targets and Achievement	26
B. Pattern of Implementation	29
C. Monitoring	34
CHAPTER V <i>Miscellaneous</i>	
A. Fresh Survey	37
B. Perspective Plan	39
C. Coop. House Building Societies	41
D. National Policy	42
ANNEXURES	
: I to VII	53

336 395R

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

(1985-86)

CHAIRMAN

1. Shri Chintamani Panigrahi

MEMBERS

2. Shri Jai Prakash Agrawal
3. Shri Sarfaraz Ahmad
4. Shri T. Basheer
5. Shri Manoranjan Bhakta
6. Shri Birinder Singh
7. Shri Saifuddin Chowdhary
8. Shri Somjibhai Damor
9. Prof. Madhu Dandavate
10. Shri N. Dennis
11. Shrimati Sheila Dikshit
12. Shri G. L. Dogra
13. Shri H. N. Nanje Gowda
14. Shri M. R. Janardhanan
15. Shri Keyur Bhushan
16. Shri Lal Duhoma
17. Shri Mahavir Prasad
18. Shri Hannan Mollah
19. Shri Ajay Narayan Mushran
20. Shri Ram Pyare Panika
21. Shri Uttamrao Patil
22. Shri Jagannath Patnaik
23. Shri B. B. Ramaiah
24. Shri Navin Ravani
25. Shri Bhola Nath Sen
26. Prof. Nirmala Kumari Shaktawat
27. Shri Satyendra Narain Sinha
28. Shri P. K. Thungon
29. Shri Nissankara Rao Venkatratnam
30. Shri D. P. Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri N. N. Mehra—*Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Ram Kishore—*Chief Financial Committee Officer.*
3. Shri T. S. Ahluwalia—*Senior Financial Committee Officer.*

(iii)

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of Estimates Committee having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Thirty-second Report on the Ministry of Urban Development—Housing for Landless Rural Labour.

2. The Estimates Committee (1985-86) took the evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Urban Development on 23rd and 24th December, 1985 and the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Rural Development) on 24th December, 1985. The Committee wish to express their thanks to the Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development and Secretary, Department of Rural Development and the officers of the aforesaid Ministries for placing before them the material and information which they desired in connection with the examination of the subject and giving evidence before the Committee.

3. The Committee also wish to express their thanks to Shri B. C. Chattopadhyay of I.I.T. Kharagpur, who furnished memorandum on the subject to the Committee.

4. The Report was considered and adopted by the Committee on 17 April, 1986.

5. For facility of reference, the recommendations/observations of the Committee have been printed in thick type in the body of the Report and have also been reproduced in a consolidated form in Appendix to the Report.

CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI

*Chairman
Estimates Committee*

NEW DELHI;

April 21, 1986

Vaishakha 1, 1908(S)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. *Genesis*

1.1 Shelter is one of the basic necessities of life, next in importance only to food and clothing and deserves to be given appropriate priority in planned development. In India, particularly in rural areas, millions have been living without a shelter on their head. The Landless rural labour in the country is the worst affected lot. They deserve foremost attention while solving this alarming problem.

1.2 Social housing schemes, in India, commenced in an organised way with the onset of the planning era. The initial set of schemes included in the First Five Year Plan were (i) the subsidised industrial housing; (ii) coal and mica miners housing; and (iii) low-income group housing scheme which was initiated in 1954. However, at that time no scheme was visualised for the rural areas. The Village Housing Scheme as a Plan Scheme was first started during the Second Five Year Plan wherein village housing was viewed as part of a large programme of rural reconstruction. The Village Housing touched only a fringe of the problem during the Third Five Year Plan. During the last two years of the Fourth Plan, whereby a 'crash' programme for providing house-sites to the agricultural landless labourers was initiated; but the scheme moved in a tardy fashion.

1.3 The Estimates Committee (1967-68) in their 3rd Report on Rural Housing had observed as follows :—

“The Committee are unhappy to observe that there has practically been no progress in providing house sites for landless agricultural workers in the villages although this scheme was introduced about 5 years ago in 1962. It is regrettable that non of the States and Union Territories have taken up the scheme seriously. While no action has been taken to introduce the scheme by the majority of the States, the progress in the four States which are implementing the scheme, is far from satisfactory. The Committee are distressed at the apathy of the State Governments in this vital matter. It is well known that the living condition of the landless agricultural workers in the villages is deplorable and can only be improved by constant, continuous and sympathetic endeavours by Government and the village communities. The Committee urge that earnest efforts should be made by Government to tackle this problem on a priority basis as a social measure of vital importance to

the village community. They suggest that this programme should be made into a separate scheme. The Committee hope that necessary action will be taken by Government in this regard and that the progress in the implementation of the scheme would be closely watched by means of periodical progress reports."

1.4 However, the Estimates Committee (1967-68) in their Fifty-Seventh Report on Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the 3rd Report of the Committee did not pursue the above recommendation further, as the Government had accepted the suggestion of the Committee to make earnest efforts to tackle the problem on a priority basis as a social measure of vital importance and to watch the progress of implementation carefully.

1.5 The Estimates Committee (1972-73) had also in their Thirty-Seventh Report emphasised this problem as under :—

"The Committee are distressed to note that although 83 per cent of India's population live in villages and about 73 per cent of rural population reside in unsatisfactory "kutcha" structures, the problem of rural housing has not received close attention of the Government. The Committee note that although the shortage of houses in rural areas has been estimated to be about 18.6 million units, only 80,111 houses under the Village Housing Projects Scheme have been sanctioned since 1957 and only 50,525 houses i.e. about 2,000 houses per year on an average have been constructed. The Committee regret to note that although the Estimates Committee (1967-68) had drawn attention to the unsatisfactory performance of the Village Housing Schemes during the Three Five Year Plans and the apathy of the State Governments towards the scheme, the position has not shown any improvement and even the representative of the Government of India have admitted that in the matter of rural housing, the States had not paid that much attention that was needed and the funds were being diverted for other purposes."

1.6 In their action taken reply the Government have stated :—

"All the social housing schemes (including Village Housing Projects Scheme) introduced by this Ministry from time to time, are being administered and implemented by the State Governments and Union Territory Administrations. They have to provide adequate funds for rural housing out of their own resources, including the Central block assistance. The recommendations of the Committee have, therefore, been brought to the notice of State Governments for necessary action."

1.7 With a view to ameliorate the lot of the rural poor a scheme for allotment of house sites to rural landless workers, free of cost, was initiated in October, 1971 in the Central Sector. The scheme was thereafter transferred to the State Sector w.e.f. 1st April, 1974 and was included in the Minimum Needs Programme. Originally the scheme was initiated to benefit landless rural workers who did not own any land whatsoever, agricultural or otherwise. In June, 1974 the scheme was extended to cover rural artisans too. Furthermore, provision of construction assistance to those rural landless families who were provided with house sites was made. It was made a part of the 20 Point Programme in July, 1975.

To offer a fillip to the scheme, the Rural House Sites-~~own~~-Construction Assistance Scheme under the Minimum Needs Programme has been made a part of the new 20-Point Economic Programme in 1982. Points No. 9 and 10 of the Programme refer to :—

Point No. 9.—Allotment of house-site to rural families who are without them and expanded programmes for construction assistance to them.

Point No.10.—Improve the environment of slums, implement programmes of house building for economically weaker sections and take measures to arrest unwanted increase in land prices.

The erstwhile Ministry of Works & Housing (now Ministry of Urban Development) were made responsible for monitoring the progress of programmes relating to the above points. This is now being done by Ministry of Urban Development.

1.8 The objective of this scheme is to provide developed sites in clusters to the landless labourers in rural areas, free of cost, where they can construct houses with their own effort. The scheme also envisages provision of infrastructure facilities like access roads, masonry drinking water wells etc.

1.9 Asked, whether any survey of rural housing needs of the landless had been conducted before formulation of the scheme during the Second Five Year Plan to determine the magnitude of the rural housing problem at that time, the Secretary of the Ministry of Urban Development stated during evidence :—

“This scheme was started on a modest scale as an overall housing scheme during the Second Five Year Plan at that time this was the concept, a concept on a limited basis linked-up with the Community Development Scheme. So, no detailed survey was undertaken at that time.”

1.10 The Committee note that rural housing scheme in India, was not included as a separate item as a Plan scheme in the First Five Year Plan but rural housing, as a part of the Community Development Programme, did receive some attention during the First Plan period. The Committee regret to note that no detailed survey had been conducted before the formulation of the scheme to find out the magnitude of the rural housing problem. The Committee are constrained to note that during the last three decades of planning the Government has not taken the problem of providing houses to landless rural labour with the importance it deserves, although the Committee in their earlier Reports in 1967-68 and 1972-73 had drawn attention to the unsatisfactory performance of the Village Housing Scheme during the earlier Five Year Plans and the apathy of the State Governments towards the scheme. The Committee, are of the view that an important social welfare scheme like the rural housing scheme which affects a vast majority of the poorest section of the population should have been prepared after a careful and realistic assessment of the needs of the rural people of the country and not without making any detailed survey. The result is that much valuable time was lost on account of not tackling the problem on a scientific and practicable basis and the cost escalations during the last three decades have made the task of the poor in putting up a shelter over the piece of land given to them much more difficult. All concerned have to take a lesson from this if things are not to be allowed to go away in future in matters which cover millions of the poorest of the poor in the country.

B. Magnitude of Housing Problem

1.11 The Ministry of Urban Development in a note furnished to the Committee have stated that the Planning Commission had estimated in 1971 that the total number of eligible landless families would be about 145 lakhs by 1985. Clarifying the basis of arriving at the figure of 145 lakhs for Six Plan the Ministry in a note have stated, "the Expert Committee on Population Projection had estimated the total rural population for 1985 at 556.77 million. Applying to this the proportion of rural landless worker population, as obtained from National Sample Survey (N.S.S.) data which is 1/7 of the total rural population, the rural landless labour population was reckoned at about 86 million for 1985. Making use of the average household size of rural landless families as available from NSS surveys which was assumed to hold good for 1985 also, the number of rural landless worker families was arrived at which came to 14.5 million or 145 lakhs and was adopted in the Sixth Plan Document."

1.12 When asked if the projections were made by the Planning Commission in the year 1971, then the other Five Year Plans and the Annual Plans should also have been taken into consideration while making further

projections, the Director of the National Building Organisation (N.B.O.) informed the Committee during the evidence as follows :—

“The calculation of housing shortages is based on the assessment made by N.B.O. in the 1981 population census. Earlier it was generally on the basis of 1971 census. For 1981 census, the housing tables are yet to come. Our projections are based on the 1971 census. According to this, the total housing shortage in the country is of the order of 24.7 million dwelling units out of which 18.8 million are in the rural areas. While assessing the housing shortages, we consider three types of housing—pucca housing, an acceptable housing and semi-pucca housing, which is also considered as acceptable housing and the third category is the kuchha housing which is made of mud-thatched roof. It is divided into two categories—serviceable and unserviceable kuchha houses. The serviceable kuchha houses do not constitute housing shortage in the rural areas. Unserviceable kuchha means, the dilapidated house which is not fit for human habitation. This is taken into consideration. Taking this as a definite figures, the present rural housing shortage at the beginning of the 1985 is of the order of 18.8 million.”

1.13 The Committee note that on the basis of 1971 population census, the Planning Commission had projected the requirement of housing for landless rural labour as 145 lakhs by 1985 while on the basis of 1981 population census the National Building Organisation had estimated it as 188 lakhs. Making allowance for increase in landless labour force consequent upon increase in population and adding the other landless workers in the rural area e.g. artisans and fishermen who are an inseparable part of the village community, the projection would be much higher. The Committee fail to understand that when N.B.O. could project the requirement on the basis of 1981 census why the Ministry could not collect the realistic data on that basis and make projections accordingly. This shows glaringly the continued apathy and lack of zeal on the part of the Ministry towards the scheme. The Committee, need hardly emphasise that only urgent and concerted multipronged result oriented steps can solve the rural housing problem. The Committee feel that in order to fulfil this social obligation, mobilisation of financial, physical, human and institutional resources is called for on a priority basis with a time bound programme.

C. Housing in the Five Year Plans

1.14 The Ministry of Urban Development in a note furnished to the Committee have stated that the problem of housing in rural areas has been engaging the attention of the Government since the commencement of the planning era. During the First Plan period, there was no specific scheme

developed for rural housing in the country. However, rural housing could not be excluded from the Community Development programme.

For the first time, during the Second Five Year Plan, a rural housing scheme named 'Village Housing Project Scheme' was formulated wherein village housing was viewed as a part of the larger programme of rural reconstruction. The amount allocated under this scheme was Rs. 10 crores. In spite of the low provision in the Second Plan, the utilisation was still lower; out of Rs. 10 crores, only Rs. 3.70 crores were actually utilised. The details of the amount sanctioned and actual expenditure along with the units sanctioned and units completed from Second to Fourth Plan are as follows :—

Five Year Plan	Amount sanctioned (Rs. in crores)	Expenditure (Rs. in crores)	Units sanctioned	Units Completed
Second Plan (1957—61)	10.00	3.70	15,400	3,000
Third Plan (1961—65)	12.70	4.22	42,523	25,326
Annual Plans (1966—69)	3.19	2.56	11,601	12,048
Fourth Plan (1969—74)	5.25	4.27	15,414	12,140

The Scheme of allotment of house sites to rural landless workers free of cost was initiated in October 1971 in the Central Sector. It remained in the Central Sector upto the end of the 4th Five Year Plan and was transferred to the State Sector with effect from 1st April, 1974 on the recommendations of the National Development Council.

