

SECOND REPORT

STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE (1999-2000)

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
(DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL
RESEARCH & EDUCATION)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (1999-2000)

*[Action Taken by the Government on the Recommendations/
Observations contained in the Nineteenth Report of the
Standing Committee on Agriculture (1998-99)]*

Presented to Lok Sabha on 14.3.2000

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 14.3.2000



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

March, 2000/Phalguna, 1921 (Saka)

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE (1999-2000)

Shri S.S. Palanimanickam — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Ram Tahal Chaudhari
3. Shri Shivraj Singh Chouhan
4. Shri Shamsher Singh Dullo
5. Shri Ramdas Rupala Gavit
6. Shri Thawar Chand Gehlot
7. Shri G. Putta Swamy Gowda
8. Shri Raghunath Jha
9. Shri Shivaji Vithalrao Kamble
10. Shri Abul Hasnat Khan
11. Shri Y.G. Mahajan
12. Shri Haribhau Shankar Mahale
13. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
14. Shri Jagannath Mallick
15. Shri M. Master Mathan
16. Shri Tarachand Shivaji Patel
17. Shri Prakash V. Patil
18. Shri Sharad Pawar
19. Shri G. Sukender Reddy
20. Shri N.R.K. Reddy
21. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
22. Shri Adi Shankar
23. Shri Chhatrapal Singh
24. Shri Lakshman Singh
25. Shri Rampal Singh

26. Shri Tejveer Singh
27. Shri Zora Singh
28. Shri Bhal Chandra Yadav
29. Shri Mahaboob Zahedi
30. Vacant

Rajya Sabha

31. Shri Oscar Fernandes
32. Shri Gufran Azam
33. Shri Ramji Lal
34. Shri Devi Prasad Singh
35. Dr. Ranbir Singh
36. Shri Khagen Das
37. Shri Yadlapati Venkata Rao
38. Shri H.K. Javare Gowda
39. Shri Naresh Yadav
40. Shri R. Margabandhu
41. Shri Korambayil Ahammed Haji
42. Shri Sharief-Ud-Din Shariq
43. Shri Devi Lal
44. Shri Kanshi Ram
45. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

- | | |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 1. Shri Harnam Singh | — Joint Secretary |
| 2. Dr. (Smt.) Paramjeet Kaur Sandhu | — Director |
| 3. Shri Raj Shekhar Sharma | — Deputy Secretary |
| 4. Shri K.L. Arora | — Assistant Director |
| 5. Shri Anil Kumar | — Reporting Officer |

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1999-2000) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Second Report on Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations/observations contained in the 19th Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1998-1999) (Twelfth Lok Sabha), on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education).

2. The Nineteenth Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1998-99) on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education) was presented to Lok Sabha on 22.4.99 and laid in Rajya Sabha on 23.4.99. The Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education) was requested to furnish action taken replies of the Government to recommendations contained in the Nineteenth Report. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received.

3. The Committee considered these action taken replies furnished by the Government in its sitting held on 28th February, 2000, approved the draft comments and adopted the Second Report. Minutes of the sitting are placed in Appendix I.

4. An analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations/observations contained in the Nineteenth Report (12th Lok Sabha) of the Committee is given in Appendix II.

NEW DELHI;
28th February, 2000
9th Phalguna, 1921 (Saka)

S. S. PALANIMANICKAM,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Agriculture.

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Agriculture deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Nineteenth Report (Twelfth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1998-99) on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education) which was presented to the Lok Sabha on 22nd April, 1999 and laid in Rajya Sabha on 23rd April, 1999.

1.2 Action taken replies have been received from the Government in respect of all the 16 recommendations contained in the Report. These have been categorised as follows:

- (i) Recommendations/Observations that have been accepted by the Government (Chapter II of the Report)
Recommendation Sl. Nos. 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15 & 16.

(Total 8)

- (ii) Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies (Chapter III of the Report)
Recommendation Sl. Nos. 3 & 14

(Total 2)

- (iii) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which reply of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee (Chapter IV of the Report to be commented upon in Chapter I of the Report)
Recommendation Sl. No. 13

(Total 1)

- (iv) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited (Chapter V of the Report)
Recommendation Sl. Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5, & 8

(Total 5)

1.3 The Committee will now deal with the action taken by Government on some other recommendations.

A. 100% Central funding of the Programmes meant for the North East

Recommendation Sl. No. 4 (Para Nos. 3.7 to 3.9)

1.4 The Committee were informed that the Department had allocated Rs. 36.00 crore for various activities in the North-Eastern States which included various research institutions, Central Agricultural University, Krishi Vigyan Kendras and Development Grants to Assam Agricultural University, a number of centres operating in North-East States, All India Coordinated Research Projects etc. This amount was 8% of the Domestic Budgetary Support of Rs 448.50 crores out of the total available funds.

The Committee pointed out the contents of para of Hon'ble Finance Minister's Budget Speech 1998-99 wherein he had mentioned about the creation of a non-lapsable Central Reserve Pool for deposit of funds from all Ministries where the plan expenditure on the North Eastern region is less than 10% of the total plan allocation of the Ministry. The difference between 10% of the plan allocation and the actual expenditure incurred on the North-Eastern Region would be transferred to the Central Resource Pool which would be used for funding specific programmes for economic upliftment of the North Eastern States.

The Committee recommended that the Department should make 10% allocation of the total plan outlay for the year 1999-2000 for the North-Eastern States. Further, all schemes that are planned for these States should be 100% funded by the Union Government.

1.5 Government in their reply have stated that the Department was making all out efforts to reach a level of 10% funding out of the plan budget during the current financial year 1999-2000 towards the activities of North-East States and Sikkim. The Department has sought the permission of Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission to exempt the Externally Aided Projects/World Bank Projects i.e. Domestic Budgetary Support should be the basis for this 10% funding scenario. This is due to the fact that such projects are usually specific and funds could only be spent under the mutually agreed programmes under which there seems to be little scope of diverting the EAP/World Bank funds to the programmes to the regions other than those agreed upon between the donor agency and DARE/ICAR. However, the North-East States and Sikkim too, as per EAPs/World Bank Projects/Programmes, as the case may be to some extent are being benefited, but fulfilling 10% funding requirement in such cases is not exactly possible.

The recommendations of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture that all the schemes planned for North-East States and Sikkim should be 100% funded by the Union Government is being forwarded to the Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance for policy decision and for providing consequential budgetary increase in the current year budget.

Comments of the Committee

1.6 The Committee may be apprised of the Government's decision on the request of the Department to calculate 10% funding to N.E. States on Domestic Budgetary Support (DBS) and not on the total plan allocation. The Committee may also be informed of the policy decision on their recommendation in respect of 100% funding by Union Government of all the Plan Schemes of the North-Eastern States.

