

FORTY-EIGHTH REPORT  
STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
PETROLEUM & CHEMICALS  
(2003)

(THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA)

PRODUCTION AND AVAILABILITY  
OF  
PESTICIDES

MINISTRY OF CHEMICALS & FERTILISERS  
(DEPARTMENT OF CHEMICALS & PETROCHEMICALS)

*[Action Taken by the Government on the Recommendations contained in the  
Thirty-Seventh Report (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on  
Petroleum & Chemicals (2002) on 'Production and Availability of Pesticides']*

*Presented to Lok Sabha on 22.8.2003*

*Laid in Rajya Sabha on 22.8.2003*



LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI

*August, 2003/Sravana, 1925 (Saka)*

## CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE .....	(iii)
COMPOSITION OF SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHEMICALS & PETROCHEMICALS.....	(v)
INTRODUCTION .....	(vii)
CHAPTER I Report .....	1
CHAPTER II Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government .....	22
CHAPTER III Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies. ....	35
CHAPTER IV Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee. ....	42
CHAPTER V Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited. ...	48
<b>APPENDICES</b>	
I. Minutes of First Sitting of the Sub-Committee on Chemicals & Petrochemicals (2003) held on 11th June, 2003. ....	53
II. Minutes of Second Sitting of the Sub-Committee on Chemicals & Petrochemicals (2003) held on 18th August, 2003. ....	55
III. Minutes of Seventh Sitting of the Standing Committee on Petroleum & Chemicals (2003) held on 19th August, 2003. ....	57
IV. Composition of the Standing Committee on Petroleum & Chemicals (2002) .....	59
V. Composition of the Sub-Committee on Chemicals & Petrochemicals (2002). ....	61
VI. Analysis of Action Taken by Government on the Recommendations contained in the Thirty - Seventh Report (13th Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Petroleum & Chemicals (2003) on 'Production and Availability of Pesticides'. ....	62

COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (2003)

Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav—*Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Ashok Argal
3. Shri Ramchander Baina
4. Dr. (Smt.) Suguna Kumari Chellamella
5. Shri Padam Sen Choudhary
6. Shri Khagen Das
7. Smt. Sheela Gautam
8. Shri Paban Singh Ghatowar
9. Shri Bijoy Handique
10. Shri Shriprakash Jaiswal
11. Shri Jagannath Mallick
12. Shri Punnulal Mohale
13. Shri P. Mohan
14. Shri Ashok N. Mohol
15. Dr. Debendra Pradhan
16. Shri Rajesh Ranjan
17. Shri Mohan Rawale
18. Shri Ram Sajivan
19. Dr. Bikram Sarkar
20. Dr. (Smt.) V. Saroja
- \*21. Shri Harpal Singh Sathi
22. Shri Shyamacharan Shukla
23. Shri Prabhunath Singh
24. Dr. Ram Lakhan Singh
- \*\*25. Dr. Ramesh Chand Tomar
26. Shri Shankersinh Vaghela
27. Shri Ratilal Kalidas Varma
28. Shri A.K.S. Vijayan
29. Dr. Girija Vyas
30. Shri Dinesh Chandra Yadav

---

\*Nominated *w.e.f.* 21st February, 2003.

\*\*Nominated *w.e.f.* 26th February, 2003.

*Rajya Sabha*

31. Shri Balkavi Bairagi
32. Shri Ram Nath Kovind
33. Shri Anil Kumar
34. Shri Rajiv Ranjan Singh 'Lalan'
35. Shri Moolchand Meena
36. Shri Dipankar Mukherjee
37. Shri Pritish Nandy
38. Shri Kripal Parmar
39. Shri Ahmed Patel
40. Shri Keshubhai S. Patel
41. Shri V.V. Raghavan
42. Ms. Mabel Rebello
43. Shri Yadlapati Venkat Rao
44. Shri Thanga Tamilselvan
45. Prof. Ram Gopal Yadav

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.K. Grover — *Director*
3. Shri J.N. Oberoi — *Officer on Special Duty*
4. Dr. Ram Raj Rai — *Assistant Director*

COMPOSITION OF SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHEMICALS  
& PETROCHEMICALS

A SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
PETROLEUM & CHEMICALS (2003)

Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav — *Chairman*

2. Dr. Girija Vyas — *Convenor*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

3. Shri Shriprakash Jaiswal
4. Shri P. Mohan
5. Shri Ashok N. Mohol
6. Dr. Debendra Pradhan
7. Shri Mohan Rawale
8. Dr. Bikram Sarkar
9. Dr. V. Saroja
10. Dr. Ram Lakhani Singh
11. Shri A.K.S. Vijayan
12. Shri Dinesh Chandra Yadav

