

15

STANDING COMMITTEE  
ON AGRICULTURE  
(1996-97)

ELEVENTH LOK SABHA

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL  
RESEARCH & EDUCATION

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (1996-97)

*[Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations/observations  
contained in the Second Report (1996-97) of Standing Committee  
on Agriculture (1996-97) (Eleventh Lok Sabha)]*

FIFTEENTH REPORT



सत्यमेव जयते

28.3657f  
N6.15;3

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

July, 1997/Shravana, 1919 (Saka)

FIFTEENTH REPORT  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
(1996-97)

(ELEVENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURAL  
RESEARCH & EDUCATION

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS (1996-97)

*[Action taken by the Government on the recommendations/observations  
contained in the Second Report (1996-97) of Standing Committee  
on Agriculture (1996-97) (Eleventh Lok Sabha)]*

Presented to Lok Sabha on.....  
Laid in Rajya Sabha on.....



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*July, 1997/Shravana, 1919 (Saka)*

Price : Rs. 16.00

PARLIAMENT LIBRARY  
Central Govt Publications (4)  
Acc. No. RC 97947  
Date 1.8.1977

LC  
328.3657R  
N6.15.3

© 1997 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 Jainco Art India, 13/10, W.E.A., Saraswati Marg, Karol Bagh, New Delhi-110005.

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE .....	(iii)
INTRODUCTION .....	(v)
CHAPTER I Report .....	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by the Government.....	7
CHAPTER III Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies.....	16
CHAPTER IV Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee .....	23
CHAPTER V Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited .....	26

### APPENDICES

I. Minutes of the sitting of the Committee held on 10 July, 1997 .....	30
II. Analysis of Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (Eleventh Lok Sabha).....	32



COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE  
ON AGRICULTURE (1996-97)

Shri Santosh Kumar Gangwar — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Pandurang Fundkar
3. Shri Ramesh Bais
4. Shri Thawar Chand Gehlot
5. Shri Padamsen Chaudhary
6. Shri Bhimrao Badade
7. Shri G. Mallikarjunappa
8. Shri Gordhanbhai Javia
9. Shri Manibhai Chaudhuri
10. Shri Sohanveer Singh
11. Shri Bhupender Singh Hooda
12. Smt. Ratna Singh
13. Shri Madan Patil
14. Shri Gangadhar Kunturkar
15. Shri Annaihgari Sai Pratap
16. Shri Gulam Mohd. Mir Magami
17. Shri Vishveshwar Bhagat
18. Shri Meti Hullappa Yamanappa
19. Shri Sukdeo Paswan
20. Shri Bajuban Riyan
21. Shri Mahaboob Zahedi
22. Shri K. Natarayan
23. Shri Munavvar Hassan
24. Dr. K.P. Ramlingam

25. Shri Sydaiah Kota
26. Shri Suresh Jadhav
27. Shri Sode Ramaiah
28. Dr. Mohan Singh
29. Shri Bhim Prasad Dahal
30. Smt. Satwinder Kaur

*Rajya Sabha*

31. Shri Ananta Sethi
32. Shri A.S. Chowdhri
33. Maulana Habibur Rahman Nomani
34. Shri Suresh Pachouri
35. Shri Jagir Singh Dard
36. Shri Shiv Charan Singh
37. Dr. Ranbir Singh
38. Shri Anil Kumar
39. Shri Ramnarayan Goswami
40. Shri O.S. Manian
41. Shri Devi Prasad Singh
42. Shri Sharief-ud-din Shariq

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S. Bal Shekar — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Smt. Anita Jain — *Under Secretary*
3. Shri K.L. Arora — *Assistant Director*
4. Shri Anil Kumar — *Reporting Officer*

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1996-97) having been authorised by the Committee to submit Report on their behalf, present this 15th Report on Action Taken by Government on the recommendations/observations contained in the 2nd Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1996-97) (Eleventh Lok Sabha) on the Demands for Grants (1996-97) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Deptt. of Agricultural Research & Education).

2. The Second Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1996-97) on Demands for Grants (1996-97) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Deptt. of Agricultural Research & Education) was presented to Lok Sabha on 29th August, 1996. The Ministry of Agriculture (Deptt. of Agricultural Research & Education) was requested to furnish action taken replies of the Government to recommendations contained in the Second Report. 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 10th July, 1997, approved the draft comments and adopted the 15th Report.

4. An analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations/observations contained in the 15th Report (Eleventh Lok Sabha) of the Committee is given in Appendix II.

NEW DELHI;  
July, 1997  
*Shravana, 1919 (Saka)*

SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR,  
*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 Second Report (Eleventh Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1996-97) on Demands for Grants (1996-97) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agricultural Research and Education) which was presented to the Lok Sabha and laid in Rajya Sabha on 29th August, 1996.

1.2 Action Taken Replies have been received from the Government in respect of all the 18 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 Serial Nos. 3 (paras 2.32, 2.32A & 2.33), 5 (para 2.49), 7 (paras 2.51 & 2.52), 8 (paras 2.59, 2.60 & 2.61), 9 (paras 2.79 & 2.80), 10 (paras 2.88 & 2.89), 12 (para 2.101), 15 (paras 2.108 & 2.109) and 17 (para 2.119)

Total 9

- (ii) Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies : (Chapter III of the Report)—

Recommendation Serial Nos. 4 (paras 2.46, 2.47 & 2.48), 11 (paras 2.90 & 2.91), 13 (para 2.102), 14 (paras 2.103 & 2.104) and 18 (para 2.120)

Total 5

- (iii) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which reply of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee: (Chapter IV of the Report has been commented upon in Chapter I of the Report)—

Recommendation Serial Nos. 2 (paras 2.26 & 2.27) and 6 (para 2.50)

Total 2

- (iv) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited : (Chapter V of the Report)—

Recommendation Serial Nos. 1 (paras 2.11, 2.12, 2.13 & 2.14),  
16 (paras 2.117 & 2.118)

Total 2

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.

**Recommendation Serial No. 2 (Para Nos. 2.26 & 2.27)**

*Higher Allocations for Agricultural Research*

1.4 In its Second Report on Demands for Grants (1996-97) in Para Nos. 2.26 & 2.27 the Committee made the following recommendation :—

“The Committee was rather surprised to know that the Government still wants the ICAR to provide necessary technology to improve the foodgrains production upto 210 million tonnes by 2000 A.D. and also to produce more for export. ICAR has put up a very strong case for the allocations to be a minimum of Rs. 340 crores as asked before and is certainly required during the current annual plan in order to meet the target of terminal year of VIII Plan. The fund utilisation by the Council has also been very effective during the later years of the Current Plan period. The Department has further communicated that EFC/PICs clearance for important schemes with revised outlays amounting to more than Rs. 68 crores are available and there are no procedural formalities to be completed for ensuring expenditure during the on-going financial year.

The Committee is, therefore, of strong opinion that agricultural research programmes at this crucial juncture must not be allowed to receive a set back for want of adequate funds. The Committee hence recommend that the Ministry of Finance must find a way out to provide the approved minimum outlay of Rs. 340 crores in the current fiscal year. Unless this is done, priority research programmes are bound to suffer which would adversely affect the agricultural growth of the country.”

