

32

STANDING COMMITTEE  
ON AGRICULTURE  
(1995-96)

TENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE  
(DEPTT. OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH & EDUCATION)

- DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (1995-96)

*[Action taken by Government on the recommendations/observations  
contained in the Twentieth Report of Standing Committee on Agriculture]*

**THIRTY SECOND REPORT**



LC  
328.3657R  
N5.32;2

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

December, 1995/Agrahayana, 1917 (Saka)

**THIRTY SECOND REPORT**  
**STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE**  
**(1995-96)**

**TENTH LOK SABHA**

**MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE**  
**(DEPTT. OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH & EDUCATION)**

**DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (1995-96)**

*[Action taken by Government on the recommendations/  
observations contained in the Twentieth Report of Standing  
Committee on Agriculture]*

Presented to Lok Sabha on 14th December 1995  
Laid in Rajya Sabha on 14th December 1995

19 DEC 1995  
15 DEC 1995



सत्यमेव जयते

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT**  
**NEW DELHI**

*December, 1995/Agrahayana, 1917 (Saka)*

Price : Rs. 10.00

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY  
Central Govt. Publications  
App. No. 93620(3)  
Date 6/2/96

le  
328.3657R  
\*N5.32j2

© 1995 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Eighth Edition) and Printed by Akashdeep Printers, 20 Ansari Road, Daryaganj, New Delhi-110002.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE .....	(iii)
COMPOSITION OF THE SUB-COMMITTEE 'B' .....	(v)
INTRODUCTION .....	(vii)
CHAPTER I Report	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by Government .....	4
CHAPTER III Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies .....	8
CHAPTER IV Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of Government have not been accepted by the Committee .....	10
CHAPTER V Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of Government are still awaited .....	11
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX I Minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 7th December 1995 .....	13
APPENDIX II Analysis of Action Taken by Government on the Recommendations contained in the Twentieth Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (Tenth Lok Sabha) .....	15

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
(1995-96)

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

Shri Nitish Kumar – *Chairman*

2. Shri D. Pandian
3. Shri Birbal
4. Shri Nathuram Mirdha
5. Shri G. Ganga Reddy
6. Shri Ankushrao Raosaheb Tope
7. Shri Sarat Pattanayak
8. Shri Govindrao Nikam
9. Kumari Pushpa Devi Singh
10. Shri Channaiah Odeyar
11. Shri Tara Singh
12. Shri Anantrao Deshmukh
13. Shri Uttamrao Deora Patil
14. Shri V.V. Nawale
15. Shri Rajvir Singh
16. Kumari Uma Bharati
17. Shri Rudrasen Chaudhary
18. Shri Ganga Ram Koli
19. Dr. Gunawant Rambhau Sarode
20. Dr. Parshuram Gangwar
21. Shri Rajendra Kumar Sharma
22. Smt. Krishnendra Kaur (Deepa)
23. Shri Ram Tahal Chaudhary
24. Shri Zainal Abedin
25. Shri B.N. Reddy
26. Shri Kamla Mishra Madhukar
27. Dr. R.K.G. Rajulu
28. Shri Upendra Nath Verma
29. Shri Shibu Soren

(iv)

*Rajya Sabha*

30. Shri Govindrao Adik
31. Shri Satyanarayana Dronamraju
32. Shri Ramnarayan Goswami
33. Shri H. Hanumanthappa
34. Shri Anant Ram Jaiswal
35. Dr. Bapu Kaldate
36. Shri David Ledger\*
37. Shri Bhupinder Singh Mann
38. Shri N. Thangaraj Pandian
39. Shri S.K.T. Ramachandran\*\*
40. Shri K.N. Singh
41. Shri Maheshwar Singh
42. Dr. Ranveer Singh
43. Shri Shiv Charan Singh
44. Shri Som Pal

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S.N. Mishra – *Additional Secretary*
2. Smt. Roli Srivastava – *Joint Secretary*
3. Shri P.D.T. Achary – *Director*
4. Shri S. Bal Shekar – *Under Secretary*

---

Ceased to be member of the Committee consequent upon retirement from Rajya Sabha w.e.f. 14.6.95.

