This chapter summaries the main findings of the study, draws some conclusions based on the findings and suggests some policy options for the planners and decision-makers in context of optimizing the benefits from the rural-urban migration and abating the undesirable flow of rural workforce to the towns and cities. It is well recognized from the theoretical and empirical literature on migration that migration has both positive and negative impacts on the migrants, the place of origin and the place of destination. However, migration from one region to another in search of better livelihood options is a general phenomenon in any economy. Workers migrate from the backward regions to the developed regions as they get more income earning opportunities there. The slow growth in agriculture and fast growth of industry and services widen the gap between rural and urban areas and push the rural workforce towards the urban centres of industrialized regions. Expansion of transport and communication facilities coupled with industrialization and economic development have made possible the exodus of large number of people from villages to towns, from towns to other towns and from one rural area to another. Moreover, the policies of economic liberalization and globalization initiated during the last two decades in India have given more impetus to the growth of cities, especially located in the developed states and consequently
more flow of people from rural and urban areas of poorer states to the richer ones. Apart from the natural population growth, rural-urban migration is another critical factor in raising the growth of towns and cities. It influences size, composition and distribution of population. As stated earlier, rural-urban migration is classified into two categories: migration by birth and migration by place of last residence. In this research, migration by place of last residence is considered as it provided valuable information about the internal migration.

This study examines the various aspects of rural-urban migration and identifies trends, dimensions and determinants of rural-urban migration in Uttar Pradesh. The specific objectives of the study are to: analyze the trends in rural–urban migration.; assess the impact of various determining actors on it; examine its composition and dimensions; study the gender and regional patterns of rural-urban migration; examine interrelationship between development and migration; study the main consequences of rural-urban migration; and suggest policy options for controlling unwarranted inflows of rural workforce to urban areas.

The study is mainly based on secondary data collected from population censuses, and statistical abstracts of Government of Uttar Pradesh. District-wise information on migration and the related aspects have been collected for the last two decades for all the districts of the State. The collected data are classified by region, gender and social groups to examine variations in the rural-urban migration across regions and groups. Apart from these, the rural-urban migration is also classified by occupation and level of education. Impact
of various determinants of rural-urban migration has been assessed by applying regression models.

8.1 ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

The thesis comprises eight chapters. Chapter 1 is introductory in nature. It deals with the statement of the problem, scope and importance of the study, terms and concepts, and main features of the economy of Uttar Pradesh. Chapter 2 reviews the earlier studies on migration. The review consists of both theoretical and empirical studies on migration. Based on the review of relevant literature, research gap is identified for carrying out the present study. Chapter 3 is devoted to the methodology which includes, objectives, hypotheses, data sources, tools and techniques and the limitations of the study. Chapter 4 examines trends in rural to urban, rural to rural, urban to rural and urban to urban migration in the State. The trends are based on two population censuses, namely, 1991 and 2001. The analysis of migration data is based on place of last residence criterion. Since, the main focus of the study is on rural-urban migration, the detailed discussion have been made on this stream of migration. Region-wise and gender-wise trends in the rural-urban migration have also been estimated.

Chapter 5 studies various socio-economic, demographic, natural and climatic factors that affect the rural-urban migration. The key determinants are identified thorough regression analysis. The analysis, which covers all the
districts of the state, is based on data collected from 1991 and 2001 population Censuses, with corresponding district-wise data from statistical abstracts of the State Government. Chapter 6 examines the various aspects of rural-urban migration. The chapter is divided into five main sections. The first section explains the economic aspects of rural to urban migration. Next section deals with social dimension of rural–urban migration. It is followed by a section on the demographic aspects of the rural-urban migration. Region-wise and gender-wise detailed analyses of rural-urban migration of workers are made in the fourth section. In the last, various consequences of rural-urban migration are discussed. Chapter 7 examines the relationship between migration and development. Apart from studying the theoretical underpinnings of the relationship, the chapter also discusses the relationship between rural-urban migration and rural development, between rural-urban migration and economic inequality and between rural-urban migration and urban development. Finally, Chapter 8 presents summary of findings of the study; conclusions and policy options.

### 8.2 Major Findings

The major findings of the study are summarized in the following points.

#### 8.2.1 Trends in Rural-urban Migration

- Total internal rural-urban migrants in Uttar Pradesh increased from 33.91 lakhs in 1991 to 40.13 lakhs in 2001, thus, registering a growth
rate of 18.40 percent. More female than male migrants moved at shorter distance. Moreover, over a period of one decade, the percentage of short duration migration has declined.