### Reply of the Government

1.5 We have communicated the above mentioned observations/recommendations to the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance. In view of DARE/ICAR capacity and preparedness to optimise funds utilisation (cumulatively built up during the successive years of the VIII Plan as well to contain the cost escalations owing to inflation), the Department had projected an outlay of Rs. 440 crore to the Planning Commission for 1996-97. But during the discussion, the Planning Commission had tentatively agreed for an outlay of Rs. 340 crore. However the Government has given only Rs. 310.8 crore during 1996-97, thus leaving a difference of Rs. 29.2 crore. It is felt that if funds are provided to the tune of Rs. 340 crore, the Council would be in a position to utilise the whole outlay, as EFC/PIC clearances of important schemes whose revised outlays amounting to more than Rs. 68 crore are available and there is no further procedural formalities remaining to be fulfilled.

### Comments of the Committee

1.6 The Committee are dismayed to learn that DARE has not been provided with the minimum agreed outlay of Rs. 340 crore in the last fiscal year of the VIII plan, i.e., (1996-97) against the projected outlay of Rs. 440 crore even after their repeated recommendations in favour of an enhanced outlay. The Committee are further to note that the plan funds allocation for 1997-98 is Rs. 331.17 crore only against a projected outlay of Rs. 1000 crore by the Deptt. for carrying out its research activities in the thrust areas of the Ninth Plan. The Committee observe that Rs. 331.17 crore as plan outlay for 1997-98 is Rs. 8.83 crore less than the agreed outlay for 1996-97 of Rs. 340 crore.

In view of the above stated position, the Committee feel that DARE is not able to put forth a strong case to secure a higher outlay matching with the high expectations for providing necessary technology to improve foodgrains production not only to achieve self-reliance but also for exporting them.

The Committee, therefore, would impress upon the Department to put their facts and figures more convincingly before the Planning Commission for additional funds. Simultaneously, the Committee wish to impress upon the Ministry of Finance and the Planning Commission the imperative need for making sufficient allocation of

**funds to this very crucial activity in order to achieve realistic progress and to tackle the problem of hunger that is imminent in view of the stagnation found in the quantum of foodgrains produced in the country in the last three years.**

**Recommendation Serial No. 6 (Para No. 2.50)**

*Bringing More Land Under Cultivation by Reclamation*

1.7 The Committee in its' Second Report in Para No. 2.50 made the following recommendation :—

“The stagnation obtaining in the net area cultivated under different crops and in different ecological zones over the years is rather perturbing. The Committee note the explanation of the Council in this regard that technologies have been developed for reclamation and utilization of lands and it is for the States to utilize/adopt the research for such reclamation, it is the responsibility of the States to reclaim areas for sowing more crops. The Committee are disappointed to note that the fruits of 10 years of research in reclamation has not been put to use by the States and as such produced no fruitful results. Therefore, sufficient allocation under this head for the Ninth Plan should be earmarked to evolve low cost technology and the States should be directed to revise their priorities in order to bring more land under cultivation by undertaking immediate reclamation works.”

**Reply of the Government**

1.8 The Central Soil Salinity Research Institute (CSSRI), Karnal is pursuing its research for development of technologies for reclamation of salt affected soils. This Institute has successfully generated and demonstrated in a model way, the technologies for amelioration and utilization of alkali soils and inland waterlogged saline soils. In addition, the technologies have also been generated for utilization of the coastal saline soils for productive purposes.

For quicker dissemination of the technologies, the Institute had been undertaking training of Subject Matter Specialists (SMSs) working with the State Departments as well as of various Land Reclamation Corporations. So far, 1104 SMSs working with States having salinity/alkalinity affected areas have been trained through institutional training. A series of publications on “Better Farming in Salt Affected Soils”

have been published in English/Hindi and circulated on a wide scale. Efforts will be made to publish them in local languages.

Viable working linkages have been established by the institute with various State Governments such as Land Reclamation Corporation of Haryana and U.P. Several pilot projects on sub-surface drainage in Haryana and an EEC funded project for large scale users land reclamation in U.P. and Bihar are being implemented by these State Governments. The Director of the institute is a member of the national/state level committee for overseeing the implementation of these projects. The institute has entered into a memorandum of understanding with the UP Land Reclamation and Development Corporation for adaptive testing of the technologies and many adaptive trials have been laid out at Sivri Farm, Lucknow. Similarly, adaptive research project on afforestation is being implemented at Saraswati Farm in cooperation with the Forest Department, Government of Haryana. The Institute has also extended its technologies in Gujarat in association with Gujarat Land Development Corporation.

The data collected by this Institute from various Land Reclamation Corporations in the States of Haryana, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh have shown that during the last two decades over 7.6 lakh hectares of affected areas have been reclaimed by adopting the Institute package of practices and brought under productive use, thus adding nearly 30 lakh tonnes of additional foodgrains in the form of rice and wheat per year.

Several research projects have already been initiated such as on bio-ameliorative measure for seepage control, bio-reclamation of alkali soils, alternative use of alkali/saline soils in agroforestry and use of brackish water in afforestation and agriculture to develop low cost options for rehabilitation of salt affected soils, as per perspective plan of the Central Soil Salinity Research Institute, Karnal. Sufficient allocations will be earmarked during the IX Plan period to promote further refinement and evaluation of these low cost reclamation technologies. These technologies will also be promoted by the centres of the All India Coordinated Research Project on Management of Salt Affected Soils and Use of Saline Water in Agriculture and also through the Irrigation Salinity Drainage Network of the Indo-Dutch Project. These efforts will address the soil problems in different States.

#### **Comments of the Committee**

**1.9 The Committee find from the reply that only the States of Haryana, Punjab and U.P. have reclaimed 7.6 lakh hectares of affected**



areas during the last 2 decades by adopting the CSSRI, Karnal package of practices for land reclamation. Nothing has been mentioned about the position of land reclamation in rest of the 22 States and 6 UTs of India nor anything is said about whether the States have revised their priorities in order to bring more land under cultivation by undertaking immediate reclamation works as recommended by the Committee.

The Committee also find that the reply is silent about reclamation of ravines and wastelands. The Committee are of the opinion that ICAR should develop low-cost technologies for levelling ravines and reclaiming wastelands so that such lands can be brought under cultivation. DARE in collaboration with the Deptt. of Agriculture and Cooperation should fix a target for land reclamation in all the States and UTs.

The Committee, therefore, reiterate that the Government should see that the low cost technology developed by the DARE for land reclamation must be utilized to produce fruitful results. The States should be advised to revise their priorities in order to bring more land under cultivation by undertaking immediate works. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the details of lands proposed to be reclaimed and already reclaimed so far in all the States and UTs.

