

35

**COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES
(2012-2013)**

FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA

THIRTY-FIFTH REPORT

REVIEW OF PENDING ASSURANCES PERTAINING TO THE
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
(DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND CO-OPERATION)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 29 August, 2013



**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

August, 2013/Bhadrapada , 1935 (Saka)

THIRTY FIFTH REPORT

COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES

(2012-2013)

(FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA)

REVIEW OF PENDING ASSURANCES PERTAINING
TO THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
(DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND CO-OPERATION)

Presented to Lok Sabha on 29 August, 2013



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

August, 2013/Bhadrapada, 1935 (Saka)

CGA No. 246

Price: ₹ 45.00

© 2013 BY LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

Published under Rule 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Fourteenth Edition) and Printed by the General Manager, Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi-110 002.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE (2012-2013)	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
REPORT Review of Pending Assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation)	1
APPENDICES	
I-XII Questions and the Answers	8
XIII Extracts from Manual of Practice & Procedure in the Government of India, Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, New Delhi	27
ANNEXURES	
I. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 20 June, 2013.	31
II. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 02 July, 2013.	34
III. Minutes of the Sitting of the Committee held on 26 August, 2013.	38

COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES*
(2012-2013)

Shrimati Maneka Sanjay Gandhi — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Anandrao Adsul
3. Shri Rajendra Agrawal
4. Shri Hansraj G. Ahir
5. Dr. Rattan Singh Ajnala
6. Shri Kantilal Bhuria
7. Shri Jayant Chaudhary
8. Shri Gurudas Das Gupta
9. Shri Bijoy Handique
10. Shri Badri Ram Jakhar
11. Sardar Sukhdev Singh Libra
12. Shri Anjan Kumar M. Yadav
13. Shri Nama Nageswara Rao
14. Rajkumari Ratna Singh
15. Dr. M. Thambidurai**

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P. Sreedharan — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri U.B.S. Negi — *Director*
3. Shri T.S. Rangarajan — *Additional Director*
4. Shri Kulvinder Singh — *Committee Officer*

* The Committee was constituted *w.e.f.* 23 September, 2012 *vide* Para No. 4552 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 18 October, 2012.

** Nominated to the Committee *vide* Para No.4625 of Lok Sabha Bulletin Part-II dated 16 November, 2012.

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairperson of the Committee on Government Assurances, having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Thirty Fifth Report of the Committee on Government Assurances.

2. The Committee (2012-2013) at their sittings held on 20 June and 02 July, 2013 took oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture regarding pending assurances from the 7th Session of 14th Lok Sabha to the 9th Session of the 15th Lok Sabha pertaining to the Department of Agriculture and Co-operation.

3. At their sitting held on 26 August, 2013, the Committee (2012-2013) considered and adopted their Thirty Fifth Report.

4. The Minutes of the aforesaid sittings of the Committee form part of this report.

5. For facility of reference and convenience, the observations and recommendations of the Committee have been printed in bold letters in the Report.

NEW DELHI;
26 August, 2013

4 Bhadrapada, 1935 (Saka)

MANEKA SANJAY GANDHI,
Chairperson,
Committee on Government Assurances.

REPORT

Introductory

The Committee on Government Assurances scrutinize the assurances, promises, undertakings etc. given by the Ministers from time to time on the floor of the House and report to the extent to which such assurances, promises, undertakings etc. have been implemented. Once an assurance has been given on the floor of the House, the same is required to be implemented within three months. The Ministries/Departments of the Government of India are under obligation to seek extension of time, if they are unable to fulfil the assurance within the prescribed periods of three months. Where a Ministry/Department are unable to implement an assurance, they are required to more the Committee to drop the same. The Committee consider such requests and agree to drop, if they are convinced with the grounds cited to be justified. The Committee also examine whether the implementation of assurances has taken place within the minimum time necessary for the purpose and the Committee also look into the extent to which the assurances have been implemented.

2. The Committee on Government Assurances (2009-2010) took a policy decision to call the representatives of the various Ministries/Departments of the Government of India, in a phased manner, to review the pending assurances and also look at the reasons for pendency, the operation of the prescribed system in the Ministries/Departments for dealing with assurances. The Committee also decided to look at the quality of assurances implemented by the Government.

3. In pursuance of the decision referred to above, the Committee (2012-2013) called the representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation) and examined the 12 pending assurances (Appendix-I to XII) pertaining to them at their sitting held on 20 June and 2 July 2013.

Review of Pending Assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation)

12 assurances pertaining to the Department of Agriculture and Co-operation which were pending at the time of taking oral evidence are as follows:—

Sl.No.	SQ/USQ No. and date	Subject
1	2	3
1.	SQ No. 367 19.04.2000	Minimum Support Price for Agricultural Crops
2.	SQ No. 448 07.05.2007	Performance of NHM
3.	USQ No. 2712 19.03.2007 [^]	Revival of Coconut Sector in Kerala
4.	SQ No. 243 03.12.2007	Soil Tests
5.	USQ No. 3295 22.12.2008	Loss of Foodgrains due to Flood
6.	USQ No. 3213 28.07.2009	Assistance to Orange Growers
7.	USQ No. 1926 01.12.2009 ^{^^}	Fund to Karnataka under National Horticulture Mission

1	2	3
8.	Calling Attention 23.03.2011	Problems being faced by Farmers in Andhra Pradesh
9.	USQ No. 3312 23.08.2011	Financial Irregularities in NAFED
10.	USQ No. 3182 13.12.2011 ^{^^}	MSP of Medicinal Plants
11.	USQ No. 2125 27.03.2012	Inter-States Taxes on Farm Produce
12.	USQ No. 2244 27.03.2012 ^{^^^}	Price of Medicinal Plants

[^] Partly implemented *vide* SS-II/4 on 31.08.2007

^{^^} Partly implemented *vide* SS-III/3 on 18.08.2010

^{^^^} Partly implemented *vide* SS-5/1 on 13.03.2013

^{^^^} Partly implemented *vide* SS-4/2 on 13.03.2013

4. At the outset, the Committee desired to know as to whether any system exists to take care of the assurances given by the Ministers on the floor of the House from time to time. In their response, the representative of the Ministry stated as follows:—

“Madam, we do have a system. In fact, I take monthly meetings on all important issues concerning the Ministry and reviewing the status of implementation of assurances is one of the issues that is discussed in this officers’ meeting held every week. In addition, all the Divisional Heads, that is, Joint Secretaries take meetings of their respective divisions on these issues.”

5. When the Committee pointed out that according to the instructions a review is supposed to be undertaken periodically at the highest level to minimize the delay in the implementation of the assurances and whether such a review of the pending assurances has been undertaken, the representative of the Ministry stated as under:—

“Madam, I was away abroad. Otherwise, I hold a meeting every Monday.”

6. On being inquired by the Committee as to when did the last review taken of assurance, the representative of the Ministry responded as under:—

“This very month—I left on 8th—it must have been around 3rd, 4th or 5th. Each Monday I take a meeting.”

7. When the Committee asked to know as to whether the Ministry apprises the Minister about the progress made in the implementation of assurances, the representative of the Ministry responded in negative.

8. When the Committee pointed out that the status note submitted by the Department on pending assurances shows that there is no coordination at all with the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs in the matter of laying of implementation reports on the Table of the House and desired to know the reason for that, the representative of the Ministry stated as under:—

“No, Madam. As soon as we fulfil an assurance, we send across the draft fulfillment statement, after taking approval of the Minister, to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs.”

Observations/Recommendations

9. The Committee note that 12 assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation) are pending implementation. Six assurances are pending for the last four years and the oldest one for over a decade. Although the Ministry is stated to be aware of the Manual of Parliamentary Procedures which provides for periodic reviews of all assurances at highest level and they have a system to take care of the assurances given by the Minister on the floor of the House, the inordinate delay in the fulfilment of the assurances under examination clearly shows that the existing mechanism presently in place in the Ministry is not adequate enough for ensuring effective implementation of the assurances expeditiously. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the Ministry should take appropriate steps with a view to ensuring timely implementation of the assurances without any further loss of time.

