

FIFTEENTH REPORT
STANDING COMMITTEE
ON AGRICULTURE
(2001)

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
(DEPARTMENT OF ANIMAL HUSBANDRY AND
DAIRYING)

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS
(2000-2001)

*[Action Taken by the Government on the Recommendations/
Observations contained in the Eighth Report of the
Standing Committee on Agriculture (1999-2000)]*

Presented to Lok Sabha on.....

Laid in Rajya Sabha on 13 MAR 2001



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

March, 2001/Phalguna, 1922 (Saka)

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE FOR THE YEAR-2001

Shri S. S. Palanimanickam — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

2. Shri Ram Tahal Chaudhari
3. Shri Shivraj Singh Chouhan
4. Shri Shamsher Singh Dullo
5. Shri Ramdas Rupala Gavit
6. Shri Thawar Chand Gehlot
7. Shri Raghunath Jha
8. Shri Shivaji Vithalrao Kamble
9. Shri Abul Hasnat Khan
10. Shri Y.G. Mahajan
11. Shri Haribhau Shankar Mahale
12. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
13. Shri Jagannath Mallick
14. Shri M. Master Mathan
15. Shri Dalpat Singh Parste
16. Shri Tarachand Shivaji Patel
17. Shri Prakash V. Patil
18. Shri Sharad Pawar
19. Shrimati Rama Pilot
20. Shri G. Sukender Reddy
21. Shri N.R.K. Reddy
22. Shri Pyare Lal Sankhwar
23. Shri Adi Shankar
24. Shri Chhatrapal Singh
25. Shri Lakshman Singh
26. Shri Rampal Singh
27. Shri Tejveer Singh
28. Shri Zora Singh Mann
29. Shri Bhal Chandra Yadav
30. Shri Mahboob Zahedi

Rajya Sabha

31. Shrimati Jamana Devi Barupal
32. Shri Khagen Das
33. Shri Devi Lal
34. Shri Oscar Fernandes
35. Shri H.K. Javare Gowda
36. Shri Korambayil Ahammed Haji
37. Shri Kailash Joshi
38. Shri Kanshi Ram
39. Dr. A.R. Kidwai
40. Shri R. Margabandu
41. Shri M. Rajashekara Murthy
42. Shri Yadlapati Venkata Rao
43. Shri Sharief-Ud-Din Shariq
44. Shri Devi Prasad Singh
45. Vacant

SECRETARIAT

1. Dr. (Smt.) Paramjit Kaur Sandhu — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Rajshekhar Sharma — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Shri K.L. Arora — *Under Secretary*
4. Shrimati Ratna Bhagwani — *Committee Officer*

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (2001) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Fifteenth Report on Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations/observations contained in the Eighth Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1999-2000) (Thirteenth Lok Sabha), on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying).

2. The Eighth Report of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1999-2000) on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying) was presented to Lok Sabha and laid in Rajya Sabha on 19.4.2000. The Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying) was requested to furnish action taken replies of the Government to recommendations contained in the Eighth Report. The replies of the Government to all the recommendations contained in the Report were received.

3. The Committee considered these action taken replies furnished by the Government in its sitting held on 22nd February, 2001, approved the draft comments and adopted the Fifteenth Report. Minutes of the sitting are placed in Appendix I.

4. An analysis of the Action Taken by the Government on the recommendations/observations contained in the Eighth Report (13th Lok Sabha) of the Committee is given in Appendix-II.

NEW DELHI;
28 February, 2001
9 Phalguna, 1922 (Saka)

^
i

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

CHAPTER I

REPORT

This Report of the Committee on Agriculture deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Eighth Report (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Agriculture (1999-2000) on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying) which was presented to the Lok Sabha and laid in Rajya Sabha on 19th April, 2000.

1.2 Action taken replies have been received from the Government in respect of all the 15 recommendations contained in the Report. These have been categorised as follows:

- (i) Recommendations/Observations that have been accepted by the Government (Chapter II of the Report)

Recommendation Sl. Nos. 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14 and 15.

(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 Sl. No. 10

(Total 1)

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

Recommendation Sl. Nos. 1, 5

(Total 2)

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

Recommendation Sl. Nos. 4, 8 and 13

(Total 3)

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

Growth of Financial Outlay

Recommendation (Sl. No. 1)

1.4 The Committee had noted that in pursuance of Governmental strategy for doubling the food production the Department had stepped up the allocation from Rs. 1677.88 crore to Rs. 2345.64 crore as budgetary support to the Department for IXth Plan. The Committee noted that the percentage of plan outlay for the year 1997-98 (first year of the 9th Plan) is 0.27% of the total Central Plan outlay, whereas in 2000-2001 (the fourth year of Ninth Plan) the percentage is 0.19% out of Central Plan outlay. The Committee also noted that NDC (National Development Council) had approved the higher plan allocation for the Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying at 1996-97 prices.

The Committee felt that animals are the most important component of the ecosystem that holds the balance between man and nature. It is essentially a vocation of the relatively poor. The reduction in the annual budget to the Department amounts to virtually neglecting the animal and livestock wealth of the nation.

The Committee, therefore, recommended that more thrust should have been given to this sector and the Department should be allocated at least Rs. 385.06 crore for the year 2000-2001 so that meaningful activities relating to animal health and animal produce and resultant production takes place in the country.

1.5 The Government in their reply have stated that the recommendation of the Committee was referred to the Planning Commission for consideration. The Planning Commission, stated that in view of the pace of utilization of allocations made to the Department during the first three years of the Ninth Plan and constraints on resources, an allocation of Rs. 250 crore was felt adequate to meet the requirements of the Department. However, on further representation of the Department the outlays were further revised upward to a level of Rs. 300 crore for sustaining and achieving accelerated growth. The Planning Commission had further informed that as there would not be any upward revision for the budgeted outlays at this stage, any additional requirement of funds may be taken up with the Ministry of Finance for enhancement in the provisions at the RE stage.