## CHAPTER II

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

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 3 (Para Nos. 2.32, 2.32A & 2.33)**

##### *Proper Assessment of Expenditure on Proposed Activities*

2.1 The Committee in its' Second Report in Para Nos. 2.32, 2.32A & 2.33 had made the following recommendations:

"The Committee note that the reasons given by the Government for an estimated savings component of Rs. 10 lakhs was mainly due to non-operation of posts in the set-up meant for MOS. But the actual saving was Rs. 24 lakhs and the entire money has been surrendered to the Government. The Committee further observe that against an actual expenditure of Rs. 7.94 lakhs towards office expenses in the year 1994-95, the Department has raised a demand for Rs. 20 lakhs in the R.E. of 1995-96 which is an increase of about 150% of the original estimate. The Department have stated that due to computerisation, there is rise in the demand.

The Committee find that the demand for Office Expenses is Rs. 22 lakhs in Non-plan in 1996-97. The Committee desires that during 1996-97, there should not be any unrealistic estimate made under this head leading to surrender of funds at the end of the year.

The Committee reiterates their earlier recommendations in the previous years that demands should be assessed properly and with extra care so that vital money could be utilised in other spheres of the development which are hit by the financial crunch."

#### **Reply of the Government**

2.2 In the light of the observations/recommendations of the Committee, steps have been taken to reduce the demand for office expenses under non-plan from Rs. 22 lakhs to Rs. 17 lakh at RE of 1996-97.

**Recommendation Serial No. 5 (Para No. 2.49)**

*Distribution of Certified Seeds to Farmers*

2.3 The Committee in its' Second Report in Para No. 2.49 had recommended as follows :

“The Committee also note the achievements in certified seeds distributions but fails to understand the severe problems being faced by farmers throughout the country at appropriate times.”

**Reply of the Government**

2.4 This item relates to the availability of certified/quality seed distribution to the farmers. The Indian Council of Agricultural Research has the mandate of nucleus and breeder seed production only. If the chain of seed production from breeder to foundation to certified seed is carried out with the optimum expectations of seed multiplication ratio as established for different crops, there should be no dearth of quality/certified seed availability to the farmers. In the light of the observation of the Standing Parliamentary Committee efforts to strictly monitor the production and distribution of foundation and certified seed programmes will be carried out by National Seed Corporation and State Seed Corporations as well as related functionaries. ICAR will interact with the DAC, the nodal department, so that strict monitoring of foundation and certified seed production can be carried out.

**Recommendation Serial No. 7 (Para Nos. 2.51 & 2.52)**

*Association of Private Agencies for Distribution of Improved Varieties of Seeds*

2.5 In its' Second Report in Para Nos. 2.51 and 2.52, the Committee had recommended as follows :

“The Committee suggests that the Department to explore the possibilities of introducing its high performance seeds through governmental agencies, co-operatives and private agencies as well with all the subsidies rather than Seed Corporations only so that distribution is faster and widespread.

The Committee further recommend that an attempt should be made to sustain food productivity at optimum level, alongwith maintenance of natural resources base. The Committee recommend

that there should be major emphasis on "Development of sustainable milk and crop production systems" suited for various agro-ecological regions of the country in near future under forthcoming National Agriculture Technology Project (NATP)."

### Reply of the Government

2.6 The suggestion of the Committee that NGOs and Private Sector should also be involved in the faster and wide spread distribution of the seed of the improved varieties is well taken. The Council has already initiated action in this direction by involving NGOs like KVKs, Private Sector and sponsored breeder seed production programme. In addition to the conventional agencies like Seed Corporations, the estimated coverage of about 50 thousand ha. under hybrid rice has been possible through the collaborative approach between the public and private sector. Several public-bred parental lines of hybrids have been made available to private sector as well as NGOs, like Gaddipali KVK (Andhra Pradesh) which are under active hybrid seed production. As suggested, further filip will be given to this aspect in the ensuing plan by promoting involvement of all concerned agencies in augmenting seed availability to farmers.

The recommendation of the Standing Parliamentary Committee has been noted for appropriate action. Livestock is an integral part of all the key production system research proposal under NATP.

### Recommendation Serial No. 8 (Para Nos. 2.59 to 2.61)

*Need to cut down the time Lag in the Release of New Varieties of Seeds*

2.7 The Committee in its' Second Report in Para Nos. 2.59 to 2.61 had recommended as follows :

"The Committee note that great effort has been made by the Council for the release of these high-yielding varieties and also note that it takes almost one decade from the initial stage of development of a variety to the stage it actually reaches the hands of the farmer through the stages of notification, production of certified seeds and distribution.

In this connection, the Committee feel that the Council should seriously examine whether the period of 8 to 10 years required for development of a variety could be shortened. The Committee are disappointed to note that out of a paltry sum of Rs. 9.89 crores

approved, for the VIIIth Plan towards Plant Genetic Resources, only Rs. .9.05 crores has been allocated and even out of this budgetary allocation only Rs. 8.64 crores has been spent (assuming that the total B.E. of Rs. 1.95 crores for 1996-97 is also spent completely).

The Committee, therefore, recommend that more thrust should be given to the Gene Bank which is the base to all hybrid technology and that the time lag in the release of new variety should be minimised."

### **Reply of the Government**

2.8 Efforts are made to shorten the time taken for development of new varieties by using off-season nurseries for growing an additional crop in the same year. Off-season nurseries have already been established at Dalang Maidan (Lahaul Valley), Wellington (Nilgiri Hills), Coimbatore, Adduthurai and Sholapur for various crops. The use of off-season facilities is expected to substantially reduce the time taken for development of new varieties. The national Gene Bank, recently inaugurated, is one of the largest and most modern in the world. This facility would help in preservation of valuable genetic material for improving crop variety productivity and profitability in posterity.

### **Comments of the Committee**

2.9 The reply indicates the existing arrangements only and not about any special/additional efforts made by the Government in the light of the recommendations of the Committee.

The Committee appreciate the efforts being made by the Department to shorten the time taken for development of new varieties by using off-season nurseries established at Dalang Maidan, Wellington, Coimbatore, Adduthurai and Sholapur. The Committee feel that the Department should establish a network of such off-season nurseries in sufficient numbers to cover all the agro-climatic zones in the country for the quicker development of new hybrid varieties of seeds and the other agro-climatic zones should not remain neglected.

### **Recommendation Serial No. 9 (Para Nos. 2.79 & 2.80)**

#### *Under-utilisation of funds for AICRP—Cotton*

2.10 The Committee in its' Second Report in Para Nos. 2.79 & 2.80 had recommended as follows :—

"The Committee observe that the area under cultivation as in the other cases has been fluctuating between 7.3 million hectares and

8.00 million hectares but the production has sizeably increased from 6.38 million bales of 170 kgs. each to 12.3 million bales, *i.e.*, almost double in about a decade. The yield was 169 kgs./hectares in 1986-87 and now it is 260 kgs./hectare. But inspite of this achievement the consumption exceeds the output. Further, the Committee also look towards cotton as a crop which can earn a good amount of foreign exchange for the country. So, there is yet a far goal to reach.