In the Fifth Plan, there was no separate provision for rural housing except Rs. 108.16 crores for providing four million rural house sites to the landless agricultural workers—including homestead rights as a part of the Minimum Needs Programme. The latter provision constituted about 10% of the total allocation provided in the Fifth Plan for housing.

During the Sixth Plan period, an amount of Rs 353.50 crores was made for the scheme of the House Sites-cum-Construction Assistance (Rs. 170 crores for house sites and Rs. 183.50 crores for construction assistance).

The Seventh Plan provides for Rs. 577 crores in the States Sector out of which Rs. 36 crores are earmarked for the provision of house sites at the rate of Rs. 500 per site and Rs. 541 crores for provision of construction assistance at the rate of Rs. 2,000 per family to 2.71 million families.

1.15 Asked on what basis the allocation for the Third Five Year Plan was increased to Rs. 12 crores when the amount allocated for the Second Five Year Plan had not been fully utilised, the representatives of the Ministry of Urban Development stated in his evidence before the Committee :

"It has been recognised in all the Plan documents that the total housing problem has very vast dimensions and the Plan Schemes from the State Sector are for the vulnerable small sections of the society and the remaining requirements of the housing sector have to be taken care of by the private efforts and banking operations, and so on. There is very little relationship between the total housing shortage and the Plan scheme target as such. I think this is one thing which has to be kept in view."

1.16 Asked whether the Planning Commission allotted the funds in consultation with the Ministry or without consulting them, the representative of the Ministry of Urban Development stated in his evidence before the Committee :

"This is the usual annual Plan discussions held in the Planning Commission in which the representative of our Ministry also participates. After that there is discussion with the Deputy Chairman and the Chief Ministers level and then the whole thing is finalised."

1.17 When asked whether the Committee should go by the position that the Seventh Five Year Plan document has been prepared on the basis of the 1971 census figures and not on those of 1981, the Secretary of Ministry of Urban Development confirmed the position during the evidence.

1.18 The Committee note that during the 1st Five Year Plan there was no specific scheme for rural housing in the country. However, the Second Five Year Plan envisaged a rural housing scheme called "Village Housing Project Scheme" and an allocation of Rs. 10 crores was made. Again during the 3rd Plan (1961—65), Annual Plans 1966—69 and 4th Plan 1969—74, an amount of Rs. 12.70 crores, Rs. 3.19 crores and Rs. 5.25 crores respectively was allocated for rural housing. The Committee feel concerned by low priority given and the low provision made in the Plans for rural housing. What pains the Committee more is that even these low allocations were not fully utilised and only Rs. 3.7 crores were spent in the Second Plan as against allocation of Rs. 10 crores. Likewise, during the 3rd Plan only Rs. 4.22 crores were spent as against Rs. 12.7 crores. During the Annual Plans, as against Rs. 3.19 crores only Rs. 2.56 crores were spent. In the 4th Plan the expenditure was Rs. 4.27 crores against an allocation of Rs. 5.25 crores. The Committee are distressed to find a continuing trend of according a very low priority to the rural housing

schemes and still a lower priority to its implementation. Although the rural housing was recognised as a "social measure of vital importance" in 1968 yet the magnitude of the rural housing problem was not realistically assessed and projected in the subsequent Five Year Plans. The Committee are surprised to note that while preparing the 7th Plan Document, census figures of 1971 were depended upon although the latest census figures of 1981 were available for quite sometime. The Committee can clearly perceive the lack of interest on the part of the Planners towards the rural housing despite the declared national Policy of the Government to accord high priority to rural housing. The Committee are of the view that housing for the rural poor, which is a basic human necessity, should be accorded appropriate high priority by the Planning Commission.

CHAPTER II

HOUSING SCHEMES

A. *Scheme for landless rural labour/artisans etc.*

2.1 With a view to ameliorating the lot of the rural poor, a scheme for allotment of house sites to rural landless workers free of cost was initiated in October, 1971 in the Central Sector. Under the scheme 100 per cent grant assistance was provided to the State Governments/U.T. Administrations to cover reasonable cost of acquisition of land where necessary and cost of development not exceeding Rs. 150/- per house-site. It was transferred to the State Sector as a result of the decision taken by the National Development Council in its meeting held in December, 1973. It was also included in the Minimum Needs Programme, funds for which are specifically earmarked by the Planning Commission in the annual plan outlays of the State/U.T Governments.

Originally the scheme was initiated to benefit landless rural workers who did not own any land whatsoever, agricultural or otherwise, in the rural areas. In June, 1974 the scheme was extended to cover rural artisans too. The Housing Ministers' conference held at Srinagar in July 1973 recommended that the landless workers should also include such landless workers as artisans, fishermen etc. who had no house-sites or other land of their own, as they were considered to be an inseparable part of the village community. The recommendation was accepted and the scope of the scheme widened in June, 1974. The scope of the scheme was further widened to include assistance for construction of House/hut on the developed house-site @ Rs. 500/- per family for purchasing local building materials. The programme visualised that all labour inputs will be provided by the beneficiaries. It was made a part of the 20 Point Programme in July, 1975. Later this scheme was incorporated as point 9 of the new 20-Point Programme announced in January, 1982.

The scheme has been in operation all over the country except in the States of Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Sikkim and Union Territories of Arunachal Pradesh, Lakshadweep and Mizoram.

The objective of this scheme is to provide developed sites in clusters to the landless labourers in rural areas free of cost where they can construct houses with their own effort. The scheme also envisages provision of infrastructure facilities like access roads, masonry drinking water wells etc.

2.2 When asked to state the consideration on which the scheme was transferred to the State Sector and whether the purpose for which it was transferred had been achieved, the Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development stated :

"In regard to the transfer also, the National Development Council's summary is available with us and some of the Chief Ministers have emphasised this point. For example, I would read out the NDC proceedings. The Chief Minister of Kerala has stated that in this programme which is included in the Minimum Needs Programme some flexibility should be allowed to the State so as to enable them to draw up their own plan/scheme on the basis of felt-priorities. Insisting of uniformity in the pattern of minimum needs programme was bound to come into conflict with regional priorities because situations differ from State to State. Similarly, this was the view of another Chief Minister. The Maharashtra Chief Minister also stated the same point. He said that the effect of this programme would be considerably diluted and distorted if a rigid adherence to the norms and programmes specified was insisted on. He suggested that the effective implementation of this programme should be left to the State Government. Considering all these views expressed, it was decided that the schemes covered under the Minimum Needs Programme should form part of the State Plan and none of them should remain in the centre."

2.3 Regarding the achievement of purpose, he further stated :

"It is very difficult question to answer. If we see the overall performance during the 6th Plan in the housing sector, and in regard to these schemes also, there has been an improvement compared to the previous Plans. But of course, there are problems in regard to each State. After the scheme has been transferred to the State Sector, there has been a distinct improvement. This is not only because of the transfer, we may also take some credit for learning from our past experience and gearing up our implementation and follow up."

2.4 Further, in a note submitted to the Committee, the Ministry of Urban Development have stated that "housing generally got low priority in the State Sector, the control of the Union Government became nominal. As a result of which the Union Government is left only with power to lay norms and also monitor the scheme. It is left to the respective State Governments/Union Territories to implement the scheme within the broad guidelines issued by the Government of India. A good deal would depend upon the stress laid by a particular State Government in regard to provision of funds out of their State share. It is very difficult to assess whether the

purpose of transferring the scheme in the State sector has been achieved. However, it may be stated that since inception of the scheme in 1971 upto 31-3-1974, 8,85,502 house sites were allotted by the States/Union Territories. From 1-4-1974 (when the scheme was transferred to the State Sector and upto 31-3-1985) the performance of various States/Union Territories is that 1,21,87,071 house sites have been allotted."

2.5 During their visit to Enayamthurai, Eramanthurai, Madalaxmi, Neorodithorai, Muttam and Malamidalam Fishermen villages of Kanyakumari District in Tamil Nadu the Committee were informed by the beneficiaries that in a Fisheries Department colony of the State where houses had been provided, no provision for infrastructural facilities like drinking water etc. had been made. At Neorodithorai most of the fishermen families, were found living in thatched huts of their own which were absolutely insufficient to provide them housing facilities. At Muttam and Malamidalam the Committee found that whereas Government land was available, the State Government had not implemented the scheme for providing construction assistance to the fishermen there and no survey to this effect had been conducted.

2.6 The Committee note that scheme for providing houses to the landless agricultural labour was transferred to the State Sector as a result of the decision taken by the National Development Council in its meeting held in December, 1973. They also note that upto 31-3-1974, when the scheme was under the Central Sector, 8,85,502 house sites were allotted to the landless rural workers by the States/Union territories whereas from 1-4-1974, when the scheme was transferred to the State Sector, and upto 31-3-1985, the number of house sites allotted by the various States/Union territories was 1,21,87,071. The Committee agree that there is need for learning from the past experience and gearing up the implementation and follow up efforts. Apart from allotting house sites, there is also need for providing other basic minimum needs like drinking water, road etc. if it is to be ensured that landless rural poor get the best benefit of the land given to them and are not tempted to part with it due to non-availability of drinking water and other basic amenities. The Committee hope that the State Governments would be persuaded to share their responsibility towards this social obligation earnestly and to implement the scheme expeditiously and vigorously in their respective States. The Committee recommend that States should be asked to ensure that funds provided for housing schemes in the annual Plans are not diverted to any other development projects.

2.7 During their visit to fishermen colonies at Neorodithorai, Muttam and Malamidalam in Kanyakumari District of Tamil Nadu the Committee found that in most of the Colonies infrastructural facilities like drinking water etc. had not been provided. The Committee noted that at Neorodithorai, Muttam and Malamidalam the fishermen lived in thatched huts of

their own which apart from being insufficient to provide them housing facilities could not face the vagaries of weather in some cases the land allotted was not developed for putting up any construction. The Committee recommend that the matter may be taken up with State/U.T. Government so that a Committee consisting of local M.P., M.L.A., Municipal Councillor and Sarpanch of Panchayat is formed to sort out the difficulties of beneficiaries and to advise the State/U.T. Government in identifying the land for allotment to beneficiaries which should be developed for putting up construction and for providing them requisite construction assistance and minimum basic infrastructure for drinking water etc.

B. Scheme for Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes

2.8 In a note furnished to the Committee, the Ministry of Urban Development has stated that "it is the policy of the Union Government as well as the State Governments that preference should be given to the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes landless families for allotment of house sites and those villages should be taken first where concentration of such population is more." Hence, the settlement having majority population of SCs/STs are normally given preference under this scheme. A statement showing the number of house sites allotted to SCs/STs by the States/U.Ts. under the House Sites-cum-constructions Assistance Scheme during the Sixth Five Year Plan period (year-wise) has been appended at Annexure—I.

2.9 While allotting house site to landless workers belonging to different castes, communities and religions, the State Governments have to ensure that it leads to integration in social and economic spheres of life.

When asked to state if this policy was being observed by each State/U.T. the Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development informed the Committee as follows :

"We are persuading and pressurising the State to follow this policy."

2.10 Regarding identifying the landless Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, the Ministry of Urban Development in a note furnished to the Committee have stated :

"Generally, some agencies at States/District/Block level in the States/U.Ts. which are involved in the allotment of house sites are also involved in identifying the landless Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes families in the allotment of house sites to them."

A statement indicating the agencies involved in the implementation of the scheme is given in Annexure—II.

C: Scheme of Ministry of Agriculture

2.11 The Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Rural Development) also commenced a Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme (RLEGP) with effect from 15th August, 1983. Under the programme work

projects relevant to the 20-Point Programme and Minimum Needs Programme could be taken up for implementation in rural areas. Point No. 9 of the 20-point Programme covers allotment of house sites to rural families and expansion of the programme of constructional assistance to such families. In view of this it was felt that construction of houses for rural areas could be taken up under the RLEGP. However, since under the RLEGP individual beneficiary work could only be taken up for SC/ST beneficiaries, construction of houses was, therefore, restricted to these categories under the RLEGP.

During the Sixth Five Year Plan following projects were undertaken for construction of SC/ST housing :

Name of state	Approved cost of projects (Rs. in lakhs)	No. of units proposed	Number of units constructed
Kerala	1,000.00	8,000	2,909 (upto June, 1985)
Tamil Nadu (a)	615.00	10,000	20,129 (upto Sept., 198)
(b)	615.00	10,000	
	2,230.00	28,000	23,038

During 1985-86, an amount of Rs. 400 crores was provided under the RLEGP. However, Finance Minister during the course of his reply to the Finance Bill, announced an additional allocation of Rs. 100 crores under the RLEGP in 1985-86 for the construction of rural houses for SC/ST. In this, it was envisaged that the houses should be constructed in clusters on Government land/land acquired by State Governments on their own cost. The cost of construction of each house with a plinth area of about 21 Sq. Metre was assumed to be around Rs. 6,000 based on Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUDCO) estimates. As far as possible locally available materials were to be used for the construction and beneficiaries would be the poorest of the poor belonging to the SC/ST who would be employed in the construction work giving them benefit of wage as well.

Under this programme, on the basis of the economic conditions the poorest among the poor from the SC/ST target group are identified by associating their representatives in an open Gram Sabha meeting.

The programme provides that construction of houses should be by beneficiaries themselves though they will be provided with type-designs, plan etc. In case it is not possible for the beneficiaries to construct the house, the construction may be carried out by the Rural Engineering Organisation etc.