Comments of the Committee

1.6 The Committee are highly constrained to note that the Department have failed to implement the recommendation made by the Committee year after year in regard to low budget utilization, failure in achieving set targets, non-achievement of growth rate envisaged etc. As a sequel, the department have been deprived of higher allocation in the budgetary provisions. The Committee, therefore, strongly feel that the Department should have a fresh look at their policies, schemes, funding pattern etc. so as to achieve higher targets through better financial management techniques. The Committee has always been of the opinion that allocations had been too meagre for the Department of such a size and importance. The Committee would watch the performance with a view to see that the Department gets a better budgetary allocation for the Budget 2001-2002.

Animal Disease Surveillance Scheme

Recommendation (Sl. No. 5)

1.7 The Committee had noted that Animal Disease Surveillance Scheme started with the main objective to collect and compile information with respect of Animal Diseases in the country on regular basis and disseminate the same to the States/UTs by publishing bulletins. The Committee had recommended earlier that this publication should be made available in local language also. Now the Committee have been informed that very few States/UTs like Karnataka, Gujarat, Tripura and Mizoram, UP and UT of Pondicherry have responded in the matter and are publishing and circulating the bulletin in local languages.

The Committee also noted that the Department have no information regarding the number of copies circulated among their own Departmental officials and institutions. The Committee are also surprised that only 50 copies of the Hindi version are circulated by the Department. Animals are kept by farmers and diseases are found among these animals. They are the first people who should know about the current diseases found in farm animals and their likely cures. The Committee found that these bulletins are being circulated to officials and institutions only and not to the concerned farmers and felt that the very purpose of issuing such bulletins is defeated.

The Committee, therefore, recommended that the matter should be pursued sincerely and more States/UTs should be persuaded to issue such bulletins. These bulletins should invariably be available with the local bodies, village panchayats, farmers cooperatives, Krishi Vigyan Kendras, Block Development Officers, Patwaris etc. particularly for the use of the small and marginal farmers. A farmer's Education Programme should be there on the local TV networks for educating and creating awareness amongst the farmers.

The Committee also recommended that the State Government should be asked to give details of such circulation to the Department along with copies of issues circulated. As for the Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying, it should make sure that copies are circulated to all SAUs, State Animal Husbandry Departments and Dairy Co-operatives Federations in sufficient numbers for onwards transmission. One copy each of these Hindi Bulletins should also be forwarded to all the members of the Standing Committee and two copies of each such issue to the Standing Committee on Agriculture. The Department should also forward one copy of the State/UTs local language bulletins to the Standing Committee, which shall be placed in the Chairman's Office for reference for the Members.

1.8 The Government in their reply have stated that in view of the recommendation of the Standing Committee, all the State/UT Governments had been requested to:

- (a) Publish the Livestock Disease Information Reports in local languages apart from the English language.
- (b) Circulate the reports widely and make them available with local bodies farmers co-operatives, Krishi Vigyan Kendras, village panchayats, BDOs, Patwaries etc. and to inform the Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying about the number of copies circulated.
- (c) Send a copy of the report published in local language to the Department and two copies to the Chairman, Standing Committee on Agriculture, New Delhi.

The Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying had already started sending the bulletin to the State Agricultural/Veterinary Universities and publishing the monthly Animal Disease Surveillance (ADS) bulletins in Hindi also.

Comments of the Committee

1.9 The Committee are surprised that not a single copy of the livestock Disease information Report in local language of any State Government/UT has reached the Chairman, Standing Committee's Office. This only shows lack of seriousness with which the State Governments have taken the suggestion of the Department. The Committee would like to be apprised of the response the Department have received to its request.

The Committee reiterate their recommendation and request the Department to adopt strict measures for compliance of the recommendation by States.

CHAPTER II

RECOMMENDATIONS/OBSERVATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

Special Action Plan (SAP)

Recommendation (Sl. No. 2)

2.1 The Committee note that in the light of the Prime Minister's announcement for doubling the foodgrain production and making India hunger free in the next ten years starting 1999-2000, the Department had evolved a Special Action Plan for achieving accelerated growth of live-stock products and projected Rs. 2490 crore for 9th Plan as against the allocation of Rs. 1677.88 crore. The Planning Commission enhanced the 9th Plan allocation for the Department of Rs. 2345.64 crores under SAP. Seventeen schemes identified for SAP having an allocation of Rs. 1133 crores within Rs. 1677.88 crores were reprioritized and the Department earmarked Rs. 1763.62 crores, for these SAP schemes leaving the rest for the other schemes.

The Committee observe that the expenditure upto Feb. 2000 *i.e.* first three years of Plan against the SAP schemes is Rs. 338.87 crores only leaving Rs. 1424.75 crores for the last two years of the Plan. The main reason for non-utilization given by the Department is want of clearance of full Planning Commission and CCEA.

The Committee take a very serious view of the delay in clearance by the Planning Commission and CCEA. On the one hand, the 9th Plan allocations are enhanced by the Planning Commission under SAP whereas on the other hand it takes number of years to clear proposals thereby defeating the very purpose of making higher allocations. The Committee are afraid that by the time the clearance will come forth from the various agencies the Plan period will be over and all these allocations will remain unutilized. Further more, the year to year allocations which the Department makes under these schemes also go unutilized awaiting clearance of the schemes. The SAP on all the 17 schemes, therefore, may prove to be a futile exercise.