Ceased to be member of the Committee consequent upon retirement from Rajya Sabha w.e.f. 24.7.95.

## COMPOSITION OF SUB-COMMITTEE 'B'

- |                            |   |                           |
|----------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Shri Rajvir Singh          | - | <i>Convenor</i>           |
| 2. Shri Anantrao Deshmukh  | - | <i>Alternate Convenor</i> |
| 3. Shri Rudrasen Chaudhary |   |                           |
| 4. Shri Sarat Pattanayak   |   |                           |
| 5. Shri K.N. Singh         |   |                           |
| 6. Shri Anant Ram Jaiswal  |   |                           |
| 7. Shri Shibu Soren        |   |                           |
| 8. Shri B.N. Reddy         |   |                           |
| 9. Shri Govindrao Adik     |   |                           |

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1995-96) having been authorised by the Committee to submit Report on their behalf, present this 32nd Report on Action Taken by Government on the recommendations/ observations contained in the 20th Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1995-96) (Tenth Lok Sabha) on the Demands for Grants (1995-96) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Deptt. of Agricultural Research & Education).

2. The Twentieth Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1995-96) on Demands for Grants (1995-96) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Deptt. of Agricultural Research & Education) was presented to Lok Sabha on 4th May, 1995. The Ministry of Agriculture (Deptt. of Agricultural Research & Education) was requested to furnish action taken replies of the Government to recommendations contained in the Twentieth Report by November, 1995. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received.

3. The Committee considered the action taken replies furnished by the Government in its sitting held on 7th December 1995, approved the draft comments and adopted the 32nd Report.

4. An analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations/observations contained in the 20th Report (Tenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee is given in Appendix II.

NEW DELHI;  
8th December, 1995  
*17th Agrahayana, 1917 (Saka)*

NITISH KUMAR,  
*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 Twentieth Report (Tenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1995-96) on the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research & Education) which was presented to the Lok Sabha on 4th May, 1995.

1.2 Action taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 13 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 Para Nos. 2.13, 2.14, 2.39, 2.49, 2.50, 2.51, 2.58 and 2.64 (Total 8)
- (ii) Recommendation/Observation which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies:- (Chapter III of the Report)  
Recommendation Para No. 2.76 (Total 1)
- (iii) Recommendation/Observation 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 Para No. 2.75 (Total 1)
- (iv) Recommendation in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited:- (Chapter V of the Report)  
Recommendation Para Nos. 2.15, 2.27 and 2.73 (Total 3)

1.3 The Committee will now deal with the recommendations which have not been accepted and have been included in Chapter IV of the Report.

#### **1.4 Recommendation Para No. 2.75**

In its Twentieth Report on Demands for Grants 1995-96 the Committee made the following recommendation:-

“The Committee observed that such a large amount of the budget was being utilised for extension & education and this should really benefit the

farmers. In order to keep a check and properly monitor the expenditure under this head a separate head was suggested to be opened. The Committee wanted to know how many SAUs had actually opened a separate head and if they had not been monitored was the ICAR thinking to release funds on the compliance of this factor as the pre-condition."

#### **1.5 The Government in their reply has stated:-**

"The recommendation is very valuable for proper monitoring of extension education programmes, so that farmers are really benefitted. The DARE/ICAR is already having a monitoring mechanism through which the ICAR Institute & Projects are critically evaluated by QRTs and also evaluation/review committees.

Scope for diversion of funds in SAUs has been minimised by the opening a separate account for KVK in 12 SAUs; remaining 15 are in the process of making change in their act and statutes so that they could open separate account of KVKs. These universities are in the process of opening a separate account of KVK at the University Headquarters. However, they have already separate accounts of KVK in respective districts."