*Rajya Sabha*

13. Shri Mool Chand Meena
14. Shri Pritish Nandy
15. Shri V.V. Raghavan
16. Shri Yadlapati Venkat Rao

SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.D.T. Achary — *Additional Secretary*
2. Shri P.K. Grover — *Director*
3. Shri J.N. Oberoi — *Officer on Special Duty*
4. Dr. Ram Raj Rai — *Assistant Director*

## INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman, Standing Committee on Petroleum & Chemicals (2003) having been authorised by the Committee to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Forty-Eighth Report on Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in Thirty-Seventh Report (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Petroleum & Chemicals (2002) on 'Production and Availability of Pesticides'.

2. The Thirty-Seventh Report of the Committee was presented to Lok Sabha on 20th December, 2002. Replies of Government to all the recommendations contained in the Thirty-Seventh Report were received on 10th April, 2003. The Sub-Committee on Chemicals and Petrochemicals took oral evidence of the representatives of Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilisers (Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals) and Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation) on 11th June, 2003 and sought clarifications on certain points. Thereafter, the Ministry of Chemicals and Fertilisers (Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals) furnished the updated/revised replies on 14th August, 2003. The Sub-Committee on Chemicals & Petrochemicals considered the Action Taken Replies received from the Government and adopted the Report at their sitting held on 18th August, 2003.

3. The Committee wish to express their thanks to officers of the Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers (Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals) and Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture and Cooperation) for placing their views before the Committee and for furnishing the information desired in connection with examination of the subject.

4. The Standing Committee on Petroleum & Chemicals (2003) considered and adopted this Report at their sitting held on 19th August, 2003.

5. The Committee place on record their appreciation of the work done by the Sub-Committee on Chemicals & Petrochemicals.

6. An analysis of the Action Taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-Seventh Report (Thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Committee is given in appendix-VI.

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

8. The Committee place on record their appreciation for the valuable assistance rendered to them by the officials of the Lok Sabha Secretariat attached to the Committee.

NEW DELHI;  
August 19, 2003  
*Sravana 28, 1925 (Saka)*

MULAYAM SINGH YADAV,  
*Chairman,*  
*Standing Committee on*  
*Petroleum & Chemicals.*

## CHAPTER I

### REPORT

This Report of the Committee deals with the action taken by the Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-Seventh Report (thirteenth Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Petroleum & Chemicals (2002) on 'Production and Availability of Pesticides' which was presented to Lok Sabha on 20th December, 2002.

2. The Ministry of petroleum and Natural Gas was requested to furnish replies to recommendations contained in the Thirty-Seventh Report within three months from the presentation of the Report *i.e.* by 20th March, 2003. The replies of the Government to the recommendations contained in the Report were received on 10th April, 2003. The Sub-Committee on Chemicals and Petrochemicals took oral evidence of the representatives of Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals and Department of Agriculture & Cooperation. Thereafter, the Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals was asked to furnish updated/revised replies. Updated/revised Action Taken notes have been received from the Government in respect of all the 24 recommendations/conclusions contained in the Report. These have been categorised as follows:—

- (i) Recommendations/conclusions that have been accepted by the Government:—  
Sl. Nos. 5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22 and 24
- (ii) Recommendations/conclusions which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of the Government's replies:—  
Sl. Nos. 1, 2, 7, 9 and 12
- (iii) Recommendations/conclusions in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee:—  
Sl. Nos. 3, 4, 8, 10 and 11.
- (iv) Recommendations/observations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited:—  
Sl. Nos. 18, 19 and 23.



3. The Committee desire that the final replies in respect of the recommendations for which only interim replies have been furnished by the Government and the recommendations which have been commented upon by the Committee in Chapter-I should be furnished expeditiously.

4. The Committee will now deal with the action taken by the Government on some of their recommendations and make suggestions thereupon.

A. ENFORCEMENT OF INSECTICIDES ACT, 1968 IN STATES.

**Recommendation No. 3 (Para No. 1.11)**

5. The Committee had noted that as such, Agriculture was a State subject but overall governance of pesticides related matters was under Central Government. It had been brought to the notice of this Committee that Ministry of Agriculture had been issuing several instructions from time to time to regulate the important issues relating to pesticides but due to reluctant approach of State Governments, those were not being implemented. Since States had to play effective role in regulation of pesticides related matters, the Committee, had desired that the Central Government should develop a better coordination mechanism with the State Governments through establishing a Coordination Committee involving all the States so that the policies of the Central Government might be implemented in all the States properly.