The Committee in their 20th Report on Demands for Grants 1999-2000 had strongly commented on such practices which are a negation of the basic principles of parliamentary democracies and had recommended that the whole procedure of approval of schemes should be thoroughly overhauled and made less time consuming. Despite this recommendation

unapproved important schemes keep accumulating and keep lying unutilized leading to non-implementation of the policies framed by the Government for the development of the nation and belying the aspirations raised in the minds of the people.

The Committee once again impress upon the Government to simplify the cumbersome procedures for seeking approvals from various authorities after an allocation to a scheme is made. The scheme should start immediately from day one it gets the allocations.

Reply of the Government

2.2 The thrust of the recommendation is to review and simplify the existing time consuming procedures entailing multiple approvals of SFC/EFC/CCEA and Planning Commission etc., to minimize the time lag in completing pre-implementation requirements so that the schemes approved by Parliament in the Budget are started immediately so as to fulfill the hopes and aspiration of the people arising out of the proposals. The recommendation was accordingly referred to the Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance for simplification of the existing cumbersome procedures.

- (i) The Planning Commission *vide* their letter dated 20.05.2000 has indicated that with a view to cut down delays in processing cases for investment decisions and also to ensure that adequate outlays are provided for the approved programmes, the Planning Commission has already streamlined the procedure and minimized the duration to obtain approval of SFC/EFC/CCEA to the proposal.
- (ii) Similarly, the Ministry of Finance *vide* letter dated 08.06.2000 has stated that the powers delegated under EFC/PIB procedure are enhanced from time to time. As a result, many 9th Plan schemes could be approved departmentally, eliminating the need for appraisal by Planning Commission and Ministry of Finance. Besides, the Eighth Plan Schemes, to be continued in the Ninth Plan, without any change in their scope, have been exempted from approval procedures. The procedures for approval of individual schemes have also been streamlined to ensure that the schemes are designed in a cost effective manner and approval to the Scheme and its component is made available expeditiously.
- (iii) The exact text of comments of Planning Commission and the Ministry of Finance are given at Annexure-I and Annexure-II.

Under Utilisation of Funds

Recommendation (Sl. No. 3)

2.3 The Committee find that the budgetary provision for the 9th Plan for the Department is Rs. 2345.64 crores but the actual budgetary allocation for the 5 years of the 9th Plan is expected to be Rs. 1682.95 crores assuming Rs. 300.00 crores as BE 2001-2002 on the same scale as BE 2000-2001. With the present pace of utilisation the Department will be able to utilise 50% of the RE allocation in the 9th Plan and 38% of the BE allocation. The Committee are pained to note the low pace of utilisation of funds more so when over the last three years it has been continuously cautioning the Department to gear up its activities and achieve targets. Unfortunately these have not borne fruits so far. The Committee feel that the Department has not shaken off its lethargy and are not in a mood to meet the targets set forth by Hon'ble Prime Minister under the Special Action Plan. The Committee, therefore, desire that Department should adopt stricter measures exercise maximum control over various schemes pending with authorities, revise policies of funding/ publicise schemes through different modes of mass media, introduce incentives, etc. to achieve targets with simultaneous utilisation of funds to the fullest extent.

Reply of the Government

2.4 The Department has made sincere efforts during the first 3 years of the Ninth Plan to accelerate the pace of utilization and achieve the targets set under the Special Action Plan. However, it could not succeed in its mission, because several major projects of the Department could not be approved due to various reasons, including changes of Government at the Centre. Besides, most of the schemes envisage matching share from the State Governments. Due to lack of resources and financial constraints, the State Governments did not fully participate in the schemes and did not come up with adequate proposals for central assistance.

It is expected that the pace of utilization would improve substantially during the current year because of the following efforts made by the Department:—

- (i) The clearance of the schemes of Assistance to State Poultry Farms, Cattle Insurance, Establishment of Fishing Harbours, Assistance to Cooperatives, Development of Freshwater Aquaculture, National Welfare of Fishermen has been obtained. Besides, Draft Cabinet Notes of National Project on Cattle and Buffalo Breeding and Integrated Dairy

Development Project in Non-OF, Hilly and Backward Areas have been approved and circulated for comments in June, 2000. These Projects are expected to be cleared in the current year.

- (ii) The funding pattern for Foot and Mouth Disease Control Programme is being changed to provide for 100% Central funding.
- (iii) The Department has chalked out a Programme for holding regional meetings with the State Governments to regularly review the progress of the schemes.
- (iv) As recommended by the Committee, major focus has been concentrated on the ongoing schemes in the current year for which the State Governments are being pursued to actively participate by furnishing and implementing proposals in greater numbers. Substantially higher allocation has been provided for the following ongoing schemes.

S. No.	Schemes	RE (1999-2000)	BE 2000-2001)
1.	National Project on Rinderpest Eradication	5.00	15.00
2.	Assistance to States for Control of Livestock Diseases	7.75	13.00
3.	Directorate of Animal Health	1.53	4.75
4.	National Ram/Buck Production Programme	0.50	2.50
5.	Assistance to States for Integrated Piggery Dev.	2.50	3.00
6.	Improvement of Slaughter Houses/CUC	1.50	2.50
7.	Assistance to Cooperatives	4.00	25.00
8.	Establishment of Fishing Harbours	12.52	21.00
9.	Development of Freshwater Aquaculture	8.00	20.00
10.	National Welfare of Fishermen	20.00	23.70

National Project on Rinderpest Eradication

Recommendation (Sl. No. 6)

2.5 The Committee are happy to note that till date, no case of rinderpest has been detected in the country through village, stock route and institutional searches. The Committee are also happy to note that the Department has prepared a proposal for implementation of the ongoing components out of internal resources, during the remaining period of 9th Plan. The Committee are concerned to note that out of an allocation of Rs. 10.00 crores for 1999-2000 at BE stage the RE allocation is only Rs. 5.00 crores because of an overall cut by Ministry of Finance.