**1.6 The Committee note that there are 28 State Agricultural Universities in the country and out of them only 12 State Agricultural Universities have opened separate budget account heads so far despite repeated observations of the Committee since 1993. The Committee are not satisfied with the tardy progress made in the implementation of the recommendation of the Committee. The Committee also note that the Government have kept silent over the suggestion of the Committee to make the opening of the separate head of account as a precondition for the release of funds to the agricultural universities and it appears no time frame has been prescribed by the Union Government in the matter. The Committee recommend that drastic and urgent steps are required to be taken by the Union Government in the matter by stipulating a time limit within which separate budget heads should be opened by all the State Agricultural Universities and they should be warned that in case of default release of funds would be stopped forthwith. The Committee also desire that the Government should consider the possibility of direct release of funds to KVKs run by the SAUs through the Zonal Coordination Units of ICAR till separate budget-heads are opened by the SAUs.**

#### **Implementation of Recommendations**

**1.7 The Committee would like to emphasise that the greatest importance should be attached to the implementation of the recommendations by**

**Government. They, therefore, expect that Government would implement such recommendations expeditiously. In case, it is not possible to implement any recommendation in letter and spirit for any reason, the matter should be reported to the Committee in time with reasons for non-implementation.**

## CHAPTER II

### RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY GOVERNMENT

#### **Recommendation at Para No. 2.13**

2.1 The reply of the Government corroborates the fact that it has not even been able to get an increase of 11% due to budgetary inflation over the RE of the previous year and is happy with the little increase. It seems obvious that the department has not been able to spend its plan allocation during 1993-94 which clearly shows that it does not have the required capacity and capability. The Department should make special efforts to enhance its capacity to utilise more funds so that the Committee's recommendation regarding, increased allocation should be meaningful.

#### **2.2 The Government in their reply stated:**

Observations are noted. However, it is stated that during 1994-95 due to sustained efforts there has been full utilisation of plan allocation.

#### **Recommendation at Para No. 2.14**

2.3 The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department keeping in mind the priorities should make all out efforts to meaningfully utilise the approved outlay for Sectors/Schemes so that it does not have to surrender any amount due to non-utilisation/under utilisation.

#### **2.4 The Government in their reply stated:**

Observations are noted. However, it is stated that during 1994-95 due to sustained efforts there has been full utilisation of plan allocation.

#### **2.5 Recommendation at Para No. 2.39**

##### *Major Head 2415—Crop Husbandry*

The Committee recommends that plan schemes should be targeted and should not be overlapped with other schemes. The success of the schemes should be monitored by evaluating the number of varieties released to the farmers and the area in which they are used and production thereof.

## **2.6 The Government in their reply stated:**

Observations/noted. It is, however, stated that certain apparent overlaps are due to development and evaluation of regional and location specific packages.

## **2.7 Committee's Comments:**

The Committee noted that while making the recommendation it was not convinced by the academic reply of the department (Para 2.37 of the 20th Report) and therefore wanted specific details such as when the nature in any particular field was taken up and in which agro zones, when was it completed, what is the impact on the total production of any and what is the acceptability of the results of research so that the Committee could effectively evaluate in terms of finance the extent of budgetary provision on these heads.

The Department may please refer to the action taken reply to Para 2.49 wherein they have stated that impact of research is assessed using indicators like varieties released, area of coverage, level of productivity increase achieved, net return to the growers, the employment generation potential etc. as in the case of high yielding basmati rice, hybrid rice, hybrid cotton, soyabean, sunflower, potato, apples, banana, grapes etc.

2.8 The Committee hope that the Department would in future, meticulously furnish the above mentioned details while giving replies.

## **2.9 Recommendation at Para No. 2.49**

Keeping all the above facts in view whereas the Committee is happy over the high funding to Crop Husbandry within the financial constraints, it feels that the allocation is on the higher side because the allocation is not justified by the quality/outcome/results of productivity achievements. Research should be linked with results and not self sufficiency with decreasing per capita availability.