- Inter-district rural-urban migration has slightly declined in 2001 over 1991. The decline is only due to deceleration in the percentage of female migrants, as percentage of male migrants has increased.

- The percentage of migrants with durations of stay 1-4 years and 5-9 years show deceleration in 2001 when compared to that in 1991. Contrary to this trend, percentages of migrants with duration of stay between 10-19 years and 20+ years have increased in 2001 over 1991.

- About 50 percent of total migrants have long duration stay (more than 10 years). The percentage of such migrants is higher for female than male migrants.

- At the state level, no perceptible change in the rural-urban migration rate (person) is observed between two censuses. However, some variations are observed in case of male and female migration rates. For instance, the migration rate for male declined from 8.09 percent in 1991 to 7.40 percent in 2001, whereas the corresponding rate for female increased slightly from 20.0 percent in 1991 to 20.26 percent in 2001.

- On an average, the rural-urban migration rates have declined in CR, BK and ER in 2001 over 1991; while the rate shows an increase in
the WR. This indicates that during the last one decade, relatively more people from the rural areas migrated to the urban areas of WR.

- Migration rate in the state, based on the last residence elsewhere within the district of enumeration, declined from 7.29 percent in 1991 to 6.98 percent in 2001 for person. In case of male, the rate declined from 4.09 percent to 3.42 percent, while there was no much change in migration rate for female. Except for migration rates for female in BK and ER, in all other regions, these rates were slightly lower in 2001 than 1991. These results again confirm that rural-urban migration as percentage to total urban population does not evince any trend in the State.

- Rural-urban migration rates of workers have significantly increased in 2001 over 1991 in all the regions of the State, while there was not any perceptible increase in these rates of total migrants. This implies that during the last one decade, more workers moved from rural to urban areas than non-workers.

- A region-wise comparison shows that the most backward BK region has the highest migration rate of workers, followed by CR and ER, while the most developed WR has the lowest.

- The gender difference exists in the rural-urban migration rate of workers. The migration rates of female workers are much higher than male workers. It is mainly due to the lower work participation rate of females than males.
- Short distance migration rate of workers (based on last residence elsewhere in the district of enumeration) has increased in 2001 over 1991. It is found highest in BK, followed by CR and ER and lowest in WR.

- Total domestic rural to rural migrants (based on last residence elsewhere in India) increased from 220.39 lakhs in 1991 to 273.78 lakhs in 2001, thus, registering a growth rate of 16.43 percent. However, over a period of one decade, rural to rural migration of males has declined while for females, it has increased.

- Inter-state rural to rural migration of male workers has increased in 2001 over 1991, whereas it has declined for female migrants. Contrary to this, intra-state rural to rural migration of females has increased in 2001 when compared to that of 1991.

- Short distance rural to rural migration was higher for females than males. Further, it decelerated from 71.07 percent in 1991 to 69.64 percent in 2001 for females and from 65.90 percent to 63.02 for males. The rural to rural migration in the state is basically intra-district and inter-district.

- About two-third of total rural to rural migrants have long duration stay (more than 10 years). The percentage of such migrants is higher for female than male migrants.
• Total urban to rural migration declined from 11.88 lakhs in 1991 to 11.65 lakhs in 2001. The decline was only due reduction in the number of male migrants as it has slightly increased for females.

• Intra-district urban to rural migration for both males and females has increased in 2001 over 1991. Further, inter-district migration is higher for males than females while intra-district migration is higher for females than males.

• The percentage of urban to rural migration with duration of stay between 5-9 years was higher for male than female migrants in both the censuses. Contrary to this trend, the percentages of migrants with duration of stay between 10-19 years and 20+ years were found higher for female migrants.

• The number of total urban to urban migration has increased from 25.69 lakhs in 1991 to 30.91 lakhs in 2001, registering a net increase of 22.22 percent. Over a period of one decade, the percentage share of male migrants in the total urban to urban migration has increased while for females, it has decreased.

• Total migration in the State has increased from 291.87 lakhs in 1991 to 356.48 lakhs in 2001, thus registering a net increase of 22.14 percent. Total rural migration increased from 254.30 lakhs in 1991 to 313.93 lakhs in 2001, a net increase of 23.45%, while total urban migration went up from 37.57 lakhs in 1991 to 42.55 lakhs in 2001.
Thus, urban migration grew at a slower rate than the rural migration.