An allocation of Rs. 15.00 crores has been made as BE for 2000-2001. The Department propose to spend the amount on procurement of sophisticated equipments, meeting demands of States, purchase of vehicles and diagnostic kits and upgradation of facilities for production of vaccines in the States of Orissa, Rajasthan, J&K, Haryana, Punjab, Bihar, Assam and U.P. The Committee visualize that all these activities can be completed within the limited time frame of the financial year 2000-2001. They, therefore, hope that the amount earmarked for the year 2000-2001 will be fully utilized and there will be no scope left for under-utilisation of funds.

Reply of the Government

2.6 The NPRE has initiated action for utilization of funds provided in BE 2000-2001 for Rs. 15 crore. Necessary tenders for procurement of sophisticated equipments worth Rs. 2 crore have already been floated. Proposal for purchase of Elisa Kits through FAO worth Rs. 80 lakh has already been sent to the Ministry of Finance for approval. A proposal worth Rs. 1 crore for installation of V-SAT facility has also been moved with the NIC. Necessary proposal for release of funds as grants-in-aid to the States/UTs/Research Institutes for about Rs. 3 crores have also been initiated. It will be ensured that the funds as provided in BE are fully utilized during the current financial year.

Delay in sanctioned projects due to inaction by CPWD/Construction Agencies

Recommendation (Sl. No. 7)

2.7 The Committee find that many of the projects which have been sanctioned over the years have not taken off because construction/maintenance activities have not been started by the CPWD/Construction agencies. As a result funds allocated for these projects keep lying unutilized

year after year without any useful purpose. These projects are the National Veterinary Biological Products Quality Control Centre, Animal Quarantine and Certification Services etc.

The Committee had expressed great concern over the loss to the nation for lack of these centres earlier in their Reports. The Committee are of the considered view that in the event of further delay the Department should consider giving the construction activities to private parties. This will expedite the functioning of the Centres and also save the loss accruing due to enhanced construction costs year after year, besides benefiting the nation by making available quality biologicals. The Committee wishes to know the details of institutes suffering on this account and the decision taken by the Department to expedite their construction/maintenance.

The Committee also strongly recommend that in the absence of a building the Department may start functioning from a hired premises so that a smooth transfer takes place and delay does not occur in implementation of these projects of national importance.

Reply of the Government

2.8 In view of the cancellation of allotment of the land by Government of Orissa, new construction of the proposed National Veterinary Biological Products Quality Control Centre cannot be taken up at present and hence, there will be no involvement/action to be undertaken by the CPWD.

As regards the Animal Quarantine and Certification Services, the offices at Calcutta and Mumbai has already shifted to their respective buildings. The issue of hiring offices for new AQCS Stations at Bangalore and Hyderabad would be possible after the revised EFC for setting up of these two Stations is approved.

Poultry Marketing Federation

Recommendation (Sl. No. 9)

2.9 The Committee in their 20th Report on Demands for Grants 1999-2000 had recommended that poultry marketing federations should be set up, so that poor farmers have an assured marketability of their produce and also get reasonable price to keep them engaged in their small trade. The Department in their reply have not given a suitable solution regarding strengthening the marketing structure for poultry. The Committee are of the opinion that poultry is something which the poorest of poor can develop and even a widow or an individual can earn livelihood from this activity. It is not only employment generation intensive but also the best and the cheapest way to self employment in the rural areas. With these earnings the standard of living of poor farmers engaged in poultry trade can improve.

The Committee feel that the Department has been thinking in terms of large scale activity in poultry in the vicinity of urban areas and have allowed the poor and marginal farmers to fend for themselves in the rural areas thereby letting them to be exploited by the middlemen. The Committee are unable to gauge the local consumption in rural areas which the Department feels is adequate to subsume the entire rural production.

The Committee, therefore recommend that establishment of an authority/body is a must, which can give the poor and marginal farmers a food remunerative price for their poultry produce. They feel that by letting the market decide its own price will not be just and equitable to the small and marginal farmers who find difficulty in selling their poultry produce. Poultry Marketing Federations can be a solution to this problem. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Department should make a detailed study on aspects of rural production/consumption State-wise/block-wise, the number of poor farmers involved *vis-a-vis* the relatively rich farmers, the price received by the poor farmers and the market price etc. and submit a report to the Committee giving its comments analytically in favour/against setting up a Poultry Marketing federations before the Demands for Grants of the financial year 2001-2002 are taken up by the Committee for consideration.

The Committee further recommend that if the setting up of Poultry Marketing Federations is not a viable proposal the Department should come up with some other concrete proposal which will look after the interest of the poor farmers. The Committee also recommend that the Government should initiate steps to implement the recommendations of the High Power Committee which was constituted to reorganize Central Poultry Farms.

Reply of the Government

2.10 The Department has already finalized the terms of reference for conducting the study and the same has been sent to some reputed Organizations who are conducting such studies. Responses have been received and the Department is now processing the same for finalizing the award of consultancy.

Cattle Insurance

Recommendation (Sl. No. 11)

2.11 The Committee have been informed that a corpus of Rs. 5 crores has been released to General Insurance Corporation (GIC) for Cattle Insurance. The interest which GIC will get on their corpus of Rs. 5 crores will be utilized for funding the premium subsidy in eight pilot districts chosen for this purpose.

The Committee are further informed that under the umbrella policy the district administration gives necessary feedback to the insurance company and mediates for the settlement of claims. The premium on non-scheme animals is 4 per cent. The Insurance Company subsidizes 1.75% premium out of the interest on Rs. 5 crores corpus. Publicity is being taken up on a pilot basis so that the experience can be utilized to take a final decision on whether an umbrella policy or an individual policy will be beneficial to the farmers. As regards publicity aspects, the Committee feel that unless comprehensive and intensive publicity is given to the innermost and lowest level of villages *i.e.* to the poorest of poor farmers, the objective of Cattle Insurance scheme will remain unfulfilled.