## **2.10 The Government in their reply stated:**

Though Crop Husbandry that encompasses all disciplines of agri-horticulture accounts for the largest share of the budget, its proportion has relatively come down over the years. The resource allocation for targetted research programmes is done on the basis of priority, programme and applied significance of the research programmes. Impact of research is assessed using indicators like varieties released, area of coverage, level of productivity increase achieved, net return to the growers, the employment generation potential etc. as in the case of high yielding Basmati rice, hybrid rice, hybrid cotton, soyabean, sunflower, potato, apples, banana, grapes etc. Shifting of emphasizing and consequent reallocation of

resources is a continuing process based on critical and detailed review of relevant factors including national priorities.

### **2.11 Recommendation at Para No. 2.50**

The Committee, therefore, feels that some sort of mechanism should be involved so that research may be linked with acceptability/increased productivity and this should determine the allocation of funds. If, however, results are not achieved it recommends a reduction of allocation to cater to other priority areas.

### **2.12 The Government in their reply stated:**

Though crop husbandry that encompasses all disciplines of agri-horticulture accounts for the largest share of the budget, its proportion has relatively come down over the years. The resource allocation for targeted research programmes is done on the basis of priority, programme and applied significance of the research programmes. Impact of research is assessed using indicators like varieties released, area of coverage, level of productivity increase achieved, net return to the growers, the employment generation potential etc. as in the case of high yielding basmati rice, hybrid rice, hybrid cotton, soyabean, sunflower, potato, apples, banana, grapes etc. Shifting of emphasising and consequent reallocation of resources is a continuing process based on critical and detailed review of relevant factors including national priorities.

### **2.13 Recommendation at Para No. 2.51**

The Committee further stresses that the ICAR should evaluate the research done *vis-a-vis* the money spent and evaluate what part of the research has been actually effective in elevating production, per capita availability, foreign currency earnings, etc. and submit a report in the context.

### **2.14 The Government in their reply stated:**

Money spent/earmarked for spending on a research activity is decided upon after a detailed review of various factors such as crops, disciplines and ecologies that would sustain the productivity growth etc. For example, major investment was done in the initial years for crop improvement with special emphasis on food crops (particularly rice and wheat); subsequently the emphasis has shifted on resource management. Similarly, there was emphasis for technology development of irrigated ecologies in the beginning but now it is for the rainfed ecologies with emphasis on horticulture, agro-forestry, livestock husbandry etc.

**2.15 Recommendation at Para No. 2.58**

The Committee expressed its dissatisfaction at the slow progress made during the 1st three years of the VIII Plan. However, they were pleased with the actual utilisation of funds this year and observe that a close watch may be kept on the successful implementation of the schemes during the balance two years of the VIII Plan.

**2.16 The Government in their reply stated:**

The monitoring machinery has been geared up to ensure this.

**2.17 Recommendation at Para No. 2.64**

The Committee being convinced with the clarification expressed their desire to be kept abreast of the progress made in these fields in the years to come.

**2.18 The Government in their reply stated:**

Observations are duly taken note of.

## CHAPTER III

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

#### 3.1 Recommendation at Para No. 2.76

##### *Agricultural Produce Cess Act, 1990*

The Committee has observed that now that ICAR has Institutes, Research Centres/AICRPs to cover all the conceivable commodities, there is no justification for giving it grants in aid under the Agricultural Produce Cess Act, 1990. The grant-in-aid for research in commodities covered by this Act amounts to Rs. 21 crores (Rs. 7 crores in Plan and Rs. 14 crores in Non-Plan). It should be adjusted against the total allocation made under Plan and Non-Plan Budgets.