6. In their reply the Government have stated as under:—

“Regarding coordination of the Central Government with State Governments, it is submitted that the requisite mechanism is already in place in the form of two National level conferences and two zonal conferences, which involve participation of the State Governments and were all issues relating to implementation of the Insecticides Act and rules made thereunder are discussed and problems faced by the State Governments in the process of implementation are addressed. In addition, references on specific issues including directions are issued to the States, as and when required. Besides, the Central Government organizes several training programmes for updating the knowledge of State Governments functionaries responsible for enforcement of the provisions of the Insecticides Act, 1968 relating to supply of quality pesticides.

Technical auditing of State Pesticides Testing laboratories is also done to assess their efficiency and grants-in-aid are released for strengthening these labouratories as well as for establishment of new laboratories. Therefore, a separate committee for the same purpose does not seem to be warranted."

7. While going into the details of the issue, the Committee specifically asked the Ministry whether they were satisfied with the roles being played by the State Governments in the implementation of Insecticides Act and they also wanted to know about the mechanism available with the Central Government to persuade the State Governments for implementation of the Act. The Government submitted the following reply:—

"The quality of implementation of Insecticides Act is different in different States. The Government feels that improvements can be made in the implementation of the Insecticides Act, 1968 by the State Governments. The Central Government has been organizing zonal and national conferences twice-a-year before the two main cropping seasons to interact with the State Governments to assess the situation and persuade them to accelerate the pace of implementation of the Insecticides Act, 1968, especially relating to quality control of pesticides. Besides, the Central Government organizes several training programmes for updating the knowledge of State Governments functionaries responsible for enforcement of the provisions of the Insecticides Act, 1968 relating to supply of quality Pesticides. Technical auditing of State Pesticides Testing Laboratories is also done to assess their efficiency and grants-in-aid are released for strengthening these laboratories as well as for establishment of new laboratories."

8. During the course of evidence, the Committee specifically referred to the views expressed by the Members in Parliament that there should be some monitoring from Central Government in the implementation of provisions of the Act and wanted to know the reaction of the Government in this regard. Additional Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture expressed the view of the Government as under:—

"We monitor it, we hold two Central Conferences every year and two regional Conferences. There are four meetings in which half a day is allocated to pesticides. When this Act was framed, we also discussed it with the representatives of State Governments because ultimately implementation is mainly with State

Governments. So, we have to take all their concerns and views into consideration. I must admit that there is always scope for improvement both at the State level and at the Central level. I do appreciate that there are some problems at the lower level, at the inspector level, like in other Departments whether it is income tax or customs. We are trying, in the new Act, as I have explained, for the first time to make inspectors accountable. If they try to harass a party, we are proposing that for these vexatious acts, action should be taken against them."

9. The Committee are not convinced with the justification given by the Ministry of Agriculture for not establishing a Coordination Committee involving all the States to handle the matters relating to pesticides. During the course of discussion, the Ministry has candidly accepted that the quality of implementation of Insecticides Act is different in different States and there is a wide scope of improvement at State level and Central level. The Committee are not satisfied with the present allocation of only half-a-day in Central/Regional Annual Conferences for discussion on pesticides related matters with the State Governments. Pesticides related matters require regular vigilant monitoring and better coordination between the Central and State Governments. The Committee, therefore, reiterate that the Government should establish an efficient monitoring system for pesticides related matters by establishing a Coordination Committee involving all the concerned Ministries and the States.

#### B. CONSUMPTION PATTERN OF PESTICIDES IN STATES

##### Recommendation No. 4 (Para No. 2.15)

10. The Committee had observed the consumption pattern of pesticides and had found that there was enough scope for improvement in that. The Committee had specifically observed that insecticides had traditionally accounted for majority of agro-chemicals. They had also observed the beginning of wider use of weedicides and fungicides. The Committee however, did not agree with the contention of the Ministry of agriculture that lower rate of consumption of pesticides in most of the States was a healthy sign since that signified lesser pest outbreaks as well as adoption of environment friendly approach of plant protection by the farmers. The Committee had noted that there was an annual loss of Rs. 90,000 crores per annum due to pests which were affecting the standing crops or grains in each State. There might be little variations in consumption quantity of pesticides from one

State to another State depending upon size of State and specific crops but logically the gap should not be much wider. The Committee had, therefore, desired that the Government should undertake a scientific study to assess the consumption pattern of pesticides in each State. Thereafter, based on the results of the study, steps should be taken to remove the imbalance in the consumption pattern of pesticides. The Committee had also desired that the Government should take special initiatives to popularize the use of herbicides and fungicides with low residues to minimise the losses due to vigorous growth of herbs in fields and growth of fungi on fruits and vegetables.