B. Agricultural Engineering

Recommendation Sl. No. 13 (Para No. 3.28)

1.7 The Committee had observed that All India Co-ordinated Research Project on Human Engineering & Safety in Agriculture (AICRP-HESA) was sanctioned in 1997-98 and had a coordinating cell at the Central Institute for Agricultural Engineering (CIAE) at Bhopal. The allocation for this project was under-utilized because of shortage of scientific personnel. The Committee, therefore, recommended that urgent steps should be taken to recruit the technical personnel immediately. Although the Central Institute for Post Harvest Engineering & Technology (CIPHET), Ludhiana was about 9 years old, majority of Scientific & Technical positions and even the post of Director were still vacant. The Institute was in the process of constructing functional buildings and was still setting up laboratories. The Committee recommended that immediate steps should be taken by the Institute to get the construction work completed at the earliest so that laboratories and research facilities are provided within a targeted framework. Necessary action should be taken to get all the technical and scientific personnel in position.

1.8 In their reply Government have stated that the All India Coordinated Research Project on Human Engineering and Safety in Agriculture (HESA) was approved by the ICAR and the project was started in July, 1996. The Project had a total sanctioned strength of 34 (9 scientific, 14 technical, 6 administrative and 5 supporting posts). However, the order also mentioned that for the centres located at ICAR institute, the available staff should be redeployed and no new posts were created for the coordinating cell as well as cooperating

centre located at CIAE, Bhopal. The Institute has 98 scientific manpower for 5 Divisions, 6 Coordinating Cell of AICRP, 7 Cooperating Centres under AICRP, 1 Sub-Centre of NRC for women in Agriculture, 1 Soyabean Processing and utilization centre, 1 KVK and Trainers' Training Centre. The posts in AICRP on HESA could not be filled with redeployment. The non-availability of staff has been one of the major bottlenecks in effective operation of the project. The activities were started with Research Associates. A proposal for conversion of one post of Principal Scientist (FMP) in to a post of Project Coordinator (HESA) is under consideration in the ICAR. Now in IX plan, the Council is considering creation of 8 posts for CIAE Cooperating Centre and 6 posts for Coordination Cell located at CIAE so that the research as well as coordination activity envisaged in AICRP on HESA can be carried out efficiently.

As regards CIPHET, the interview for the post of Director was held during December 1995. However, due to pendency of a vigilance case against the selected candidate, the post could not be filled up with a regular Director. Presently, a very senior officer in the rank of Project Coordinator, AICRP on PHT is functioning as Acting Director.

Recruitment efforts have been made by the ICAR and ASRB for the posts of Head of the Department, Sr. Scientist and Scientist. Recently, three HODs have been appointed of which one has already joined on 22.6.99. For Sr. Scientists 20 positions were advertised by ASRB in Aug./Sept., 1998. Interviews were expected in near future. There were 20 scientists in position as on June 15, 1999 against sanctioned strength of 63.

Recruitment efforts for the posts of technical staff have also been intensified by the Institute. During the year 1999-2000 tests were conducted for 13 posts till June 15, 1999. Similarly, efforts were on to fill up the vacancies in administrative and supporting categories. Following has been the overall position.

Category filled	No. of Posts Sanctioned	No. of Posts
1. Scientific	63	20
2. Technical	93	25
3. Administrative	45	20
4. Supporting	58	10
Total	259	75

Regarding completion of construction works, Institute has already proposed for essential buildings (Office, laboratories and residential quarters) in the IX Loan. A total of Rs 511 lakh has been agreed under the Head "Works for CIPHET" during the plan period. However, final approval of the Planning Commission was awaited.

Comments of the Committee

1.9 The Committee are astonished to learn that the project which started in July, 1996 faces major bottlenecks in effective operation because the posts in AICRP HESA could not be filled with redeployment as envisaged. One year of the Eighth plan and three years of Ninth Plan have already elapsed and the ICAR is still considering the creation of the Posts for AICRP HESA. The Committee take a very serious view of the casual manner of implementation of AICRP HESA and filling up of posts for the project. AICRP HESA is a project which will directly address the safety of farmers using modern implements for enhancing the production of the nation. The Committee, therefore, recommend that immediate action should be taken by ICAR and CIAE Bhopal for deploying the desired scientific, technical and supporting staff without further delay so that AICRP HESA starts giving results.

The Committee observe that out of an amount of Rs. 294 lakhs allocated for the project for the IXth Plan, an amount of Rs. 76.97 lakhs had already been utilised upto the financial year 1998-99. The Committee fail to understand the utilisation of funds when so staff has been deployed for the project and all building and materials is located in the CIAE, Bhopal. They would therefore like to be informed as to how this amount has been utilised.

1.10. In the case of Central Institute of Post Harvest Engineering Technology (CIPHET), Ludhiana the Committee observe that a candidate against whom a vigilance case was pending was interviewed for the post of Director in 1995. The Committee would like to be apprised of the pressing circumstances under which such a candidate was interviewed and the reasons for not taking any action for all these 4 years to select a suitable person for this post. They further recommend that the Institute, which deals with Post Harvest Engineering Technology, should be adequately staffed at the earliest so that the benefits of the research reach the farmers using age-old technologies.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Recommendation Sl. No. 6 (Para Nos. 3.12 to 3.14)

Sectoral Allocations for the year 1999-2000

2.1 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para Nos. 3.12 to 3.14 had made the following observations/recommendations:—

The Committee have been informed that the entire plan outlay has been distributed among 8 sectors of activity and each sector has to be allotted a percentage share of the plan outlay ideally on the basis of the proportion recommended by the Working Group. The Agricultural Education should get 15% while the Agricultural Extension should get 10%. It envisages a share of 6% for the Fisheries and a 14% share for Animal Science. Horticulture should get 10% while Crop Science has a major share of 25%. The Natural Resource Management, the Agricultural Engineering, Agricultural Economics and Statistics sectors along with ICAR Headquarters put together are to get 20% share. The Working Group had not taken into account any provision for External Aided Projects (EAP) while suggesting this apportionment.

But the Committee observe that the percentage share to these sectors for the year 1999-2000 is 9.59%, 8.72%, 4.88%, 9.42%, 8.19%, 16.91%, 20.49% respectively and 21.80% share of plan allocations have gone to EAPs although no such provision has been recommended by the Working Group.

The Committee recommend that all efforts should be made to apportion funds as per the recommendation of the Working Group so that all the sectors get their optimal and ideal requirement of funds to carry out the mandate assigned to them properly.