However, even in this case beneficiaries should be inducted as workers to the maximum extent possible. No contractors can be used in the scheme. Voluntary Organisations can also be entrusted with such schemes."

The State-wise allocation for SC/ST housing under RLEGP is given in Annexure-III.

2.12 When asked to state how the funds under Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme were distributed among the States/U.Ts., the Secretary, Rural Development informed the Committee during the evidence as follows :

"The Central assistance will be allocated to the States and U.Ts. on the basis of the following criteria :

- (a) 75% weightage being given to the number of agricultural workers and marginal farmers;
- (b) 25% weightage given to the incidence of poverty in each State."

2.13 When asked whether 75% weightage was given irrespective of the size of population of SC and ST among the agricultural workers and marginal farmers, the representative of the Ministry stated that "it is presumed that among agricultural workers, a large number of percentage would be from SC and ST." When asked that in Madhya Pradesh the population of SC/ST was much higher than in U.P. and in that case the allocations under RLEGP should have been higher for Madhya Pradesh than U.P., the representative replied that "to that my submission would be since it is a programme for employment to the landless agricultural workers basically, we have given weightage to the agricultural workers and marginal farmers. Therefore, taking care of the other portion i.e. poverty group, again SC and ST will figure in. We have given 25% weightage to the incidence of poverty." It was pointed out that 80-90 per cent of marginal farmers were people who were living in big houses and became marginal farmers because they wanted to get subsidy and that such farmers should be excluded. Thus the criteria and identification of the beneficiary should not be the total number of people of a particular class, and there was need to have a realistic approach because marginal farmers could not have the benefit of two things as they also got substantial subsidy for agricultural implements, seeds etc. It was felt that there should be inter-action between the Agriculture Ministry and the Ministry of Urban Development to avoid overlapping of benefits to the same people. The Secretary, Department of Rural Development, then stated :

"Two issues are involved, First issue is allocations of funds for which we have taken the marginal farmers and the agricultural workers together. It does not mean that the benefit is flowing to the marginal farmers because one has to work to get the benefit. It is basically an employment scheme."

2.14 Regarding identification of beneficiaries, the Secretary, Rural Development stated :

“In view of the large magnitude of the problem and the limited availability of resources for the purpose, it is necessary that a fair and effective system should be evolved for identifying the persons to be benefited under the Programme. Accordingly the issue of identification of beneficiaries becomes very important. Since this Scheme is intended for the poor, the basis of identification will have to be poverty criterion. As the poorest of the poor live in the worst condition, it is necessary that identification of beneficiaries for construction of houses should be, their economic condition. First priority for housing may be given to the freed bonded labour who are being rehabilitated under various schemes. Since allotment of houses is Point No. 9 of the Twenty-Point Programme, if necessary, priority should be given to such allottees in the matter of construction of houses. Where considered necessary, beneficiaries who have house-sites may also be considered. It is desirable to associate representatives of SC/ST in the identification of beneficiaries. It is better if selection is done in open Gram Sabha so that the attention is focussed on the poorest.”

2.15 When asked if he felt that there was some kind of overlapping of funds between the Department of Rural Development and the Ministry of Urban Development, and whether it would not be appropriate if allocations by Rural Development were made for creating other assets in villages like building roads, digging wells, constructing tanks etc. instead of providing help to the landless or the homeless to build their houses, the Secretary, Department of Rural Development during the evidence stated as follows :

“Construction activity is one of the most labour-intensive activities; it is a major activity for absorption of labour. As such, there is nothing wrong in using the RLEGP funds for construction purposes.”

2.16 On being emphasised the need for entrusting the whole thing to one Ministry, the Secretary Department of Rural Development, agreed with the Committee during the evidence and stated :

“It will be desirable if one Ministry does it. On that, there can be no two opinions. One Ministry will have a total view of what is happening.”

2.17 The Committee are aware that the Ministry of Urban Development has a programme of providing House-sites-cum-Construction Assistance to the Landless Rural Labour including Scheduled Castes/Scheduled

Tribes, and the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Rural Development) also provides Construction Assistance to the landless Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The Committee feel that for better coordination and implementation of the scheme and also to check the overlapping of funds, the Government should consider the feasibility of entrusting the work relating to administration of both the schemes to one Ministry.

2.18 The Committee are in agreement with the view that while allotting house sites to landless workers belonging to different castes, communities and religions, it should be ensured that it leads to integration in social and economical spheres of life and does not result in segregation of families belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and that they are suitably interspersed with other families settled in the same locality.

CHAPTER III

FINANCE FOR HOUSING

A. Plan Provisions

The under-noted table indicates the amount allotted and actually spent on the working of the scheme of 'Housing for Landless Rural Labour' during the Second to Fourth Plan period :—

Five Year Plan	Amount Sanctioned (Rs. in crores)	Expenditure (Rs. in crores)
Second Plan (1957—61)	10.00	3.70
Third Plan (1961—65)	12.70	4.22
Annual Plans (1966—69)	3.19	2.56
Fourth Plan (1969—74)	5.25	4.27

As already stated in the draft Fifth Plan, there was no separate provision for rural housing except Rs. 108.16 crores for providing four million rural house-sites to the landless agricultural workers—including homestead rights as a part of the Minimum Needs Programme. The latter provision formed about 10% of the total allocation provided in the draft Fifth Plan for Housing. During the Sixth Plan period an amount of Rs. 353.50 crores was made for the scheme of the house site-cum-construction assistance (Rs. 170 crores for house-sites and Rs. 183.50 crores for construction assistance). The year-wise allocations for States/UTs during the Sixth Plan period and the actual expenditure for the period from 1974-75 to 1985-86 are shown in Annexures IV to VI. During the Seventh Five-Year Plan an allocation of Rs. 36 crores has been made for provision of house sites.

3.2 When asked whether the Ministry got the utilisation certificate from the connected State/U.T. before releasing the next instalment, the Secretary, Department of Urban Development informed the Committee during the evidence as under :—

“ it is true that the usual procedure is, before the next instalment is released, the completion certificate for the first instalment must come. But usually because this is Plan assistance and because there are difficulties this condition is being relaxed and the amounts are released. The second instalment is also released even without the full utilisation report. This is a recognised relaxation.”

3.3 On enquiry as to why the Ministry went on increasing the number of houses in the subsequent Plans knowing well that the amount earmarked in the earlier Plan not utilised, the representative of the Ministry stated :—

“It has been recognised in all the Plan documents that the total housing problem has very vast dimensions and the Plan Schemes from the State Sector are for the vulnerable small sections of the society and the remaining requirements of the housing sector has to be taken care of by the private efforts and banking operations, and so on. There is very little relation between the total housing shortage and the Plan scheme target as such. I think this is one thing which has to be kept in view.”

3.4 When asked if it had ever come to their notice that all the money allocated for the rural housing schemes had been spent on the urban areas, the representative of the Ministry during the evidence stated :—

“The present system is that the Minimum Needs Programme money cannot be diverted. So, the first check is by the State Planning Department. MNP fund is earmarked and when the States send the statement to the Planning Commission, the second check is there”.

3.5 When asked whether Planning Commission allotted funds without consulting the Ministry of Urban Development, the representative of the Ministry stated :—

“This is the usual annual plan discussions held in the Planning Commission in which the representative of our Ministry also participates. After that there is discussion with the Deputy Chairman and the Chief Ministers level and then the whole thing is finalised”.

3.6 When asked about the reaction to the suggestion whether it would make any difference if Planning Commission routed the funding through the Ministry of Urban Development, the representative of Ministry of Urban Development informed that it would enable them to have better control.

3.7 The Committee note that there is a progressive increase in different Five Year-Plans in the amounts sanctioned for the housing for landless rural labour. Despite the fact that the amount spent in the previous Plan was far less than allocated, the allocations were increased. The Committee learn that subsequent instalments of amounts under the scheme of “Housing for Landless Rural Labour” are being released to States/UTs without getting the proper utilisation certificates from them for the previous instalment. The Committee are distressed to note the lack of interest on the part of the Ministry to go into the reasons of non-utilisation of the amount sanctioned under the previous Plans and in just mechanically releasing the subsequent instalments without insisting on any utilisation certificates for the earlier instalment and without knowing whether the amounts have been actually spent for the programme for which it was given.

3.8 The Committee agree that the funds for such social-oriented schemes for the landless poor should be released with utmost speed so that the projects in hand are not held up for paucity of funds. At the same time the Committee would expect the Government to go by the normal financial procedures in getting the utilisation certificates before releasing any further instalments and thereby ensuring that money has been actually spent for the purpose for which it was given.

3.9 The Committee also recommend that the funds for the Housing for landless rural labour under the Minimum Needs Programme should be routed by the Planning Commission through the Ministry of Urban Development so that the Ministry can exercise better control over their utilisation.

B. Housing and Urban Development Corporation (HUDCO) and Rural Housing

3.10 In a note furnished to the Committee explaining the aim and objects of HUDCO it has been stated that :—

“In 1977-78, HUDCO started financing rural housing scheme. Under this, HUDCO encourages projects which (a) meet the basic need of shelter by providing inexpensive and functionally efficient shelter for the rural families; (b) tend to promote community effort and help organise the poor to participate and even contribute their spare time; (c) provide essential services like water supply, waste disposal system etc. (d) encourage adoption of appropriate construction methods; (e) use local materials, local skills, facilities such as, School, Panchayat Ghar are available.

The house in rural in contrast to the one in the cities has to be more functional as not only to provide shelter but also space for storage of agricultural produce, outlets and keeping up cattles. The house is also designed to meet the future growth needs of the family.

With the above in view, HUDCO has provided the following facilities within the house :—

- (i) Living space etc. as stated above.
- (ii) Space for cattles, agricultural produce, outlets, etc.
- (iii) Storage space;
- (iv) Kitchen with smokeless chulah;
- (v) Toilet and the bathroom, etc.
- (vi) Proper disposal arrangements for kitchen and bath disposal with specially designed system for human waste.

Financial Assistance

The financial assistance for rural housing scheme would be available to any agencies nominated by State Governments such as, Housing Board, Rural Housing Board, District Board, Panchayat, Taluka Development Board, etc. provided the following requirements are complied with :—

(a) The scheme provides for construction of dwelling units for persons belonging to Economically Weaker Section i.e. whose household income does not exceed Rs. 350 p.m. (now raised to Rs. 700 p.m.).

(b) The borrowing agency is competent under its constitution or statute governing it, to undertake such projects and to raise loans for rural housing.

(c) The borrowing agency has land in its possession with a clear and marketable title and free from encroachments or there is an agreement with the owners of land to part with the land, free from all encroachments, for the purpose of construction of the dwelling units and other related activities for the execution of the scheme. This will include arrangements made for the construction of a house by the allottee himself, on site owned by him.

(d) The total cost of a completed house should not exceed Rs. 4000 which should include the cost of construction of the dwelling unit including internal services, administrative and supervision charges and interest during construction (to be capitalised) but without the cost of land and its development. Further, no profit should be charged from the beneficiaries.

The loan assistance will be available only to those States who have made suitable provision in their respective State Budgets for meeting their part of the obligations in the scheme from their own resources.

HUDCO's financial assistance would be limited to 50% of the total cost of each dwelling units. The remaining 50% will have to be met out of loans/subsidy by the respective States either in cash or in kind.

This scheme is applicable all over the country. But, the major thrust has been in the five States viz. Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Karnataka and Gujarat. Other States are now coming forward to avail of this assistance."

3.11 When asked as to why should not the Government take more assistance from HUDCO for the rural housing, because HUDCO would be responsible to the Government, the Committee have been informed during

the evidence by the representative of Ministry of Urban Development that "out of the annual expenditure of HUDCO, 15% is reserved for rural housing. This is a totally State Sector Plan and HUDCO gives loan assistance."

3.12 The Committee have been further informed that in regard to HUDCO schemes, there was a proper screening as the HUDCO team went there in field and watched the progress from time to time.

3.13 Asked about the performance of HUDCO, the representative of the Ministry has stated in his evidence before the Committee :—

"48 schemes have been done at a Project cost of Rs. 492 crores, Rs. 235.33 crores loan from HUDCO. Dwellings sanctioned will produce 1.135 million houses. HUDCO was giving 50% of Rs. 6000 so far the ceiling limit in rural area was Rs. 6000."

3.14 Asked why did the Government not take the guidance of the voluntary agencies in rural housing apart from HUDCO, the representative of the Ministry has stated in his evidence before the Committee :—

"In Kerala for the next plan, this would be in collaboration with voluntary agencies and HUDCO. But it depends on different States. In Kerala, one million houses are to be built by and large by voluntary organisations with people's participation. Even the stones and bricks are being manufactured locally by the beneficiaries."

3.15 Asked as to why could it not be made a uniform practice so that HUDCO also work with voluntary agencies in every State, the representative added :—

"This is a HUDCO promotional activity. The State Government must accept that because it is of 50 : 50 basis. If the State Government comes forward, the HUDCO will definitely do the needful. But we have to induce them."

3.16 The Committee urge the Government to examine the possibility of associating HUDCO with their rural housing schemes for proper screening and implementation of the Schemes and also induce the State Governments to make use of HUDCO's promotional activities in their respective States.

C. Assistance through Financial Institutions

3.17 When asked what efforts had been made by the Union Government/State Governments to mobilise adequate financial, physical, human and institutional resources necessary for implementing the scheme, the Committee have been informed in a written note by the Ministry of Urban Development that since the scheme was in the State sector it was for the State

Government to mobilise adequate financial, physical, human and institutional resources. However, the Union Government through HUDCO provided financial back-up in the form of loan to the State agencies through NBO and its 12 Regional Rural Wings for technical back-up. The Ministry helped in providing and formulating these schemes.