11. The Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture & Cooperation (DAC) has submitted the following reply in this regard:-

“There are many reasons for different use patterns of pesticides in different States. The use of pesticides depends on the nature of crop, weather conditions, awareness of farmers, availability of distribution network including cooperatives, etc. However, DAC maintains that the reduction in the use of pesticides in India is a healthy sign, especially in view of the growing concerns that high pesticide consumption has been a major cause for physiological disorders in people exposed to them for long periods and that contamination of ground water and food products on account of pesticides has resulted in presence of undesirably high level of pesticide residues therein and has also become a major reason for rejection of our exports of agricultural produce.

The Government is promoting organic farming and Integrated Pest Management approach in agriculture with a view to reduce the dangers of pesticide and other chemical residue. Although the use of weedicides and fungicides is increasing, the DAC is taking initiatives to popularize the use of bio-pesticides in treating seeds/soil. The emphasis is on timely spraying of fungicides on fruits and vegetables to minimize crop loss due to pests and diseases.

There is no shortage of availability of pesticides in any of the States and the consumption of pesticides in the States is dependent on the above-mentioned factors.”

12. The Committee had noted that the Government had been monitoring the demand and consumption of pesticides in various States on a continuous basis. The Committee specifically wanted to know about the parameters of the monitoring and also asked about the

justification for the conclusion that imbalance consumption of pesticides in several States was due to better awareness of farmers about the ill effects of chemicals pesticides and not due to other reasons. The Ministry of Agriculture has submitted following explanation:-

“Demand for various pesticides is assessed based on the input from the State Governments, which is in turn based on the demand pattern of the preceding years, agro-climatic conditions, prevailing insect-pest, disease situation, etc. in the respective States. Consumption figures are obtained by computing the quantity of pesticides actually used. Consumption of pesticides in different States may vary depending upon the size of the State, cultivated crop area, outbreak of insect-pests/diseases/weeds, awareness among the farmers about the optimal usage of chemicals as well as the extent to which the IPM approach has been adopted in various regions/States. Consumption pattern of pesticides also varies from year to year depending upon the crops cultivated and also on crop diversification trends. It is thus clear that differing consumption of pesticides in different States is based on the requirement of that State based on cumulative effect of various factors mentioned above. There is generally no shortage of pesticides in any part of the country.”

13. In response to specific query of the Committee whether any scientific study has ever been made to analyse the factors responsible for imbalanced use of pesticides in the States, the Ministry of Agriculture stated as under:—

“No. As explained above, the consumption of pesticides in a State depends on many factors and the primary concern of Government is that pesticides should be easily available in the States and there should be no shortage of pesticides in any State.

Government does not feel that there is any imbalance in consumption of pesticides by States. Hence, no scientific study has been carried out in this regard.”

14. When asked about the specific steps taken/being taken to popularize the use of herbicides and fungicides particularly on fruits and vegetables, the Ministry stated as under:—

“It is a fact that the use of fungicides and herbicides has shown an increasing trend in the past few years. However, the policy of

the Government is to reduce the use of chemical pesticides in agriculture so as to safeguard the interests of the consumers from the excessive pesticides residues contamination in fruits and vegetables. Due to adoption of the IPM strategy, the use of bio-pesticides and pesticides of plant origin is gaining popularity. Need based use of pesticides including herbicides and fungicides is also advocated through IPM Farmers field Schools."

15. The Committee are astonished to note that the Government have never thought it necessary to conduct any scientific study to assess the consumption pattern and analyse the reasons for imbalanced use of pesticides in the States. The Committee do agree that there are multiple factors responsible for imbalanced use of pesticides in States but they don't think it impossible to scientifically analyse the reasons in this regard. In Committee's view only a scientific study of this issue may derive the desired results which may be used to improve the balanced use of pesticides in all the States. They therefore, once again urge the Government to examine the matter systematically and scientifically to ensure a balanced use of pesticides in all the States to minimize the crop loss due to pests and diseases. The Committee, however, urge the Government that during the process of removal of imbalance in consumption of pesticides, the initiatives to promote the use of herbicides and fungicides with low residues should also get due importance with a view to make these steps environment-friendly.

#### C. IMPORT OF ILLEGAL PESTICIDES

##### Recommendation No. 8 (Para No. 3.15)

16. The Committee had expressed their great concern over the issue of questionable quality of petroleum products from foreign countries being dumped into Indian markets at ridiculous prices without proper back up data on toxicity. The Committee had, therefore, desired that the Government should be very vigilant and active on this front and take quick action by either restricting the import or imposing appropriate anti-dumping duties to stop such illegal imports of non-registered agro-chemicals from foreign sources.