- The share of urban male migrants in total male migrants has increased from 25.44 percent in 1991 to 28.80 percent in 2001, while the corresponding percentage share of urban female migrants has declined from 10.74 to 9.55. This shows that during the last one decade, the percentage share of female migrants in total rural migrants has increased while it has decreased in the total urban migrants.

- The share rural to urban male migration in the total rural male migration increased from 38.21 percent in 1991 to 45.35 percent in 2001, whereas the corresponding percentage share of female declined from 9.80 in 1991 to 9.17 in 2001.

8.2.2 *Determinants of Rural-Urban Migration*

- People migrate from rural to urban areas due to various socio-economic, geographical, political, cultural, demographic and climatic factors. The factors that affect the rural-urban migration are generally classified as ‘Push’ and ‘pull’ factors. High intensity of poverty & unemployment, in rural areas, lack of basic amenities, displacement due to development projects, natural calamities, social and religious conflicts may be the main push factors, while better income & employment opportunities, better health & education
facilities, better infrastructure and amenities in the urban areas are the key pull factors.

- The probability of movement of a person is relatively high from a household who does not have access to land and other productive assets.

- Initially, 16 variables were identified as determinants of rural-urban migration; however, some of the variables had to be dropped either because they did not explain the dependent variable or they had problem of multi-collinearity. A multivariate regression analysis is conducted by pooling the district-wise data on two data points (1991 and 2001). The empirical results indicate that eight variables together explain 41-55 percent variation in the total rural-urban migration rates (RUMT_P, RUMT_M and RUMT_F) and 48-60 percent variation in the rural-urban migration rates of workers (RUMW_P, RUMW_M and RUMW_F).

- The findings of regression analysis show that in case of total rural-urban migration rate (RUMT_P) five out of 8 variables turn out to be statistically significant in causing variation the rural-urban migration of people. Length of pucca road and D1 are found to have positive impact on rural-urban migration, while R_HHI, CI and URB do have negative impact on RUMT_P.
- Standardized coefficients (βs) show that urbanization explains the largest variation in the dependent variable, followed by D1, PUCCA_R, R_HHI, and CI.

- It is evident from the findings that the independent variables explain the rural-urban migration of female population better than that of the male population. The magnitude of adjusted R square is found higher (0.526) in case of RUMT-F than in case of RUMT-M. The F-value is also observed much higher in RUMT_F than in RUMT_M. Similarly, values of individual coefficients are also found higher for RUMT-F than RUMT_M.

- The empirical results show that RUMW_P is better explained by the explanatory variables when compared to RUMT_P. It is evident from the magnitudes of regression coefficients that all the explanatory variables, except for NIA, turn out to be statistically significant to causing variation in the RUMW_P. Three variables, namely, RLIT, PUCCA_R and D1 have positive impact on the dependent variables, while four variables, namely NSA_RW, URB, CI and R_HHI are found inversely related to the RUMW_P. Values of standardized coefficients indicate that length of pucca road ranks first in terms of its contribution to the RUMW_P, followed by urbanization, D1, NSA_RW, R-HHI, CI and RLIT.

- The results also reveal that the contribution of explanatory variables varies across gender. For example, RLIT does not have any impact
on RUMW_M, while it has significant impact on the RUMW_F. Similarly, D1 is statistically significant for RUMW_M, but insignificant for RUMW_F.

8.2.3 **Dimensions of Rural-urban Migration**

- A majority of people migrate from rural to urban area due to non-economic reasons. The percentage of such migrants is much higher for female (75.55%) than male (37.75%).

- Main workers consist of 16.83 percent of the total migrants. The percentage is much higher for male migrants (54.70%) than female migrants (9.92%). Contrary to this, the proportion of marginal workers in the total migration is much higher for female migrants (14.53%) than male migrants (7.55). Although, percentage share of marginal workers in the total migrants is higher for female migrants, the percentage of those migrant workers who seek employment or available for work is higher for male migrants.

- Percentage of migrant workers increase with the increase in age group up to 40-59 years and thereafter the percentage declines. The age group 40-59 years constitutes the highest percentage share of migrant workers, followed by the age group 35-39 years and age group 30-34 years. However, the percentage distribution of migrant workers by age group varies across gender.
Only 5.44 percent of total rural to urban migrants move for the purpose of getting work or employment. The percentage of such migrants is much higher for males (28.80%) than female (1.17%). About 70 percent of total women migration from rural to urban area is only due to marriage while the corresponding percentage for male migrants is much low at 5.15.