The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Department should take utmost care to involve all State Departments in the publicity of the Cattle Insurance Policy besides the GIC. The Committee would like to be apprised of the methods of publicity which are proposed to be utilized and the allocation made for each mode of publicity within 3 months of presentation of this Report to Parliament.

Reply of the Government

2.12 The Scheme of Cattle Insurance is being implemented on a pilot basis in eight districts of the country. The Block level Committees were formed, in all the eight districts where Cattle Insurance scheme is being implemented, involving the district and block level officials along with Insurance Company representatives. They are involved in propagating awareness of the scheme. The General Insurance Corporation and its flagship companies in the insurance sector are to prepare leaflets/posters in regional languages for the districts and these will be distributed/displayed in the village and panchayat offices where the scheme will be in operation. This being a part of the scheme, its financial requirements will be taken care of by the interest accrued on the seed money of Rs. 5 crore.

Development of Freshwater Aquaculture

Recommendation (Sl. No. 12)

2.13 The Committee note that under the scheme development of Freshwater aquaculture the budget provision for the year 1997-98 was Rs. 15.05 crores and the actual expenditure is Rs. 14.94 crores. During the year 1998-99 the allocations are Rs. 18.50 crores and the expenditure is Rs. 7.98 crores. The Committee note that presently 422 Fish Farmers Development Agencies (FFDAs) have been sanctioned to cover the potential districts in all the States and the Union Territory of Pondicherry. However, against the potential of 22 lakh hectare,

about 4 lakh hectare has only been covered so far which is only 25% of the total target. The Committee feel that our country has tremendous potential in the coastal areas for fisheries and aquaculture but are very unhappy to note that even small countries like Thailand, Malaysia and Singapore have made a tremendous progress in this field but we are lagging far behind despite of having vast potential for marine products. The Committee also note that the Department have allocated. Rs. 21 crores during 1999-2000 to achieve the targets of covering 30,000 hectares water to be brought under fish farming and by giving training facilities to 35,000 fish farmers by the Government agencies. Looking into the low achievements in physical and financial targets in this scheme, the Committee feel that a review of the policy is necessary. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Government should set up a High Level Expert Committee to evaluate the potential, and also to see how vast potential of the coastal areas can be exploited to the best advantage of the country.

Reply of the Government

2.14 As recommended by the Committee, Agriculture Minister has ordered constitution of High Level Expert Committee to evaluate the potential available for fresh water aquaculture and to make recommendations as to how best the vast potential can be optimally utilized. The Committee is to be headed by Dr. S. Ayyappan, Director, CIEE, Mumbai (ICAR). FDC, DAHD will be the Member Secretary. Experts drawn from different States are on the Committee, which also has a private entrepreneur selected from Andhra Pradesh and a representative of fish farmers selected from West Bengal. The Committee is to submit its report within a period of six months from the date of its constitution.

Fisheries Survey of India

Recommendation (Sl. No. 14)

2.15 The erstwhile Ministry of Food Processing Industries and now the Department of Food Processing Industries has given assurances to the Committee year after year regarding purchase of new vessels. It is regrettable that no vessels have been procured till date.

The Committee observe that though it takes almost 2-3 years for the construction of the vessels after a valid contract is signed by the manufacturer and the purchaser, yet neither any agreement has been signed till date nor any advance has been made. No parties have been identified for placing an order for the vessels. There is virtually, therefore, no progress.

The Committee record their displeasure over the manner in which it is being misled by the Department. The Committee wants results, without any further delay. The Committee would like to have a white paper on the subject from the Department within one month of presentation of report so that it could be taken up at the appropriate levels.

Reply of the Government

2.16 As desired, the white paper on the subject has been submitted to the Committee *vide* letter No. 25-5(1)/2000-AHD (Coord.) dated 29.02.2000.

National Welfare of Fishermen

Recommendation (Sl. No. 15)

2.17 The Committee are informed that this scheme has three components viz. Group Accident Insurance started in 1982-83 for death or permanent disability, Development of Model Fishermen Villages started in 1986-87 under which houses, tubewells and community halls are provided and the savings-cum-relief component introduced in 1991-92 under which financial assistance is provided to marine fishermen during monsoon/close period.

The Committee observe that under the saving-cum-relief component contribution of Rs. 45/- per month for eight fishing months in a year is collected from the beneficiaries which is equally matched by the Central and State Governments. A sum of Rs. 1080/- thus collected is distributed to fishermen in four equal monthly installments of Rs. 270/- each during the monsoon/close period. Financial assistance is given to States/UTs for implementation and the selection of beneficiaries is entirely the prerogative of the State Governments, subject to overall guidelines laid down in the scheme.

The Committee are of the opinion that Rs. 270/- pm during monsoon/close period is too little an amount for a reasonably poor standard of living. Furthermore, the beneficiaries are selected by State Governments. Since the allocations are limited only a few resourceful fishermen may be reaping the benefit.

The Committee are of the strong view that the share money should be increased so that a marine fishermen gets at least Rs. 1000/- pm during the monsoon/close period. The Committee are also of the opinion that since the scheme is contributory it should cover all marine fishermen who approach for enrolment as member of the saving-cum-relief scheme, of source subject to verification of other factors.

Reply of the Government

2.18 The recommendation of the Committee to enhance the share money to Rs. 1000/- pm was referred to the Planning Commission for their consideration. The Planning Commission have, however opined that since the scheme has been modified and approved by the Expenditure Finance Committee only recently, incorporation of the proposed amendment may be examined while revising the scheme for continuation during the Tenth Plan period.