The Committee, therefore, while being happy on the one hand over the good results of research in this field impress upon the Council the need for better efforts to meet the targets of consumption & handsome exports. To achieve this, the Committee suggest for an increase in the total land under cultivation and a dedicated effort towards research. The Committee, however, are not happy to note the under-utilisation of allotted funds for AICRP-Cotton in the last two years and desire that the allocation for 1996-97 should be fully utilised to achieve the desired results."

### **Reply of the Government**

2.11 There is hardly any scope for area growth in the already established traditional areas. Vertical expansion in terms of yield improvement holds the key for further growth in cotton production. However, little area can be brought under Cotton cultivation in non-traditional areas like Orissa, Bihar, West Bengal and North-East.

To meet the demand of raw cotton of 24 million bales in 2020 A.D., major research thrust will be given during 9th Plan to:—

- (a) Develop high yielding varieties and hybrids tolerant to moisture stress conditions which account for 75% of the total cotton area;
- (b) Augment hybrid breeding using cytoplasmic male sterility system and increasing area under hybrids. Special emphasis on development of short duration intra-specific hybrids for north zone;
- (c) Integrate Pest Management to tackle the twin problem of environmental pollution and high cost of cultivation;
- (d) Development of transgenic cottons through bio-technological tools for the control of bollworms;

- (e) Development of special genotypes for organic farming in view of the increasing demand of organic cotton for export purposes.

The position with regard to utilization of funds under AICRP (Cotton) has improved, *i.e.*, Rs. 116.66 lakh in 1994-95, Rs. 160.31 lakh in 1995-96 and Rs. 158.22 lakh during 1996-97 up to December, 1996 against the budget allocation of Rs. 160.00 lakh.

### **Recommendation Serial No. 10 (Para Nos. 2.88 & 2.89)**

#### *Under-utilisation of Funds for Research on farm Implements*

2.12 In its' Second Report in Para Nos. 2.88 & 2.89 the Committee had recommended as follows :—

“The Committee note that ICAR produces only proto-types and undertakes manufacturing promotion activities through interaction with agricultural machinery manufacturers and supplies drawings to them. They have no role in the manufacturing, supply, cost evaluation, quality, control incorporation of safety devices etc.

As regards the budgetary Division in the 8th Plan in Farm Implements & Machinery the Committee point out that Rs. 13.70 crores had been allocated to this programme and Rs. 08.24 crores has been spent in the 1st four years, *i.e.*, 60% approximately. The Committee are not sure as to how an allocation of Rs. 3.45 crores can be utilised in the last year of the Plan, as there had been under-utilisation of funds in all the last four years of the Plan period.”

### **Reply of the Government**

2.13 To improve the fund utilisation position, the Council has recently attempted to streamline the procedure of fund release to the research centres by delegating the relevant powers to the Project Coordinators of the various schemes. It is anticipated that the fund release and utilisation position may improve with this step as the Project Coordinator is intimately associated with the requirements of various centres of his project. Such delegation of financial and other monitoring evaluation powers will also bring in much needed transparency in the system.

### **Recommendation Serial No. 12 (Para No. 2.101)**

#### *Adequate Funds for Construction of CIBA Building at Madras*

2.14 The Committee in its' Second Report in Para No. 2.101 had Recommended as follows :—

“The Committee observe that funds were kept lying unutilised for four years due to non-availability of land for construction of headquarters of CIBA at Madras. These funds could have been utilised for other programmes. The Committee expect that the land allotted to CIBA now should be acquired immediately and construction work should be taken up and completed within a particular time frame and there should be adequate funds earmarked for the construction work.”

#### **Reply of the Government**

2.15 The Govt. of Tamil Nadu in October, 1990 had allotted to Central Institute of Brackishwater Aquaculture (CIBA) 10 acres of land at Adyar. The institute took over the land within two months of the allotment. However, the land had to be got reclassified by Chennai Metropolitan Development Authority. Meanwhile, the Government of Tamil Nadu unilaterally reduced the allocation from 10 acres to 3 acres which could not meet the requirements of CIBA. Moreover, subsequently on a public interest writ petition filed by the Consumer Action Group in the Hon'ble High Court at Chennai ordered in 1994 that no constructions activities in the Adyar Creek area should be undertaken.

Therefore, as an alternative, the Government of Tamil Nadu on the request of CIBA allotted 5.19 ha. of land at Santhome in Chennai for construction of permanent infrastructure of the Institute. The procedures to take over the allotted land at Santhome and finalisation of the layout plans for construction work through the CPWD have been initiated.

It is submitted that the funds earmarked for CIBA during the first four years of the VIII Plan could not be utilised due to disputes in regard to the allotment of land by the Government of Tamil Nadu. However, the amount was utilised fruitfully elsewhere by the Council. During the current year adequate provisions have been made to initiate the construction work for CIBA at Chennai.



**Recommendation Serial No. 15 (Para Nos. 2.108 & 2.109)**

*Simplification of Procedures to ensure full utilisation of Funds*

2.16 The Committee in its Second Report in Para Nos. 2.108 & 2.109 had recommended as follows :—

“The Committee has taken note that this programme has slack utilisation of funds because of formalities and procedures in the utilisation and implementation of the scheme and higher allocation of outlay and funds are being made available through resources under NARP.

The Committee observes that in a number of programmes the reasons given by the Department for slack utilisation over the total outlay has been formalities & procedures which has delayed the implementation. The Committee take serious note of this lapse and recommend better management of funds in the IX Plan so that newly introduced programmes take off in the 1st year of the Plan and not in the last year.”

**Reply of the Government**

2.17 The Council has introduced computerisation of accounts and regular periodic review of utilisation of funds at different levels. The rules and formalities have also been streamlined so that there will be optimum utilisation of funds throughout the plan period.

**Recommendation Serial No. 17 (Para No. 2.119)**

*Conversion of Farmers Training Centres as KVKs*

2.18 In its Second Report in Para No. 2.119 the Committee had recommended as follows :—

“KVKs wherever existing invariably lack enough manpower and hence their activity is limited to only a few villages. The Committee has learnt that there are nearly 30,000 scientific manpower in ICAR Institutes and SAUs. Even when there will be more than 500 KVKs functioning, this number should be sufficient to spare enough scientists to cover the activities in the entire district. The Committee is, therefore, of the opinion that why not an action plan is proposed wherein Scientists are actively involved in on-farm demonstration as a part of their extension activities. In this endeavours institutions of KVKs could effectively be utilised. Looking to the urgency,

mandate and operation realities, it would be appropriate as put forth by the Department to raise the Regional Research Station under SAUs and Farmers Training Centres in States to the level of KVKs."

### **Reply of the Government**

2.19 The Council, in consultation with Vice-Chancellors of State Agricultural Universities, has taken decision for all the scientists of the ICAR/SAUs system who have generated technology to devote 20% of time in technology demonstration on farmers' field and/or for Technology Assessment and Refinement. Certain ZRSs and FTCs are also being considered for strengthening to function as KVKs in the IX Plan.