Agriculture and allied activities together constitute about 10 percent of total rural to urban migrant workers. This indicates that 90 percent of total rural -urban migrant workforce are from other than agriculture and allied activities. However, the percentage of those moving out of agriculture and allied activities is much higher for female workers (33.95%) than male workers (5.11%).

As per the 2001 Census, Scheduled Castes constitute 23.4 percent of total rural population of the State, while their share in the total urban population is only 12.5 percent. The share of SC migrants in the total rural-urban migrants within the State is 15.51 percent which is relatively lower than their share in total rural population.

Gender pattern of rural-urban SC migrants indicates that the percentage share of SC female migrants in the total female migrants is higher than the share of SC male migrants in the total male migrants.

According to the last residence within the State, about 15 percent of total rural to urban SC migrants migrate for the purpose of getting
work or employment in the urban area. The percentage of such migrants is much higher for males (47.60) than female (1.67%). About 72 percent of total SC women migration is only due to marriage while the corresponding percentage for SC male migrants is only 2.03.

- Age-wise marital status indicates that all the migrants in the age group 0-9 years are unmarried while a majority of migrants in the age group 10-19 years are also unmarried. Only 21 percent of migrants in the age group 10-19 years are found married. The percentages of currently married persons increase with the increase in age group 20-49 years and then decline. There is a mark difference in the distribution of male and female migrants by the marital status. As against 51.07 percent of total male migrants married, the corresponding percentage for female migrants is much higher at 78.21.

- There is also significant difference in the age composition of widowed male and female migrants. Female migrants are having relatively more longevity than their male migrants.

- About 55 percent of total rural to urban migrants are illiterate. It is much higher for female (59.83%) than male migrants (27.44%). Further, the education level of male migrants is far better than their female counterparts. For instance, as against 21.63 percent male
migrants having education level matriculate/secondary but below graduate, the percentage for female migrants is only 10.09.

- The region-wise migration pattern indicates that most developed WR has the lowest percentage share of rural-rural migration in the total migration (66.13%), followed by CR (71.0%); while ER has the highest percentage (90.94%) followed by BK (83.69%).

- Rural to urban migration is found highest (about 17%) in WR, followed by CR (16.38%) and lowest in ER (4.30%). This indicates that rural to urban migration is positively associated with the level of economic development. The percentage of urban-urban migration of workers to the total migration is also found highest in WR (12.68%), followed by the CR (9.79%) and lowest in the ER (2.60%).

- There exists significant difference in male and female migration across migration streams. In case of female workers, migration is mainly rural to rural as it constitutes more than 92 percent of total female migration, while in case of male migrant workers, more than one third of total migration is from rural to urban. Urban to urban migration is also higher for males than females.

- Regional pattern of distribution of rural to urban migration across broad categories of economic activities shows that there is significant difference in the pattern across regions. For instance, as against 9.75 percentage share of cultivators in the total rural to urban migration in the BK, the corresponding percentage is only 4.03 in the WR.
Similarly, agricultural labour constitutes 13.12 percent of total rural-urban migration in the BK, while its share in the CR is only 2.69 percent. Further, percentage share of different economic activities in the total rural to urban migration also shows gender differences across regions.

8.2.4 Rural-urban Migration and Development

- Inter-relationship between rural-urban migration and economic development has been critically reviewed. The study argues that the rural–urban migration has both positive as well as negative impacts in the place of origin and the place of destination. On the one hand, it provides remittances to the rural areas, which may directly increase consumption and investment levels of the families whose members migrate to the urban areas and indirectly may boost the rural economy through multiplier effect. On the other hand, it may have adverse impact on the rural economy as it looses the human capital resource necessary for agricultural and non-agricultural activities in rural areas.

- Urban sector is also affected both positively and negatively due to inflow of rural workforce. As the urbanization grows and people begin to concentrate in urban areas, the negative aspects of concentration become apparent. The high concentration of population creates the problem of negative externalities, such as
traffic congestion, housing shortages, and growth of slums, etc. The positive aspect of the migration seems to be the benefit of economies of scale and greater opportunities to the migrant workers to upgrade their education and skills. The inflow of physical, financial and human capital to the big cities accelerates the economic growth of urban areas and consequently the economic status of the urban people. The relatively high growth of urban economy enhances the capacity of the government to generate more tax revenues for the investment in rural areas.