3.18 The Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development further informed the Committee that :—

“At the Central level also, apart from this scheme, we have the Housing and Urban Development Corporation and 55% of whose funding is for the economically weaker sections and the lower income group. We have also started dialogue with the nationalised banks, LIC and GIC so that they can put in more money for the housing. Loans can be given to the people so that they can construct houses. Apart from that, we have also floated a paper for setting up of a National Housing Bank to look after exclusively for the requirement of financing the housing sector. That matter is still under consideration. The banking sector used to allocate certain amount, as in the case of agricultural finance. But that amount was never disbursed. The reason given by them is, no applications are coming and all that. But the real reason was there was no effort made by anybody. So, we are trying to improve the procedure and persuading them to fulfill the targets, as in the case of agriculture.”

3.19 Regarding HUDCO scheme, the representative of the Ministry of Urban Development informed the Committee during the evidence :—

“48 schemes have been done at a project cost of Rs. 492 crores, Rs. 235.33 crores loan from HUDCO. Dwellings sanctioned will produce 1.35 million houses. HUDCO was given 50% of Rs. 6,000 so far. So far the ceiling limit in rural area was Rs. 6,000. Some State Governments say that Rs. 6,000 is not adequate. Now we have revised the guidelines. Even we are extending all the urban housing schemes, although the pressure is on economically weaker sections. It will not debar rural areas from taking benefit of other housing schemes also. There are two schemes. One is EWS-I. That will be upto Rs. 6,000. The rate of interest is 6%. The other scheme is for others and is upto Rs. 10,000. The difficulty is, the bank finances for SC and ST at 5% interest. But for non-SCs, it is at commercial rate. It comes to 11% or 12% which is very high and which is not well within the rural housing scheme.”

3.20 Asked whether taking the guidance of the voluntary agencies, apart from HUDCO had ever been considered, the Committee have been informed during the evidence :—

"In Kerala, for the next Plan, this would be in collaboration with voluntary agencies and HUDCO. But it depends on State Governments' reactions in different States. In Kerala, one million houses are to be built by and large by voluntary organisations with people's participation. Even the stones and bricks are being manufactured by them. That is a very good example of voluntary housing scheme."

3.21 The Committee note that HUDCO is promoting the construction of houses for rural landless labour by providing 50% of Rs. 6,000 which has been taken as anticipated cost of a rural house. The Committee are, however, distressed to note that the performance of banking sector in the field of rural housing is far from satisfactory. The Committee do not agree that the banks are not receiving applications for loans from the beneficiaries. The Committee understand that wide publicity, as necessary, has not been given to loan programmes of the Banks. The interest being charged at the commercial rate of 11% to 12% for the loans is also not conducive to construction activities of weaker section of the society. The Committee feel that like Kerala State, other States/UTs should consider collaborating with voluntary agencies and HUDCO for rural housing. The Committee appreciate the proposal put forward for the setting up of a National Housing Bank for financing the housing sector and recommend that Government do finalise it at the earliest.

D. Subsidy

3.22 In a written note the Committee have been informed that during the Sixth Five Year Plan the level of subsidy in the scheme was Rs. 250 per family for provision of free house sites which could be utilised for land acquisition, site development etc. A sum of Rs. 500 was given as construction assistance to 25% of the same beneficiaries. A total of Rs. 353.50 crores had been earmarked under the Minimum Needs Programme in the Sixth Five Year Plan to provide house sites to 68 lakh families and construction assistance to 36 lakh families. (Rs. 170 crores for house sites and Rs. 183.50 crores for construction assistance.)

The Ministry have further stated that level of subsidy which was envisaged during the Sixth Five Year Plan was not adequate and on the basis of representations received from the States/UTs, the Working Group on Housing for the Seventh Five Year Plan considered the matter in depth. Expert Organisations like National Building Organisation and Housing and

Urban Development Corporation were on the Working Group which made the recommendations. The Planning Commission fixed the following norms for the Seventh Five Year Plan :—

House-sites	— Rs. 500.00
Construction Assistance	--- Rs. 2,000.00

3.23 Regarding the level of assistance the Committee have been informed by the Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development as under :—

“This was based only on certain *ad hoc* calculation. A site not exceeding 100 Sq. yds. was to be given. Necessary levelling etc. has to be done. At that time it was felt that considering the cost of acquisition and land prices being cheaper in rural areas, this would suffice. On an average this was worked out. Levelling may take about Rs. 20 or 25 and there may be other items. Drainage may be for Rs. 70 *per capita*.”

3.24 The representative of the Ministry added during the evidence that :—

“.....Rs. 5,000 per acre is the lowest acquisition cost. Government land/Gram Sabha land has become scarce. In the 7th Plan we have programme for acquisition of site; there has to be levelling of plots, paving of streets and drainage. If you take paving of streets and drainage, the excess would come to Rs. 350 to Rs. 400 or so. So, Rs. 5,000 per acre is the minimum. Drinking water facility has to be there. Planning Commission stepped up to Rs. 500 per site which is inadequate. Rs. 1,250 would be a good amount if the resources of the country would permit it. But they do not permit it.”

3.25 The representative of the Ministry substantiated his point saying that even the construction assistance by HUDCO was proving inadequate. Hilly States and some of the coastal States also felt that it was inadequate.

3.26 When asked about any research done on low-cost housing, the Director, N.B.O. informed the Committee during the evidence that the Ministry of Urban Development with the help of the National Building Organisation, had set-up 12 Regional Centres for Research, training and extension.

3.27 On being asked if a beneficiary could construct a house with Rs. 2,000, the Director, National Building Organisation informed the Committee during the evidence as follows :—

“With the range of space provided and other facilities given, we are putting up a cluster of 20 demonstration houses depending upon geo-climatic conditions in the country. Lot of local materials

can be used. We have said, the cost will work out to so much. Within a range, it will work out to Rs. 2,000 to Rs. 6,000. We have constructed 50 clusters in all parts of the country including Mizoram, Assam, U.P., etc. Minimum size is 20 sq. mtrs. There should be one room; there should be space for cooking; also space for sanitary latrine etc."

3.28 It has been stated in a publications Implementation of the Rural House sites-cum-construction Assistance Scheme for the Landless Workers in Sixth Five Year Plan broughtout by the Ministry that "it is quite likely that in terms of conventional housing the amount may be found to be inadequate. If, however, the concept of incremental housing is accepted as essential in such cases, it should be possible for the States to provide shelter within this amount, which in fact is even at present practised in some States. It is important to ensure that the loan component is affordable by the beneficiaries as otherwise he may not be able to take advantage of the scheme and become a defaulter soon after construction. Hence in modifying the scheme the linkage between affordability and construction cost has to be accepted. The proposed scheme is a departure from the existing scheme envisaged in the Plan or from those that are being implemented in the States, and seek to augment the level of subsidy and link it with institutional finance. This proposal is now under consideration of the Planning Commission. Pending a decision on this new scheme, the possibility of confining the existing subsidy with institutional finance (mainly HUDCO) can be considered provided the target group is in a position to repay the loan."

3.29 The Committee note the work being done by National Building Organisation in the field of construction of cheap houses. They are happy that the Ministry of Urban Development with the help of the National Building Organisation, has set up 12 Regional Centres for research, training and extension. The Committee feel that through research, suitable designs of low cost houses which ensure economy in space utilisation and functional efficiency should be evolved for different climatic conditions with the use of locally available building materials and skills, while ensuring more durable and economical construction by adoption of improved construction technology.

3.30 The Committee note that the quantum of subsidy being provided to the beneficiaries has been found inadequate and if the concept of incremental housing is accepted as essential then it should be possible for the States to provide shelter within this amount. The Committee also note that the proposal of augmenting the level of subsidy and linking it with institutional finance has been under consideration of the Planning Commission. The Committee would like the Ministry to apprise them of the decision taken by the Planning Commission in the matter.

CHAPTER IV

IMPLEMENTATION

A. Targets and Achievements

4.1 The following table indicates the physical targets laid down for each State/Union Territory in respect of allotment of house sites to rural landless labour and the achievements made by them since the inception of the scheme in 1971 till March, 1985 :

States/UTs.	Total No. of eligible families as estimated by		No. of families allotted house sites
	Planning Commission	State Govts.	
1	2	3	4
1. Andhra Pradesh	19,60,000	21,33,000	23,99,726
2. Assam	2,80,000	2,37,607	1,30,754
3. Bihar	24,00,000	2,91,000	75,987
			7,30,000(i)
4. Gujarat	6,10,000	7,54,448	8,17,570
5. Haryana	3,20,000	2,47,601	2,95,090
6. Himachal Pradesh	Neg.	5,304	5,288
7. Jammu & Kashmir	20,000	20,120	7,426
8. Karnataka	12,00,000	11,88,234	12,67,796
9. Kerala	3,20,000	2,20,000	62,944
10. Madhya Pradesh	11,10,000	9,13,037	8,96,512
11. Maharashtra	4,50,000	4,97,547	5,01,950
12. Orissa	5,10,000	5,00,000	3,17,197
13. Punjab	3,50,000	2,94,930	2,94,930
14. Rajasthan	10,40,000	10,50,000	11,96,947
15. Tamil Nadu	18,40,000	19,40,000	18,56,408
16. Tripura	50,000	42,650	54,071
17. Uttar Pradesh	16,10,000	16,10,000	17,95,332
18. West Bengal	3,40,000	3,16,393	3,09,446
UTs.			
1. A. & N. Islands	10,000	5,000	4,855
2. D. & N. Haveli	Neg.	1,035	867
3. Delhi	10,000	28,888	26,536
4. Goa, Daman & Diu	10,000	1,596	4,522
5. Lakshadweep	—	—	—20
6. Pondicherry	10,000	15,213	20,399
TOTAL	1,45,30,000	1,22,14,103	1,30,72,573

(i) By way of regularisation of encroachments under Home-stead Tenancy Act.

Sixth Five Year Plan targets and achievements as on 31-3-1985 are :

States/UTs.	House Sites			Construction		Assistance
	Target	Achievement	%age	Target	Achievement	%age.
1. Andhra Pradesh .	11,10,000	15,49,726	139.61	4,90,000	5,27,318	107.61
2. Assam	2,30,000	81,698	35.52	70,000	56,713	81.01
3. Bihar	16,80,000	85,987	5.11	6,00,000	40,777	6.80
4. Gujarat	2,00,000	4,07,370	203.78	1,53,000	1,68,010	109.81
5. Haryana	1,20,000	95,090	79.24	80,000	10,563	13.20
6. Himachal Pradesh	—	739	—	—	747	—
7. Jammu & Kashmir	10,000	2,151	21.51	5,000	2,174	43.48
8. Karnataka	3,50,000	4,17,796	119.37	3,00,000	2,92,568	97.52
9. Kerala	2,70,000	22,641	8.38	90,000	10,102	11.22
10. Madhya Pradesh	3,50,000	1,36,512	39.00	2,78,000	1,92,711	69.52
11. Maharashtra	90,000	1,77,362	197.06	1,13,000	1,36,358	120.67
12. Orissa	3,20,000	1,27,127	39.74	1,28,000	16,396	12.81
13. Punjab	60,000	4,930	8.22	88,000	27,863	31.66
14. Rajasthan	1,90,000	3,46,201	182.21	2,35,000	1,22,634	52.18
15. Sikkim	—	—	—	—	60	—
16. Tamil Nadu	13,20,000	13,27,408	100.56	4,60,000	1,59,900	34.76
17. Tripura	20,000	24,071	120.35	13,000	16,597	127.66
18. Uttar Pradesh	3,70,000	5,55,332	150.08	4,03,000	59,055	14.63
19. West Bengal	60,000	40,401	67.33	85,000	57,658	67.83
UTs.						
1. A. & N. Island	—	3,855	—	—	1,020	—
2. D. & N. Haveli	—	173	—	—	955	—
3. Delhi	10,000	14,540	145.40	3,000	2,699	89.96
4. Goa, Daman & Diu	—	3,522	—	—	1,121	—
5. Lakshadweep	—	20	—	—	—	—
6. Pondicherry	10,000	8,587	85.87	3,000	9,520	317.33
TOTAL :	67,70,000	54,33,509	80.25	35,97,000	19,13,519	53.20

4.2 According to the Planning Commission, the estimated number of eligible landless families in rural areas was 14.5 million by 1985. Based on the Plan objective of providing house sites to all the eligible landless families and construction assistance to 25 per cent of them, the 6th Plan target had been fixed (6.8 million to be covered under house site in addition to 7.7 million already covered prior to the commencement of the Plan and 3.6 million to be covered under the construction assistance scheme). However, the estimates of the State Governments indicated a lower figure (12.2 million).

4.3 Regarding Sixth Five Year Plan targets and achievements, the representative of Ministry of Urban Development stated in his evidence before the Committee :

"For house-site the target was 68 lakhs and the achievement was 54.33 lakhs. The percentage is 80.25. . . . For construction assistance 36 lakhs was the target and the achievement was 19.13 lakhs. The percentage is 53.20."

4.4 When asked about the position of implementation of the scheme in the Union territory of Andaman and Nicobar Islands, the representative of the Ministry stated :

"The latest figure is that of 1984-85, for Andaman Islands 0.50 lakhs was the outlay. 1500 house sites was the target and the achievement was 1305. Percentage of achievement was 87%. The target for construction assistance was 150 the achievement was 84 and percentage of achievement was 56%."