Review of Pending Assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation)

10. During the sitting of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation) held on 20 June and 02 July 2013 examined 12 pending assurances made between 3rd Session of 13th Lok Sabha and 10th Session of 15th Lok Sabha. The Starred/Unstarred Questions and replies thereto that were treated as assurances are given at Appendices I to XII. Some of the important assurances critically scrutinized by the Committee are given in the succeeding paragraphs.

(A) Funds to Karnataka under National Horticulture Mission

USQ No.1926 dated 01.12.2009 regarding Funds to Karnataka under National Horticulture Mission.

The above mentioned question and the reply given thereto, as reproduced may be seen at Appendix-VII.

11. A complaint about the misuse of funds under National Horticulture Mission (NHM) in Bellary district during June 2009 came to the notice of Government of India. In reply to USQ No.1926 dated 01.12.2009, an assurance was given that a criminal case against the guilty officials have been booked in July 2009 and is under investigation.

12. When the Committee enquired about the guilty officials after they were put under suspension, the representative of the Ministry responded as under:—

“In fact, all of them sent to jail also and they are out on bail. We had initiated departmental proceedings against them. The Government of Karnataka has entrusted these proceedings to the Lokayukta there. They are pending.”

13. The Committee were informed that all the five guilty officials are under suspension and getting 75 per cent of their salary. One of them had died and the other one had since retired from service.

14. When the Committee asked as to whether the case is being followed up, the representative of the Ministry stated as under:—

“This is being followed up by the Government of Karnataka. They are doing it in two fronts—one with the Lokayukta and the second at the criminal court in Bellary where this irregularity took place.”

15. The Committee were informed that Rs.1.54 crore of funds under NHM was misused, out of which, the share of the Centre is 85 per cent. The Committee then enquired as to why the case had been sent to the Lokayukta and why the person has been allowed to retire from service, the representative of the Ministry stated as under:—

“No Sir. The proceedings against him are continuing. He has reached the age of superannuation. That is why he has retired.”

16. When the Committee asked about the benefits received by him, the representative of the Ministry responded as under:—

“He has not got any benefit. The case against him is continuing.”

17. The Committee were informed that the criminal case is still pending in the court at Bellary Judicial Magistrate. When the Committee asked the Ministry as to whether they would ask the court to expedite the trial, the representative of the Ministry responded as under:—

“We will certainly take it up. I admit we have not followed up; this case with the local authorities. As you have directed us to do, we will take it up, I assure you.”

Observations/Recommendations

18. The Committee are constrained to note that the assurance given in reply to USQ No. 1926, dated 01 December 2009 regarding investigation of misuse of funds under the National Horticulture Mission (NHM) is still pending for implementation even after a lapse of about four years. It was informed to the Committee that the five officials who were involved in misuse of funds allocated to Karnataka to the tune of Rs.1.54 crore under NHM were placed under suspension. They were under judicial custody for three months but presently they are out on bail. Besides, a departmental enquiry has also been initiated against the guilty officials. In the meantime, one guilty person has died and another one has retired from service. However, no benefit has been given to the retired official and the case is still being pursued against him. The Committee were also informed that the case is being followed by the State Government of Karnataka with the Lokayukta as well as at the criminal court in Bellary where the irregularity took place. It was also revealed to the Committee during the course of the evidence of the Ministry that a sum of Rs.1.54 crore was misused by the five officials, out of which the share of the Centre was 85 per cent. The Committee are of the firm view that it was a simple case of fraud and criminal conspiracy to cheat the Government. Expeditious action was, therefore, expected to be taken and so the case should not have gone to the Lokayukta. However, the Committee are anguished to note the slow progress of the case at the criminal

court and the benefit of 75 per cent of the salary being enjoyed by the suspended officials. During the course of evidence, the representative of the Ministry was candid enough to accept that the case is not being followed by them with the local authorities. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Ministry should expedite the departmental enquiry against the guilty officials to its logical conclusion and they should also approach the court for their speedy trial with a view to ensuring implementation of the pending assurance without any further delay.

1. (B) Financial irregularities in National Agricultural Cooperative Marketing Federation of India (NAFED)

USQ No. 3312 dated 23.08.2011 regarding Financial irregularities in NAFED.

The above mentioned question and the reply given thereto, as reproduced may be seen at Appendix-IX.

19. In reply to aforesaid USQ, it was mentioned that the Central Registrar of Cooperative Societies (CRCS) has issued show cause notice to a total of 34 officers/ex-officers including the then Director/Members of Business Committee of NAFED for causing deficiency to the assets of NAFED and the hearing in the matter before CRCS is under progress.

20. On being pointed out by the Committee as to how it was possible for NAFED to divert its financial facilities to non-agricultural activities without the knowledge of the Ministry, the representative of the Ministry clarified as under:—

“Madam, NAFED is a co-operative society and we do not have control over it directly. Having said that, the MD of NAFED was a Government servant and the staff of NAFED were Government servant, even though it is a co-operative society. In 2005, with a resolution adopted within the NAFED, they allowed NAFED to undertake business in a non-agriculture sector and those businesses were with the help of private parties in which NAFED would provide the capital and hope to get a share of the proceeds. Now, a large number of these business undertakings seem to be of fly-by-night variety.”

The representative also added as under:—

“We have launched criminal proceedings against all the officers and, in fact, even against the Board Members of NAFED.”

21. The Committee were informed that these officers were sentenced to jail but are out on bail. On being enquired as to whether these people have been suspended or whether they are still in service, the representative of the Ministry responded as under:—

“They are no longer with the Ministry, so I cannot be sure of the exact status of these people.”

22. When the Committee asked as to how can the Ministry not be aware of such an important case where the Government has lost Rs. 3945 crore, the representative of the Ministry replied as under:—

“Of course, it is still a huge amount, but the loss now is Rs.1200 crore. But that is not the point. The point is, Madam, NAFED was housed by people on deputation. When this scam broke out, they were reverted to their cadre.”

The representative also added as under:—

“That is not a punishment, Madam. Criminal proceedings were launched against them and departmental proceedings have been launched against them.”

23. On being enquired by the Committee as to whether any money has been recovered at all, the representative of the Ministry stated as under:—

“Out of this Rs. 3945 crore, everything but the principal amount of Rs.1042 crore has been recovered.”

24. But when the Committee asked as to how much money has been recovered from the officials involved in the irregularity, the representative of the Ministry replied as under:—

“Nothing as of yet. The recovery proceedings are underway in the court of the Central Registrar.”

25. On being enquired as to whether a case has been registered against CMD, the representative of the Ministry responded in negative and he is still working in the State Government of Uttar Pradesh. It was also informed to the Committee that the proceedings have been launched against all the Members of the Board.

26. When the Committee enquired as to whether the Agriculture Ministry has its nominee on the Board, the representative of the Ministry stated as under:—

“Yes, Mr. Vatarkar who is non-official was the nominee.”

27. When the Committee asked as to whether the Government of India nominee objected to the resolution being adopted, the representative of the Ministry stated as under:—

“It has not been recorded”

He further added as under:—

“I can say only on the basis of the record. The record does not say there was any objection.”

28. When the Committee asked as to whether an explanation will be called from the said nominee of the Ministry, the representative of the Ministry replied as under:—

“The recovery proceedings are already on against him and all other Board Member.”