8.3 KEY CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions are drawn:

1. The percentage shares of both rural-urban and urban-rural migrants have declined in the State of Uttar Pradesh, while the corresponding shares of rural- rural and urban -urban have increased.

2. The share of male migrants is relatively higher in rural--urban migration and urban-urban migration as compared to other streams of migration. However, the percentage share of male migrants has declined in total rural migrants, while it has increased in total urban migrants.

3. The percentage share of rural-urban migrant workers moving out of the rural non-farm activities to the total rural-urban migration is much
higher for male workers than the female workers, whereas, the agriculture related activities have more percentage share of female migrant workers than the male migrant workers.

4. The education level of migrants is quite low. Further, it is much lower for female than male migrants.

5. Rural-urban and urban-urban migration of workers as percentages of total migration are higher in economically developed regions, while rural-rural migration as percentage of total migration is higher in economically backward regions of the State. This implies that level of economic development is one of the critical factors in the mobility of workforce from rural to urban areas.

6. Rural-rural migration constitutes a very high percentage of total female migration in the State and the percentage varies significantly across regions.

7. The percentages of urban-urban and urban-rural migration of workers are relatively higher for males than females and the percentages vary significantly across regions.

8. Economically developed WR has the highest percentage share of rural-urban and urban-urban migration of both male and female workers among all the regions.

9. The occupational distribution of migrant workers varies across gender. Relatively more female workers move out of agriculture and allied
activities to get employment in the urban areas than their male counterparts.

10. Short-term and medium-term migration of males is higher than that of females.

11. Marital status of the migrants shows that the percentage of never married migrants is higher for males than females.

12. Percentage of rural-urban migration varies significantly across regions. Economically developed WR has the highest percentage of rural-urban migration, while the ER has the lowest.

13. Percentage of rural-urban migration is much higher for male than females and its magnitude varies across regions.

14. Distribution of rural-urban migration across broad categories of economic activities shows a significant difference across regions.

15. The male migrants have relatively higher percentage share in non-agricultural activities, while female have relatively more percentage share in agricultural related activities.

16. In case of total rural-urban migration rate (RUMT_P), length of pucca road and dummy variable (D1) representing CR and BK turn out to have significant positive impact on rural-urban migration, while rural household industries, urbanization and cropping intensity are negatively associated with the RUMT_P. However, the magnitudes of coefficients vary across gender. The explanatory variables explain the rural-urban migration of female population better than that of the male population.
17. The rural-urban migration of workers (RUMW_P) is better explained by the explanatory variables when compared to RUMT_P. All the explanatory variables, except for NIA, turn out to be statistically significant to causing variation in the RUMW_P. Three variables, namely, RLIT, PUCCA_R and D1 do have positive impact on the dependent variables, while four variables, namely NSA_RW, URB, CI and R_HHI are found inversely related to the RUMW_P. The contribution of explanatory variables varies across gender.

8.4 POLICY OPTIONS

This study has examined the trends, dimensions and determinants of rural-urban migration in the State of Uttar Pradesh. As discussed, the rural-urban migration has both positive and negative consequences. It is, therefore, quite obvious that the policy focus must be on eliminating the negative impacts and promoting the positive ones. In order to optimize the benefits from rural-urban migration and control the undesirable flow of people to urban areas, the following policy options are required to be taken into consideration.

8.4.1 Acceleration of Growth of Rural Economy

1. The human capital base of rural workers and prospective workers, especially of those from marginalised groups should be increased so that they may participate in the more lucrative rural non-farm activities.
2. Agriculture, the backbone of rural economy of the State, has been adversely affected by the sharp decline in the public investment. The World Development Report, 2008 (WDR 2008) indicates that the agriculture growth is four times as effective in eliminating poverty in developing country as the non-agriculture growth. Our study shows that agriculture-related factors have negative significant influence on the rural-urban migration. Irrigation, agricultural research & extension, transport, storage, market, and electricity are the State subjects, though the central government also invests in these areas. Therefore, the development of agriculture largely depends on the ability and willingness of the State government to investment. The role of the central government is crucial not only in the resource transfer to the State but also in the formulation of macroeconomic policies that directly or indirectly affect agriculture. Public investment in irrigation coupled with agricultural R&D and extension services would not only enhance on-farm employment via raising agricultural productivity but also stimulate rural non-farm activities through backward and forward linkages.