## CHAPTER III

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

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 4 (Para Nos. 2.46 to 2.48)**

##### *Limited Impact of Research on Production of Rice and Pulses*

3.1 The Committee observe that there has not been any sizeable difference in the area of cultivation of rice. The production of rice has risen upto 100% in Bihar whereas in other states it has not risen sizeably inspite of the new varieties. The production in Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, Assam, Kerala has rather decreased

The average area under cultivation in Pulses has decreased; the average productivity increased but per capita availability decreased.

The Committee, therefore, concludes that although research on rice has had its impact in specific areas by the release of new varieties the production when seen in comparison with the increasing population and the increasing number of research years is not commensurate. The Committee note that the same situation prevails in respect of pulses also.

#### **Reply of the Government**

3.2 The over all rice production and productivity significantly increased during 1992-1995, with no significant change in rice area. The production rose from 72.6 million tonnes in 1992-93 to 82.16 million tonnes in 1994-95. The productivity also increased from 1744 kg/ha in 1992-93 to 1955 ka/ha in 1994-95. In certain states marginally low production during these years is traced to natural calamities like cyclone/floods and drought at early stage of the crop, imbalance in nutrient use and decrease in the rice area. The specific reasons for low production in Assam, Andhra Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh and Kerala are as follows:

In Andhra Pradesh, besides a marginal decrease of about 0.5 lakh ha., natural calamities such as drought and floods had affected

significantly the production and productivity. During 1993-94, 4.52 lakh hectares of seven districts and in 1994-95, 6.65 lakh hectares in nineteen districts of coastal Andhra Pradesh were affected by flood. Delayed on set of monsoon also significantly affected the area and production during 1995-96. Similarly, the severe cyclonic damage during October, 1996-97 caused extensive damage to the standing rice crops. Thus the natural calamities/weather were important destabilizing factors in Andhra Pradesh.

In Assam, stagnation of rice production at lower level is primarily due to climatic conditions. Uncontrolled floods and lack of proper drainage preclude the use of fertilizers (below 10 kg./ha. of nutrients compared to 67 kg./ha. of national average). Because of very low fertilizer consumption, the yields are significantly low. The recurrent flood damage also affects over all production.

In Uttar Pradesh, drought and floods are major destabilizing factors for production. Although Nitrogen is utilised extensively, the overall consumption of Phosphorus & Potash is extremely low. This imbalance has affected production significantly. The major problem is inadequate adoption of improved technologies in Eastern Uttar Pradesh, which has large area of rice under rainfed conditions. Greater stress to improve the frontline extension activities will be taken up in future.

In Kerala, rice land alienation due to urbanization, switching over to other profitable cash crops and high cost of human labour hampers production. Though technology is available for higher rice production because of economic factors, rice production in the Kerala is constantly declining.

In Bihar, due to adverse conditions the production and productivity of rice had declined during 1991-92 and 1992-93. However, during 1993-94 and 1994-95 both production and productivity of rice increased and reached the earlier level of 6 million tonnes and 1300 kg./ha. though there is some decline in area. On an overall basis, it can be said that though rice area in Bihar has almost stabilized, production and productivity both are showing an increasing trend.

In pulses, the National Commission on Agriculture in 1973 set up a production target of 25 million tonnes by 2000 A.D. based on per capita requirement of 80 g/day. However, the concept of protein nutrition and demand for pulse should be considered in the background of other protein sources such as foodgrains, milk and its products,

eggs, fish, meat etc. Based on this, per capital availability of 55 g/day against 37 g/day presently available has to be viewed.

Accordingly, the demand of pulses for dietary need has been estimated at 20 million tonnes for an estimated population of 985 million by 2000 A.D. If seed, feed and wastage etc. are included (12.5% of gross production), the total demand would be 22.5 million tonnes by 2000 A.D.

Although the wide gap between demand and availability of pulses is continuing prior to VIII Five year Plan period, which could not be fully reduced despite the increasing trend of production during the last 4 years of VIII Plan, has been encouraging, the total area under pulses during the last 4 years of VIII Plan (1992-93) to (1995-96) remained 22 to 23 million hectare but the total production has shown an increasing trend from 12.8 million tonnes to 15.0 million tonnes. An increase of about 2 million tonnes in production during the last 4 years reflects the positive contribution of improved production/protection technology.

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 11 (Para Nos. 2.90 & 2.91)**

##### *Production of Implements by ICAR for Small Farmers*

3.3 The Committee in its' Second Report in Para Nos. 2.90 & 2.91 had recommended as follows :—

"The Committee, therefore, recommend that the ICAR should be involved in the production process of implements costing up to Rs. 1,000 through their K.V.Ks. and the sale of these implements should also be through KVKs. This would ensure that the farmers will get genuine certified products/machinery at the lowest cost. The farmers will also be able to get subsidy more easily if the KVKs are involved in the sale. KVKs on the other hand will also be able to generate resources. KVKs are in a better position to determine the status of a farmer and recommend for subsidy. In this way genuine small farmers will get subsidy and there will be proper utilisation of money.

The Committee further recommend that more thrust should be given to the small farmers who has a small holding. Implements prototypes that have been supplied during 1991-96 and are costing over Rs. 500 are 18 out of 25, *i.e.*, 72%. In other words 72% of the

budget allocation has been utilised for big farmers. Big farmers have already the benefit of advance research from big manufacturers, therefore, the research should be oriented to spend more money for the benefit of small farmers."

### **Reply of the Government**

3.4 The KVKs will be able to produce low-cost implements provided they have qualified agricultural engineers, workshop with manufacturing capacity and trained personnel. Presently, the first two are not available in most of the KVKs. Establishing workshop facilities for large scale manufacture of even low cost implements may be expensive, but can be done if sufficient funds are available. To reach the technology to a large number of farmers, the Council has initiated a Revolving Fund Scheme in which the sponsoring agency is given an initial grant (refundable) for the promotion of various agricultural implements developed through different ICAR schemes. ICAR while screening such proposals, will try to stress on prototype production of implements for small farmers. At present level of cost of the raw material, labour, manufacturing machinery etc. only limited number of implements can be made at a cost of Rs. 500 or less. Even simple implements like animal drawn seed drill (single row) and three row seed-cum-fertilizer drill, animal drawn tool frame, animal drawn groundnut planter, manually operated post harvest equipment such as hand cleaner, pedal operated cleaner, groundnut decorticator etc., which are technically suitable for the holdings of small farmers, the cost goes to at least Rs. 1000 or more. Big farmers use higher power source like tractors and motors and the machinery developed to be operated by such power sources are 10 out of 25 which is 40% the remaining are either manually operated or animal power operated.

### **Recommendation Serial No. 13 (Para No. 2.102)**

*More Vessels for CMFRI, Cochin*

3.5 In its' Second Report in Para No. 2.102 the Committee had recommended as follows :—

"The Committee further recommend that CMFRI which had 3.6 million tonnes of landings utilised the entire fish for survey. It has only two research boats at Cochin and one at Vizhinjam amongst 5026 mechanical fishing boats; 4 research boats amongst 5061 in Tamil Nadu & Pondicherry; one amongst 3730 mechanised boats

in Karnataka; and one amongst 4082 in Andhra Pradesh i.e. total 9 boats amongst 17899 mechanised boats. CMFRI could increase the number of vessels and increase the catch for building up internal resources which would be in effect releasing valuable funds for other fields of research for which ICAR is already hard pressed."