Observations/Recommendations

29. The Committee note that in reply to USQ No. 3312 dated 23 August 2011 regarding Financial Irregularities in NAFED, an assurance was given that the Central Registrar of Cooperative Societies (CRCS) has issued show cause notice to a total of 34 officers/ex-officers including the then Director/Members of Business Committee of NAFED for causing deficiency to the assets of NAFED and that the hearing in the matter before CRCS is under progress. During the course of oral evidence of the Ministry, the Committee were informed that NAFED is a cooperative society and the Government do not have direct control over it. During the years 2003-04 to 2005-06, NAFED undertook tie-up business in non-agricultural activities which was contrary to its bye laws. The Committee were also informed that out of Rs. 3945.50 crore invested by NAFED in non-agricultural items/activities, the principal amount of Rs.1042 crore has been recovered from the firms and companies. However, the recovery proceedings against the guilty officials are still underway in the court of CRCS. It also came to the notice of the Committee that all the erring officials who were on deputation to NAFED had since been reverted to their parent cadre. The Committee are extremely unhappy with the slow progress of the proceedings against the guilty officials and as a result the assurance continues to remain pending for implementation. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Ministry should pursue the case vigorously with all concerned to its logical conclusion and thereby implement the pending assurance expeditiously.

NEW DELHI;
26 August, 2013

4 Bhadrapada , 1935 (Saka)

MANEKA SANJAY GANDHI,
Chairperson,
Committee on Government Assurances.

APPENDIX I

(Vide Para 3 of the Report)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 367

ANSWERED ON 19.04.2000

Minimum Support Price for Agricultural Crops

*367. SHRI THAAWAR CHAND GEHLOT:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) the various crops for which support prices were fixed during the last three years and the details of support prices;

(b) whether any gradation was fixed for purchasing agricultural produce at the support price; and

(c) if so, the details thereof?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (S. B. P. B. K. SATYANARAYANA): (a) The Minimum Support Prices (MSPs) are fixed for 24 major agricultural crops and the details of support prices fixed during the last three years are enclosed (Annexure).

(b)&(c) The MSPs are fixed for Fair Average Quality (FAQ) of the agricultural crops. However, Paddy/Rice are procured in two groups viz., Grade 'A' & Common. Kernel having length and breadth ratio 2.5 and above are classified as Grade 'A' and Kernel having length and breadth ratio less than 2.5 are classified as Common. In the case of Jute, the Government fixes the MSP for TD-5 Grade of raw jute and the Jute Corporation of India (JCI) fixes the MSPs for other grades based on the market price differentials of the main grade. In the case of Cotton, the Government fixes MSP for two main varieties viz., F-414/H-777/J-34 & H-4 and the MSP for other varieties are fixed on the basis of normal market differentials with the basic variety by the Cotton Corporation of India. Similarly, in the case of Tobacco, the Government fixes MSP for two grades viz., L-2 & F-2, and the MSPs for other grades are, fixed by the Tobacco Board, on the basis of normal market price differentials with the basic variety.

ANNEXURE

MINIMUM SUPPORT PRICES (According to Crop Year)

(Rs. per quintal)

Sl. No.	Commodity	Variety	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
1.	Paddy	Common	415	440	490
		Grade 'A'	445	470	520
2.	Jowar		360	390	415

Sl. No.	Commodity	Variety	1997-98	1998-99	1999-2000
3.	Bajra				
4.	Ragi				
5.	Maize		360	390	415
6.	Wheat		510*	550	580
7.	Barley		350	385	430
8.	Gram		815	895	1015
9.	Arhar		900	960	1105
10.	Moong		900	960	1105
11.	Urad		900	960	1105
12.	Sugarcane@		48.45	52.70	56.10
13.	Cotton	F-414/H-777	1330	1440††	1575††
		H-4	1530	1650	1775
14.	Groundnut-in-shell		980	1040	1155
15.	Jute		570	650	750
16.	Rapesed/Mustard		940	1000	1100
17.	Sunflower Seed		1000	1060	1155
18.	Soyabean	Black	670	705	755
		Yellow	750	795	845
19.	Safflower		910	990	1100
20.	Toria		905	965	1065
21.	Tobacco (VFC)				
	(Rs. Per kg.)	Black Soil (F2 Grade)	20.50	22.50	25.00
		Light Soil (L2 Grade)	23.50	25.50	27.00
22.	Copra				
	(Calendar Year)	Milling	2700	2900	3100
		Ball	2925	3125	3325
23.	Sesamum		950	1060	1205
24.	Nigerseed		800	850	915

* Including a Central Bonus of Rs.55.00 per quintal payable from 01.04.1998 to 30.06.1998.

@ Statutory Minimum Price linked to a basic recovery of 8.5% with proportionate premium for every 0.1% increase in recovery above that level.

†† For J-34 variety also.

APPENDIX II

(Vide Para 3 of the Report)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 448

ANSWERED ON 07.05.2007

Performance of NHM

*448 . SHRI SUGRIB SINGH:

SHRI KISHANBHAI VESTABHAI PATEL:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the funds released to the States by National Horticulture Mission (NHM) have been fully utilized during the last two years;

(b) if not, the reasons therefor and the reaction of the Union Government thereto, State-wise;

(c) whether the Government has reviewed the performance of the NHM;

(d) if so, the details thereof in physical and financial terms during the said period;

(e) the extent to which the Mission is expected to achieve its objectives during the coming years; and

(f) the details of the funds allocated for implementing the programmes under NHM during 2007-08?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI SHARAD PAWAR): (a) to (f) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) TO (f) OF LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 448 DUE FOR REPLY ON 7TH MAY, 2007

(a) and (b) The Centrally Sponsored Scheme of National Horticulture Mission (NHM) was launched during 2005-06. An amount of Rs.586.20 crore was released to the State Horticulture Missions (SHMs) during the year 2005-06, against which an expenditure of Rs.196.09 crore was reported by the SHMs. During 2006-07, an amount of Rs. 843.85 crore was released, against which an expenditure of Rs. 686.91 crore has been reported by the SHMs. Low expenditure during the year 2005-06 was on account of the fact that, being the first year of its launch, the State Governments took some time in constituting the State Horticulture Missions as a registered Society under the Societies Registration Act and in formulating and approving the Annual Action Plans (AAPs) as per the scheme guidelines. As a result, funds could be released to most of

the SHMs during the last two quarters of the financial year 2005-06 and the funds could not be utilized fully, as the planting season was over by then.

(c) and (d) The General Council of NHM headed by the Union Agriculture Minister has reviewed the performance of NHM thrice since the launch of the Scheme. Besides, the performance of the Scheme in terms of physical and financial progress is being reviewed regularly by the Executive Committee of NHM under the Chairmanship of Secretary (Agriculture and Cooperation). In addition, Joint Inspection Teams constituted by the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation conduct regular field visits to the individual States. Besides, senior officers of the department also conduct State-wise review meetings periodically to review the performances. Summary details of the physical targets and achievements for major components during 2005-06 and 2006-07 are given at Annexure-I and Annexure-II, respectively. State-wise details of funds released and expenditure incurred during 2005-06 and 2006-07 are given at Annexure III.

(e) 'In principle' approval has been accorded for implementing the Scheme during the Eleventh Five Year Plan period. It is expected that the objective of the Mission will be achieved in the coming five years.

(f) An amount of Rs. 1150 crore has been earmarked for implementing the Scheme during 2007-08.