#### 3.2 The Government in their reply stated:

It is felt there has been a proper appreciation of the utility and purpose served by AP Cess Fund. It may kindly be appreciated that Adhoc AP Cess Fund Schemes are specially meant for supporting time-bound research projects in respect of problems that require immediate attention. These funds are utilised to find solutions to issues which arise owing to sudden and peculiar situation which need immediate attention. Quick studies for short period of time are required to look at the specific problems to bridge the research gap and add to the ongoing research efforts under the ICAR. For this purpose there should be enough scope to consider what the peers feel important and then finance them. Presently AP Cess Fund is utilised to take care of such research areas. Adjusting the grant-in-aid for research in commodities covered by this act which amounted to Rs. 21 crore against the total plan and non-plan allocation of the Department will severely and adversely effect the working of the ICAR. It will prevent funding of basic research, pilot exploratory research projects sponsored by SAUs and other Institutions of higher learning. A portion of the fund is also utilised to promote and encourage professionalisation of scientific activities in different disciplines of agricultural research through societies, seminars, international conferences etc. These activities will also be affected considerably by stoppage of this source.

It may be pertinent in this connection to mention that the Planning Commission has provided funds to ICAR to the tune of only 1300 crore, for VIII Plan period, as against the DARE's requirement of Rs. 2008.78 crores. The inadequacy of



money provided by Planning Commission to agricultural research and education has already been commented upon by the Committee in this Report as can be seen from Para 2.15 wherein they have observed that funds for agricultural research should be increased to a graded level of 1% of agricultural GDP. Hence it will be in appropriate at this stage if this amount of Rs. 21 crore of AP Cess Fund is stopped or adjusted against the total allocation of ICAR/DARE.

## CHAPTER IV

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

#### **4.1 Recommendation at Para No. 2.75**

The Committee observed that such a large amount of the budget was being utilised for extension & education and this should really benefit the farmers. In order to keep a check and properly monitor the expenditure under this head a separate head was suggested to be opened. The Committee wanted to know how many SAUs had actually opened a separate head if they had not been monitored, was the ICAR thinking to release funds on the compliance of this factor as the pre-condition.

#### **4.2 The Government in their reply stated:**

The recommendation is very valuable for proper monitoring of extension education programmes, so that farmers are really benefited. The DARE/ICAR is already having a monitoring mechanism through which the ICAR Institute & Projects are critically evaluated by QRTs and also evaluation/review committees.

Scope for diversion of funds in SAUs has been minimised by the opening a separate account for KVK in 12 SAUs; remaining 15 are in the process of making change in their act and statutes so that they could open separate account of KVKs. These universities are in the process of opening a separate account of KVK at the University Headquarters. However, they have already separate accounts of KVK in respective districts.

## CHAPTER V

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

#### 5.1 Recommendation at Para No. 2.15

The Committee once again reiterate their earlier recommendation that the outlay for agriculture research should be targeted to reach a graded level of 1% of the agricultural GDP and that the Department of Agricultural Research & Education should bring to the notice of Planning Commission the matter of additional funding in right earnest. The Planning Commission should be requested to increase the budgetary allocation actually visualising agricultural research & education as the only gateway to development, enhanced productivity, increased per capita availability and not only restricting it to the annual budgetary inflation.

#### Government in their reply stated:

5.2 A request has been sent from DG ICAR and Secretary DARE to Member Secretary, Planning Commission, to enhance the allocations for agricultural research and education to the level of 1% of agricultural GDP as recommended by the Parliament Standing Committee along with the indications that ICAR/DARE has need and also the capacity to utilise the additional funds. The fact that there has been the full utilisation of plan funds in 1994-95 has also been brought to his notice.

#### 5.3 Recommendation at Para No. 2.27

##### *Major Head 3451—Secretariat Economic Services*

The Committee is therefore, pained to record that its recommendations have not been given due regard and the Department continues to follow its strategy of budgeting by adding percentages on previous budget figures rather than making an effective evaluation & then projecting their Demand. Economic control on expenditure is a result of evaluation and not surplus presumptive budgeting and its surrender. The Committee recommends that an exercise is carried out by the department to plug in loopholes of excessive budgeting and give results of actual exercise of control on expenditure on this head. It further recommends that there is no justification for abnormal increase under Foreign Travel specially because there is no justification for such abnormal increase under this Act specially because in most of the cases provisions for foreign travel is under the relevant scheme. This

allocation may, therefore, be reduced and the entire allocation should be under non-plan.