Reply of the Government

2.2 The Government in their reply have stated as under:—

The Department makes every effort to broadly coincide the sectoral proportions as indicated in the IX Plan Working Group report but during 1999-2000 the sectoral allocation were made keeping in view the national priorities within the budgetary allocation of Rs 573.50 crore only. The Department had a realistic assessment of its fund requirement of Rs 712.68 crore against which Rs. 573.50 crore were provided by the Planning Commission. No separate budget was provided for EAPs/World Bank Projects for which the Department had submitted requirement for Rs. 214.91 crore. Hence, less funding during 1999-2000 coupled with no separate budget allocation for EAPs/World Bank Projects was the particular reason for a tilted sectoral allocation against the proportion recommended by the IX Plan Working Group. Further the allocation shown against different sectors indicate fund allocation under DBS. If the EAPs are taken into account, the allocation to the division will be closer to the desired sectoral allocations. However, the Department aspire a better maintenance of proportional rate for various sectoral allocation as recommended by the IX Plan Working Group. If our repeated requests for raising the allocation to the required level of Rs. 712.68 crore is acceded to atleast at the RE 1999-2000 stage. The Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance are being acquainted with observations/recommendations of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture in this regard.

Recommendation Sl. No. 7 (Para Nos. 3.15 to 3.17)

Agricultural Scientist Recruitment Board (ASRB)

2.3 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para Nos. 3.15 to 3.17 had made the following observations/recommendations:—

The Committee have been informed that the Agricultural Scientist Recruitment Board comprises of whole time Chairman and two other members who are appointed by the President, ICAR with the approval of Government of India. The Board presently has only the acting Chairman and no Member is in position.

The Committee have been informed that quite a big number of senior and junior scientific posts are lying vacant in various institutes of ICAR, e.g. Central Institute. Temperate Horticulture, NRC-Medicinal and Aromatic Plants, Central Institute of Agricultural Engineering, Bhopal, Central Institute of Post Harvest Engineering and Technology, Ludhiana, National Bureau of Plant Genetic Resources, NATP etc. because of which the institutes are neither doing justice to Research nor are the funds being utilized.

The Committee recommend that the vacant posts in the ASRB should be filled up on urgent basis so that the recruitment process is set in motion at the desired pace which would in turn facilitate conduct of research work.

Reply of the Government

2.4 The Government in their reply have stated as under:—

The post of the Chairman, ASRB has already been filled on regular basis and the Chairman, Dr. R.B. Singh assumed the office on 12.7.99. Offer of appointment has also been sent to one Member of the Board namely Dr. A.G. Sawant and he is expected to be in position shortly. As regards second Member of the Board, the matter is being pursued at the higher level and as soon as approval of Competent Authority is received, offer of appointment to the selected candidate will be issued.

A statement showing the name of the Institute, sanctioned strength in position and percentage of the scientists in position with reference to the sanctioned strength in respect of the institute mentioned in this recommendation is enclosed. For filling up of the posts of scientists at entry level, competitive examination on All India basis is held every year. The result of 1998 ARS examination has already been declared and the vacant position in the grade of scientists are expected to be filled up from the selected candidates of ARS examination, 98. As regards the vacancies in the grade of Senior Scientists, requisitions have already been sent to the ASRB for filling up these posts.

**Total sanctioned strength and Scientists &
Sr. Scientists amongst institutes**

Sl. No.	Name of the Institute	Scientist			Sr. Scientist		
		Sanctioned Strength	In position	%age in position	Sanctioned strength	In position	%age in position
1.	CITH, Srinagar	08	04	50	02	01	50
2.	NRCMAP, Anand	10	07	70	04	01	25
3.	CIAE Bhopal	45	32	71	30	23	77
4.	CIPHET, Ludhiana	34	16	47	18	18	100
5.	NBPGR, New Delhi	83	75	90	37	26	70

Recommendation Sl. No. 9 (Para Nos. 3.21 & 3.22)

Crop Science

2.5 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para Nos. 3.21 & 3.22 had made the following observations/recommendations:

The Committee observe that the working group had suggested an allocation of 25% of total DBS for the plan outlay to Crop Sciences. The percentage share given in the year 1999-2000 for this sector is only 16.91% whereas a target has been set in the National Agenda to double the production of foodgrains in the next ten years.

The Committee strongly recommend that each sector should be given its due share of allocation, so that justice appears to have been done. The Committee further recommend that higher allocation should be given to this sector at the RE stage.

Reply of the Government

2.6 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

The percentage share of 16.91 per cent of the Annual Plan allocation (1999-2000) given to Crops Division is on the base of Domestic Budgetary Support (DBS). If the funds allocated under Externally Aided Projects (EAPs) including National Agricultural Technology Project (NATP) is taken into account, the percentage of fund allocations to this Division will be higher. Although the Department has been constantly striving for higher allocation, the limitation of funds is major constraint in allocating the amounts as recommended by the IX Plan Working Group. If the Department is given higher allocation at RE stage, the Sectoral allocations will be made accordingly.

Recommendation Sl. No. 10 (Para Nos. 3.23 & 3.24)

Crop Science: Plant Genetic Resources

2.7 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para Nos. 3.23 & 3.24 had made the following observations/recommendations:

In the changing global scenario towards Patent laws, there is an urgent need to protect the Rights of the plant Breeders and Farmers also the right of the Nation in particular over the biological resources in general. The following two pieces of Legislation in this regard should be taken into consideration urgently:—

- (i) Plant Variety and Farmers' Right Protection Act;
- (ii) National Biological Diversity Act.

The Committee recommend that in order to protect the rights of the farmers the above pieces of legislation should be given utmost priority and got enacted in the current Budget Session itself.

Reply of the Government

2.8 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

Plant Variety and Farmers' Right Protection Act: Department of Agriculture and Cooperation has prepared the draft plant variety and

farmers' rights protection bill and the Cabinet proposal for enactment of the above bill in consultation with concerned Ministries/ Departments. Presently, the draft plant variety and farmers' rights protection bill is with the Legislative Department, Ministry of Law for vetting. After return of the draft bill from the Legislative Department, the proposal will be submitted to the Cabinet for consideration. The bill will be introduced in the Parliament on approval of the proposal by the Cabinet.

National Biological Diversity Act: The Department of Environment and Forest, Govt. of India has formulated a draft bill to protect National Biological Diversity. The elements of the bill are also discussed at the level of Cabinet Secretary.