Physical Targets and Achievements for major activities under NHM during 2005-06

Sl.No.	States	Area Coverage (ha.)		Rejuvenation (ha.)		Nurseries (Nos.)		Organic Farming (ha.)		Integrated Pest Management / Integrated Nutrient Management (ha.)		Post Harvest Management (PHM) (No.)		Markets (No.)	
		Tar.	Ach.	Tar.	Ach.	Tar.	Ach.	Tar.	Ach.	Tar.	Ach.	Tar.	Ach.	Tar.	Ach.
1.	Andhra Pradesh	24398	18576	9670	5515	5	5	200	113	9000	—	—	—	—	—
2.	Bihar	3320	—	13367	—	17	—	—	—	2500	3	—	—	—	—
3.	Chhattisgarh	7680	2086	2450	—	9	—	—	—	500	7	—	—	—	—
4.	Delhi	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
5.	Goa	155	251	1250	552	2	7	300	—	500	—	—	—	—	—
6.	Gujarat	27032	11591	400	—	42	36	50	—	7000	—	1	—	—	—
7.	Haryana	2907	837	200	60	6	6	60	60	600	13	—	—	—	—
8.	Jharkhand	7000	—	—	—	75	—	—	—	440	12	—	—	12	—
9.	Karnataka	17010	17101	801	812	95	103	4800	2365	—	—	3	—	—	1
10.	Kerala	10830	2836	7500	—	48	5	2019	160	3000	—	—	—	—	—
11.	Madhya Pradesh	5950	1370	1250	1144	20	32	1668	717	11000	4	—	—	—	—
12.	Maharashtra	28495	35750	9000	4386	26	1	4400	1305	19477	—	—	—	—	1
13.	Odisha	17200	14687	4500	1303	35	35	100	100	200	—	—	—	—	—
14.	Punjab	2480	1142	3350	230	5	—	—	—	—	1	3	—	11	11
15.	Rajasthan	11662	13937	70	146	15	8	500	467	1800	2	—	—	4	4
16.	Tamil Nadu	8369	13884	650	877	25	42	800	998	3300	—	—	—	—	—
17.	U.P.	14940	—	4850	1320	11	10	1050	3493	400	—	150	13	—	—
18.	West Bengal	8480	8490	3900	3900	4	—	2500	2021	10000	57	57.00	70	—	—
Total		197908	142538	63208	20245	440	284	18447	11799	69277	34651	245	81.00	97	17.00

Physical Targets and Achievements for major activities under NHM during 2006-07

Sl.No.	States	Area Coverage (ha.)		Rejuvenation (ha.)		Nurseries (Nos.)		Organic Farming (ha.)		Integrated Pest Management / Nutrient Management (ha.)		Post Harvest Management (PHM) (No.)		Markets (No.)		
		Tar.	Ach.	Tar.	Ach.	Tar.	Ach.	Tar.	Ach.	Tar.	Ach.	Tar.	Ach.	Tar.	Ach.	Tar.
1.	Andhra Pradesh	42636.36	57764.97	7770.00	10194.09	66.00	25.00	1950.00	0.00	33250.00	31681.00	48.00	4.00	37.00	6.00	0.00
2.	Bihar	12212.00	5939.00	0.00	2.00	28.00	99.00	1000.00	0.00	4000.00	500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
3.	Chandigarh	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
4.	Chhattisgarh	12493.00	10614.00	1420.00	0.00	8.00	1.00	1100.00	0.00	14000.00	6000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
5.	Delhi	160.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	15.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
6.	Goa	750.64	7.62	300.00	0.00	2.00	3.00	450.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
7.	Gujarat	16386.40	22143.00	178.00	8.00	27.00	8.00	100.00	197.00	3002.00	6966.00	2.00	3.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
8.	Haryana	5379.85	7243.00	939.00	464.00	16.00	12.00	380.00	424.00	1781.00	1710.00	0.00	14.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9.	Jharkhand	10400.00	7339.00	0.00	0.00	63.00	57.00	150.00	0.00	500.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
10.	Karnataka	34450.40	10675.00	2130.58	0.00	189.00	1.00	5500.00	0.00	45000.00	0.00	0.00	4.00	48.00	1.00	0.00
11.	Kerala	26600.00	5275.00	15000.00	7000.00	120.00	9.00	2800.00	1075.00	4101.00	2250.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
12.	Lakshadweep	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13.	Madhya Pradesh	7110.00	18396.98	2445.00	2584.05	27.00	40.00	1200.00	2685.00	10000.00	13942.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
14.	Maharashtra	73081.30	94032.19	10300.00	8100.24	75.00	33.00	5350.00	3248.94	14650.00	8406.11	90.00	104.00	0.00	4.00	0.00
15.	Odisha	19500.00	22069.00	1433.00	0.00	42.00	68.00	1000.00	440.00	1200.00	0.00	11.00	0.00	24.00	0.00	0.00
16.	Punjab	3057.00	5133.50	0.00	5603.00	2.00	0.00	1000.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
17.	Rajasthan	22534.00	15160.51	97.58	387.00	25.00	37.00	700.00	1162.00	3493.00	10084.50	4.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
18.	Tamil Nadu	41113.10	19544.00	500.00	2044.00	34.00	117.00	3960.00	4252.00	7000.00	20105.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
19.	Uttar Pradesh	0.00	7469.60	0.00	78.70	0.00	0.00	0.00	10459.20	0.00	1300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
20.	West Bengal	18366.60	7380.00	300.00	112.00	214.00	5.00	4000.00	0.00	11000.00	0.00	17.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
21.	Andaman & Nicobar	334.00	19.70	50.00	0.00	2.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Total	346564.65	316206.07	42863.16	36577.08	952.00	517.00	30640.00	23943.14	152977.00	102944.61	188.00	130.00	109.00	11.00	0.00

ANNEXURE III

**State-wise details of amount released and expenditure incurred under NHM during
2005-06 and 2006-07**

(Rupees in lakh)

Sl. No.	State	Amount Released			Expenditure incurred		
		2005-06	2006-07	Total	2005-06	2006-07	Total
1.	Andhra Pradesh	4420.96	7500.00	11920.96	1781.14	7137.47	8918.61
2.	Bihar	3100.00	3500.00	6600.00	3.02	2403.91	2406.93
3.	Chhattisgarh	2367.83	5500.00	7867.83	353.96	4560.66	4914.62
4.	Goa	315.20	200.00	515.20	112.91	26.57	139.48
5.	Gujarat	3239.28	2577.03	5816.31	1011.24	2823.55	3834.79
6.	Haryana	1050.00	3480.00	4530.00	180.33	3539.38	3719.71
7.	Jharkhand	3030.00	4000.00	7030.00	-	2383.52	2383.52
8.	Karnataka	4455.17	8448.25	12903.42	322.72	6461.32	6784.04
9.	Kerala	3533.98	7959.53	11493.51	400.14	2471.72	2871.86
10.	Madhya Pradesh	2839.77	4291.75	7131.52	481.67	4400.26	4881.93
11.	Maharashtra*	8260.28	14492.65	22752.93	3228.67	12999.79	16228.46
12.	Orissa	3611.91	4450.00	8061.91	2572.76	3286.59	5859.35
13.	Punjab	2868.82	1150.00	4018.82	697.21	1736.88	2434.09
14.	Rajasthan	2259.57	3837.93	6097.50	1833.31	3306.96	5140.27
15.	Tamil Nadu	3891.67	6450.00	10341.67	2462.47	8498.23	10960.70
16.	Uttar Pradesh	5340.25	1500.00	6840.25	537.97	2257.78	2795.75
17.	West Bengal	4035.31	4600.00	8635.31	3629.59	395.40	4024.99
18.	Delhi	-	300.00	300.00	-	0.00	0.00
19.	Lakshadweep	-	63.00	63.00	-	-	0.00
20.	Andaman & Nicobar	-	85.00	85.00	-	1.22	1.22
Total		58620.00	84385.13	143005.13	19609.11	68691.21	88300.32

* 2nd released in Maharashtra is for 6 suicide prone districts.

APPENDIX III

(Vide Para 3 of the Report)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2712

ANSWERED ON 19.03.2007

Revival of Coconut Sector in Kerala

2712 . SHRI P.C. THOMAS:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Union Government has received any proposal from Government of Kerala for Revival of Coconut Sector and Conservation and Revival of Kuttanad Wet (Paddy) lands including reconstruction and strengthening of Thanneermukkom Bund; and

(b) if so, the details thereof and action taken thereon?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI KANTI LAL BHURIA): (a) and (b) A letter from the Chief Minister of Kerala dated 04.10.2006 addressed to the Union Minister of Agriculture has been received in this regard. Based on the suggestion, the M.S. Swaminathan Research Foundation, Chennai has been entrusted the task of formulating a project for rejuvenation of Kuttanad wet lands including reconstruction and strengthening of Thanneermukkom Bund. The Foundation has submitted its interim report in February, 2007. As regards the revival of coconut sector, a comprehensive project has been received from the Coconut Development Board, Cochin during December, 2006 for 'Replanting and Rejuvenation of Coconut Gardens in Traditional States in India', with emphasis on Kerala State. The project is under examination by the Department.