4.5 When asked that the information was based on the report received and whether it was factually correct or not, the representative stated "we go by the reports we receive." When asked in certain cases the figures given were not correct and actually physical possession had not been given and that certain sites offered had not been actually developed, (e.g. being on hill slopes) and how could the beneficiaries built houses there, the representative stated :

"When we receive any complaint, we send them (complaints) to the concerned State Government."

4.6 When asked to clarify the position about Union territories which are directly under the Ministry, he stated :

"We presume that the information given by the State and Union territories administration is correct unless the contrary comes to our notice. Now, in this case we take note of the hon. Member's statement and we would try to cross-check and have discussion with the officers there."

4.7 The Committee note that some States e.g. Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, U.P. have done well and exceeded the target fixed for allocations of house-sites during the period 1971—1985, but regret that States like Bihar, J & K, Kerala, Orissa and Punjab have not shown the necessary interest in the execution of the 'Housing for Landless Rural Labour' scheme and are lagging behind the targets fixed. While the Committee realise that the implementation of the scheme is the responsibility of the State Governments, they feel that the poor progress in the implementation of the scheme by the States/Uts is

partly due to lack of interest and effective follow up measures by the administrative Ministry. The Committee recommend that Ministry should persue the matter vigorously with the States/UTs lagging behind in performance and impress upon them the need to follow the scheme in letter and spirit.

4.8 The Committee are surprised to note that the Ministry of Urban Development had not cared to test-check the correctness of the figures furnished by the States/UTs in respect of implementation of the scheme and instead they are only going by the reports received from them. The Committee deprecate the laxity on the part of the Ministry in not verifying the veracity of the figures furnished even in respect of the Union territory of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands where the Union Government is directly responsible. The Committee would impress upon the Government to take adequate interest to assess the practical working of this social welfare measure.

B. *Pattern of Implementation*

4.9 The Committee have been informed in a note that "since the scheme is in the State Sector, house sites are allotted free of cost to the rural landless workers by the State Government/UTs. However, there is a varied pattern of implementation of the scheme at different levels in States/UTs."

4.10 When asked to elucidate the term 'varied pattern', the Committee have been informed during the evidence as under :

"It is of two kinds. One is the variation in regard to the financial ceilings and the other variation is in regard to the implementing agencies. In regard to the implementing agencies, the State have the freedom. May be certain States have a Housing Board, some may utilise the Block agency or land revenue staff. In regard to the financial variation, the main reason why the financial variations are arising is due to the fact that the ceilings which are there due to financial constraints do not realistically reflect the requirements. If they are realistically fixed, then we can say to each State that this is the uniform pattern and they have to follow this. The total requirement is not taken into consideration. In order to make the scheme effective in the field, the States have to supplement it. Depending on the local situation and resources, which the States have, they vary the pattern. It can only be remedied, if the allocations are made adequately and if their total needs are taken into consideration."

4.11 When asked about the actual content of State finances in regard to the housing, the representative of the Ministry stated during evidence :

"...The quantum is different in respect of various States. Andhra Pradesh was giving Rs. 1000/-, Assam Rs. 1500/-, Gujarat, Rs. 1000/-, Haryana Rs. 1000/-, HP 75% of the construction cost., Orissa Rs. 1500/-, Punjab Rs. 5500/- etc.—Rs. 5000/- is the block grant and Rs. 500 is for construction assistance."

4.12 Asked how it was ensured that the amount given goes to the beneficiary and not to the contractor, the representative added :

"We have been impressing on the States not to get it done through the contractors; they should do it through the Block machinery or Housing Boards."

4.13 When asked what was done in case complaints were received regarding malpractices in the disbursement of the amount, the representative stated that in that case a report was asked for from the concerned State.

4.14 Regarding capability of the existing pattern in achieving the objectives of the programme, the Committee have been informed in a note that the pattern of implementation needed some back-up like central subsidy.

4.15 When asked whether the Ministry had ever examined the manner of implementation of the scheme in various States, the Ministry in a note have stated :

"The Ministry have prepared the basic guidelines which remain unaltered till day except in case sources and norms of financing. Since this scheme is in the State sector and the objective perhaps for transferring the scheme to State sector was to give more freedom to the States/UTs. Therefore, it was never felt that Government of India should get into the domain of the State Governments."

4.16 Regarding having uniformity in the manner of implementation of the scheme all over India, the Committee have been informed that it was not possible to bring about uniformity in the manner of implementation of the scheme all over India, because India is a very big country with different life styles and cultural ethos. The only uniformity which could be introduced was in size of the plot, level of assistance and preference to the highly deprived sections.

4.17 The Committee have been further informed that "it was decided by the Union Government that there would be a regular monitoring of the scheme by the officers of the Ministry of Works and Housing. Hence in

the Ministry of Works and Housing a Monitoring Cell was set up especially for looking after the implementation of the scheme of allotment of rural house sites.

4.18 After the scheme was incorporated in the New 20-Point Programme in 1982 the monitoring efforts of the Ministry were further strengthened. Quite frequently Union Minister for Works & Housing, Deputy Minister and also the Senior Officers of the Ministry visited States and had detailed discussions regarding the implementation of the scheme. In 1984 the indepth review were also conducted at various State Capitals to assess the performance of the scheme."

4.19 In regard to the role of State Governments/U.Ts. for implementation of the scheme the Committee have been informed that "the scheme is being implemented by State Governments and Union territories Administrations. At the outset of the scheme the State Governments were expected to take urgent action to :

- (i) Enact suitable legislation (where this has not already been done) conferring homestead rights on landless workers in rural areas in respect of sites on which their houses/huts stand at present.
- (ii) Utilise available land owned by the State Government of the Gaon Sabha in Villages for providing house sites, free of cost to families of landless workers in rural areas who are not covered by action under (i) above.
- (iii) All administrative expenses will have to be borne by the State Governments from their own resources.
- (iv) The benefits of the scheme will be admissible only to such families of landless workers in rural areas as cannot be given house-sites in terms of the preceding sub-paras.
- (v) The criteria for landless families are :
 - (i) Neither the head of the family nor any of its other members own any land whatsoever (agricultural or otherwise) in the villages/rural areas.
 - (ii) the family depends for its livelihood mainly on the unskilled labour of its members (c.g. landless agricultural workers), and
 - (iii) the members of the family reside in the village, rural area for the major part of the year.

4.20 In October, 1974 the Union Government issued Guidelines to the States/U.Ts. which are as follows :—

- (f) The scheme should be implemented and projects sanctioned by the State Governments, with reference to the provisions of

1. the scheme as introduced by the Central Government. No deviation relaxation of the existing provision of the scheme should be made without prior consent of the Ministry.
- (ii) While sanctioning projects under the scheme the State Governments should adopt a check list to ensure that the projects are properly scrutinised before the sanction is issued.
 - (iii) The State Governments should send this Ministry a copy of the orders issued by them sanctioning each of the project under the scheme, with a view to ensure that all such orders reach this Ministry, the State Governments may number the sanction order serially.
 - (iv) The State Governments should submit to the Ministry of Works & Housing quarterly progress reports separately in respect of (i) and (ii) above."

4.21 In reply to a question, the representative of Ministry of Urban Development informed the Committee that 24 States/U.Ts. as indicated in Annexure VII had enacted a new Law or revised the existing legislation rules conferring homestead rights on landless workers. Regarding the States which had not so far enacted legislation, he informed the Committee as under :—

"The States which have not so far enacted the legislation and which are not listed here are; Assam, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh, Dadra and Nagar Haveli and Mizoram. Now the position is the in case of Assam under the existing land revenue regulation there is a provision for confirmment of the right of land. In case of Meghalaya, Nagaland, Sikkim, Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram, the problem is slightly different because they are under the Sixth Schedule of the Constitution, the administration of land vests in the District Councils and they have a system of Tribal Chieftains and the Tribal Chieftains give the land for cultivation as well as land for home-stead and it is they who distribute the land. So there is no question of any legislation there because the customary rights and law prevail. In regard to only Dadra and Nagar Haveli the information is not complete."

4.22 When asked during evidence whether apart from depending on the statistics furnished by the States which in certain cases was not correct and thus could not be relied upon, what other agency had been developed for watching the implementation of the scheme, the Committee, have been informed :

"As a matter of fact, in regard to the implementation of scheme, wherever we found that the progress was not upto the mark we have personally written to the Chief Secretary concerned drawing his attention to this. We have a small monitoring cell here in the Ministry. But, by and large, because this is a Scheme in the State

Plan, we depend upon the State machinery and though at some stage we had made proposal for having some regional monitoring organisation also under the Ministry but on overall consideration and after consultation with the concerned Ministry and the Planning Commission and the Finance Ministry it was thought that it may not be practicable to have such regional organisations because there are various implications. States may think that it might lead to the undesirable developments."

4.23 When asked whether elected Gram Panchayats were associated with the implementation of the programme, as Gram Sabha were being associated in implementing the anti poverty programmes and there were clear instructions from the Central Government to that effect, the representative of the Ministry stated during evidence :

"We will issue guidelines stating that Gram Panchayats should be associated in the implementation."

4.24 Asked to state the possibility of setting up an exclusive agency for identification of housing sites and to develop them, the representative of Ministry stated before the Committee :

". firstly to have an exclusive central agency for identification of house-sites and the development thereof would be an unwieldy organisation. Secondly it would not be practicable for a central organisation to function because they have to function right at the village level and at the Block level and there it could be only through the instrumentality of the Block people, through the village level worker and so on. Even if we try to set-up a parallel agency, it would be very difficult for them to function for a limited scheme, for rural housing. The other difficulty is, it would not be an economically viable proposition to have an organisation which will only take over the land and develop it. It will not have sufficient resources unless it is subsidised in a large measure. my suggestion would be that at the State level the States might have separate rural Housing Boards, they could very well have their branches right upto Block level depending on their functioning and they can channelise the various assistance given from the Plan and also from HUDCO."

4.25 The Committee are distressed to note that so far the Ministry of Urban Development have not been able to evolve suitable guidelines for proper implementation of the scheme for Landless Rural Labour and collection of data and mostly they depend on the statistics supplied by the State agencies. Even the Ministry have not issued guidelines for associating the elected Gram Panchayats in implementation of the programme which is essential for having people's involvement and participation in the scheme.

The Committee are of the opinion that suitable procedure to test-check the informations supplied by the States should be evolved. The Committee also urge that Government should immediately issue suitable guidelines to States/UTs for involvement of Gram Panchayats in the implementation of the programme.

4.26 The Committee note that the pattern of implementation of the scheme for landless rural labour varies from State to State. The Committee also note that because of the vastness of the country and other geographical considerations it is not possible to attain uniformity in the implementation of the scheme or in having an exclusive agency for identifying and developing the house-sites. The Committee agree that in the circumstances, uniformity in the size of the plot of house and the level of assistance should be maintained. They, however, impress that the highly deprived sections of the society should receive preference in the matter of giving financial assistance and allotment of house-plots.

C. Monitoring

4.27 When asked to state the position of staff in the Monitoring cell set-up in the Ministry of Urban Development, the Committee have been informed during the evidence as follows :

“The monitoring arrangement is this. There is an officer with a cell. There is not arrangement for actual visit to the sites. We do not have a field machinery for the purpose of monitoring.”

4.28 When asked if the staff strength in the cell was sufficient for conducting regular monitoring, the Committee have been informed by the Secretary Ministry of Urban Development as under :

“Our present arrangement for monitoring is not sufficient as it is very rudimentary. If a real effective implementation and supervision is to be done this arrangement has to be suitably strengthened.”

4.29 Regarding indepth review conducted at various State capitals in 1984, the Committee have been informed that :

“as a part of the monitoring, the Ministry of Urban Development (earlier M/O Works and Housing) conducted in-depth reviews of the schemes under new 20-Point Programme at various State capitals. The following in-depth review meetings were conducted from 1984 onwards :—

Review at Shillong on 16—18-1-1984—Assam, Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Sikkim, Tripura, West Bengal and UTs—Arunachal Pradesh and Mizoram.

Review at Bhubaneswar on 31-1-1984—Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and Orissa.

- Review at Jammu on 23—24-1-1984—Jammu and Kashmir.
 Review at Chandigarh on 24-1-1984 (Haryana) —24-1-1984
 —AN (Punjab).
 Review at Madras on 25-6-1984—Tamil Nadu and Kerala.
 Review at Bangalore on 12-9-1984—Karnataka.

4.30 Asked whether any improvement in the implementation of the Scheme has been noticed in the States which were reminded about the tardy progress in their States, the representative of the Ministry of Urban Development has stated in his evidence before the Committee :—

“We had an evaluation done about four districts in Orissa by an independent agency called the Centre for Evaluation Research Planning and Action.....”

4.31 The Centre for Evaluation Research Planning and Action have *inter alia* stated in their study note that “survey reveals that in majority of cases beneficiaries are those who happened to be already in occupation of the land that was given to them.....Systematic identification of prospective beneficiaries is still to be completed..... However in some cases the beneficiaries have neither occupied the house-sites nor shown any anxiety to occupy them.....Keeping this in view rules may be prepared to the effect that where the house-sites are not occupied or construction completed within a period of 6 months or one year from the date of possession ownership in these house-sites shall revert to the State and allotted to other eligible beneficiaries.....Beneficiaries should be able to make do with much less area and surplus land should be utilised to rehabilitate more and more of houseless population.”