17. The Department of Chemicals and Petrochemicals has clarified the position in this regard as under:—

"With the aim of preventing imports of inferior quality pesticides, a prohibition is already in place on import of any insecticide

without registration in terms of Section 17(1)(c) and Section 18 (1) (a) of the insecticides act. Moreover, the Registration Committee grants registration certificate only after ensuring that the pesticide being imported conforms to various parameters stipulated thereon, including those relating to bio-efficacy and toxicity.

As regards the anti-dumping duties, requests for imposition of such duties are dealt with by the Department of Commerce as per the procedure laid down and after detailed investigations."

18. The Committee agree that there are provisions in the Act for preventing imports of inferior quality pesticides in the country but they had made their observation on the basis of field reports and information received from Pesticides Manufacturers' Associations that very cheap and poor quality of pesticides were being dumped in the market. These Pesticides were reportedly being dumped in the market without any registration etc. and the farmers using these pesticides were feeling deceived. The Committee, therefore, once again urge the Government to investigate the matter and take all initiatives to prevent such illegal imports of non-registered agro-chemicals from foreign sources because this is harming the Indian Pesticides industry on one side and on the other side poor farmers are getting inferior quality products for their use.

#### D. REGISTRATION OF PESTICIDES

##### Recommendation No. 10 (Para No. 4.48)

19. The Committee had noted that as a regular system of streamlining process, the guidelines, for registration of insecticides for manufacture import, export and use under Section 9 (3) and 9 (4) had been streamlined. The computerisation of formats, labels, leaflets, etc. had been done and checklists for expeditious scrutiny of application for registration had been introduced. Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture had informed that the Ministry would simplify the process of registration further. The Committee had noted that the Ministry was considering a provisions regarding allotment of provisional registration valid for two years and the final certificate would be issued after satisfaction of the Registration Committee about the necessary manufacturing facilities having been set up and production started by the company/firm/entrepreneur and production of ISI certificate. The Committee did not favour the imposition of any such condition in

regard to issuing of temporary registration since that would simply hinder and complicate the registration process and also create suspense in the mind of manufacture. The Committee had, therefore, desired that the Ministry should not incorporate those provisions in the proposed amendment of the Act. The Committee had also desired that provisions should be made in the Act whereby registration for import of pesticides was made only if the importer had manufacturing facilities. The identity of producer of such imported pesticides should also be disclosed.

20. The Ministry of Agriculture has submitted the following reply to justify its views:—

“On the direction of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, the amendment to the Insecticides Act, 1968 is under consideration of DAC. The views and comments of various Departments/Ministries have already been obtained. A provision regarding temporary registration is being contemplated to ensure that any body applying for registration has an intention of manufacturing. This has been proposed so that only genuine applicants apply for registration of insecticides. It has been noticed in the recent past that a large number of applicants have obtained registration but they have not established manufacturing facilities. Besides such an arrangement would help in improving the quality of insecticides produced in the country. Also ISI certification is being considered to ensure supply of quality pesticides to farmers. These amendments to the Act will, in any case, be presented before the Cabinet as well as will have to be considered by the Parliament.

As the import of insecticides is not always for manufacturing a formulation, but also for direct sale, hence it will not be practical to insist that the importer should have manufacturing facility while granting registration for import.”

21. In the same context when the Committee specifically wanted to know the number of manufacturers registered for manufacturing of pesticides and the number who did not establish manufacturing facilities after obtaining registration during the last three years, the Ministry has submitted the following reply:—

“Since issuing of license to manufacture insecticides comes under the purview of respective state Governments, the actual number of pesticides registered for which manufacturing facilities were not established by the manufacturers/registrants thereof, after obtaining



registrations, is not available in the Secretariat of Central Insecticides Board and Registration Committee (Sectt. of CIB and RC). During the last three years, a total of 12208 registration certificates have been issued under various Sections of the Act for import, manufacture and export of pesticides. Government has not specifically investigated the cause of failure of registrants to manufacture the pesticides which have been registered by the CIB and RC. The provision of temporary registration is being included to ensure that persons desirous of taking registration also seriously initiate action for manufacturing."

22. While going into the details of quality control measures, when the Committee specifically wanted to know the present system being adopted to ensure the quality of pesticides before granting the permission for registration and the effectiveness of this system, the Ministry of Agriculture stated as under:-

"Before granting registration for a product, the Registration Committee ensures verification of chemical composition of the product, its bio-efficacy and toxicity, which are then specified on the certificate of registration as well as on labels and leaflets. The Committee also approves its method of analysis for monitoring its quality subsequently. These are only pre-registration precautions. Monitoring the quality of pesticides after registration is of utmost importance. The applicants give best possible date to obtain registration. Experience demonstrates that in practicality it remains different thereafter, especially at the peak of cropping seasons and the manufactures try to do anything in their zest to bag the supply orders and meet deadlines thereof. Post-registration verification is, therefore, equally important, for ensuring the quality of pesticides."