APPENDIX IV

(Vide Para 3 of the Report)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 243

ANSWERED ON 03.12.2007

Soil Tests

*243 . SHRI JIVABHAI AMBALAL PATEL:
SHRI HARI KEWAL PRASAD:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) the details of the soil tests on non-agricultural and agricultural land being conducted by the Government;

(b) whether soil-tests are not being conducted according to the rules due to which the production capacity of land is not being fully utilised;

(c) if so, the details thereof and the action taken thereon; and

(d) the details of the performance of the Centrally Sponsored Schemes in this regard?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI SHARAD PAWAR): (a) to (d) A statement is laid on the Table of the House.

STATEMENT REFERRED TO IN REPLY TO PARTS (a) TO (d) OF LOK SABHA STARRED QUESTION NO. 243 DUE FOR REPLY ON 3RD DECEMBER, 2007

(a) to (c) Soil tests for soil fertility on agricultural land are being carried out by the soil testing laboratories as per standard methodology. Besides, Soil and Land Use Survey of India (SLUSI) conducts detailed soil survey in the priority watershed of various catchments of river valley project, as per standard methodology irrespective of soils occurring under various land use such as agriculture, forest and open scrub.

(d) Under the centrally sponsored scheme (namely, balanced and integrated use of fertilizer) assistance is given for setting up of new laboratories and for strengthening the existing laboratories. At present there are 651 soil testing laboratories in the country with an annual analyzing capacity of about 7 million soil samples. The capacity utilization is about 82%. Under the Central Sector Scheme for Soil and Land Use Survey of India (SLUSI) detailed surveys are conducted in the priority watersheds. The organization has so far covered 13.5 million hectares under detailed soil survey.

APPENDIX V

(Vide Para 3 of the Report)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3295

ANSWERED ON 22.12.2008

Loss of Foodgrains Due To Flood

3295. SHRI AJAY CHAKRABORTY:
SHRI SARBANANDA SONOWAL:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether a large amount of crops and foodgrains were lost due to unprecedented flood during the current year in some parts of the country including Bihar and Assam;

(b) if so, the details thereof along with the estimated amount of losses;

(c) whether the Government proposes to provide relief including waiver of loans, free seeds for further cultivation to those farmers who have lost their entire crop in the flood;

(d) if so, the details thereof;

(e) whether the Government is also extending any relief to those agricultural workers who are entirely dependant for their livelihood on those lands under flood; and

(f) if so, the details thereof?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI KANTI LAL BHURIA): (a) to (f) Information is being collected and will be laid on the Table of the House.

APPENDIX VI

(Vide Para 3 of the Report)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3213

ANSWERED ON 28.07.2009

Assistance to Orange Growers

3213 . SHRI SHIVAJI ADHALRAO PATIL:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government is aware that the orange growers are facing problems due to receding ground water level in the country including Maharashtra;

(b) if so, the details thereof;

(c) whether the orange growers have urged for digging of community water tanks for storage of run off water;

(d) if so, the reaction of the Government thereto;

(e) whether the Government of Maharashtra has sent a proposal for increasing post harvest management and marketing subsidy amount and the budget for community tanks; and

(f) if so, the details thereof and the action taken by the Union Government thereon?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (PROF. K.V. THOMAS): (a) and (b) There is no specific information about the problem being faced by the orange growers due to receding ground water level in the country. However, as per the information provided by the State Government of Maharashtra the ground water level is receding in the Orange Growing belt in Maharashtra.

(c) and (d) The President, Maharashtra State Orange Growers Association has demanded to increase the budgetary allocation for community farm ponds under National Horticulture Mission (NHM). To give protective irrigation to the fruit crops, the component of community tanks/ponds has been included under NHM. During the year 2009-10, a provision of Rs. 864.93 lakhs has been made to complete 564 ongoing community tanks and Rs. 349.92 lakh for 72 new community tanks in the State of Maharashtra. Besides, during 2009-10, assistance of Rs.144.00 crore has been provided under the scheme of Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY) for farms ponds, repair of Bodis and Malgajari tanks.

(e) and (f) Yes, Madam. The proposal for increasing the subsidy amount for the Post Harvest Management and Marketing is under consideration of the Government. A proposal for increasing the budget allocation of community tanks from 15% to 33% under NHM has been received from the Government of Maharashtra. As the major focus of NHM scheme is on the holistic development of horticulture by additional area coverage, setting up of nurseries and creation of infrastructure for post harvest management and marketing, earmarking of funds to the tune of 33% of the outlay for construction of water tanks/ponds along, is not feasible. Moreover, several other schemes of the Government like RKVY, National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme (NREGS) and Watershed Development Scheme also provides assistance for the development of water harvesting structures.

APPENDIX VII

(Vide Para 3 of the Report)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 1926

ANSWERED ON 01.12.2009

Fund to Karnataka Under National Horticulture Mission

1926. SHRIN. CHELUVARAYA SWAMY SWAMYGOWDA:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether instances of misuse of funds allocated under the National Horticulture Mission (NHM) have been received; and

(b) if so, the details thereof, along with the action taken by the Union Government against the guilty?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS, FOOD AND PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION (PROF. K.V. THOMAS): (a) and (b) The State Government of Karnataka has informed Government of India that it had received a complaint about the misuse of funds under National Horticulture Mission (NHM) in Bellary district during June 2009. Detailed field inspection and document verification was conducted by the State Horticulture Mission (SHM) during June 2009 and the report was submitted to the State Government. As NHM is implemented by concerned State through SHM, the State Government of Karnataka has taken immediate action and the concerned officers have been placed under suspension. In addition, a criminal case against guilty officials has been booked in July 2009 and is under investigation.

APPENDIX VIII

(Vide Para 3 of the Report)

Calling Attention dated 24.03.2011 Shri L. Rajagopal

Plight of farmers in Andhra Pradesh who have lost their entire produce, including ready to harvest crop, due to cyclones, floods, incessant and torrential rains during the last few months and left with no other alternative but to look at the Government of India for help and this House appeals the Government of India to take all steps immediately without any further delay to help the farming community and agriculture sector in Andhra Pradesh in this hour of distress.

Ministry of Commerce has informed that the export of non-basmati rice (including Sona Mussorries) is permitted without any quantitative restriction with effect from 09.09.2011.

APPENDIX IX

(Vide Para 3 of the Report)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA
MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3312
ANSWERED ON 23.08.2011

Financial Irregularities In NAFED

3312 . SHRI P. LINGAM:
SHRI BIBHU PRASAD TARAI:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Government is aware that the National Agriculture Co-operative Marketing Federation of India Limited (NAFED) had diverted its financial facilities to private/non-agricultural activities under the pretext of promoting exports of iron ore to China;

(b) if so, the details thereof along with the monetary losses suffered by the NAFED due to its non-agricultural activities;

(c) whether the Government has set up an inquiry committee to look into financial irregularities committed by the NAFED;

(d) if so, the details and the outcome thereof; and

(e) the action taken/being taken by the Government against the guilty officers and to recover the losses suffered by the NAFED?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI HARISH RAWAT): (a) and (b) NAFED has informed that during the years 2003-04 to 2005-06, NAFED undertook Tie-up business under Public-Private Partnership mode on the pattern of other PSUs like STC, MMTTC, PEC etc. for an amount of Rs. 3945.50 crores to 62 parties inclusive of about Rs. 2196 crore towards non-agricultural items. An amount of Rs. 2880.91 crore has been released upto 30.4.2011 from these business associates. An amount of Rs. 1726.82 crores inclusive of Principal amount of Rs. 1064.59 crore, service charges of Rs. 7.48 crore and interest of Rs. 654.75 crore upto 30.4.2011 is due from 29 parties.