### **Reply of the Government**

3.6 The mandate of the Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (CMFRI) is to undertake survey and research on marine fisheries resources in relation to environment. For this purpose the Institute possesses small mechanised boats as well as a researchship, FORV Sagar Sampada provided by the Department of Ocean Development for distant oceanic research. Commercial fishing is not within the mandate of the Institute.

In regard to the Institute's mandate on studies of marine fish resources and their seasonal and annual fluctuations, the CMFRI undertakes sampling to estimate the landings from the coastal waters by various types of country craft and mechanised boats. The figure of 2.36 million tonnes is the marine fish production during 1994 as estimated by the Institute based on survey of marine fish landings on East and West Coasts of India.

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 14 (Para Nos. 2.103 & 2.104)**

*Funds for Water Front for CMFRI, Cochin*

3.7 The Committee in its' Second Report in Para Nos. 2.103 & 2.104 had recommended as follows :—

"The Committee take a serious note of the fact that the allocations under fisheries research have been under-utilised in the last successive four years and still some portion of the unutilised money was not allocated to CMFRI Cochin to acquire the much-needed marine-water front for research purposes. When the matter was taken up by the Chairman on behalf of the Committee with the Minister of Agriculture, a reply dated 25th October, 1995 was sent to the effect that due to paucity of funds, the proposal has been dropped. The Committee wonder as to how there could be paucity of funds when there has been under-utilised funds available in each of the last four years under Fisheries Sector and also there had been unutilised funds in the total budgetary provision of the Department in the first two years of the Eighth Plan period. The Committee could only feel that there is total lack of application of mind on the part of the Ministry in the matter of making use of the unutilised money on priority sectors and it is a matter of

regret that the Department has taken a rigid view despite the importance assigned to the matter by a Parliamentary Committee.

The Committee take a serious view of the lack of economic sense on the part of the Department which kept funds unutilised for years together in expectation of land allotment for CIBA, Madras on the one hand and denying the necessary funds for acquiring valuable land being offered at concessional rates for CMFRI, Cochin on the other hand. The Committee desire an enquiry to be ordered into the matter immediately to fix responsibility on the matter whereby assets worth crores of rupees could not be acquired by the Government at concessional rates for essential research work, the Committee recommend that immediate allocation of budgetary resources should be made during 1996-97 itself to enable CMFRI, Cochin to acquire the necessary water-front as the Cochin Development Authority has agreed to keep the rate frozen at the last sale price as a special consideration to CMFRI and the Ministry should come up with suitable Revised Estimates in this regard. The Committee should be kept informed of the outcome of the enquiry, ordered in this regard within three months of the presentation of this Report."

#### **Reply of the Government**

3.8 The Central Marine Fisheries Research Institute (CMFRI) had not included any proposal in the VIII Plan to acquire the water front necessitating the purchase of a strip of land measuring 12m x 84m in front of the Institute's property facing the Kochi backwaters. Hence the proposal of CMFRI to acquire two acres of land with a water front at an initially estimated cost of Rs. 12.5 crores could not be considered feasible on account of paucity of funds. Further in a meeting taken by DG, attended by DDG (Fy.), DDG (Hot.) and F.A., the proposal was reviewed afresh and it was decided that the proposai to spend Rs. 12.5 crores was not technically justifiable owing to doubts raised on its utility. However, in the light of the observations of the Standing Committee of Parliament an allocation of Rs. 1.84 crore was tentatively made for the proposal to buy only 25 cents with a narrow strip of land putforth by the Institute during 1995-96. While going through full particulars of the tiny land proposed to be acquired and the merits of the proposal for processing the case, the following became clear:

- I. The purpose to acquire the narrow strip of land was to gain an access to the so called water front for the institute to conduct marine biological research.
- II. The pollution status of the backwaters due to the massive oil jetty in close proximity within the backwater channel in



front of the Ernakulum Foreshore Road would preclude any mariculture research at the proposed water front. However, a marine biological laboratory has been established in the campus of the CMFRI by providing underground pure saline water through a bore-well.

- III. The resulting claim on a 12m. wide water front corresponding to the width of the proposed strip of land to be acquired would possibly be of use, if at all, only for berthing small wooden boats. But, for this the facilities at present are already being extended to the CMFRI, Kochi by the Integrated Fishery Project of the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation at nominal charges.
- IV There are apprehensions of a massive tourist complex, possibly to be built on either side of the proposed strip of land with overwhelming domination. This would render the proposed narrow strip of land as an approach lane to the water front only with no other utility.

Dy. Director General (Fy.) also personally visited CMFRI, Kochi to examine the site and to have personal discussions with the Director and the staff of CMFRI on the pros and cons of the proposal and observed that the proposal was not justified on merits.

It is therefore, submitted that the revised proposal to acquire the tiny piece of land for the CMFRI had to be dropped due to doubts raised on its utility as above.

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 18 (Para No. 2.120)**

3.9 The Committee in its' Second Report in Para No. 2.120 had recommended as follows :—

“The Committee also desire the ICAR to reprioritise its programmes and think earnestly on increasing the internal resources of the KVKs while not forgetting its social obligation towards small farmers. The Committee believe that KVKs are a life line to progress in our villages and they must be made to succeed in this ambitious programme.”

#### **Reply of the Government**

3.10 The Council has a scheme of Revolving Fund under which KVKs have been advised to seek one time refundable support for generating internal resources to help them to become self-reliant and sustainable eventually.

## CHAPTER IV

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

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 2 (Para Nos. 2.26 & 2.27)**

##### *Higher Allocations for Agricultural Research*

4.1 The Committee in its' Second Report in Para Nos. 2.26 & 2.27 had recommended as follows :—

“The Committee was rather surprised to know that the Government still wants the ICAR to provide necessary technology to improve the foodgrains production upto 210 million tonnes by 2000 A.D. and also to produce more for export. ICAR has put up a very strong case for the allocations to be a minimum of Rs. 340 crores as asked before and is certainly required during the current annual plan in order to meet the target of terminal year of VIII Plan. The fund utilisation by the Council has also been very effective during the later years of the Current Plan period. The Department has further communicated that EFC/PICs clearance for important schemes with revised outlays amounting to more than Rs. 68 crores are available and there are no procedural formalities to be completed for ensuring expenditure during the on-going financial year.

The Committee are, therefore, of strong opinion that agricultural research programmes at this crucial juncture must not be allowed to receive a set back for want of adequate funds. The Committee hence recommend that the Ministry of Finance must find a way out to provide the approved minimum outlay of Rs. 340 crores in the current fiscal year. Unless this is done, priority research programmes are bound to suffer which would adversely affect the agricultural growth of the country.”