4.32 The Committee are surprised to note that the scheme for Landless Rural Labour is being implemented without creating a suitable and proper monitoring cell at the Centre. They also note that a proposal for having some regional monitoring organisation had been dropped due to certain implications. The Committee, further note that the Central Ministry had made certain in-depth studies at the capitals of various States which remained confined to the minutes of the meetings and for want of adequate staff, no proper follow-up action on the findings of the studies could be taken. The Committee recommend that monitoring cell in the Ministry should be suitable strengthened, both qualitatively and quantitatively, at the administrative as well as technical levels, in order to ensure proper monitoring which will effectively improve the implementation of the scheme by the States and UTs in letter and spirit.

4.33 The Committee note that on the behest of the Ministry, the Centre for Evaluation, Research, Planning and Action, New Delhi had evaluated the implementation of scheme in the four districts of Orissa. The Committee are of the considered view that more such evaluations should be conducted in different States and UTs to pinpoint the weak spots in the implementation of the scheme for appropriate remedial action.

CHAPTER V
MISCELLANEOUS
A. Fresh Survey

5.1 Regarding the need for a fresh survey to find out the exact number of landless families yet to be covered, the Committee have been informed in a note that some of the State Governments had already started their survey work. However, it was left to the States/UTs, to decide whether there was any need for survey or not. The Ministry has clarified that survey involved quite a bit financial burden and the Government of India did not finance such activities. However, during the evidence, the representative of the Ministry stated that :

“The need for a housing census is there. We have been asking for this but because of the pressure on the Census Commission we have not been able to have a census of it.”

5.2 When asked if it would be possible to conduct a survey with the help of local bodies like Panchayats, the Committee have been informed during the evidence by the Director, N.B.O. as under :

“As I mentioned earlier, the assessment of housing shortage can only be based on national population census because there is no separate housing census. The second thing is that while considering this, we have to take certain degree of acceptance of a house—pucca house, semi-pucca house, serviceable house, unserviceable house and all that. What we have done is that we have assessed on the basis of the population data of 1981 the shortage in each State and have referred this figure to each of the States and have also sent our officers there to ratify and to request them to examine whether that shortage exists. Because of the geographical situations, the definition of house is different in North—Western region than it is in U.P., Rajasthan or Punjab. So we have written to all the States. Our Officers have also gone to the States. But, as has been pointed out by the Hon. Member, it is a fact that no housing census has been undertaken so far and I think we are trying our best with the help of the national population census.”

5.3 The representative of the Ministry of Urban Development further stated :

“There is a great need of housing census which would bring about data. For the present, as suggested by you, we are having a dialogue with the State Governments on what kind of housing is accep-

table to them. Then we shall identify them. In estimating the shortages, three main factors are taken into consideration. One is the increase in population. Second is the breaking of the joint family system and the third is the obsolescence of houses that is the old houses getting dilapidated and going out of use. Due to natural calamities, thousands of houses are washed away. These are also taken into consideration."

5.4 Asked if the migratory nature of the landless rural labour is also taken into consideration while making an assessment of the needs of the houses, the representative of the Ministry of Urban Development stated in evidence before the Committee :

"As a matter of fact, one of the main guidelines in this scheme is that when the Members of the families of the beneficiaries of the scheme should be residing in the villages of areas for the major part of the year. Subject of course to some variations, the practice is that even if one or two grown up members of the family go to work in the other area, some members continue to live in that accommodation. But there are certain areas where may be the whole family migrates to places where they get work. Similarly in hilly areas, particularly where jhoom cultivation is practised, after three years or so, they go to other areas. These are some of the directives. There is no specific allowance in these projections because the population covered by these operations would be marginal, may be 1% or so of the total population of the country comes under rural households."

5.5 When asked that a fresh survey was urgently needed to indicate the number of families yet to be covered, the representative of the Ministry during the evidence deposed :

"We took it up with the Planning Commission and we wanted a scheme to be included for an All India housing census or a Survey. But there has been no allocation for this purpose with the result that we would have to depend on the State agencies. The State Government have to make an assessment of the requirements in this connection. We have written to the State Governments to make a fresh assessment and update their figures regarding their requirements in the housing sector, particularly for rural housing and rural landless."

5.6 The Committee note that a part of national resources is being invested in the scheme for Housing for Landless Rural Labour. The Committee further note that no proper survey to assess the number of homeless families has been conducted so far and calculation are based more or less on the 1971 or 1981 census figures. The Committee recommend that in order to

ensure that the benefits of the scheme reach the poorest of the poor landless rural people it is essential to identify them on a systematic and continuing basis and with that end in view it is essential that a national housing census in the rural areas is undertaken. The Committee suggest that in order to undertake such a gigantic venture, help of the States and U.Ts. and their local bodies like Panchayats etc. should be sought. While conducting the survey, details of pucca house, semi-pucca house, serviceable house and unserviceable house should be separately enumerated and the migratory nature of the landless rural labour should be taken into account. This will ensure implementation of the scheme in a planned and systematic way.

B. Perspective Plan

5.7 When asked if Government contemplated formulating a total comprehensive perspective plan to provide houses/sites to the landless rural labour within a specified stipulated time frame, the Ministry of Urban Development in a note have informed the Committee as follows :—

"There is a wide gap between the housing requirements and availability of houses. The housing conditions in the country are rather poor. A large number of people either live without any shelter whatsoever or the units are below the lowest possible standards. The objectives of our Five Year Plans have been, therefore, to reduce substantially the number of absolutely shelterless people and to provide conditions for others to improve their housing environment.

Based upon the Census data, the National Buildings Organisation (NBO) estimated the housing inadequacy in the country during 1985. During 1985, the housing shortage was of the order of 24.7 million dwelling units (18.8 million in the rural areas and 5.9 million in the urban areas) keeping in view the following criteria :—

- (a) Every household, urban or rural, should have a housing unit to itself;
- (b) In urban areas, a housing unit may either be pucca or semi-pucca, and
- (c) In rural areas, the housing unit may be pucca, semi-pucca or serviceable kutcha.

On the same basis, it is estimated by 2000 A.D., the housing shortage would be 39.1 million dwelling units (29.8 million in rural areas and 9.3 million in urban areas).

A review of the past performance in the public sector as well as the private sector housing investment makes it clear that country's

housing problems, both rural as well as urban, cannot be solved in one plan period. Keeping in view the projected shortage of housing by 2000 A.D., it should be feasible to catch up with housing requirements of the country if a sustained programme of investment and construction is undertaken over the next 15 years. The housing activities are, therefore, required to be boosted by encouraging private savings, extension and fiscal incentives, liberalisation of bank finance, etc. In the public sector, Plan funds are no doubt the main source of finance to State Government's/UTs. HUDCO's role in providing housing finance has been quite effective. It has been observed that HUDCO is already prepared to finance well-conceived housing programmes including rural housing programmes."

5.8 The Secretary of Ministry of Urban Development further informed the Committee during the evidence that, "as a matter of fact, our perspective has been that from the very beginning we have been planning over a time span of 15 years or so. And apart from that, we have also accepted the U.N. Assembly Resolution relating to the International Year of the Shelter for Homeless 1987 (I.Y.S.H.). But the objective is that by the end of this century, there should not be any person without one housing unit of a reasonable quality. This is the 15 year framework in which we have to work."

5.9 The Committee are happy to note that the Government have accepted the U.N. Assembly Resolution for observing 1987 as International Year of the Shelter for the Homeless, and feel that as a befitting response the Government should give an impetus to the scheme of housing for landless rural labour by accelerating the pace of implementation of the scheme with the end in view that by the turn of century there does not remain a single rural landless family shelterless. The Committee are of the opinion that direct involvement of the beneficiaries with the implementation of the programme is a condition precedent in making the scheme a success and ensuring that the benefits of the scheme flow only to the right persons. The Committee would also like to emphasise the importance of constructing houses in clusters where common facilities like water supply, approach road, sanitary facilities could be economically provided and houses so located that they are near the place of work of the labour.

C. Cooperative House Building Societies

5.10 In a note on Cooperative House Building Societies, the Committee have been informed by the Ministry of Urban Development that :

"The importance of co-operative activity in the field of housing is well recognised in all the countries. The main advantage of promoting housing through cooperative efforts lies in pooling the savings of the persons even in the lowest categories, raising resources through financial institutions on their collective security and collective development of land and construction of housing thereby reducing the cost of construction and creating livable and pleasant environment in human settlements. Housing cooperatives are also efficient agencies for providing utility services at economical cost ensuring efficient architectural planning to achieve economical space utilisation in designing dwellings by getting services of competent architects, planners and engineers.

The Apex Housing Cooperative Societies are charged with the responsibility of financing the primary housing cooperatives and also to provide general guidance and advice in administrative, technical, financial and legal matters. The Apex Cooperative Housing Finance Societies are, at present, operating in Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, J&K, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Manipur, Punjab, Orissa, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal, Meghalaya and in the Union Territories of Goa, Daman and Diu and Delhi. There are now about 37,000 primary cooperative housing societies in the country.

A National Cooperative Housing Federation was registered in 1969. Its headquarters are in Delhi. This Federation represents the Cooperative Housing movement in the country and has got affiliated to it most of the State level Apex Societies.

By and large, the cooperative housing Societies in the country depend on their share capital, loans available from the State Governments. Members' contribution and the loans from LIC and HUDCO.

It may, however, be added that the administrative control over the National Cooperative Housing Federation (the National level organisation of cooperative housing assistance) has been transferred from the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation to the Ministry of Urban Development. This is being done so that the activities of cooperative sector come under direct and effective supervision of the Ministry of Urban Development. Which is the nodal Ministry of Housing."

5.11 When asked to state the working of the cooperative housing schemes in rural areas, the Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development stated in the evidence before the Committee :

“.....Uptill now, cooperative housing as a subject was not with the Housing Ministry; it was with the Ministry of Agriculture. Only recently on our persistent request, it is proposed to transfer cooperative housing to the Ministry of Urban Development. Another thing is this. What we are proposing now is, on the same pattern as in the case of agricultural cooperatives where money is being given, similarly for housing cooperatives also there should be a flow and a channel of funding. All those ideas, we are trying to work out in consultation with banks.”

5.12 The Committee note that the administrative control over the National Cooperative Housing Federation has been transferred from the Ministry of Agriculture to the Ministry of Urban Development. This arrangement, the Committee are sure, will result in better and effective implementation of various housing schemes. The Committee recommend that Ministry should ensure adequate flow of funds for rural housing through the housing cooperatives in the field of housing for landless rural labour.

D. National Policy

5.13 In a note on “National Policy” submitted by the Ministry of Urban Development, the Committee have been informed that the “National Policy” for providing housing to the landless labour was first formulated in 1971 in the Ministry of Works & Housing (now M/o Urban Development). The scheme aimed to provide house sites to landless agricultural labour free of cost with a view to ameliorating the lot of the rural poor. Under this scheme, 100% grant assistance was provided to the State Govts./UT Administrations. The scheme remained in Central sector upto the end of 4th Five Year Plan and transferred to the State sector with effect from 1-4-74 on the recommendations of National Development Council. It was also included in the Minimum Needs Programme, funds for which are specifically earmarked by the Planning Commission in the Annual Plan outlays of the States/UT Administrations.

Originally, the scheme was intended to benefit landless agricultural workers, who did not own any land whatsoever, agricultural or otherwise, in the rural areas. Subsequently, the scheme was extended to the rural artisans.

The latest housing policy is reflected in the Seventh Five Year Plan document, which also provides allotment of house sites and construction assistance norms. The salient feature of the scheme remains unchanged except the norms of financing.”

5.14 When asked during the evidence if the Ministry has formulated any National Policy for providing houses to the landless labour, the Secretary, Ministry of Urban Development informed the Committee as under :

“Apart from whatever has been stated in the Seventh Plan, we do not have anything. This is also a question which is being discussed, whether we should have a National Housing Policy like the Industrial Policy or Textile Policy or Education Policy. But so far this has not materialised, and we are guided by whatever is stated in the Seventh Plan document in this connection.”

5.15 The Committee feel concerned to note that Government have not yet conceived a National Housing Policy. The Committee feel that the time has come when Government should give a serious thought and evolve a ‘National Housing Policy’ without further loss of time for planned development of livable human settlements keeping in view the basic requirements and need for having pleasant environment. The Policy should be explicit about the time schedule for achieving the set target.