3. Rural development, however, is much more than the agricultural development. It comprises, among others, enhancement of wellbeing of common masses and their socio-economic empowerment. This includes their greater access to basic social services, specially education, health, safe drinking water etc, and to productive employment and also their
participation in local governance and decision-making. Therefore, to accelerate the pace of rural development, apart from agricultural development, development of education, health and other social sector infrastructure, and governing institutions are necessary.

4. Region-specific as well as sector-specific policy interventions may be more effective. For instance, in an economically backward Bundel Khand (BK) region where distress-push factors are more evident, both short-term measures, such as public works programmes and appropriate social safety net as well as long term measures like capacity building of rural workforce, developing market, insurance, credit, education and health institutions must be given priority, while in economically developed WR, policy focus must be more on creating an enabling environment for the growth of rural non-farm activities.

5. Rural household industries are found to have a negative impact on rural-urban migration. These industries, in which females have the largest share, to a greater extent, suffer from the technological inefficiencies and lack of effective demand. Therefore, apart from transfer of cost-effective technology and its constant up-gradation of household industries, policy support to promote group entrepreneurship among rural women must be given greater focus.

6. The government is required to initiate group-target oriented schemes for improving access of poor and marginalized groups to education, skills
and healthcare facilities so that they may improve their livelihood through upward mobility and occupational diversification.

7. There is need to strengthen the MGNREGS through empowering the institution of Gram Sabha and building the capacity of officials associated with the scheme. MGNREGS is not only an important stride towards the realisation of the right to work but also a vital step towards creating durable socio-economic infrastructure in rural areas. Convergence of the NREGS with other related programmes, such as, watershed development programme, National Horticulture Mission, SGSY, National Livelihood Security Mission, activities of KVKs, etc would not only help in sustaining the rural livelihood through constructing quality assets and their better utilisation but also help in the efficient utilisation and physical and financial resources.

8.4.2 Fostering Effective Rural-Urban Linkages

Rural sector of the State requires substantial investment in five key areas—education, roads, healthcare, information technology, and electricity—to improve the income, employment and living conditions of rural households and to abate undesirable flow of rural workforce to the urban areas. The investment in these areas would strengthen the rural-urban linkages and help in attracting private investment in rural manufacturing, agriculture, and modern services. Establishment and
strengthening of rural-urban market linkages would support the rural development activities and help to control the rural-urban migration.

Urban economic activities are moving out of big cities to the surrounding rural areas, as land becomes more expensive in the urban areas and environmental regulations become more stringent. High prices of agricultural land and better rural-urban linkages due to improved transport and communication infrastructure would make the rural people living in the vicinity of towns and cities economically better off than the average rural people. This rural-urban linkage should be promoted. Enabling rural people avail urban amenities without having to shift to a city and better transport and communication facilities would be important policy initiatives towards fostering effective rural-urban linkages. Further, the policy orientation should be towards development of small towns as growth centres. The development in rural and urban areas should not be competing for the limited resources but rather should be considered as complementary process where the benefits of development would support each other in a balance manner.

8.4.3 Promotion of Circular Rural-urban Migration

Circular rural-urban and urban-urban migration should be promoted through policy support. A large number of workers commute daily from one place to another. Except for using the urban transport infrastructure, these migrants do not require many other urban amenities, such as,
housing, education, health and sanitation. Effective linkage of cities and towns with fast and cheap means of transportation and villages with local cities and towns would not only promote rural to urban migration but also reduce the slum population and ease the pressure on urban amenities and infrastructure. Results of our regression analysis show that road infrastructure plays a significant role in the rural-urban migration. It is, therefore, necessary to investment heavily in linking the cities and town with cheaper and fast means of transport.

8.4.4 Development of Urban Infrastructure

Withdrawal of workforce from rural economy and its absorptions in the urban economy have created serious stress on the carrying capacity of cities and towns. Assimilative capacity of urban areas in providing basic amenities and housing facilities should be expanded. In a dynamic economy, movement of workers from one place to another is a general phenomenon which cannot be forcefully controlled as people have freedom to move from one place to another within the geographical territory of the country. The increase in level of education, better transport and communication and concentration of physical, financial and human capital in big cities and towns are expected to further increase the inflow of people to growing cities and towns, especially located in the economically developed regions. It is therefore necessary to expand the capacity of urban centres through investment in basic infrastructure. Urban planning should give top priority to create basic
facilities such as housing, education, healthcare, public transport, sanitation and waste disposal system, etc. In addition, satellite towns should be development in the vicinity of each big city. Government policy related to setting up special economic zones (SEZs) far away from the cities would also help to reduce the pressure of workers on the big cities.