The Cabinet Committee on Economic Affairs (CCEA) in its meeting held on 11.07.2000 has cleared the proposal to enhance the monthly payments from Rs. 270/- to Rs. 300/- during the monsoon/lean period. As per the revised pattern the beneficiary contribution for marine fishermen has been raised from Rs. 45/- to Rs. 75/- during eight active fishing months. The State and Centre would together contribute Rs. 75/- pm. The sum of Rs. 1200/- thus collected would be distributed to the beneficiaries in four equal monthly instalments during the lean period. In the case of inland fishermen, a contribution of Rs. 50/- per month would be collected from the beneficiaries during the nine active fishing months. The Centre and State will together contribute Rs. 50/- per month. The sum of Rs. 900/- thus collected would be distributed to the beneficiaries in three equal monthly instalments. So far only marine fishermen were covered under the scheme, which has now been extended to inland fishermen also.

CHAPTER III

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

Imbalances in States due to stipulation of matching contributions

Recommendation (Sl. No. 10)

3.1 The Committee have observed that most of the schemes suffer because the state is unable to provide a matching grant. The budget allocation by the Central Ministry/Department to the State remains unutilized and lapses year after year.

On an analysis of this aspect, the Committee have come to a conclusion that every year relatively poorer States have many liabilities to be fulfilled to the Centre due to which a large chunk of their resources are paid back to the Centre. This leaves the States with practically no funds to contribute towards matching contributions for various schemes run by the Centre. The financial position of some of the States is deteriorating year after year. In this manner some of the schemes gradually die their own death. On the contrary some other states that have high levels of revenue generation besides providing for matching contribution engage themselves in other developmental activities. These States take their share of allocations from the Department regularly but may not utilize them for purposes for which they have been allocated the funds.

In Committee's view this may be one of the reasons for some of the State Departments of Animal Husbandry & Dairying being very poor and there is no tangible developmental work observed in these States. The Committee recommend that these States may be given a one time general amnesty and a policy decision be taken to assist these States with a more liberal policy of funding so that the existing imbalances can be removed. The Committee further impress upon the Department to strictly monitor the progress made by those States which come under this liberal system of funding.

Reply of the Government

3.2 The recommendation of the Committee was referred to Planning Commission for consideration. The Planning Commission *vide* letter dated 02.02.2000 has expressed that:—

“Planning Commission is of the view that the factors like fiscal profligacy, subsidies, creation of posts in excess of requirement, etc. have largely been responsible for the resource constraints faced by the States. The States’ contribution is needed for their involvement in the success of the schemes otherwise their dependence would further increase”.

CHAPTER IV

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

Growth of Financial Outlay

Recommendation (Sl. No. 1)

4.1 The Committee note that in pursuance of Governmental strategy for doubling the food production the Department have stepped up the allocation from Rs. 1677.88 crore to Rs. 2345.64 crore as budgetary support to the Department for IXth Plan. The Committee note that the percentage of plan outlay for the year 1997-98 (first year of the 9th Plan) is 0.27% of the total Central Plan outlay, whereas in 2000-2001 (the fourth year of Ninth Plan) the percentage is 0.19% out of Central Plan outlay. The Committee also note that NDC (National Development Council) has approved the higher plan allocation for the Department of Animal Husbandry & Dairying at 1996-97 prices.

The Committee feel that animals are the most important component of the eco-system that holds the balance between man and nature. It is essentially a vocation of the relatively poor. The reduction in the annual budget to the Department amounts to virtually neglecting the animal and livestock wealth of the nation.

The Committee, therefore, recommend that more thrust should be given to this sector and the Department should be allocated at least Rs. 385.06 crores for the year 2000-2001 so that meaningful activities relating to animal health and animal produce and resultant production takes place in the country.

Reply of the Government

4.2 The recommendation of the Committee was referred to the Planning Commission for consideration. The Planning Commission, have stated that, in view of the pace of utilization of allocations made to the Department during the first three years of the Ninth Plan and constraints on resources, an allocation of Rs. 250 crore was felt adequate to meet the requirements of the Department. However, on further representation of the Department,

the outlays were further revised upward to a level of Rs. 300 crore for sustaining and achieving accelerated growth. The Planning Commission has further informed that, as there would not be any upward revision for the budgeted outlays at this stage, any additional requirement of funds may be taken up with the Ministry of Finance for enhancement in the provisions at the R.E. stage.

Comments of the Committee

4.3 For comments of the Committee please refer to para No. 1.6 of Chapter I of this Report.

Animal Disease Surveillance Scheme

Recommendation (Sl. No. 5)

4.4 The Committee note that Animal Disease Surveillance Scheme started with the main objective to collect the complete information with respect of Animal Diseases in the country on regular basis and disseminate the same to the States/UTs by publishing bulletins. The Committee had recommended earlier that this publication should be made available in local languages also. Now, the Committee have been informed that very few States/UTs like Karnataka, Gujarat, Tripura and Mizoram, U.P. and UT of Pondicherry have responded in the matter and are publishing and circulating the bulletin in local languages.

The Committee also note that the Department have no information regarding the number of copies circulated in the States and that copies of the bulletin are circulated among their own Departmental officials and institutions. The Committee are also surprised that only 50 copies of the Hindi version are circulated by the Department. Animals are kept by farmers and diseases are found among these animals. They are the first people who should know about the current disease found in farm animals and their likely cures. The Committee wonder so to why these bulletins are being circulated to officials and institutions only and not to the concerned farmers. In their opinion the very purpose of issuing such bulletins is defeated.

The Committee, therefore, recommend that the matter should be pursued sincerely and more States/UTs should be persuaded to issue such bulletins. These bulletins should invariably be available with the local bodies, village panchayats, farmers cooperatives, Krishi Vigyan Kendras, Block Development Officers, Patwaris etc. particularly for the use of the small and marginal farmers. A Farmer's Education Programme should be there on the local TV networks for educating and creating awareness amongst the farmers.