23. When the Committee specifically asked the way in which the temporary allotment of registration would help to improve the quality of pesticides, the Ministry of Agriculture clarified the objectives of proposed provision in the following words:—

"Temporary registration does not mainly aim at improving the quality of pesticides, rather it is being introduced to ensure that the registrants become serious towards manufacturing. If they do not create manufacturing facility in the stipulated time, there is no justification for registration certificate being with them."

24. In response to the observation of the Committee that provision to introduce ISI certificate for confirmation of registration is going to put an excess financial burden on manufacturer and ultimately on the consumer, the Ministry submitted its reaction as under:—

“There would be some financial burden on the manufactures which may or may not be passed on to the consumers as the ultimate prices will depend on market forces and demand and supply position, but this provision is essential as the primary concern of the Government is to ensure that quality pesticides are made available to farmers. Making BIS certification a requirement for registration is a step in that direction as it will ensure the supply of quality pesticides in the country. Further, it is also felt that consumers will also be benefited as the quality pesticides will be available at competitive prices in the market.”

25. The Committee are surprised to note that the Central Government are going to incorporate a provision in the Insecticides Act, 1968 regarding temporary registration of pesticides without any proper justification. They have different versions in their reply to the recommendation made by the Committee and further queries by the Committee in this regard. In their reply they have stated that a total of 12208 registration certificates have been issued under various sections of the Act for import, manufacture and export of pesticides. They have taken this decision without any information about the number of pesticides registered for which manufacturing facilities were not established by the manufacturers/registrants thereof after obtaining registrations. Similarly, they have not specifically investigated the cause of failure of registrants to manufacture the pesticides registered by the Central Insecticides Board and Registration Committee. The Committee, therefore, do not agree with the justification given by the Government for introduction of this provision because it has no convincing reason. They feel that the Government have taken a decision without proper examination of the issue. The Committee, therefore, strongly recommend that the Government should not impose any provision regarding allotment of provisional registration for two years without any justified reason since this is against the objective of streamlining the registration process and it will create suspense in the mind of manufacturers. The Committee also do not approve of the proposed provision regarding production of ISI certificate for getting final certificate for production. In Committee's view it will simply enhance the production cost and ultimately the consumer will bear the cost.

## E. PESTICIDES TESTING LABORATORIES.

### **Recommendation No. 11 (Para No. 4.49)**

26. The Committee had noted that 45 Pesticides Testing Laboratories were functional in 18 States and one Union Territory. The Central Government had also established two Regional Pesticides Testing Laboratories to supplement the resources of States/UTs who did not either had a Pesticides Testing Laboratory or adequate analysis capacity or adequate analysis facility for monitoring the quality of Pesticides. There was also a Central Insecticides Laboratory. Samples which were referred by the Courts of Law or referred on the directions of Courts of Law were analysed at that laboratory. However, the Committee had found that those laboratories had to test samples drawn from 50,000 MT (in terms of technical grade pesticides) of as many as 165 types of pesticides. The Committee had observed that the number of laboratories was not adequate. The Committee had, therefore, recommended that the number of Pesticides Testing Laboratories should be substantially increased. They had also desired that such Laboratories should also be set up at district level to expedite the process.

27. The Ministry of Agriculture has submitted the following reply describing the position in this regard:-

“Committee’s recommendation that the number of pesticides testing laboratories should be substantially increased is welcomed by the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation (DAC). It is pertinent to mention here that the Government of India is concerned about monitoring the quality of pesticides reaching the farming community. Consequently, the Central Government has been extending financial assistance to the States for strengthening of existing and setting up of new Pesticide Testing Laboratories since Eighth Five Year Plan. So far, Rs. 6.79 crore have been released to 20 States and one UT for the purpose. It is proposed to continue this component in the 10th Five Year Plan also. Therefore, the emphasis is on creation of better facilities for analysis of samples in State Pesticide Testing Laboratories (SPTLs) and on creation of more such facilities in various States of the country. However, the issue of setting up of such laboratories at the district level depends on the concerned State Governments.”