#### **Reply of the Government**

4.2 We have communicated the above mentioned observations/recommendations to the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance. In view of DARE/ICAR capacity and preparedness to optimise funds utilisation (cumulatively built up during the successive years of the VIII Plan as well to contain the cost escalations owing to inflation), the Department had projected an outlay of Rs. 440 crore to the Planning Commission for 1996-97. But during the discussion, the Planning

Commission had tentatively agreed for an outlay of Rs. 340 crores. However the Government has given only Rs. 310.8 crores during 1996-97, thus leaving a difference of Rs. 29.2 crore. It is felt that if funds are provided to the tune of Rs. 340 crore, the Council would be in a position to utilise the whole outlay, as EFC/PIC clearances of important schemes whose revised outlays amounting to more than Rs. 68 crore are available and there is no further procedural formalities remaining to be fulfilled.

#### **Comment of the Committee**

4.3 For Comments please see Para No. 1.6 of Chapter-I of this Report.

#### **Recommendation Serial No. 6 (Para No. 2.50)**

##### *Bringing more land under Cultivation by Reclamation*

4.4 The Committee in its' Second Report in Para No. 2.50 had recommended as follows :—

“The stagnation obtaining in the net area cultivated under different crops and in different ecological zones over the years is rather perturbing. The Committee note the explanation of the Council in this regard that technologies have been developed for reclamation and utilization of lands and it is for the States to utilize/adopt the research for such reclamation, it is the responsibility of the States to reclaim areas for sowing more crops. The Committee are disappointed to note that the fruits of 10 years of research in reclamation has not been put to use by the States and as such produced no fruitful results. Therefore, sufficient allocation under this head for the Ninth Plan should be earmarked to evolve low cost technology and the States should be directed to revise their priorities in order to bring more land under cultivation by undertaking immediate reclamation works.”

#### **Reply of the Government**

4.5 The Central Soil Salinity Research Institute (CSSRI), Karnal is pursuing its research for development of technologies for reclamation of salt affected soils. This Institute has successfully generated and demonstrated in a model way, the technologies for amelioration and utilization of alkali soils and inland waterlogged saline soils. In addition, the technologies have also been generated for utilization of the coastal saline soils for productive purposes.

For quicker dissemination of the technologies, the Institute had been undertaking training of Subject Matter Specialists (SMSs) working with the State Departments as well as of various Land Reclamation Corporations. So far 1104 SMSs working with States having salinity/

alkalinity affected areas have been trained through institutional training. A series of publications on "Better Farming in Salt Affected Soils" have been published in English/Hindi and circulated on a wide scale. Efforts will be made to publish them in local languages.

Viable working linkages have been established by the institute with various State Governments such as Land Reclamation Corporation of Haryana and U.P. Several pilot projects on sub-surface drainage in Haryana and an EEC funded project for large scale users land reclamation in U.P. and Bihar are being implemented by these State Governments. The Director of the institute is a member of the national/state level committee for overseeing the implementation of these projects. The institute has entered into a memorandum of understanding with the UP Land Reclamation and Development Corporation for adaptive testing of the technologies and many adaptive trials have been laid out at Sivri Farm, Lucknow. Similarly, adaptive research project on afforestation is being implemented at Saraswati Farm in cooperation with the Forest Department, Government of Haryana. The Institute has also extended its technologies in Gujarat in association with Gujarat Land Development Corporation.

The data collected by this Institute from various Land Reclamation Corporations in the States of Haryana, Punjab and Uttar Pradesh have shown that during the last two decades over 7.6 lakh hectares of affected areas have been reclaimed by adopting the Institute package of practices and brought under productive use, thus adding nearly 30 lakh tonnes of additional foodgrains in the form of rice and wheat per year.

Several research project have already been initiated such as on bio-ameliorative measure for seepage control, bio-reclamation of alkali soils, alternative use of alkali/saline soils in agro-forestry and use of brackish water in afforestation and agriculture to develop low cost options for rehabilitation of salt affected soils, as per perspective plan of the Central Soil Salinity Research Institute, Karnal. Sufficient allocations will be earmarked during the IX Plan period to promote further refinement and evaluation of these low cost reclamation technologies. These technologies will also be promoted by the centres of the All India Coordinated Research Project on Management of Salt Affected Soils and Use of Saline Water in Agriculture and also through the Irrigation Salinity Drainage Network of the Indo-Dutch Project. These efforts will address the soil problems in different States.

#### **Comments of the Committee**

4.6 For Comments 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 Serial No. 1 (Para Nos. 2.11 to 2.14)**

##### *Allocation of 1% of Agricultural GDP for Research and Catch-up Grants for Infrastructure Upgradation*

5.1 In its' Second Report on Demands for Grants (1996-97) in Para Nos. 2.11 to 2.14 the Committee made the following recommendation :—

“The Committee have over the years consistently maintained that the outlay for agricultural research should be targeted at 1% of the agricultural GDP. In contrast, the allocation for VIII. Plan works out to a mere 0.32% of the agricultural GDP. The Committee during the evidence has noted that ICAR proposed an allocation of Rs. 2008.78 crores in the VIII Plan as suggested by the then Working Group. However, Planning Commission approved an allocation of only Rs. 1300 crores under the plan. The Finance Ministry reduced it further by another 4%.

The Committee have also gone through the report of the Working Group for the IX Plan. Its recommendations that a minimum of 1% of the GDP be allocated during the coming plan is in tune with the Committee's own recommendations. But, it still has its doubts whether this proposed amount of Rs. 7,800 crores will finally be allocated. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that not only should the Rs. 7,800 crores be given to DARE/ICAR for the IX Plan to begin with but it should also be the constant effort of the Government to ensure that the amount is at least 1 per cent of the Agricultural GDP with a tendency to increase the allocation gradually to reach 2 per cent of Agricultural GDP. The Committee are also happy with the efforts of the Council but would stress that the Department should take up this issue with the Planning Commission and subsequently Ministry of Finance while it comes up for discussion in the coming months. The members of the Committee would vigorously support the cause as and when required.

The Committee learnt that the Institutes of the ICAR have been receiving over the last several years non-plan funds not commensurate with the requirements. Consequently, the renovation of buildings and replacement of old equipments have not been done. Several of the ICAR institutes as also State Agricultural Universities and Veterinary Universities are very old and need adequate support for renovation and Infra-structural upgradation. The accumulated arrears towards this end would require injection of a minimum of Rs. 500 crores as a one time catch-up grant for the IX Plan if these Institutions are to perform competitively at global level. The Committee also took note of the statement of the Finance Minister to this effect wherein he has said that CSIR & ICAR would be provided a one time catch-up grant. The Minister has, however, also suggested that every Rupees earned by the Institute will be matched by the Government. The Committee agree with the remarks of the Department that unlike CSIR, whose clients are basically from industries, largely farmers are the recipients of the technologies development by ICAR.

The Committee, therefore, recommend that ICAR should be provided an independent catch-up grant of Rs. 500/- crores during the IX Plan so that the process of technology development in agricultural research can be globally competitive and relevant. It should not, however, be the reasons for complacency and the Department must exploit all possible avenues which can earn them resources internally. In this context, the Johl Committee Report shall not be a mere addition to the bookshelves and must be implemented in letter and spirit."

