

hon. Minister to find out how much delay has occurred. Because of that workers are suffering. So, will the Government nation-wide apply the principle of giving payment the workers who are out of employment because of the pendency of cases in such Tribunals?

[*Translation*]

SHRI RADHA KISHAN MALVIYA: Sir, whenever a case comes up before the court first of all its category is ascertained. If dues of the labour are pending against any management or the employers, 50 percent payment is immediately arranged. Later on, depending upon the decision of the court, full payment is made to him.

[*English*]

Development of Small and Medium Towns in Rajasthan

*933. SHRI VIRDHI CHANDER JAIN: Will the Minister of URBAN DEVELOPMENT be pleased to state:

(a) the number of towns in Rajasthan selected for development under the Scheme for the Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns and the progress made so far;

(b) whether Government propose to select some more towns in Rajasthan, especially in desert areas, during 1989-90; and

(c) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI): (a) to (c) A statement is given below.

STATEMENT

11 towns during VI Plan and 6 towns during VII Plan were taken up in Rajasthan under IDSMT. The names of the towns, the total cost of the projects, the share of the Central assistance and funds released till date are as follows:—

Sl. No.	Name of town	Cost of components approved for Central Assistance	Eligible Central assistance	Funds released till 31.3.89
1	2	3	4	5

(Rupees in lakhs)

6th Plan towns

1.	Pali	127.51	Rs. 40.00 lakhs for	50.18
2.	Baran	129.18	components other	48.14
3.	Bhilwara	117.50	than Low Cost	47.77
4.	Sikar	120.11	Sanitation on match-	49.32
5.	Churu	130.97	ing basis and Rs. 15.00	49.46
6.	Sumerpur	119.47	lakhs for low cost	47.11
7.	Nathdwara	130.11	sanitation provided	47.87
8.	Barmer	96.36	State Government contri-	45.10
9.	Ganganagar	146.50	butes at least	49.32
10.	Jaisalmer	101.00	Rs. 12.00 lakhs.	47.77
11.	Chittorgarh	115.42		50.31

1	2	3	4	5
7th Plan towns				
12.	Jalore	174.72	Rs. 60.00 lakhs on	54.40
13.	Sirohi	153.73	matching basis	48.27
14.	Mt. Abu	150.17	including Rs. 14.00	24.76
15.	Banswara	158.39	lakhs for low cost	49.33
16.	Bhimmal	155.90	sanitation.	44.80
17.	Dongarpur	107.62		24.00

The types of schemes undertaken are Land Acquisition and development for residential schemes, traffic and transportation, markets and mandis, low cost sanitation etc.

There is no proposal at present to include to any more town from Rajasthan under the scheme during the 7th Five Year Plan

[Translation]

SHRI VIRDHI CHANDER JAIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, from the figures of the grants given for development works to Rajasthan under the Scheme for Integrated Development of Small and Medium Towns, one thing is clear that due to non-availability of matching grants, the developments works taken up in the towns remain incomplete and the investment is not proving to be beneficial. In the Sixth Five Year Plan, assistance was given for the development of Barmer, but due to improper utilisation of funds, works are lying incomplete. Many bottle-necks are being faced in the implementation of the Scheme for Small and Medium Towns. I want to know the steps going to be taken by the Government and whether it will give matching grant? Will the Central Government make a provision for the incomplete works?

SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, at the end of the Fifth Five Year Plan, the scheme for the Development of Small and Medium Towns was launched to provide central assistance for development

of towns with a population of upto one lakh with a provision of matching grants to be given by the State Governments. Under the Scheme, if Rs. 40 lakh are provided by the Central Government, matching contribution is to be made by the State Government. However, the difficulty is that the State Governments are not fulfilling their commitment. The Central Government makes available assistance in instalments, but works remain incomplete due to non-availability of matching grants to be given by the State Governments. Initially funds were provided to make viable small town areas, Municipal Boards and small towns through construction of mandis, shops, shopping complexes and through land acquisition and similar other things. In 1983 the decision to include low cost sanitation scheme in it was taken as an urgent need was felt to do so. But due to the problems of land acquisition and non-payment of matching grants by the State Governments, these works remain incomplete. Will the hon. Member give me a single instance of laxity on the part of the Centre? These are the State Governments which are found lacking not we. We give full assistance.

SHRI VIRDHI CHANDER JAIN: Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is clear from the reply that the State Governments fail in contributing matching grants not the Central Government. I would like to know whether there is any system for monitoring through which the State Governments could be compelled to spend the matching amount for completing the incomplete works? What steps do the Central Government propose to take in the

matter?

SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, in my view the hon. Member is himself capable enough to compelling the State Government through talks. We often write to them informing them of the works remaining incomplete. In states, which make timely contribution of matching grants, lot of development works have been completed and now the percentage of urban population is 10.5 per cent. In the Sixth Five Year Plan assistance was given to the States for the development of 235 small towns and in the current plan 124 towns have been selected. Initially, 102 of them were selected and now another 22 towns have been added to the list.

SHRI RAM SINGH YADAV: Mr. Speaker, Sir, from my personal experience I can say that in the Sixth Five Year Plan, 11 towns including Sikar, the constituency of the Hon. Speaker and my own constituency, Barmer were selected. However, the money allocated in the Sixth Five Year Plan was not fully utilised and the money allocated in the Seventh Five Year Plan has also not been fully spent. The hon. Minister herself feels that the State indulging in deficit financing cannot contribute matching grants. Under the circumstances and based on her experience what does she propose to do for the backward towns, especially in Rajasthan? Is she thinking in terms of providing financial assistance?

SHRIMATI MOHSINA KIDWAI: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have already stated that the responsibility of development of small towns rests with the State Governments. For the development of these towns, the Central Government proposed to give 50 per cent assistance and expected matching contribution from the State Governments. In my opinion, the condition of small and medium towns is similar in all the States. It is neither very good nor very bad. The development can be completed only if the State Governments take pains. The Central Government is not in a position to 100 per cent finance for these schemes.

[*English*]

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up the Short Notice Question.

Shri Tulsiram. Not present.

Shri Balasaheb Vikhe Patil.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI BALASAHEB VIKHE PATIL:
S.N.Q. 2

SHRI RAM PYARE PANIKA: Why only epics? This is concerning only epics, not general. Why? (*Interruptions*)

[*Translation*]

MR. SPEAKER: Let him put his question.

SHORT NOTICE QUESTIONS

[*English*]

Effect of Watching EPIC T.V. Serials on Eyes

S.N.Q. 2. **SHRI BALASAHEB VIKHE PATIL†:**
SHRI V. TULSIRAM:

Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government have received any reports that the eyes of the viewers of the epic T.V. serials have been adversely affected;

(b) if so, the details thereof; and

(c) the guidelines issued or proposed to be issued by Government to the general public for the protection of eyes while viewing the telecast of epic serials?