28. The Committee are happy to note that the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation has accepted the observations of the Committee that the present number of Pesticides Testing Laboratories is not adequate and there is an urgent need for substantial increase in number of laboratories. While analyzing the initiatives taken by the Government the Committee observe that since 8th Five Year Plan the Ministry has released only Rs. 6.79 crore as financial assistance to such laboratories and they propose to continue this component in the 10th Five Year Plan also. The Committee do not find this amount to be adequate and desire that the Government should provide more and more assistance for modernisation of existing laboratories and establishment of more laboratories during the 10th Plan period in consultation with the State Governments. The Committee also urge the Government to persuade the State Governments to establish district level laboratories to facilitate the work relating the quality control of Pesticides.

#### F. PUNISHMENTS FOR PRODUCERS OF SPURIOUS PESTICIDES

##### Recommendation No. 13 (Para No. 4.51)

29. The Committee had observed that usually the spurious pesticides were sold using the name of reputed products and companies. If spurious products were sold in their name they lost the sale. If a sample was failed by the Agricultural Department officers, the *bona fide* manufacture was not permitted to sell in that area for six months. Legal action also went against the person or company whose name appeared on the label. The committee had found that in that way, the reputed and standard companies were being harassed. Usually, the farmers were not able to distinguish between genuine and spurious products. The Committee had treated this situation as very alarming. The Committee had, therefore, recommended that the proposed amendments in the Insecticides Act should provide for very stringent Punishment for manufacturer of spurious insecticides. The Committee had specifically desired that the punishment/penalties should commensurate with the nature of fault so that harassment of genuine manufacturer might stop and punishment was made more stringent for the persons responsible for production of duplicate/spurious pesticides. Punishment should also be provided for the Insecticide Inspectors if they were found to be deliberately ignoring the manufacture or sale of spurious goods in their area.

30. The Ministry of Agriculture have submitted the following reply:—

“The Department of Agriculture and Cooperation has already taken a positive note of the suggestions made by the Committee and the amendments to the Insecticides Act are under consideration of the Government. The Department has proposed stringent punishment for manufacturers of spurious pesticides. The punishments are being proposed to be commensurate with the nature and gravity of offence. Further, the Government is also actively considering a provision for punishment for Insecticides Inspectors, should they indulge in vexatious acts.”

31. During the course of evidence, when the Ministry of Agriculture was asked whether the Government were determined to incorporate these provisions in the Insecticides Act, the Ministry submitted:—

“The Government is actively considering the recommendations of the Committee and proposing stringent punishment for manufacturers of spurious pesticides.”

32. The Committee are happy to note that the Government have agreed to incorporate provisions for stringent punishment for the manufacturer of spurious pesticides and this will commensurate with the nature and gravity of offence. They also appreciate that for the first time the Government have recognized the need of introducing provisions for punishment of Insecticide Inspectors if they are found indulged in vexatious acts. In Committee's view both these provisions will strengthen the quality control system and minimize the malpractices prevalent in this sector. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Government should ensure that both the provisions are suitably incorporated at the time of finalisation of Amendments in the Act.

G. FINALISATION OF AMENDMENTS IN THE INSECTICIDES ACT,  
1968

**Recommendation No. 17 (Para No. 4.55)**

33. The Committee had been informed that the proposed amendments in the Insecticide Act, 1968 would include many other things like provision for cancellation/suspension of Registration Certificates by registration Committee, provision of qualified persons for distribution/retail points, categorization of various types of offences

and prescribing graded punishments therefor and exempting retailers from the requirement of licence for sale of household insecticides. While consultations among various authorities and with the Pesticide Industry had taken place many times, the concrete proposals in this regard were yet to be finalised. The Committee had recommended that the proposals should be formulated soon and the Amendment Bill brought before the Parliament at the earliest.

34. In their reply the Government have stated that on this issue, all possible efforts were being made to finalize the proposed amendments and to place the Bill before the Parliament at the earliest.

35. During the course of evidence when the Committee specifically asked the reasons for delay in finalizing the amendments in Insecticides Act, 1968, the Ministry of Agriculture stated as under:—

“The Government is committed to finalisation of the proposed amendments to the Insecticides Act at the earliest. However, the same have been pending for a long time, particularly because of the continuous change of stance on issues and changing demands of the pesticide industry associations and the lack of cohesiveness and divergence of views on almost all major issues amongst the various associations of pesticide manufacturers and formulators. It is also a fact that the various associations have been representing to all the possible levels with the Ministry, other Departments as also outside, and have been exerting all possible pressures to attempt at influencing the proposed amendments to suit their considerations.”

36. During the discussion, the Additional Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation submitted before the Committee that they would be able to bring the Amendment Bill before the Parliament during the winter session.