Recommendation Sl. No. 11 (Para Nos. 3.25 & 3.26)

Plant Genetic Resources: NRC DNA Fingerprinting

2.9 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para Nos. 3.25 & 3.26 had made the following observations/ recommendations:

The Committee note that the DNA Fingerprinting, a technique now routinely used in solving forensic cases in humans, is a powerful method to distinguish a particular variety from all other varieties. Developing the DNA fingerprints of the released varieties and valuable genetic stocks has become important due to the changed international scenario which has led to the debates on the ownership of the varieties. This method is potentially useful in the protection of rights of the breeders and farmers who are the rightful owners of the material and, in turn, protecting the precious national wealth against its unauthorized use.

The Committee desire that there should be no shortfall in utilization of plan funds earmarked for the NRC on DNA fingerprinting and there should be no diversion of funds using the allocations saved on this account to meet items of Non-plan expenditure, as has been brought to the notice of the Committee. The Committee recommend that it should be ensured that the required letter of credit is opened for the procurement of necessary equipments without any further delay during this financial year positively.

Reply of the Government

2.10 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

The desire of the Committee that there should be no shortfall in utilization of plan funds have been taken note of. It is being ensured that allocated funds for 1999-2000 will be fully utilized. Further the necessary letter of credit for purchase of pending equipment has been opened.

Recommendation Sl. No. 12 (Para No. 3.27)

Adoption of Seed Village Concept by KVKs and Agricultural Research Institutions and Agricultural Universities

2.11 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para No. 3.27 had made the following observations/recommendations:

The Committee feel that the ICAR institutions should not stop only with the production of foundation seeds and they should further go ahead to exploit this technology for the mutual benefit of the farmers and the Institutions. The Committee find that there is lot of scope for generation of internal resources by the KVKs, Agricultural Research Institutions and Agricultural Universities. If they take over a few plots of land in some selected villages nearby wherein they can grow location specific varieties of important crops for sale as certified seeds. This component can be a part of the extension activities of these institutions. In the backdrop of supply of spurious seeds by unscrupulous private seed dealers, this step will go a long way in helping the farmers in the vicinity of the institutions to get certified seeds with guaranteed germination and also to learn the processing of raising seeds for their own consumption and for sale to others apart from having demonstration value. The seeds thus made available will be certainly loss costly, as there is no overhead expenditure on transport also. The Committee, therefore recommend that ICAR should consider taking up this activity on a large scale as it helps generating resources for the institutions while helping the farmers simultaneously to get quality seeds at cheaper rates and in the process technology dissemination takes place.

Reply of the Government

2.12 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

At present, the quality seeds and planting materials produced in the KVKs are provided to the farmers of the area. Each KVK has been directed to identify important crops for producing more quality seeds and establish mother orchards/nursery in the KVK farm. Further, in order to expand this activity, the KVKs have been asked to adopt a village and identify the potential farmers in order to impart specialized training on seed production and its sale to the farmers to farmer seed exchange. Seed production programme has also been included under the guidelines formulated for Revolving Fund Scheme of the Council which will further help in providing seeds to the farmers at reasonable rates.

Recommendation Sl. No. 15 (Para Nos. 3.32 to 3.34)

Fully Functional KVKs

2.13 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para Nos. 3.32 to 3.34 had made the following observations/recommendations:

The Committee during their visit to CCS(HAU) in Feb., 1999 were informed that the KVKs under their University have been sanctioned many years ago. These KVKs still do not have buildings, trainees' hostel, staff quarters, administration units, conference hall, farm stores and laboratory equipments.

The Committee have in their earlier Reports also recommended that KVKs should be made fully functional as practically the percentage of fully functional KVKs out of the total sanctioned KVKs is extremely low. The Committee are aware that KVKs particularly in Bihar are only vast tracts of barren land which are not even fit for grazing purposes.

KVKs are important in process of extension of agricultural know-how and the overall development of agriculture depends much of their performance. The Committee are, therefore, very concerned over the alarming situation that prevails now. Therefore, the Committee recommend that all out efforts should be made to make all existing KVKs fully functional within a definite time-frame.

Reply of the Government

2.14 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

CCS Haryana Agricultural University has eight Krishi Vigyan Kendras in Faridabad, Panipat, Yamunanagar, Kaithal, Sonapat, Kurushetra, Jind and Hisar districts. The main building of the KVKs with the facilities of conducting training programmes has been constructed and occupied in all the places except Kurushetra. The Council has examined the facilities available with the KVKs as well as Krishi Gyan Kendras (KGKs) with the University by constituting a high level committee for developing infrastructural facilities for the existing KVKs as well as those KGKs to be converted to KVKs on a participatory mode. The critical gaps in infrastructural facilities have been identified and efforts are being made to develop the facilities.

Monitoring of the KVK has been further streamlined from Zonal Coordinating Units. Zonal Coordinators have been delegated with more powers for release of grants to the grantees at their level. The Vice-Chancellors of SAUs are requested to take personal interest and review the performance of KVKs in their respective university at their level more frequently. The functioning of KVKs is a permanent agenda for all Regional Committee Meetings of the Council for deliberations. The deliberations in 8 Regional Committee Meetings where VCs, Deans and Directors of SAUs, State Govt. representatives and scientists of the ICAR Institutes and headquarters are participating, are helping in streamlining the monitoring of the KVKs in order to make them more effective.

A special meeting of two Vice-Chancellors of Bihar is being arranged with DG-ICAR to discuss the issues for streamlining the functioning of the KVKs in Bihar.

Recommendation Sl. No. 16 (Para Nos. 3.35 to 3.37)

World Bank/Foreign Aided Project (NATP)

2.15 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para Nos. 3.35 to 3.37 had made the following observations/recommendations:

The Committee note that under NATP, a total of 82 posts (under ICAR component) were agreed to by the Department of Expenditure

(DoE) with a break-up of 64 posts by redeployment from within existing resources and 18 new posts will be created afresh. Out of these 18 new posts, 4 posts have been filled up and recruitment process for the remaining 14 posts is on. The Committee further note that there is under-utilization of funds to the tune of Rs 1675.00 lakh out of Rs 6875.00 lakh earmarked for 1998-99. The shortfall was primarily due to late approval of the total project by the Government of India. The approval of CCEA for the project was received only on 12th November, 1998, after a lapse of about seven months after the commencement of the financial year. Consequently, the implementation of quite a number of programmes particularly in the research component, had to be rescheduled.

The Committee are pained to observe that a lot of complicated procedural and administrative formalities come in the way of giving timely clearance/approvals choking the pace of agricultural research and development in the country.

The Committee feel that a time for introspection about the observation of these time-consuming procedural formalities has come, as these procedures have acted only as stumbling blocks instead of being enabling tools to get a work done in a systematic manner in conformity with financial disciplines. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the matter of procedural reforms should receive top priority and a Committee of experts should be immediately assigned the task of suggesting a way out of the age-old meaningless bureaucratic rigmaroles.