NEW DELHI;

April 21, 1986

Vaishakha 1, 1908 (S)

CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI

Chairman

Estimates Committee

APPENDICS

APPENDIX

Statement of Recommendations/Observations

Sl. No.	Para No.	Recommendations/Observations
1	2	3
1.	1.10	<p>The Committee note that rural house scheme in India, was not included as a separate item as a Plan scheme in the First Five Year Plan but rural housing, as a part of the Community Development Programme, did receive some attention during the First Plan period. The Committee regret to note that no detailed survey had been conducted before the formulation of the scheme to find out the magnitude of the rural housing problem. The Committee are constrained to note that during the last three decades of planning the Government has not taken the problem of providing houses to landless rural labour with the importance it deserves, although the Committee in their earlier Reports in 1967-68 and 1972-73 had drawn attention to the unsatisfactory performance of the Village Housing Scheme during the earlier Five Year Plans and the apathy of the State Governments towards the Scheme. The Committee, are of the view that an important social welfare scheme like the rural housing scheme which effects a vast majority of the poorest section of the population should have been prepared after a careful and realistic assessment of the needs of the rural people of the country and not without making any detailed survey. The result is that much valuable time was lost on account of not tackling the problem on a scientific and practicable basis and the cost escalations during the last three decades have made the task of the poor in putting up a shelter over the piece of land given to them much more difficult. All concerned have to take a lesson from this if things are not be allowed to go awry in future in matters which cover millions of the poorest of the poor in the country.</p>
2.	1.13	<p>The Committee note that on the basis of 1971 population census, the Planning Commission had projected the requirement of housing for landless rural labour as 145 lakhs by 1985 while on the basis of 1981 population census the National Buildings Organisation had estimated it as 188 lakhs. Making allowance for increase in landless labour force consequent upon increase in population and adding the other landless workers in the rural area e.g. artisans and fishermen who are an inseparable part of the village community, the projection would be much higher. The Committee fail to understand that when N.B.O. could project the</p>

1	2	3
		<p>requirement on the basis of 1981 census why the Ministry could not collect the realistic data on that basis and make projections accordingly. This shows glaringly the continued apathy and lack of zeal on the part of the Ministry towards the scheme. The Committee, need hardly emphasise that only urgent and concerted multipronged result oriented steps can solve the rural housing problem. The Committee feel that in order to fulfil this social obligation, mobilisation of financial, physical, human and institutional resources is called for on a priority basis with a time bound programme.</p>

3. 1:18 The Committee note that during the 1st Five Year Plan there was no specific scheme for rural housing in the country. However, the Second Five Year Plan envisaged a rural housing scheme called "Village Housing Project Scheme" and an allocation of Rs. 10 crores was made. Again during the 3rd Plan (1961-65), Annual Plans 1966-69 and the 4th Plan 1969-74, an amount of Rs. 12.70 crores, Rs. 3.19 crores and Rs. 5.25 crores respectively was allocated for rural housing. The Committee fell concerned by low priority given and the low provision made in the Plans for rural housing. What pains the Committee more is that even these low allocations were not fully utilised and only Rs. 3.7 crores were spent in the Second Plan as against allocation of Rs. 10 crores. Likewise, during the 3rd Plan only Rs. 4.22 crores were spent as against Rs. 12.7 crores. During the Annual Plans, as against Rs. 3.19 crores only Rs. 2.56 crores were spent. In the 4th Plan, the expenditure was Rs. 4.27 crores against an allocation of Rs. 5.25 crores. The Committee are distressed to find a continuing trend of according a very low priority to the rural housing schemes and still a lower priority to its implementation. Although the rural housing was recognised as a "social measure of vital importance" in 1968 yet the magnitude of the rural housing problem was not realistically assessed and projected in the subsequent Five Year Plans. The Committee are surprised to note that while preparing the 7th Plan Document, census figures of 1971 were depended upon although the latest census figures of 1981 were available for quite some time. The Committee can clearly perceive the lack of interest on the part of the Planners towards the rural housing despite the declared national policy of the Government to accord high priority to rural housing, the Committee are of the view that housing for the rural poor, which is a basic human necessity, should be accorded appropriate high priority by the Planning Commission.

- | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|----|------|---|
| 4. | 2.6 | <p>The Committee note that scheme for providing houses to the landless agricultural labour was transferred to the State Sector as a result of the decision taken by the National Development Council in its meeting held in December, 1973. They also note that upto 31-3-1974, when the scheme was under the Central Sector, 8,85,502 house sites were allotted to the landless rural workers by the States/ Union territories where as from 1-4-1974, when the scheme was transferred to the State Sector, and upto 31-3-1985, the number of house sites allotted by the various States/Union territories was 4,21,87,071. The Committee agree that there is need for learning from the past experience and gearing up the implementation and follow up efforts. Apart from allotting house sites, there is also need for providing other basic minimum needs like drinking water, roads etc., if it is to be ensured that landless rural poor get the best benefit of the land given to them and are not tempted to part with it due to non-availability of drinking water and other basic amenities. The Committee hope that the State Governments would be persuaded to share their responsibility towards this social obligation earnestly and to implement the scheme expeditiously and vigorously in their respective States. The Committee recommend that States should be asked to ensure that funds provided for housing schemes in the annual Plans are not diverted to any other development projects.</p> |
| 5. | 2.7 | <p>During their visit to fishermen colonies at Neorodithorai-Muttam and Malamidalam in Kanyakumari District of Tamil Nadu the Committee found that in most of the colonies infrastructural facilities like drinking water etc. had not been provided. The Committee noted that at Neorodithorai Muttam and Malamidalam the fishermen lived in thatched huts of their own which apart from being insufficient to provide them housing facilities could not face the vagaries of weather in some cases the land allotted was not developed for putting up any construction. The Committee recommend that the matter may be taken up with State/U.T. government so that a Committee consisting of local M.P., M.L.A., Municipal Councillor and Sarpanch of Panchayat is formed to sort out the difficulties of beneficiaries and to advise the State/U.T. Government in identifying the land for allotment to beneficiaries which should be developed for putting up construction and for providing them requisite construction assistance and minimum basic infrastructure for drinking water etc.</p> |
| 6. | 2.17 | <p>The Committee are aware that the Ministry of Urban Development has a programme of providing House-sites-cum-Construction Assistance to the Landless Rural Labour including Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes, and the</p> |

- | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-----|------|--|
| | | Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Rural Development) also provides Construction Assistance to the landless Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The Committee felt that for better coordination and implementation of the scheme and also to check the overlapping of funds, the Government should consider the feasibility of entrusting the work relating to administration of both the schemes to one Ministry. |
| 7. | 2.18 | The Committee are in agreement with the view that while allotting house sites to landless workers belonging to different castes, communities and religions it should be ensured that it leads to integration in social and economical spheres of life and does not result in segregation of families belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and that they are suitably interspersed with other families settled in the same locality. |
| 8. | 3.7 | The Committee note that there is a progressive increase in different Five Year Plans in the amounts sanctioned for the housing for landless rural labour. Despite the fact that the amounts spent in the previous Plan was far less than allocated, the allocations were increased. The Committee learn that subsequent instalments of amounts under the scheme of "Housing for Landless Rural Labour" are being released to States/UTs without getting the proper utilisation certificates from them for the previous instalment. The Committee are distressed to note the lack of interest on the part of the Ministry to go into the reasons of non-utilisation of the amount sanctioned under the previous Plans and in just mechanically releasing the subsequent instalments without insisting on any utilisation certificates for the earlier instalment and without knowing whether the amounts have been actually spent for the programme for which it was given. |
| 9. | 3.8 | The Committee agree that the funds for such social-oriented schemes for the landless poor should be released with utmost speed so that the projects in hand are not held up for paucity of funds. At the same time the Committee would expect the Government to go by the normal financial procedures in getting the utilisation certificates before releasing any further instalments and thereby ensuring that money has been actually spent for the purpose for which it was given. |
| 10. | 3.9 | The Committee also recommend that the funds for the Housing for landless rural labour under the Minimum Needs Programme should be routed by the Planning Commission through the Ministry of Urban Development so that the Ministry can exercise better control over their utilisation. |

1	2	3
11.	3.16	The Committee urge the Government to examine the possibility of associating HUDCO with their rural housing schemes for proper screening and implementation of the Schemes and also induce the State Governments to make use of HUDCO's promotional activities in their respective States.
12.	3.21	The Committee note that HUDCO is promoting the construction of houses for rural landless labour by providing 50% of Rs. 6000 which has been taken as anticipated cost of a rural house. The Committee are, however, distressed to note that the performance of banking sector in the field of rural housing is far from satisfactory. The Committee do not agree that the banks are not receiving applications for loans from the beneficiaries. The Committee understand that wide publicity, as necessary, has not been given to loan programmes of the Banks. The interest being charged at the commercial rate of 11% to 12% for the loans is also not conducive to construction activities of weaker section of the society. The Committee feel that like Kerala State, other States/UTs should consider collaborating with voluntary agencies and HUDCO for rural housing. The Committee appreciate the proposal put forward for the setting up of a National Housing Bank for financing the housing sector and recommend that Government do finalise it at the earliest.
13.	3.29	The Committee note the work being done by National Building Organisation in the field of construction of cheap houses. They are happy that the Ministry of Urban Development with the help of the National Building Organisation has set up 12 Regional Centres for research, training and extension. The Committee feel that through research, suitable designs of low cost houses which ensure economy in space utilisation and functional efficiency should be evolved for different climatic conditions with the use of locally available building materials and skills while ensuring more durable and economical construction by adoption of improved construction technology.
14.	3.30	The Committee note that the quantum of subsidy being provided to the beneficiaries has been found inadequate and if the concept of incremental housing is accepted as essential then it should be possible for the States to provide shelter within this amount. The Committee also note that the proposal of augmenting the level of subsidy and linking it with institutional finance has been under consideration of the Planning Commission. The Committee would like to the Ministry to apprise them of the decision taken by the Planning Commission in the matter.

- | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-----|------|---|
| 15. | 4.7 | <p>The Committee note that some States e.g. Andhra Pradesh, Gujarat, Karnataka, Maharashtra, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, U. P. have done well and exceeded the target fixed for allocations of house-sites during the period 1971-1985, but regret that States like Bihar, J & K, Kerala, Orissa and Punjab have not shown the necessary interest in the execution of the 'Housing for Landless Rural Labour' scheme and are lagging behind the targets fixed. While the Committee realise that the implementation of the scheme is the responsibility of the State Governments, they feel that the poor progress in the implementation of the scheme by the States /UTs is partly due to lack of interest and effective follow up measures by the administrative Ministry. The Committee recommend that Ministry should perseue the matter vigorously with the States/UTs lagging behind in performance and impress upon them the need to follow the scheme in letter and spirit.</p> |
| 16. | 4.8 | <p>The Committee are surprised to note that the Ministry of Urban Development had not cared to test-check the correctness of the figures furnished by the States/UTs in respect of implementation of the scheme and instead they are only going by the reports received from them. The Committee deprecate the laxity on the part of the Ministry is not verifying the veracity of the figures furnished even in respect of the Union territory of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands where the Union Government is directly responsible. The Committee would impress upon the Government to take adequate interest to assess the practical working of this social welfare measure.</p> |
| 17. | 4.25 | <p>The Committee are distressed to note that so far the Ministry of Urban Development have not been able to evolve suitable guidelines for proper implementation of the scheme for Landless Rural Labour and collection of data and mostly they depend on the statistics supplied by the State agencies. Even the Ministry have not issued guidelines for associating the elected Gram Panchayats in implementation of the programme which is essential for having people's involvement and participation in the scheme. The Committee are of the opinion that suitable procedure to test-check the informations supplied by the States should be evolved. The Committee also urge that Government should immediately issue suitable guidelines to States/UTs for involvement of Gram Panchayats in the implementation of the programme.</p> |
| 18. | 4.26 | <p>The Committee note that the pattern of implementation of the scheme for landless rural labour varies from State to State. The Committee also note that because of the vastness of the country and other geographical considera-</p> |

- | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|-----|------|--|
| | | tions it is not possible to attain uniformity in the implementation of the scheme or in having an exclusive agency for identifying and developing the house-sites. The Committee agree that in the circumstances, uniformity in the size of the plot of house and the level of assistance should be maintained. They, however, impress that the highly deprived sections of the society should receive preference in the matter of giving financial assistance and allotment of house-plots. |
| 19. | 4.32 | The Committee are surprised to note that the scheme for Landless Rural Labour is being implemented without creating a suitable and proper monitoring cell at the Centre. They also note that a proposal for having some regional monitoring organisation had been dropped due to certain implications. The Committee, further note that the Central Ministry had made certain in-depth studies at the capitals of various States which remained confined to the minutes of the meetings and for want of adequate staff, no proper follow-up action on the findings of the studies could be taken. The Committee recommend that the monitoring cell in the Ministry should be suitably strengthened, both qualitatively and quantitatively, at the administrative as well as technical levels, in order to ensure proper monitoring which will effectively improve the implementation of the scheme by the States and UTs in letter and spirit. |
| 20. | 4.33 | The Committee note that on the behest of the Ministry, the Centre for Evaluation, Research, Planning and Action, New Delhi had evaluated the implementation of scheme in the four districts of Orissa. The Committee are of the considered view that more such evaluations should be conducted in different States and UTs to pinpoint the weak spots in the implementation of the scheme for appropriate remedial action. |
| 21. | 5.6 | The Committee note that a part of national resources is being invested in the scheme for Housing for Landless Rural Labour. The Committee further note that no proper survey to assess the number of homeless families has been conducted so far and calculation are based more or less on the 1971 or 1981 census figures. The Committee recommend that in order to ensure that the benefits of the scheme reach the poorest of the poor landless rural people it is essential to identify them on a systematic and continuing basis and with that end in view it is essential that a national housing census in the rural areas is undertaken. The Committee suggest that in order to undertake such a gigantic venture, help of the States and U.Ts and their local bodies like Panchayats etc. should be sought. While conducting the survey, details of pucca house, semi-pucca |

-
- | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|
|---|---|---|
-
- house, serviceable house and unserviceable house should be separately enumerated and the migratory nature of the landless rural labour should be taken into account. This will ensure implementation of the scheme in a planned and systematic way.
22. 5.9 The Committee are happy to note that the Government have accepted the U. N. Assembly Resolution for observing 1987 as International year of the Shelter for the Homeless, and feel that as a befitting response the Government should give an impetus to the scheme of housing for landless rural labour by accelerating the pace of implementation of the scheme with the end in view that by the turn of century there does not remain a single rural landless family shelterless. The Committee are of the opinion that direct involvement of the beneficiaries with the implementation of the programme is a condition precedent in making the scheme a success and ensuring that the benefits of the scheme flow only to the right persons. The Committee would also like to emphasise the importance of constructing houses, in clusters where common facilities like water supply, approach road, sanitary facilities could be economically provided and houses so located that they are near the place of work of the labour.
23. 5.12 The Committee note that the administrative control over the National Cooperative Housing Federation has been transferred from the Ministry of Agriculture to the Ministry of Urban Development. This arrangement, the Committee are sure, will result in better and effective implementation of various housing schemes. The Committee recommend that Ministry should ensure adequate flow of funds for rural housing through the housing cooperatives in the field of housing for landless rural labour.
24. 5.15 The Committee feel concerned to note that Government have not yet conceived a National Housing Policy. The Committee feel that the time has come when Government should give a serious thought and evolve a 'National Housing Policy' without further loss of time for planned development of livable human settlements keeping in view the basic requirements and need for having pleasant environment. The Policy should be explicit about the time schedule for achieving the set target.
-

ANNEXURES I TO VII

55--56

ANNEXURE I

Statement Indicating information regarding Allotment of house sites to Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes under house sites-cum-construction Assistance scheme during Sixth Five year Plan Period—Year-wise.