The Committee also recommend that the State Governments should be asked to give details of such circulation to the Department alongwith copies of issues circulated. As for the Department of Animal Husbandry & Dairying, it should make sure that copies are circulated to all SAUs, State Animal Husbandry Departments and Dairy Co-operative Federations in sufficient numbers for onwards transmission. One copy each of these Hindi bulletins should also be forwarded to all the members of the Standing Committee and two copies of each such issue to the Standing Committee on Agriculture. The Department should also forward one copy of the State/UT's local language bulletins to the Standing Committee which shall be placed in the Chairman's Office for reference for the Members.

Reply of the Government

4.5 In view of the recommendation of the Standing Committee, all the State/UT Governments have been requested to:

- (a) Publish the Livestock Disease Information Reports in local languages apart from the English language.
- (b) Circulate the reports widely and make them available with local bodies, farmers co-operatives, Krishi Vigyan Kendras, village panchayats, BDOs, Patwaries, etc., and to inform the Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying about the number of copies circulated.
- (c) Send a copy of the report published in local language to the Department and two copies to the Chairman, Standing Committee to Agriculture, New Delhi.

The Department of Animal Husbandry and Dairying has already started sending the bulletin to the State Agricultural/Veterinary Universities and publishing the monthly Animal Disease Surveillance (ADS) bulletins in Hindi also.

Comments of the Committee

4.6 For comments of the Committee please refer to Para 1.9 of Chapter I of this report.

CHAPTER V

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

National Veterinary Biological Products Quality Control Centre

Recommendation (Sl. No. 4)

5.1 The Committee observe that National Veterinary Biological Products Quality Control Centre is a central scheme approved during the Sixth Five Year Plan but its existence is only on paper since then. For this purpose land has already been acquired at Bhubaneshwar. The Department have been providing the Budget Estimates for this scheme from the year 1992-93 onwards for setting up the National Centre. This Centre would help in making available quality biological products in the country which in turn will help the control of animal diseases. the Committee are highly constrained to note that not a single penny has been spent on this scheme so far. In reply to the recommendation made by the Committee in their 20th Report on Demands for Grants 2000-2001 expressing concern at the viability of the project, the Department assured that despite serious constraints and other technical problems, they are concerned about the delay in establishing the National Centre. They further stated that the planning and construction of the laboratory has been taken up on priority. The CPWD was being requested to identify experts for designing the laboratory and initiate construction immediately. In this connection, the Committee have now been informed that CPWD is yet to furnish the design of the laboratory and only a token amount of Rs. 10.00 lakhs has been made for the year 2000-2001. Further, the Department is exploring the possibility of using the existing facilities at Punjab Agricultural University (PAU), Ludhiana. The Committee are not sure whether the efforts of the Department will succeed in that direction.

The Committee find that in seven years no progress has taken place in the matter. The Department is dilly dallying between Orissa, Bangalore & Punjab for the establishment of the Centre. They have not zeroed on the site of the Centre. The project is hanging fire from the last seven years now. The Committee deplore such indecisiveness on the part of the Department and strongly recommend that urgent steps should be taken to finalise the project with CPWD and if further delay is anticipated then the Department should invite private contractors to taken up the construction on priority basis. The Committee further desire that the construction of the Centre should be completed within a period of 2 years from now onwards by

making a higher demand at RE stage. The Committee would also like to be apprised of the schedule for construction and design details within three months of presentation of this Report to Parliament. The Committee further recommend that the Department should identify the reasons for the delay and responsibility should be fixed in this regard.

Reply of the Government

5.2 The National Biological Products Quality Control Centre was proposed to be set up at Bhubaneswar for which Government of Orissa allocated a piece of land measuring 38.4 acres at Mouza Jolakandi, near Bhubaneswar airport in 1995. As a follow up action of the recommendations of the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Agriculture, the matter was pursued with the Director (Works) CPWD and other officers of the Ministry of Urban Development and pre-construction guidelines were obtained.

However, in May 2000, Government of Orissa informed this Department that the allotment of the land in question had been cancelled and direction issued for an alternate site to be located. The cancellation was made on the ground that the land belonged to the forest department and its use otherwise was not permissible. This Department has neither received the cancellation order of 1997 nor has heard anything about the alternative site. In view of cancellation of the allotment of the land by Government of Orissa, any construction work at the proposed site cannot be taken up.

Keeping in view the importance and urgency of setting up the Quality Control Centre, a Committee under the chairmanship of National Project Co-Ordinator, National Project on Rinderpest Eradication (NPRE) has been constituted to find out the suitability of the site at Ludhiana, belonging to the Department of Immunology (originally Theileria Vaccine Laboratory) of Punjab Agricultural University and suggest modifications and Work Plan, etc. for the quality control centre. The Committee has visited the proposed site on 22-23 May, 2000 and had detailed discussions with the senior officers of the Department of Animal Husbandry, Government of Punjab, Dean, Veterinary College and other senior officers of the Punjab Agricultural University, including Sr. Architect and other concerned officials/experts. The Committee has submitted an interim report where it has recommended this site for the establishment of the proposed Veterinary Biological Products Quality Control Centre. The report of the Committee is being processed further.