Reply of the Government

2.16 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

The observations and recommendations of the Standing Committee on Agriculture on NATP have been noted for guidance and action in future. In so far as newly created vacant positions are concerned, presently there are 14 positions which are required to be filled up at PIU HqRs and the offices of six Agro-Ecosystem Directorates. For filling up these positions recruitment process has started for the position of National Director and Finance & Accounts Officers. Simultaneously, the Departmental Promotion Committee has also met for filling up the vacancies in the grade of Finance & Account Officer at PIU & Agro Ecosystem Directorate office. Junior Accounts Officer have also been

selected through Departmental Examination and they are being deployed. As regards appointment of Technical Officer with the Agro-Ecosystem Directorate office, the concerned Agro-Ecosystems Directors have been advised to expedite the appointment with the approval of the Council. The shortfall in utilization of fund to the tune of Rs 1675.00 lakh occurred because proposal of the project by the CCEA was accorded only on 12th November, 1998. However, by July, 1999 PIU has already accorded approval to the research project costing Rs 113.58 crores. In so far as procurement of goods/equipment and services under NATP is concerned, the World Bank procedure is being followed as committed by the Government of India and approved by the Competent Authority in DARE/ICAR. This is being done with a view to ensure economy, efficiency and transparency so as to make the expenditure eligible for reimbursement.

As regards procedural reforms, it is stated that the process for approval of the research proposal under NATP is already being rationalized for expediting sanctions. The sanctions of the proposal are being accorded in decentralized mode by different committees viz. Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP), Research Programme Committee (RPC) and Project Management Committee (PMC). These committees have been empowered to sanction project costing 2.00 crore, 5.00 crore and beyond 5.00 crore respectively. These committees are functioning very effectively and have been able to cut across the procedural snarls.

As regards the Committee of experts, it is stated that the Task Force on O&M reforms has already been setup. This task force has been assigned the task of examining the existing organizational structure and administrative processes and suggest suitable changes therein including delegation and decentralization of powers for efficient functioning of the ICAR system. The Task Force has already initiated action in the matter and set up Sub Committees to the issues related to administrative, financial and personnel matters. In addition to this, consultancy services for establishing a need based and effective financial management system is also being hired to take care of the requirements of the project as well as ICAR system at large. The project information and management system is also being put in place for effecting management of information and monitoring of the project.

CHAPTER III

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE DO NOT DESIRE TO PURSUE IN VIEW OF GOVERNMENT'S REPLIES

Recommendation Sl. No. 3 (Para Nos. 3.5 & 3.6)

Inadequate Allocations for the year 1999-2000 to DARE/ICAR

3.1 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para Nos. 3.5 & 3.6 had made the following observations/recommendations:

The Committee observe that the Department of Agricultural Research and Education has proposed an outlay of Rs 712.68 crore for 1999-2000 (Plan) and has been allocated only Rs 573.50 crore which includes an external component of Rs 125.00 crore, thereby placing the Domestic Budgetary Support at the level of Rs 448.50 crore. In the year 1998-99, the Department had proposed an outlay of Rs 700.00 crore. But the Planning Commission due to General Elections and change of Government in the country has frozen the Plan Outlay of DARE to the level of 1997-98, i.e. Rs 331.17 crore which was later raised by the Planning Commission due to the persistent efforts of the Department for getting higher allocations in their favour. But the approved outlay of Rs 531.17 crore was drastically reduced to Rs 400 crore for 1998-99 at the RE stage due to resource crunch. But again due to concerted efforts of the Department it was raised to the level of Rs 445.00 crore as Final RE, although the Department had committed liabilities to the tune of Rs 477.00 crore and could have achieved all its financial targets, if Rs 531.17 crore would have been given as originally proposed.

The Committee do not approve of the manner in which the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance have been imposing drastic financial cuts arbitrarily on the Department in the name of resource crunch. It is ironical on the part of Government and its allied agencies to hopefully look upon DARE/ICAR to work wonders and double the foodgrains production within the next 10 years by achieving major breakthroughs in research and also to usher in the second Green Revolution in the country and when it comes to the question of providing funds for the Department no consideration is shown for any Special Action Plan and the scientific community is pushed to suffer the humiliation of always coming with a begging bowl crying for more funds for carrying out their agricultural research and

development activities entrusted upon them by the Government itself. The Committee strongly condemn this attitude of the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance and further recommend that they should consider favourably the request of the Department and enhance the allocation for the year 1999-2000 to at least Rs 712.68 crore.

Reply of the Government

3.2 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

The Department has repeatedly requested Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission at the level of MOS(A) & Sec-DARE & DG-ICAR to increase its allocation during current financial year 1999-2000 to a level of Rs 712.68 crore against the initial allocation of Rs 573.50 crore. The Planning Commission & Ministry of Finance have conveyed their inability to raise the allocation due to resource scarcity. However, the Department is again requesting the above two agencies for raising the allocation to Rs 712.68 crore alongwith the observation/recommendations of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture contained in its 19th report.

Recommendation Sl. No. 14 (Para Nos. 3.29 to 3.31)

Agricultural Extension: Scientists in a KVK

3.3 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para Nos. 3.29 to 3.31 had made the following observations/recommendations:

The Committee has been informed in February 1999 by the Chaudhary Charan Singh Haryana Agriculture University in a written reply that a KVK consisted of one Chief Scientist with 9 Training Associates, 6 Technical Assistants and 6 other staff (Total 22). Later the staff strength was reduced to one Chief Scientist/Training Organiser, 6 Training Associates, 3 Technical Assistants and 6 other staff, taking the total down to 16 according to the recommendations of the high powered Committee of ICAR.

However, in reply to a question on reduction of staff the ICAR has informed the Committee that through Councils Order No. 1(i)/96-AE.I dated 2.9.97 the revised staff strength of 16 (1 Chief Scientist/TO, 6 TAJs, 3 TAS, & 6 other staff) will be applicable for the KVKs when the existing staff are adjusted/redeployed within the overall institutes system or they are transferred or promoted or retired. Till such time, the host institute will make adjustment through redeployment or promotion or retirement and the existing staff shall continue to work in the KVK.

The Committee fail to understand the logic behind reducing the number of Scientists at a KVK. As it is more than 50% of the KVK are not fully functional and do not have the required deployment of scientists. Even where they are functional, vacancies exist because of non-availability of agricultural scientist. The Committee feel that by reducing the number of scientists in a number of disciplines the functioning of the KVK is further crippled. The Committee recommend that the ICAR should reconsider this matter and revive the strength of the KVK back to the original position. It is further pointed out here that this measure has adversely affected the persons appointed in the NGO-run KVKs, as a number of persons have been suddenly rendered surplus and have become jobless. Therefore, the matter should also be considered from the humanitarian angle in respect of those KVKs.