#### **5.4 The Government in their reply stated:**

Observations noted. Suitable follow up action will be taken at RE stage.

#### **5.5 Recommendation at Para No. 2.73**

##### *Major Head 2415 – Agricultural Extension*

The Committee seeing into achievements of the Department in the number of fully operational KVKs, the scarce resources available with the Department and the petty amount accepted by it for the opening of new KVKs, the new funding pattern and keeping in mind the objective of the Department to open up one KVK in each district in pursuit of the recommendation of the Committee, the Committee can only express its concern over the future of KVKs in the country. The Committee is in doubt that the new KVKs will be only be parts of land without infrastructural facilities for the next many years to come. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommends that the Department take up the course of additional funding to the tune of achieving the twin goals, of making all existing sanctioned KVKs and the establishment of new KVKs to their full operational capacity by the end of VIII Plan period in right earnest with the Planning Commission.

#### **5.6 Government in their reply stated:**

The constraints experienced by ICAR have been projected to the Planning Commission with a request for additional allocations. Observations of the Committee are again being brought to their notice.

NEW DELHI;  
8th December, 1995  
 17th Agrahayana, 1917 (Saka)

NITISH KUMAR,  
 Chairman,  
 Standing Committee on Agriculture.

## APPENDIX I

### MINUTES OF THE 92ND SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HELD ON 7TH DECEMBER, 1995 IN COMMITTEE ROOM 'B' GROUND FLOOR, PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE, NEW DELHI.

The Committee sat from 1530 hrs. to 1640 hrs.

#### PRESENT

Shri Nitish Kumar - *Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

##### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Ankushrao Raosaheb Tope
3. Shri Sarat Patttnayak
4. Shri Govindrao Nikam
5. Kumari Pushpa Devi Singh
6. Shri Tara Singh
7. Shri Rudrasen Chaudhary
8. Shri Parshuram Gangwar
9. Dr. Gunawant Rambhau Sarode
10. Shri Ram Tahal Chaudhary
11. Shri Zainal Abedin
12. Shri Upendra Nath Verma
13. Shri Anantrao Deshmukh

##### *Rajya Sabha*

14. Dr. Babu Kaldate
15. Shri Bhupinder Singh Mann
16. Shri Shiv Charan Singh
17. Shri Som Pal

At the outset Chairman (AC) welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee and requested them to take up the adoption of the Draft Report on the Rice Milling Industry (Regulation) Repeal Bill, 1995 and the Draft Action Taken

Reports on the Demands for Grants 1995-'96 in respect of the Department of Agricultural Research & Education, the Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying and the Ministry of Water Resources.

2. The Draft Reports were considered one by one and adopted without modifications. The Members of the Committee, thereafter, authorised the Chairman to present the Report on the Rice-Milling Industry (Regulation) Repeal Bill, 1995 and the Action Taken Reports on Demands for Grants 1995-96 in respect of Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research & Education), Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Animal Husbandry & Dairying) and Ministry of Water Resources to the House on a date convenient to him.

The Committee decided that the next Committee for the year 1996-97 may consider and take up "Breeding Policy" as a separate subject for study and report.

*The meeting then adjourned.*

## APPENDIX II

(Vide Introduction of the Report)

*Analysis of Action Taken by Government on the 20th Report of Standing Committee on Agriculture (10th Lok Sabha)*

I.	Total number of Recommendations	13
II.	Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by Government (Para Nos. 2.13, 2.14, 2.39, 2.49, 2.50, 2.51, 2.58, 2.64)	
	Total	8
	Percentage	62
III.	Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies (Para No. 2.76)	
	Total	1
	Percentage	7.5
IV.	Recommendations/Observations in respect of which Government's replies have not been accepted by the Committee (Para No. 2.75)	
	Total	1
	Percentage	7.5
V.	Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies are still awaited Para Nos. 2.15, 2.27, 2.73	
	Total	3
	Percentage	23