Central Frozen Semen Production and Training Institute, Hessarghatta

Recommendation (Sl. No. 8)

5.3 The Committee note that against the target of 10 lakh doses of frozen semen during each of the year 1997-98, 1998-99 and 1999-2000, the Central Frozen Semen Production and Training Institute could achieve 8.1 lakh, 8.24 lakh and 8.67 lakh doses respectively. The Department during examination of Demands for Grants in 1998-99, 1999-2000 had informed the Committee that low achievement in semen production is due to fact that new bulls could not be introduced. The Committee further note that the Department had completed the formalities to import 40 heifers and 35 bulls from Denmark in order to strengthen the Central Cattle Breeding Farms and Central Frozen Semen Production Training Institute, Hessarghatta. A team of officers visited Denmark and finally selected the animals based on the production and health parameters fixed by the Government of India. When the import of animals was to take place the Danish Government put the fact on the internet the 'mad cow disease' has been detected in one of its animals and so due to this reason the order was cancelled by the Department. The Committee have now been informed that the Department would float global tenders again with the stipulation that the supplying country must certify that the animal is free from any of the disease. Imports are, however, banned from all the European countries. The Committee are surprised to note that though a period of three years has already elapsed yet heifers and bulls could not be imported resulting in shortfall in doses and a denial of good animal population to the country. They feel that the process of global tendering may further result in wasting a period of 3 more years before the bulls are hopefully finally procured. This may lead to lapsing of funds and depletion of targets year after year. The Committee recommend that since all European countries are now debarred from supplying animals, a limited/ restricted urgent tender for supply of bulls of the requisite standard may be floated by the Department to the countries other than European countries *viz.* Australia, New Zealand and also to those countries, which had earlier offered to supply these bulls against the old tender and bulls purchased within this financial year.

Reply of the Government

5.4 The Department has made sincere efforts to import 40 heifers and 35 bulls from Denmark to strengthen the Central Cattle Breeding Farms and Central Frozen Semen Production and Training Institute, Hessarghatta. The import could however not be effected due to detection of Mad Cow

Disease in Denmark. Vigorous efforts are now being made to collect relevant information through Indian Embassies about the performance of heifers and young breeding bulls from countries which meet the Animal Health requirements of our country for import of animals.

The recommendations of the High Power Committee pertaining to reorganisation of Central Poultry Development Organisations are under consideration of the Department.

Setting up of the Indian Council of Veterinary Research

Recommendation (Sl. No. 13)

5.5 The Committee were informed that the setting up of the Indian Council of Veterinary Research on the lines of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research was to be considered by the new Government when it comes to power. Since the new Government is now in position, the Committee would like to be apprised of the action taken by the Department and progress on this issue.

Reply of the Government

5.6 The matter has been placed before the new Agriculture Minister for consideration. No decision has been taken as yet.

NEW DELHI;
22 February, 2001
3 Phalgun, 1922 (Saka)

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

APPENDIX I

MINUTES OF THE FOURTH SITTING OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HELD ON 22ND FEBRUARY, 2001 IN COMMITTEE ROOM 'C', GROUND FLOOR, PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE, NEW DELHI

The Committee sat from 1500 hrs. to 1540 hrs.

MEMBERS

Lok Sabha

Shri M. Master Mathan — *in the Chair*

2. Shri Ram Tahal Chaudhari
3. Shri Ramdas Rupala Gavit
4. Shri Raghunath Jha
5. Shri Abul Hasnat Khan
6. Shri Y.G. Mahajan
7. Shri Haribhau Shankar Mahale
8. Shri Savshibhai Makwana
9. Shri Dalpat Singh Paraste
10. Shri Adi Shankar
11. Shri Tejveer Singh
12. Shri Mahaboob Zahedi

Rajya Sabha

13. Smt. Jamana Devi Barupal
14. Shri Khagen Das
15. Shri Kailash Joshi
16. Shri Devi Prasad Singh

SECRETARIAT

1. Dr. (Smt.) Paramjeet Kaur Sandhu — *Joint Secretary*
2. Shri Raj Shekhar Sharma — *Deputy Secretary*
3. Smt. Anita Jain — *Under Secretary*
4. Shri K.L. Arora — *Under Secretary*

In the absence of Hon'ble Chairman (AC), the Committee chose Shri M. Master Mathan to act as Chairman for the sitting under Rule 258 (3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. The Committee then took up the following Memoranda for their consideration and adoption:—

Memoranda No.	Reports
1.	Draft Action Taken Report on 12th Report (12th Lok Sabha) on cultivation of cotton of the M/o Agriculture (Deptt. of Agriculture and Co-operation)
2.	Draft Action Taken Report on 6th Report (13th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the M/o Agriculture (Deptt. of Agriculture and Co-operation)
3.	Draft Action taken Report on 7th Report (13th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the M/o Agriculture (Deptt. of Agricultural Research and Education)
4.	Draft Action Taken Report on 8th Report (13th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the M/o Agriculture (Deptt. of Animal Husbandry and Dairying)
5.	Draft Action taken Report on 9th Report (13th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the M/o Agriculture (Deptt. of Food Processing Industries)
6.	Draft Action Taken Report on 10th Report (13th Lok Sabha) on Demands for Grants (2000-2001) of the Ministry of Water Resources

The Committee considered the Draft Reports one by one and adopted them without any change.

The members of the Committee, thereafter, authorised the Chairman to present all the above mentioned Reports to the House on a date and time convenient to him.

The Committee then adjourned.

APPENDIX II

[Vide Para 4 of Introduction of the Report]

ANALYSIS OF ACTION TAKEN BY THE GOVERNMENT ON THE EIGHTH REPORT OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE (THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

(i) Total Number of Recommendations	15
(ii) Recommendations/Observations which have been accepted by the Government	
Serial Nos. 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14 & 15	
Total	9
Percentage	60%
(iii) Recommendations/Observations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies	
Serial No. 10	
Total	1
Percentage	6.66%
(iv) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee	
Serial No. 1 & 5	
Total	2
Percentage	13.33%
(v) Recommendations/Observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited	
Serial Nos. 4, 8 & 13	
Total	3
Percentage	20%