Reply of the Government

3.4 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

There are 12 KVKs in Haryana with the sanctioned strength of 192 posts, against which 177 are in position and the remaining 15 are likely to be filled up soon.

As a follow up to the recommendation of Educational Commission for establishment of specialized institution to provide vocational education in agriculture and allied fields, the Council constituted a committee headed by Dr. Mohan Sinha Mehta of Seva Mandir, Udaipur for working out detailed plan for implementation of KVK. As far as the staffing pattern is concerned, the committee indicated that emphasis will be on recruiting core staff, well experienced and specialized persons. Some of the expert teachers may be hired for short period whenever required for specific courses. Keeping this in view, a multidisciplinary team consisting of 7 scientists and 3 technical persons have been provided, besides 6 administrative and supporting staff. Considering the humanitarian angle for the staff already working in the KVKs including NGOs, the Council informed all the concerned organizations that the revised staff strength will be applicable when the existing staff are adjusted/redeployed/transferred/promoted/retired.

The recommendation of the Parliamentary Standing Committee is being brought to the notice of the Planning Commission, for their consideration on the issue.

CHAPTER IV

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT HAVE NOT BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE COMMITTEE

Recommendation Sl. No. 13 (Para No. 3.28)

Agricultural Engineering

4.1 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para No. 3.28 had made the following observations/recommendations:

The Committee observe that All India Co-ordinated Research Project on Human Engineering & Safety in Agriculture (AICRP HESS) was sanctioned in 1997-98 and has a co-ordinating cell at the Central Institute for Agricultural Engineering (CIAE) at Bhopal. The allocation for this project was under-utilized because of shortage of scientific personnel. The Committee, therefore, recommend that urgent steps should be taken to recruit the technical personnel immediately. Although the Central Institute for Post Harvest Engineering & Technology (CIPHET), Ludhiana is about 9 years old, majority of Scientific & Technical positions and even the post of Director are still vacant. The Institute is in the process of constructing functional buildings and is still setting up laboratories. The Committee recommend that immediate steps should be taken by the Institute to get the construction work completed at the earliest so that laboratories and research facilities are provided within a targeted framework. Necessary action should be taken to get all the technical and scientific personnel in position.

Reply of the Government

4.2 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

The All India Co-ordinated Research Project on Human Engineering and Safety in Agriculture (HESA) was approved by the ICAR and the project was started in July, 1996. The Project had

a total sanctioned strength of 34 (9 scientific, 14 technical, 6 administrative and 5 supporting posts). However, the order also mentioned that for the centres located at ICAR institute, the available staff should be redeployed and no new posts were created for the co-ordinating cell as well as co-operating centre located at CIAE, Bhopal. The Institute has 98 scientific manpower for 5 Divisions, 6 Co-ordinating Cell of AICRP, 7 Co-operating Centres under AICRP, 1 Sub-Centre of NRC for Women in Agriculture, 1 Soyabeen Processing & Utilization Centre, 1 KVK and Trainers' Training Centre. The posts in AICRP on HESA could not be filled with redeployment. The non-availability of staff has been one of the major bottlenecks in effective operation of the project. The activities were started with Research Associates. A proposal for conversion of one post of Principal Scientist (FMP) in to a post of Project Co-ordinator (HESA) is under consideration in the ICAR. Now in IX Plan, the Council is considering creation of 8 posts for CIAE Cooperating Centre and 6 posts for Co-ordination Cell located at CIAE so that the research as well as co-ordination activity envisaged in AICRP on HESA can be carried out efficiently.

As regards CIPHET, the interview for the post of Director was held during Dec., 1995. However, due to pendency of a vigilance case against the selected candidate, the post could not be filled up with a regular Director. Presently, a very senior officer in the rank of Project Co-ordinator, AICRP on PHT is functioning as Acting Director.

Recruitment efforts have been made by the ICAR and ASRB for the posts of Head of the Department, Sr. Scientist and Scientist. Recently, three HODs have been appointed of which one has already joined on 22.6.99. For Sr. Scientists, 20 positions were advertised by ASRB in Aug./Sept., 1998. Interviews are expected in near future. There were 20 scientists in position as on June 15, 1999 against sanctioned strength of 63.

Recruitment efforts for the posts of technical staff have also been intensified by the Institute. During the year 1999-2000, tests were conducted for 13 posts till June 15, 1999. Similarly, efforts are on to fill up the vacancies in administrative and supporting categories. Following has been the overall position.

	Category	No. of Posts Sanctioned	No. of Posts Filled
1.	Scientific	63	20
2.	Technical	93	25
3.	Administrative	45	20
4.	Supporting	58	10
	Total	259	75

Regarding completion of construction works, Institute has already proposed for essential buildings (office, laboratories and residential quarters) in the IX Plan. A total of Rs. 511 lakh has been agreed under the Head "Works" for CIPHET during the plan period. However, final approval of the Planning Commission is waited.

Comments of the Committee

4.3 For Comments of the Committee please see Para No 1.9 of Chapter I of this Report.

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS IN RESPECT OF WHICH FINAL REPLIES OF THE GOVERNMENT ARE STILL AWAITED

Recommendation Sl. No. 1 (Para Nos. 3.1 to 3.3)

Inadequate Ninth Plan Allocation

5.1 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para Nos. 3.1 to 3.3 had made the following observations/recommendations:

The Committee note that the Department of Agricultural Research and Education has been provided an allocation of Rs. 2100.00 crore out of a proposed outlay of Rs. 7800 crore for the IX Plan which is only 26.92%. Under the National Agenda the country has to achieve the very difficult goal of doubling the foodgrains production in the next 10 years in order to meet the challenge of ever-increasing food requirements of the burgeoning population of the Nation.

In the Committee's opinion, the required real breakthrough for increasing the agricultural production and productivity over and above the population growth rate can only be achieved by actual research work and by the quickest possible dissemination of relevant information to the people engaged in agriculture and allied activities. For achieving all this, the Plan outlay for DARE/ICAR should be directly proportionate to the proposed targets set for achievements in Agriculture. Keeping this in view, the Committee feel that the IX Plan outlay of Rs. 2100.00 crore is too small to undertake the gigantic task of doubling the foodgrains production in the next ten years.