(c) and (d) An enquiry was ordered on 30.1.2008 by the Central Registrar of Cooperative Societies (CRCS) under sub-section (1) of section 83 of Multi State Cooperative Societies (MSCS) Act, 2002 followed by a second enquiry on 24.2.2009. The major conclusions of the enquiry are (i) tie up business in non-agricultural and non-traditional items was contrary to the bye laws of NAFED, (ii) the members of Board of Directors and Business Committee of NAFED were fully aware that the tie up business in non-agricultural and non-traditional items was contrary to the bye laws of NAFED, (iii) adequate securities were not obtained, and (iv) the officers of NAFED

did not take due care and diligence while sanctioning or disbursing the amount.

(e) CRCS has issued show cause notices to a total of 34 officers/ex-officers including the then Directors/Members of Business Committee of NAFED under section 83 of the MSCS Act, 2002 for causing deficiency to the assets of NAFED. The hearing in the matter before CRCS is under progress. Besides, NAFED has also filed 7 criminal complaints with CBI against 6 parties and the erring officers. NAFED has also filed 5 complaints with the Economic Offence Wing against the parties. In addition, NAFED has also filed 29 arbitration cases and 3 civil suits for recovery of outstanding dues from the tie-up defaulters and 175 cases have been filed under Negotiable Instrument Act.

APPENDIX X

(Vide Para 3 of the Report)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 3182

ANSWERED ON 13.12.2011

MSP of Medicinal Plants

3182 . SHRIDHARMENDRA YADAV:
SHRI ANANDRAO VITHOBA ADSUL:
SHRI SHIVAJI ADHALRAO PATIL:
SHRI BABAR GAJANAN DHARMSHI:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether any proposal is under consideration of the Union Government to fix the Minimum Support Price (MSP) of medicinal plants to encourage farmers to take up cultivation of such plants on a larger scale;

(b) if so, the present status thereof;

(c) whether there is any proposal to procure the medicinal plants through the Government's Medicinal Plant Farms and Herbal Medicine Corporation Limited if the prices in the open market drop below the MSP; and

(d) if so, the guidelines issued by the Union Government in this regard to the State Governments?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE, FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES AND PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI HARISH RAWAT): (a) to (d) Proposal for fixation of Minimum Support Price (MSP) for medicinal plants is under consideration of the Ministry of Tribal Affairs.

APPENDIX XI

(Vide Para 3 of the Report)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2125

ANSWERED ON 27.03.2012

Inter-State Taxes on Farm Produce

2125 . SHRIMATI SHRUTI CHOUDHRY:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether the Ministry is working on a law to enable traders and dealers of farm produce to bypass the multiple inter-state taxes by registering in a common centralised system; and

(b) if so, the details thereof ?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES (DR. CHARAN DAS MAHANT): (a) and (b) The Ministry of Agriculture has formulated a draft 'Agricultural Produce Inter-State Trade and Commerce (Development and Regulation) Bill, 2012 to promote, develop and regulate inter-state trade and commerce of agricultural produce and commodities to facilitate inter-state transfer of such produce for the benefit of both farmers and consumers by providing a common national level market to avoid multiple licensing requirements and minimize internal trade barriers. The draft Bill has been sent to the States for their views in the matter.

APPENDIX XII

(Vide Para 3 of the Report)

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

LOK SABHA UNSTARRED QUESTION NO. 2244

ANSWERED ON 27.03.2012

Price of Medicinal Plants

2244 . SHRI DHARMENDRA YADAV:
SHRI ANANDRAO VITHOBA ADSUL:
SHRI ADHALRAO PATIL SHIVAJI:

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether a proposal is under consideration of the Government to fix the price of medicinal plants for encouraging farmers to take up cultivation of such plants on a larger scale;

(b) if so, the details thereof and the present status of the aforesaid proposal;

(c) whether the State Governments have requested the Union Government to procure the medicinal plants through the Government's Medicinal Plant Farms and Herbal Medicine Corporation Limited, if the prices in the open market go below the MSP;

(d) if so, the steps taken by the Government thereon and the guidelines issued to the State Governments in this regard; and

(e) the time by which the MSP for medicinal plants is likely to be fixed?

ANSWER

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE AND FOOD PROCESSING INDUSTRIES (DR. CHARAN DAS MAHANT): (a) to (e) Proposal for fixation of Minimum Support Price (MSP) for medicinal plants is under consideration of the Ministry of Tribal Affairs.

APPENDIX XIII

(Vide Para 5 of the Report)

EXTRACTS FROM MANUAL OF PRACTICE & PROCEDURE IN THE
GOVERNMENT OF INDIA, MINISTRY OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS,
NEW DELHI

1	2
Definition	<p>8.1 During the course of reply given to a question or a discussion, if a Minister gives an undertaking which involves further action on the part of the Government in reporting back to the House, it is called an 'assurance'. Standard list of such expressions which normally constitute assurances and as approved by the Committees on Government Assurances of the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha, is given at Annex. 3. As assurances are required to be implemented within a specified time limit, care should be taken by all concerned while drafting replies to the questions to restrict the use of these expressions only to those occasions when it is clearly intended to give an assurance in these terms.</p> <p>8.2 When an assurance is given by a Minister or when the Presiding Officer directs the Government to furnish information to the House, it is extracted by the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs from the relevant proceedings and communicated to the department concerned normally within 10 working days of the date on which it is given.</p>
Deletion from the list of assurances	<p>8.3.1 If the administrative department has any objection to treating such a statement as an assurance or finds that it would not be in the public interest to fulfil it, it may write to the Lok/Rajya Sabha Secretariat direct with a copy to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs within a week of the receipt of such communication for getting it deleted from the list of assurances. Such action will require prior approval of the Minister.</p> <p>8.3.2 Departments should make request for dropping of assurances immediately on receipt of statement of assurances from the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs and only in rare cases where they are fully convinced that the assurances could not be implemented under any circumstances and there is no option left with them but to make a request for dropping. Such requests should have the approval of their Minister and this fact should be indicated in their communication containing the request. If</p>

1	2
	such a request is made towards the end of the stipulated period of three months, then it should invariably be accompanied with a request for extension of time. The department should continue to seek extension of time till a decision of the Committee on Government Assurances is received by them. Copy of the above communications should be simultaneously endorsed to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs.
Time limit for fulfilling and assurance	8.4.1 An assurance given in either House is required to be fulfilled within a period of three months from the date of the assurance. This time limit has to be strictly observed.
Extension of time for fulfilling an assurance	8.4.2 If the department finds that it is not possible to fulfil the assurance within the stipulated period of three months or within the period of extension already granted, it may seek further extension of time direct from the respective Committee on Government Assurances under intimation to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs as soon as the need for such extension becomes apparent, indicating the reasons for delay and the probable additional time required. Such a communication should be issued with the approval of the Minister.
Registers of assurances	<p>8.5.1 The particulars of every assurance will be entered by the Parliament Unit of the department concerned in a register as at Annex. 4 after which the assurance will be passed on to the concerned section.</p> <p>8.5.2 Even ahead of the receipt of communication from the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, the section concerned should take prompt action to fulfil such assurances and keep a watch thereon in a register as at Annex. 5.</p> <p>8.5.3 The registers referred to in paras 8.5.1 and 8.5.2 will be maintained separately for the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha assurances, entries therein being made session wise.</p>
Role of Section Officer and Branch Officer	<p>8.6.1 The Section Officer incharge of the concerned section will:</p> <p>(a) scrutinise the registers once a week;</p> <p>(b) ensure that necessary follow-up action is taken without any delay whatsoever;</p> <p>(c) submit the registers to the branch officer every fortnight if the House concerned is in session and once a month otherwise, drawing his special attention to assurances which are not likely to be implemented within the period of three months; and</p>