### **Reply of the Government**

5.2 The Council has taken up the issue of allocation of a minimum of 1% (one per cent) of the agricultural GAP during the Annual Plan 1997-98/IX Plan during the discussion with the Planning Commission on 15th January, 1997 with the Member Secretary Planning Commission. The Council is also persuing with the Planning Commission for a catch-up grant of Rs. 500 crore during the IX Plan so that the process of technology development in agricultural research can be globally competitive and relevant. The Council has developed the procedures and guidelines for implementing the recommendations of the Johl Committee and steps have been initiated for implementing these with the concurrence and approval of the concerned authorities.

### Comments of the Committee

5.3 The Committee are happy to note that the Council has been pursuing with the Planning Commission the issue of allocation of a minimum of 1% of agricultural GDP for agricultural research and for a catch up grant of Rs. 500 crores during the IX Plan. The Committee desire that it may be kept informed of the progress. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the extent to which the Johl Committee recommendations have been implemented and also about the recommendations which still remain unimplemented.

#### Recommendation Serial No. 16 (Para Nos. 2.117 & 2.118)

##### *Additional Allocation for KVKs in the Ninth Plan*

5.4 In its' Second Report in Para Nos. 2.117 & 2.118 the Committee had recommended as follows :—

“Keeping the entire picture of the sanctioned KVKs, the fully operational KVKs, the funds required for establishment of new KVKs, the Planning Commission's ceiling orders, the new funding pattern and the reaction of KVKs thereon, the proposal of shifting responsibility to States from 100% funding by ICAR, the proposal for involvement of Farmers Training Centres in other words multiplying the administrative control of KVKs, the Committee are convinced that ICAR has been bravely taking up the matter vigorously with all the concerned authorities.

Keeping in view the extent of infrastructure created, the good work being done by KVKs in the interest of small and marginal farmers, the employment generation, the development of areas where KVKs has been fully functional, the Committee recommend that the Ministry of Finance should favourably consider the release of Rs. 50 crores on an urgent basis. The Committee also feel that although it is not within their mandate, ICAR must take up the responsibility to make these KVKs model institutions. The Committee, therefore, recommend that ICAR be provided a separate allocation of Rs. 1000 crores for KVKs over and above the allocation recommended at the rate of 1 per cent of GDP in the IX Plan to make this vital tool of development become operational and viable.”

#### Reply of the Government

5.5 The Planning Commission has been approached for separate allocation of Rs. 1,000 crores for KVKs during the IXth Five year Plan

and Rs. 50 crores during the current year on an urgent basis as per recommendations of the Committee.

#### Comments of the Committee

5.6 The Committee would like to know the outcome of the efforts made by the Department to convince the Planning Commission for separate allocation of Rs. 1000 crores for KVKs. The Committee suggest the Department to continue pursuing the matter vigorously till favourable results are achieved. The Committee would also like to know whether Rs. 50 crores has been considered by the Ministry of Finance for urgent allocation in this regard.

The Committee further suggest that ICAR should make special arrangements for adequate and aggressive monitoring of all the KVKs especially those KVKs run by State Agricultural Universities and NGOs/private agencies.

NEW DELHI,  
*July, 1997*  

---

*Shravana, 1919 (Saka)*

SANTOSH KUMAR GANGWAR,  
*Chairman,*  
*Standing Committee on Agriculture.*



## APPENDIX I

MINUTES OF THE 32ND SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HELD ON THURSDAY, THE 10TH JULY, 1997 AT 1500 HRS. IN COMMITTEE ROOM 'B', PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE, NEW DELHI

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1700 hrs.

### PRESENT

Shri Mahaboob Zahedi — (*In the Chair*)

### MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Pandurang Fundkar
3. Shri Thawar Chand Gehlot
4. Shri Padamsen Chaudhary
5. Shri Bhimrao Badade
6. Shri Manibhai Chaudhuri
7. Shri Sohanveer Singh
8. Smt. Ratna Singh
9. Shri Madan Patil
10. Shri Gangadhar Kunturkur
11. Shri Gulam Mohd. Mir Magami
12. Shri Meti Hullappa Yamanappa
13. Shri Sukdeo Paswan
14. Shri Bajuban Riyan
15. Dr. K.P. Ramlingam
16. Shri Suresh Jadhav
17. Shri Sode Ramaiah
18. Dr. Mohan Singh

*Rajya Sabha*

19. Shri Ananta Sethi
20. Maulana Habibur Rahman Nomani
21. Shri Jagir Singh Dard
22. Shri Shiv Charan Singh
23. Dr. Ranbir Singh
24. Shri Anil Kumar
25. Shri Ramanarayan Goswami
26. Shri Devi Prasad Singh

## SECRETARIAT

1. Shri S. Bal Shekar — *Deputy Secretary*
2. Smt. Anita Jain — *Under Secretary*
3. Shri K.L. Arora — *Assistant Director*

In the absence of Hon'ble Chairman (AC), Shri Mahaboob Zahedi took the Chair as decided by the Members of the Committee. Memorandum No. 2 relating to the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the 2nd Report of the Committee on Demands for Grants 1996-97 in respect of Ministry of Agriculture, (Department of Agricultural Research & Education) was taken up for consideration. The categorisation suggested in the Memorandum was approved and the draft comments with slight amendments were also approved.

The Committee, then authorised the Chairman to present the Action Taken Report on the recommendations contained in the 2nd Report of the Committee on Demands for Grants 1996-97 in respect of Ministry of Agriculture, (Department of Agricultural Research and Education), to the House on a date and time convenient to him.

*The Committee then adjourned*

## APPENDIX II

(Vide Introduction of the Report)

### ANALYSIS OF ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE 2ND REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE (11TH LOK SABHA)

I	Total number of recommendations	18
II	Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by Government — Serial Nos. 3 (Paras 2.32, 2.32A & 2.33), 5 (Para 2.49), 7 (Paras 2.51 & 2.52), 8 (Paras 2.59, 2.60 & 2.61), 9 (Paras 2.79 & 2.80), 10 (Paras 2.88 & 2.89), 12 (Para 2.101), 15 (Paras 2.108 & 2.109) and 17 (Para 2.119)	
	Total	9
	Percentage	50%
III	Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government's replies — Serial Nos. 4 (Paras 2.46, 2.47 & 2.48), 11 (Paras 2.90 & 2.91), 13 (Para 2.102), 14 (Paras 2.103 & 2.104) and 18 (Para 2.120)	
	Total	5
	Percentage	27.77%
IV	Recommendations/Observations in respect of which Government's replies have not been accepted by the Committee— Serial Nos. 2 (Paras 2.26 & 2.27) and 6 (Para 2.50)	
	Total	2
	Percentage	11.11%
V	Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies are still awaited Serial Nos. 1 (Paras 2.11, 2.12, 2.13 & 2.14) 16 (Paras 2.117 & 2.118)	
	Total	2
	Percentage	11.11%