The Committee, therefore, reiterate their earlier recommendation for enhancement of the Plan outlay for DARE/ICAR to the level of at least 1% of agricultural GDP for the IX Plan. The Committee desire that the Department should keep approaching the Planning Commission & Finance Ministry always appraising them of the level of utilization and impressing upon them the need for enhanced outlays so that necessary funds are released to meet the goals of the Department.

Reply of the Government

5.2 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

The Government has all along been insisting hard with the Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission to raise its IX plan allocation to the level of 1% of Agricultural GDP *i.e.* Rs 7800 crore as realistic requirement visualised by the IX Plan Working Group of DARE and also supported strongly by repeated recommendations of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture. In this regard, the Department has been continuously making all possible efforts and the matter was taken up with the Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance at various levels, *e.g.* detailed letters were sent from MOS (Agri.) to the Dy. Chairman, Planning Commission and Finance Minister and from Secretary-DARE & DG-ICAR to the Secretary, Planning Commission & Secretary (Expenditure), Ministry of Finance.

Keeping in view the recent recommendation of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture contained in its 19th Report, the Department has again strongly requested the Ministry of Finance & Planning Commission for raising its IX Plan allocation to a level of 1% of Agricultural Gross Domestic Product (AGDP) *i.e.* Rs 7800 crore so that the giant task of doubling the food production in the next 10 years could be turned into a reality through extensive and intensive research efforts which primarily rely on fully modernized NARS manned by talented scientific and other manpower supported with excellent facilities which is not possible under fund starved conditions. The other side of the coin which is also equally and critically important is the quickest development and effective dissemination of technologies to the farmers and other clients. This extremely important matter as highlighted by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture in its 19th report has been stressed with the Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission at appropriate levels.

Recommendation Sl. No. 2 (Para No. 3.4)

Need to restore the Supremacy of Parliament in Financial Matters

5.3 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para No. 3.4 had made the following observations/recommendations:

The Committee note that there is a growing tendency on the part of the Executive to cut down altogether all the allocations for the Plan schemes and also to reduce allocations drastically to the Plan schemes at the revised estimates stage, although the Parliament has made

available these funds to all those schemes in exercise of the constitutional powers granted to them in the Constitution of India for sanctioning expenditure and its appropriation. The Committee have come across several instances where the entire allocations for various new plan schemes of the Ninth Plan have been reduced to zero at the revised estimates stage by the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance and these schemes have become chronic non-starters, although we are in the third year of Ninth Five Year Plan. The task of these reductions come to the notice of the Parliament only through the Detailed Demands for Grants laid before the Parliament at the end of a financial year, a stage at which the Parliament has to helplessly acquiesce itself into a state of acceptance of this matter; as no restoration of the originally sanctioned amounts at this stage can help due to the sheer lapse of time of almost eleven months of a financial year already during which these should have been utilized. The Committee feel that such reductions by the Planning Commission, which is only an adjunct of the main Executive without any constitutional sanction for its existence, amounts to exercise of powers, than can only be exercised by the passing of several Cut Motions for which the Parliament alone is empowered under the existing constitutional scheme of things. The Committee are aware that the expenditure budget is only an 'Estimate' and as such it has an inherent flexibility in it for 'reasonable' reductions or increase due to various factors. But such variations can be done only by the Parliament and by no other body under the existing provisions of the Constitution. The Committee feel that, ideally, once the Parliament passes a budget estimate for a purpose, sincere attempts should be made by the Executive to spend the funds for that purpose and procedural formalities to be adopted for issuing administrative sanctions for those schemes should not be abused to stall the very implementation of the schemes. But the Committee find that the present system of accord of approval consisting of the various stages of sanctions by Expenditure Finance Committee, Standing Finance Committee, Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs etc. has only led to strangulating delays in the process of implementation of schemes which have the seal of approval of popular will for them from the Parliament. The Committee cannot accept a position whereby the unending rigmaroles of procedural drills prescribed by the bureaucracy for accord of mere administrative approvals are sought to be used to put a spoke on the wheels of progress that should turn on the path delineated by the Parliament. The Committee are of the strong view that such practices are a negation of the basic principles of Parliamentary democracy whereby extra constitutional bodies, procedural devices and practices seek to undermine the supremacy of

the Parliament over the Executive. They, therefore recommend that the whole procedure prescribed for according post budget approval for plan schemes should be through overhauled in the light of the observations of the Committee made above so that the supremacy of the Parliament is re-established and the will of the people prevails. It must be remembered that every estimate in a budget raises a hope in the minds of the people for their legitimate development and, therefore any disadvantageous variation in it would only lead to misleading the public, particularly the poorer sections of the society and as such would amount to committing a fraud on those innocent people.

Reply of the Government

5.4 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

The observations and recommendations of the Parliament Standing Committee on Agriculture have been forwarded to the Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance to take procedural measures so that this Department may not be subjected to the deduction of funds at RE stage.

Recommendation Sl. No. 4 (Para Nos. 3.7 to 3.9)

100% Central Funding of the Programmes Meant for the North East

5.5 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para Nos. 3.7 to 3.9 had made the following observations/recommendations:

The Committee have been informed that the Department had allocated Rs 36.00 crore for various activities in the North-Eastern States which included various research institutions, Central Agricultural University, Krishi Vigyan Kendras and Development Grants to Assam Agricultural University, a number of Centres operating in North-East States, All India Coordinated Research Projects etc. This amount is 8% of the Domestic Budgetary Support of Rs 448.50 crores out of the total available funds.

The Committee would once again like to bring to the notice of the Department the contents of para of Hon'ble Finance Minister's Budget Speech 1998-99 wherein he had mentioned about the creation of non-lapsable Central Reserve Pool for deposit of funds from all Ministries where the plan expenditure on the North Eastern region is less than 10% of the total plan allocation of the Ministry. The difference between 10% of the plan allocation and the actual expenditure incurred on the North-Eastern Region will be transferred to the Central resource Pool which will be used for funding specific programmes for economic upliftment of the North Eastern States.

The Committee recommend that the Department should make 10% allocation of the total plan outlay for the year 1999-2000 for the North-Eastern States. Further, all schemes that are planned for these States should be 100% funded by the Union Government.

Reply of the Government

5.6 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

The Department is making all out efforts to reach a level of 10% funding out of the plan budget during the current financial year 1999-2000 towards the activities of North-East States and Sikkim. The Department has sought the permission of Ministry of Finance and Planning Commission to exempt the Externally Aided Projects/World Bank Projects *i.e.* Domestic Budgetary Support should be the basis for this 10% funding scenario. This is due to the fact that such projects are usually specific and funds could only be spent under the mutually agreed programmes under which there seems to be little scope for diverting the EAP/World Bank funds to the programmes to the regions other than those agreed upon between the donor agency and DARE/ICAR. However, the North-East States and Sikkim too, as per EAPs/World Bank Projects/Programmes, as the case may be, to some extent are being benefited, but fulfilling 10% funding requirement in such cases is not exactly possible.