(Para 2.8)

States/UTs.	Allotment of house sites during													
	1980-81		1981-82			1982-83			1983-84			1984-85		
	SC	ST	SC	ST	SC	ST	SC	ST	SC	ST	SC	ST		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11				
1. Andhra Pradesh	76064	2195	82911	4334	172472	1780	106133	2500	100000	160000				
2. Assam	251	1649	569	1572	160	275	—	4266	—	7467				
3. Bihar	1584	434	4686	1284	2785	252	11344	3300	—	—				
4. Gujarat	8307	9673	26142	14159	23774	27989	Not fixed	—	—	—				
5. Haryana	1753	—	433	—	12286	—	24727	—	8000	—				
6. Himachal Pradesh	—	—	—	—	3206	473	—	—	—	—				
7. Jammu & Kashmir	58	—	34	—	208	—	94	—	—	—		To be kept at the same level of 1983-84.		
8. Karnataka	13435	10142	20003	61	46980	7557	75000	(both)	75000	(both)				
9. Kerala	2379	30	1440	74	1826	90	1288	498	2925	325				
10. Madhya Pradesh	8626	10103	9169	6412	23096	15122	14800	14800	14800	14800				
11. Maharashtra	15877	6025	11046	3752	13471	5548	1420	350	4000	1600				
12. Orissa	2152	2443	3876	2545	3346	3108	2000	(both)	Target has not fixed.					
13. Punjab	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—				
14. Rajasthan	N.A.	—	40000	20000	30681	19395	20062	13452	7186	3394				
15. Tamil Nadu	40462	605	71246	1157	50258	19331	175000	—	NA	NA				

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	40	11
16. Tripura		804	1715	1247	2446	1484	1466	NA	NA	NA	NA
17. Uttar Pradesh		74646	—	88515	1399	6145	433	50240	1545	26464	2944
18. West Bengal		14348	4422	7355	2967	3446	1837	3800	1860	7347	3958
U. Ts.											
1. A & N Islands					—No SC/ST has been declared in this Territory						
2. Dadra & Nagar Haveli		Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	45	—	40	—	50	—
3. Delhi		261	Nil	Nil	—	—	—	500	Nil	1500	—
4. Goa, Daman and Diu		6	—	194	28	68	21	34	—	—	—
5. Pondicherry		117	—	379	—	505	—	500	—	500	—
Total		261330	49436	369545	62190	396182	87279	513982	14011	247772	134470

ANNEXURE II

Statement showing the agencies engaged in the implementation of the scheme in each State/Union Territory.

(Para 2.10)

Sl. No.	State/UT	Name of the agency implementing the Scheme at		
		State level	District level	Local level
1	2	3	4	5
1.	Andhra Pradesh	Social Welfare Deptt.	Dist. Collector	B.D.O.
2.	Assam	Revenue Department	Deputy Commissioners	Sub-Divisional Officers
3.	Bihar	Revenue & Land Reforms Department		
4.	Gujarat	Panchayat & U.D. Deptt.	Distt. Panchayats	Taluka Panchayats
5.	Haryana	Revenue Department	Distt. Collector	B.D.O.
6.	Himachal Pradesh	Revenue Department	Distt. Collector	Supdt. Engineer/Ex. Engr.
7.	Jammu & Kashmir	HUDCO	Distt. Development Commissioner	B.D.O.
8.	Karnataka	Housing & UD Deptt.	Distt. Collector	Taluka Development Board
9.	Kerala	Board of Revenue (Housing)	Distt. Collector	Panchayat & House site Committee
10.	Madhya Pradesh	Revenue Deptt.	Distt. Collector	Distt. Collector
11.	Maharashtra	Revenue & Forest Deptt.	Distt. Collector	Tehsildars
12.	Orissa	Revenue Deptt.	Distt. Collector	B.D.O.
13.	Punjab	Dte. of Housing & Urban Development.	Distt. Collector	B.D.O.
14.	Rajasthan	Rural Dev. & Panchayat Raj Department.	Zilla Parishad	Panchayat Samities
15.	Tamil Nadu	Revenue Deptt. & Social Welfare Deptt.	Distt. Collector	Tehsildars

1	2	3	4	5
16.	Tripura	Revenue Deptt.	Distt. Collector	—
17.	Uttar Pradesh	Revenue Deptt.	Distt. Magistrate	B.D.O.
18.	West Bengal	Panchayat & Community Dev. Deptt.	Distt. Magistrate	B.D.O.
19.	Andaman & Nicobar Islands	Rural Development Officer	—	—
20.	Chandigarh	Director (Panchayats)	B.D.O.	B.D.O.
21.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	Revenue Department	—	—
22.	Delhi	Panchayat Deptt.	Panchayat Secretary/ Panchayats	Pradhan/Inspector
23.	Goa, Daman & Diu	Revenue, Local Admn. & Welfare Deptt.	Distt. Collector	B.D.O.
24.	Pondicherry	Survey of Land Revenue Department	Distt. Collector	B.D.O.

ANNEXURE—III

Statement indicating State-wise allocation for SC/ST Housing under RLEGP

(Para 2·11)

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	States/UTs.	Amount
1.	Andhra Pradesh	982·00
2.	Assam	215·00
3.	Bihar	1417·00
4.	Gujarat	320·00
5.	Haryana	85·00
6.	Himachal Pradesh	60·00
7.	Jammu & Kashmir	74·00
8.	Karnataka	467·00
9.	Kerala	459·00
10.	Madhya Pradesh	725·00
11.	Maharashtra	791·00
12.	Manipur	11·00
13.	Meghalaya	15·00
14.	Nagaland	10·00
15.	Orissa	448·00
16.	Punjab	137·00
17.	Rajasthan	338·00
18.	Sikkim	8·00
19.	Tamil Nadu	887·00
20.	Tripura	33·00
21.	Uttar Pradesh	1697·00
22.	West Bengal	768·00
23.	A. & N. Islands	8·00
24.	Arunachal Pradesh	8·00
25.	Chandigarh	2·00
26.	D. & N. Haveli	4·00
27.	Delhi	4·00
28.	G. D. & Diu	9·00
29.	Lakshadweep	2·00
30.	Mizoram	8·00
31.	Pondicherry	8·00
	Total :	9900·00
	Experimental Rural Housing, Research & Development	100·00
		10000·00

ANNEXURE—IV

Statement showing Funds released under the Scheme for Provision of house sites to Landless Workers in Rural Areas, upto 31st March, 1974.

(Para 3·1)

Sl. No.	Name of State	Central financial Assistance released (Rs. in Lakhs)
1.	Andhra Pradesh	32·78
2.	Bihar	15·71
3.	Gujarat	76·65
4.	Haryana	0·06
5.	Himachal Pradesh	0·38
6.	Karnataka	59·84
7.	Kerala	358·44
8.	Madhya Pradesh	49·91
9.	Maharashtra	41·14
10.	Orissa	2·10 Refunded in March, 1974.
11.	Punjab	16·56
12.	Rajasthan	7·19
13.	Tamil Nadu	56·64
14.	Uttar Pradesh	7·71
15.	West Bengal	4·85
	TOTAL	729·96

ANNEXURE—V

Minimum Needs Programme—Rural house-sites-cum house construction Schemes
(See Para 3.1)

(Rs. in lakhs)

Sl. No.	States/UTs.	Outlay
		1980—85
1.	Andhra Pradesh	7675
2.	Assam	1000
3.	Bihar	1100
4.	Gujarat	3085
5.	Haryana	990
6.	Himachal Pradesh	25
7.	Jammu & Kashmir	100
8.	Karnataka	5500
9.	Kerala	1200
10.	Madhya Pradesh	29900
11.	Maharashtra	3500
12.	Orissa	800
13.	Punjab	1200
14.	Rajasthan	475
15.	Tamil Nadu	2500
16.	Tripura	100
17.	Uttar Pradesh	1800
18.	West Bengal	1200
U.Ts.		
1.	A & N Islands	5
2.	Dadra & Nagar Haveli	10
3.	Delhi	45
4.	Goa, Daman & Diu	50
5.	Pondicherry	90
TOTAL		35350

Source ; Planning Commission.

Note : The Scheme is not in operation in Manipur, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Sikkim & UTs. of Arunachal Pradesh, Lakshadweep & Mizoram. Programme in Chandigarh was not significant.

MINISTRY OF WORKS & HOUSING
MINIMUM NEEDS PROGRAMME—RURAL HOUSE-SITES-CUM HOUSE/HUTS CONSTRUCTION SCHEME

Actual Expenditure from 1974-75 to 1983-84 and Anticipated 1984-85
(in lakhs)

(See Para 3.1)

Sl. No.	States/UTs.	74-75	75-76	76-77	77-78	78-79	79-80	80-81	81-82	82-83	83-84	84-85
1.	Andhra Pradesh	100	217	300	500	—	1100	1269	1388	2727	5800	5800
2.	Assam	12	15	22	15	23	34	35	69	73	234.85*	275*
3.	Bihar	16	30	8	47	—	—	200	208	220	203@	140@
4.	Gujarat	23	24	23	183	176	196	284.58	513	549	716.84*	1021*
5.	Haryana	1	2	27	15	54	61	53	63	77	106	111
6.	Himachal Pradesh	3	3	Neg.	1	—	8	0.22	0.30	0.95	0.45*	0.55*
7.	Jammu & Kashmir	3	5	10	10	10	9	15	20	2.15	5@	10@
8.	Karnataka	—	—	90	540	1067	1577	936	1013	1613	1351	1302
9.	Kerala	206	25	60	110	295	261	533	429	133	327	847
10.	Madhya Pradesh	40	37	65	100	55	27	74	408	454	450	500
11.	Maharashtra	63	292	221	166	3	901	1041	1107	1077	257.70@	266
12.	Manipur	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
13.	Meghalaya	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
14.	Nagaland	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
15.	Orissa	15	29	35	35	15	45	15	50	57	60*	100*
16.	Punjab	30	30	30	150	100	70	170	285	285	311	156
17.	Rajasthan	83	4	34	4	8	25	75	225	75	100	100
18.	Sikkim	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
19.	Tamil Nadu	52	25	67	64	112	150	150	1284	1414	928	1030
20.	Tripura	3	2	3	4	6	1	12	28	38	30	40

21. Uttar Pradesh	23	75	102	60	13	599	300	299	364	253.90	230
22. West Bengal	42	117	140	122	194	210	248	221	225	105.21@	175
UTs.											
1. A & Islands	-	-	-	-	-	-	neg.	neg.	neg.	3*	0.50@
2. Arunachal Pradesh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3. Chandigarh	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4. Delhi	3	-	4	2	28	15.73	13.00	5.00	10.50	15.00	12.00
5. Dadra & Nagar Haveli	-	-	-	-	-	neg.	0.54	4.64	1.50	0.780	1.70@
6. Goa, Daman & Diu	1	1	1	neg.	2.80	1.76	3.00	4.04	6.59	5.00	12.00
7. Lakshadweep	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. Mizoram	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
9. Pondicherry	-	1	19	10	10.00	9.99	9.85	11.33	16.85	21.21@	27.00
TOTAL States/UTs.	719	934	1262	2138	2171.80	5301.48	5437.19	7635.31	9421.54	11284.94	12156.75

Source : Planning Commission.

*As intimated by State Govt. 7th. plan Document.

@As intimated by Planning Commission Annual Plan Statement.

Note : The Scheme is not in operation in Manipur, Meghalaya Nagaland, Sikkim & UTs. of Arunachal Pradesh, Lakshadweep & Mizoram.

ANNEXURE—VII

Name of the States/Union Territories which enacted Legislation or where the Legislation or rules were already existed. (Para 4·21)

1. Andhra Pradesh
2. Bihar
3. Gujarat
4. Haryana
5. Himachal Pradesh
6. Jammu & Kashmir
7. Kerala
8. Madhya Pradesh
9. Maharashtra
10. Karnataka
11. Manipur
12. Orissa
13. Punjab
14. Rajasthan
15. Tamil Nadu
16. Tripura
17. Uttar Pradesh
18. West Bengal
19. Andaman & Nicobar Islands
20. Chandigarh
21. Delhi
22. Goa and Daman & Diu
23. Lakshadweep, Minicoy, Amini Dweep Islands
24. Pondicherry

Note—Information regarding rest of the States/Union Territories not readily available.