1	2
	<p>(d) review of pending assurances should be undertaken periodically at the highest level in order to minimise the delay in implementing the assurances.</p> <p>8.6.2 The branch officer will likewise keep his higher officer and Minister informed of the progress made in the implementation of assurances, drawing their special attention to the causes of delay.</p>
<p>Procedure for fulfilment of an assurance</p>	<p>8.7.1 Every effort should be made to fulfil the assurance within the prescribed period. In case only part of the information is available and collection of the remaining information would involve considerable time, an implementation report containing the available information should be supplied to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs in part scrutinize of the assurance, within the prescribed time limit. However, efforts should continue to be made for expeditious collection of the remaining information for complete implementation of the assurance at the earliest.</p> <p>8.7.2 Information to be supplied in partial or complete fulfilment of an assurance should be approved by the Minister concerned and 15 copies thereof (bilingual) in the prescribed proforma as at Annex. 6, together with its enclosures, along with one copy each in Hindi and English duly authenticated by the officer forwarding the implementation report, should be sent to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs. If, however, the information being furnished is in response to an assurance given in reply to a question etc., asked for by more than one member, an additional copy of the completed proforma (both in Hindi and English) should be furnished in respect of each additional member. A copy of this communication should be endorsed to the Parliament Unit for completing column 7 of its register.</p> <p>8.7.3 The implementation reports should be sent to the Ministry of the Parliamentary Affairs and not to the Lok/Rajya Sabha Secretariat. No advance copies of the implementation reports are to be endorsed to the Lok/Rajya Sabha Secretariat either.</p>
<p>Laying of the implementation report on the Table of the House</p>	<p>8.8 The Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, after a scrutiny of the implementation report, will arrange to lay it on the Table of the House concerned. A copy of the statement, as laid on the Table, will be forwarded by the Ministry of</p>

1	2
	Parliamentary Affairs to the member as well as the department concerned. The Parliament Unit of the department concerned and the concerned section will, on the basis of this statement, make a suitable entry in their registers.
Obligation to lay a paper on the Table of the House <i>vis-à-vis</i> assurance on the same subject	8.9 Where there is an obligation to lay any paper (rule/order/notification, etc.) on the Table of the House and for which an assurance has also been given, it will be laid on the Table, in the first instance, in fulfilment of the obligation, independent of the assurance given. After this is done, a report in formal implementation of the assurance indicating the date on which the paper was laid on the Table will be sent to the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs in the prescribed proforma (Annex. 6) in the manner already described in para 8.7.2.
Committees on Government Assurances LSR 323,324 RSR 211-A	8.10 Each House of Parliament has a Committee on Government assurances nominated by the Speaker/Chairman. It scrutinized the implementation reports and the time taken in the scrutiny of Government assurances and focuses attention on the delays and other significant aspects, if any, pertaining to them. Instructions issued by the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs from time to time are to be followed strictly.
Reports of the Committees on Government Assurances	8.11 The department will, in consultation with the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs, scrutinize the reports of these two committees for remedial action wherever called for.
Effect on assurances on dissolution of the Lok Sabha	8.12 On dissolution of the Lok Sabha, all assurances, promises or undertakings pending implementation are scrutinized by the new Committee on Government assurances for selection of such of them as are of considerable public importance. The Committee then submits a report to the Lok Sabha with a specific recommendation regarding the assurances to be dropped or retained for implementation by the Government.

MINUTES

TWELFTH SITTING

**MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
ASSURANCES (2012-2013) HELD ON 20 JUNE, 2013 IN COMMITTEE
ROOM 'C', PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE, NEW DELHI**

The Committee sat from 1500 hours to 1600 hours on Thursday, 20 June, 2013.

PRESENT

Shrimati Maneka Gandhi — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Anandrao Adsul
3. Shri Rajendra Agrawal
4. Shri Gurudas Das Gupta
5. Sardar Sukhdev Singh Libra
6. Shri Nama Nageshwara Rao
7. Dr. M. Thambidurai

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri U.B.S. Negi — *Director*
2. Shri T.S. Rangarajan — *Additional Director*

Ministry of Agriculture

1. Shri Ashish Bahuguna, Secretary (A&C)
2. Shri Anup Kumar Thakur, Special Secretary
3. Shri Sanjeev Chopra, Joint Secretary
4. Shri Mukesh Khullar, Joint Secretary
5. Shri E.K. Majhi, Joint Secretary
6. Shri Narendra Bhooshan, Joint Secretary
7. Shri R.B. Sinha, Joint Secretary

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee and thereafter, the Committee proceeded to review the pending assurances from 3rd Session of 13th Lok Sabha to 10th Session of 15th Lok Sabha as listed in the Annexure. The Committee took oral evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture & Cooperation) on the assurances listed from S. No. 1 to 5 of the *Annexure* and sought clarification on certain issues/points which

were responded to by the Ministry. With regard to assurance given in reply to SQ No. 367 dated 19.04.2000 regarding Minimum Support Price for Agricultural Crops, the Committee were informed that Commission for Agricultural Costs and Prices assesses the cost of production of various commodities for which the Minimum Support Prices (MSP) are fixed. The Commission takes into account all the costs of inputs and makes its recommendations which are generally accepted by the Government. Occasionally where the Government felt that the Commission has not fulfilled the aspirations of the farmers in an adequate manner, a slight higher MSP is announced by the Government. In this context, the Ministry assured that a background note on the issue concerning the problems confronting the Agriculture sector and the farmers would be furnished to the Committee for information. With regard to assurance given in reply to SQ No. 448 dated 07.05.2007 regarding performance of NHM, the Committee desired that a status paper on the issue may be furnished to them. On the assurance listed at S. No. 3 of the *Annexure* regarding Revival of Coconut Sector in Kerala, the Committee desired that a detailed reply about the utilization of funds granted for the purpose may be supplied to them. The Committee decided to review the remaining assurances later.

2. A verbatim record of the proceedings has been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ASSURANCES (2012-2013) LOK SABHA
**Statement of Pending Assurances of the Ministry Of Agriculture (Department Of
 Agriculture & Cooperation)**
**(From 3rd Session of 13th Lok Sabha to
 10th Session of 15th Lok Sabha)**

Sl.No.	SQ/USQ No./dated	Subject	Page No.
1.	SQ No. 367 19.04.2000 (Shri Bikram Deo Keshari)	MINIMUM SUPPORT PRICE FOR AGRICULTURAL CROPS	
2.	SQ No. 448 07.05.2007 (Shri Sugrib Singh)	PERFORMANCE OF NHM	
*3.	USQ No. 2712 19.03.2007	REVIVAL OF COCONUT SECTOR IN KERALA	
4.	SQ No. 243 03.12.2007 (Sh. Jivabhai Ambalal Patel)	SOIL TESTS	
5.	USQ No. 3295 22.12.2008	LOSS OF FOODGRAINS DUE TO FLOOD	
6.	USQ No. 3213 28.07.2009	ASSISTANCE TO ORANGE GROWERS	
@7.	USQ No. 1926 01.12.2009	FUND TO KARNATAKA UNDER NATIONAL HORTICULTURE MISSION	
8.	Calling Attention 23.03.2011	PROBLEMS BEING FACED BY FARMERS IN ANDHRA PRADESH	
9.	USQ No. 3312 23.08.2011	FINANCIAL IRREGULARITIES IN NAFED	
%10.	USQ No. 3182 13.12.2011	MSP OF MEDICINAL PLANTS	
11.	USQ No. 2125 27.03.2012	INTER-STATES TAXES ON FARM PRODUCE	
**12.	USQ No. 2244 27.03.2012	PRICE OF MEDICINAL PLANTS	

* Partly Implemented *vide* SS-II/4 on 31/8/2007

@ Partly Implemented *vide* SS-III/3 on 18/8/2010

% Partly Implemented *vide* SS-5/1 on 13/3/2013

** Partly Implemented *vide* SS-4/2 on 13/3/2013

MINUTES

THIRTEENTH SITTING

**MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
ASSURANCES (2012-2013) HELD ON 02 JULY, 2013 IN COMMITTEE
ROOM 'A', PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE, NEW DELHI**

The Committee sat from 1500 hours to 1615 hours on Wednesday, 02 July, 2013.