The recommendations of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture that all the schemes planned for North-East States and Sikkim should be 100% funded by the Union Government is being forwarded to the Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance for policy decision and for providing consequential budgetary increase in the current year budget.

Comments of the Committee

5.7 For comments of the Committee please see Para No. 1.6 of Chapter I of this report.

Recommendation Sl. No. 5 (Para Nos. 3.10 & 3.11)

One Time Catch-up Grant

5.8 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para Nos. 3.10 & 3.11 had made the following observations/recommendations:

The Committee have been recommending the release of a One Time Catch-up Grant of Rs. 500 crore during IX Plan so that the process of technology development in agricultural research could be made globally competitive and relevant. In pursuance of the recommendation, the Planning Commission had communicated an allocation of only Rs. 400 crore for the entire Ninth Plan. The Department had requested for an allocation of Rs. 100 crore in 1998-99 and has asked for Rs. 200 crore in 1999-2000 for modernizing the age-old National Agricultural Research System. But the Planning Commission has not allocated even a single paise till date for this purpose.

The Committee wish to point out that two years of the IX Plan are already over and even in the third year of the Plan, nothing has been done to revitalize the institutions. The Committee, therefore, recommend that substantially higher allocations should be made at the Revised Estimate stage in 1999-2000 and also in the next two years of the IX Plan so that the entire committed funds of Rs. 400 crore are made available to the Department in a planned manner. The Committee further feel that the allocation of Rs. 400 crore will not be sufficient to meet the desired goal of the ICAR and therefore, as per the estimation of the Working Group allocation of Rs. 500 crore should be made as originally recommended by the Committee.

Reply of the Government

5.9 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

The Department has repeatedly requested to the Planning Commission for releasing the catch up grant out of the total allocation of Rs. 400 crore for this purpose for the IX Plan period. For the current financial year 1999-2000 too Rs. 200 crore were requested but no amount was provided despite the fact that most of the old institutions under National Agricultural Research System have already submitted their proposal for one time catch-up grant but the Department is feeling hard pressed on this aspect.

Once again the observations/recommendations of the PSCA on providing one time catch-up grant during the current financial year 1999-2000 and as also to enhance the IX Plan allocation to a level of Rs. 500 crore (as also was recommended by the IX Plan Working Group) has been forwarded to the Planning Commission.

Recommendation Sl. No. 8 (Para Nos. 3.18 to 3.20)

Pending Disciplinary/Vigilance Cases in the Department

5.10 The Committee in their Nineteenth Report (1998-99) in Para Nos. 3.18 to 20 had made the following observations/recommendations:

The Committee have recommended last year for taking immediate action to get sanction for the proposal for a separate vigilance cell headed by a Director (Vigilance). The Committee have also recommended the speedy finalisation of pending disciplinary cases within a reasonable time frame.

The Committee have been informed that the proposal for strengthening of vigilance cell of ICAR with a full time Director (Vigilance) has been formulated in the IX Plan and action to create additional posts for vigilance cell would be taken after approval of the proposal.

The Committee are not satisfied with the progress in the matter of appointment of the Director (Vigilance) and the creation of a separate Vigilance Cell. The Committee recommend that the Department should pursue the matter with the authorities concerned and get the proposal sanctioned within three months of presentation of this Report.

Reply of the Government

5.11 The Government in their reply have stated as under:

The proposal for appointment of full time Director (Vigilance) has already been submitted to the Administrative Division for necessary action. The Committee's recommendation for speedy finalisation of disciplinary cases is being implemented.

NEW DELHI;
28th February, 2000
9th Phalguna, 1921 (Saka)

S. S. PALANIMANICKAM,
Chairman,
Standing Committee on Agriculture.

APPENDIX I

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HELD ON MONDAY THE 28TH FEBRUARY, 2000 IN COMMITTEE ROOM 'C', PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE, NEW DELHI

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1730 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri S.S. Palanimanickam — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Ramdas Rupala Gavit
3. Shri Shivaji Vithalrao Kamble
4. Shri Y.G. Mahajan
5. Shri Jagannath Mallick
6. Shri M. Master Mathan
7. Shri Prakash V. Patil
8. Shri Adi Shankar
9. Shri Rampal Singh
10. Shri Zora Singh
11. Shri Bhal Chandra Yadav

Rajya Sabha

12. Shri Devi Prasad Singh
13. Shri Khagen Das
14. Shri Sharief-Ud-Din Shariq
15. Shri Devi Lal

SECRETARIAT

- | | | |
|------------------------------------|---|--------------------|
| 1. Dr. (Smt.) Paramjit Kaur Sandhu | — | Director |
| 2. Shri Raj Shekhar Sharma | — | Deputy Secretary |
| 3. Smt. Anita Jain | — | Under Secretary |
| 4. Shri K.L. Arora | — | Assistant Director |

At the outset, Chairman (AC) welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee and requested them to take up for consideration the Draft Action Taken Reports on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of the following Ministries/Departments coming under the purview of the Standing Committee on Agriculture:—

1. M/o Agriculture

- (i) Department of Agriculture & Co-operation
- (ii) Department of Agricultural Research & Education
- (iii) Department of Animal Husbandry & Dairying
- (iv) Department of Food Processing Industries.

2. M/o Water Resources

3. The Committee considered the Draft Action Taken Reports one-by-one and adopted the Reports with minor additions/modifications.

4. The Members of the Committee thereafter authorised the Chairman to present the modified and adopted Action Taken Reports on Demands for Grants (1999-2000) of all the above mentioned five Ministries/Departments to the House on a date and time convenient to him.

5. The Members also authorised the Chairman to include some more subjects of national importance for detailed examination and report by the Committee 1999-2000 in addition to those already selected by the Committee in its sitting held on 10th February, 2000.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX II

(Vide Para 4 of Introduction of the Report)

ANALYSIS OF ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE 19TH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE (12TH LOK SABHA)

(i)	Total Number of Recommendations	16
(ii)	Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by the Government: Serial Nos. 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15 & 16	
	Total	8
	Percentage	50%
(iii)	Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies: Serial Nos. 3 & 14	
	Total	2
	Percentage	12.50%
(iv)	Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee: Serial No. 13	
	Total	1
	Percentage	6.25%
(v)	Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited: Serial Nos. 1, 2, 4, 5 & 8	
	Total	5
	Percentage	31.25%