PRESENT

Shrimati Maneka Sanjay Gandhi — *Chairperson*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Gurudas Das Gupta
3. Shri Bijoy Handique
4. Sardar Sukhdev Singh Libra
5. Rajkumari Ratna Singh

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P. Sreedharan — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri T.S. Rangarajan — *Additional Director*

Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation)

1. Shri Ashish Bahuguna, Secretary (A&C)
2. Shri Anup Kumar Thakur, Special Secretary
3. Shri B.Gangaiah, ESA
4. Shri Sanjeev Chopra, Joint Secretary
5. Shri U.K.Singh, Joint Secretary
6. Shri E.K. Majhi, Joint Secretary
7. Shri Mukesh Khullar, Joint Secretary
8. Shri Ashish Kumar Bhutani, Joint Secretary
9. Shri Narendra Bhooshan, Joint Secretary
10. Shri R.B. Sinha, Joint Secretary
11. Shri Raj Singh, Joint Secretary
12. Shri Gorakh Singh, Horticulture Commissioner
13. Shri Ashok Gulati, Chairman, CACP
14. Shri. S.K. Mukherjee, Adviser

At the outset, the Chairperson welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee and apprised them regarding the day's agenda. Thereafter, the Committee

considered 26 Memoranda (Memo. Nos. 67 to 92) containing requests received from various Ministries/Departments for dropping of the pending assurances. After in-depth deliberation of the reasons adduced by the Ministries, the Committee decided to drop 10 assurances as per details given in *Annexure-I** and to pursue the remaining 16 assurances as per details given in *Annexure-II**, for implementation by the Ministry/Department concerned.

2. The Committee then resumed oral evidence of the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation) and reviewed assurances listed from Sl. Nos. 6 to 12 of the *Annexure-III*. Some of the important assurances taken up during the evidence are discussed below:—

Sl.No.7 (USQ No.1926 dated 01.12.2009 regarding Funds to Karnataka under National Horticulture Mission).

The Committee were informed that officials who were involved in misuse of funds allocated to Karnataka to the tune of Rs.154 crore under National Horticulture Mission (NHM) were placed under suspension. They were under judicial custody for three months but are out on bail. Besides, a departmental enquiry was also initiated against the guilty officials. One out of them has died and another has already retired from service. However, no benefit has been given to the retired official and the case is still being pursued against him. The Committee were also informed that the case is being followed by the State Government of Karnataka with the Lokayukta as well as at the criminal court in Bellary where the irregularity took place. The Committee observed that since it was a case of fraud and theft and there were a criminal conspiracy to cheat the Government of India, so the case should not have gone to the Lokayukta. However, the Committee directed that the Government should approach the Court for speedy trial of the guilty officials.

Sl.No.9 (USQ No. 3312 dated 23.08.2011 regarding financial irregularities in NAFED).

On being pointed out by the Committee as to how it was possible for NAFED to divert its financial facilities to non-agricultural activities without the knowledge of the Ministry, the representative of the Ministry clarified that NAFED is a co-operative society and does not come directly under the Ministry. However, MD of NAFED and staff thereunder are government servant and they allowed NAFED to undertake business in a non-agriculture sector with the help of private parties in which NAFED would provide the capital and get back a share on proceeds. The Committee were informed that criminal as well as departmental proceedings against guilty officers including Board Members of NAFED have been launched. Out of Rs.3945 crore, the principal amount of Rs.1042 crore have been recovered from the 62 firms and the companies. The recovery proceedings are on against an additional MD and all other Board Members. The Committee were anguished to note that the financial irregularity in NAFED took place in 2003-04 and even after a decade, the criminal/departmental proceedings against the guilty officials are yet to be concluded. The Committee desired

* Not enclosed.

that the expeditious action should be taken against the nominee of Agriculture Ministry who was involved in taking the decision at Board and that the Ministry should appeal to the court for expeditious trial and disposal of the case.

3. A verbatim record of the proceedings have been kept.

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEX.

STATEMENT OF PENDING ASSURANCES OF THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE
(DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE & COOPERATION) (FROM 3RD SESSION OF
13TH LOK SABHA TO 10TH SESSION OF 15TH LOK SABHA)

Sl.No.	SQ/USQ No./dated	Subject	Page No.
1.	SQ No. 367 19.04.2000 (Shri Bikram Keshari Deo)	MINIMUM SUPPORT PRICE FOR AGRICULTURAL CROPS	01-07
2.	SQ No. 448 07.05.2007 (Shri Sugrib Singh)	PERFORMANCE OF NHM	08-17
3.	USQ No. 2712 19.03.2007	REVIVAL OF COCONUT SECTOR IN KERALA	18-21
4.	SQ No. 243 03.12.2007 (Shri Jivabhai Ambalal Patel)	SOIL TESTS	22-29
5.	USQ No. 3295 22.12.2008	LOSS OF FOODGRAINS DUE TO FLOOD	30-33
6.	USQ No. 3213 28.07.2009	ASSISTANCE TO ORANGE GROWERS	34-38
7.	USQ No. 1926 01.12.2009	FUND TO KARNATAKA UNDER NATIONAL HORTICULTURE MISSION	39-42
8.	Calling Attention 23.03.2011	PROBLEMS BEING FACED BY FARMERS IN ANDHRA PRADESH	43-58
9.	USQ No. 3312 23.08.2011	FINANCIAL IRREGULARITIES IN NAFED	59-63
10.	USQ No. 3182 13.12.2011	MSP OF MEDICINAL PLANTS	64-68
11.	USQ No. 2125 27.03.2012	INTER-STATES TAXES ON FARM PRODUCE	69-72
12.	USQ No. 2244 27.03.2012	PRICE OF MEDICINAL PLANTS	73-76

MINUTES
SIXTEENTH SITTING

**MINUTES OF THE SITTING OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT
ASSURANCES (2012-2013) HELD ON 26 AUGUST, 2013 IN COMMITTEE
ROOM 'B' PARLIAMENT HOUSE ANNEXE, NEW DELHI**

The Committee sat from 1500 hours to 1530 hours on Monday, 26 August, 2013.

PRESENT

Shri Hansraj G. Ahir — *in the Chair*

MEMBERS

2. Shri Anandrao Adsul
3. Shri Bijoy Handique
4. Shri Badri Ram Jakhar
5. Sardar Sukhdev Singh Libra
6. Rajkumari Ratna Singh
7. Dr. M. Thambidurai

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri U.B.S. Negi — *Director*
2. Shri T.S. Rangarajan — *Additional Director*
3. Shri Kulvinder Singh — *Committee Officer*

In the Absence of Smt. Maneka Gandhi, Chairperson, Shri Hansraj G. Ahir, M.P. was chosen to chair the sitting of the Committee under rule 258(3) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. At the outset, the acting Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Committee and apprised them regarding the day's agenda. Thereafter Committee considered and adopted the following draft Seven reports without any amendment and Authorized the Chairperson to present them in the House in the present session itself:—

- (i) Draft Twenty Ninth Report regarding review of pending assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Heavy Industries and Public Enterprises (Department of Heavy Industries).
- (ii) Draft Thirtieth Report regarding requests for dropping of assurances (not acceded to).
- (iii) Draft Thirty First Report regarding requests for dropping of assurances (acceded to).

- (iv) Draft Thirty Second Report regarding requests of dropping of assurances (acceded to).
- (v) Draft Thirty Third Report regarding requests for dropping of assurances (not acceded to).
- (vi) Draft Thirty Fourth Report regarding review of pending assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Mines.
- (vii) Draft Thirty Fifth Report regarding review of pending assurances pertaining to the Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Co-operation)

2. In view of the debate going on in the House on an important matter, the Committee decided to postpone the evidence of the representatives of the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (Department of AYUSH) to a subsequent date.

The Committee then adjourned.