37. The Committee are not able to understand the reasons for keeping this amendment Bill pending for such a long time. All the affected agencies are trying to persuade the Government to fulfil their requirement. The Committee, therefore, desire that now the Government should finalise the proposed amendments in the Insecticides Act, 1968 in the shortest possible time so that these may be placed before Parliament during winter session positively. They would also like to remind that the Government should consider all the recommendations of the Committee at the time of finalisation of

the Bill in this regard and incorporate their suggestions in the relevant clauses. The Committee however, caution that during the finalisation of Bill, the logical interests of pesticides industry as well as farmers should get due importance.

#### H. SCHEMES TO EDUCATE FARMERS ABOUT PESTICIDES

##### Recommendation No. 18 (Para No. 5.24)

38. The Committee had observed that major exposure to pesticide occurred in the fields during their application. The Committee had also noted that all the instructions regarding safety clothing, first aid and antidotes were printed on labels and indicated. They knew that there was a network of extension functionaries in the State Departments of Agriculture who were supposed to do that work. But the Committee were of the view that teaching of farmers had a very little impact. In Committee's view farmers could be benefited only through what they were demonstrated in the field and training to educated farmers. The Committee agreed with the difficulties in training large number of people. They, however, desired that the concept of promotion of farmers' clubs and self-help groups to train a number of farmers who could train more people in groups should be encouraged. Pesticides manufacturers had also shown their interest in arranging such programmes with the support of Central Government agricultural Institutions and State Governments. Under these circumstances, the Committee had desired that the Government should take all initiative in this matter on priority basis to educate and train more and more farmers with the help of State Governments, manufacturers and NGOs. The Committee had felt that only this kind of joint effort through sharing of expertise, experience and funds could give good results.

39. In their reply the Government have stated as under:—

“A booklet in English and Hindi has been prepared with pictorial presentations on safe use of pesticides and do's and don'ts. This booklet has been given a wide circulations and being used by the farmers.

Doctors at grassroots levels are trained on different aspects of pesticides including diagnosis management and treatment of pesticides poisoning. Till today, 1,318 doctors have been trained during the period of 1995-2002.

In addition, 26 Central Integrated Pest Management Centres located in 22 States and 1 UT are involved in imparting training to farmers in IPM including safe and judicious use of pesticides by organizing Farmers' Field Schools for different crops involving them for the whole season of the crop. Farmers trained in the Farmers' Field Schools further propagate IPM and awareness about pesticides to the fellow farmers in due course. Apart from FFSs being organized by CIPMCs of the Central Government, some of the State Governments also organize FFSs from their own resources.

The Government is in agreement with the view of the Committee that there is a need for expanding the training programmes for farmers so that more and more farmers can be trained with the help of NGOs, State Governments, Krishi Vigyan Kendras and farmers groups as also pesticide manufacturer. It may be clarified at the outset that the Government has not received any concrete proposal/invitation from the Private Sector, including the Pesticide Manufacturers and Associations thereof, on the issue of collaboration and joint efforts in the matter of expansion of farmers education."

40. When the Committee specifically asked about the number of such programmes, the Central Government have been participating with the State Governments/Manufacturers and NGOs to educate and train the farmers, Ministry replied as under:—

"The Government is in agreement with the view of the Committee that there is a need for expanding the training programmes for farmers so that more and more farmers can be trained with the help of NGOs, State Governments, Krishi Vigyan Kendras and farmer groups as also pesticide manufacturers. It may be clarified at the outset that the Government has not received any concrete proposal/invitation from the Private Sector, including the Pesticide Manufacturers and Associations thereof, on the issue of collaboration and joint effort in the matter of expansion of farmer education.

The Central Government is implementing the Integrated Pest Management training programme through Farmers' Field Schools organized by the 26 Central Integrated Pest Management Centres which are stipulated across the country. So far, a total of 7761 Farmers' Field Schools have been organized and 32,188 Agricultural Extension Officers and 2,34,266 farmers have been trained. It is



pertinent to note that, apart from the Central Government Initiatives in this field, various State Governments have also been organizing Farmer Field Schools and some States have also been utilizing Central Government funding under the Macro Management mode scheme for providing IPM training, where the local CIPMC staff of the Central Government act as resource persons and contribute to the efforts of the States Government functionaries."

41. When asked about the reasons for showing reluctant approach on the part of Central Government particularly when the Pesticides Manufacturers' Associations have shown their interest arranging such programme, the Ministry of Agriculture stated as under:—

"There is no reluctance on the part of the Central Government in this regard. No concrete proposal has so far been received from the Pesticides Manufacturers' Associations or the Pesticide Industry on the matter."

42. In the same context, when the Committee enquired whether the Government propose to take fresh initiatives on the lines suggested by the Committee, the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation submitted following reply:—

"The recommendation of the Committee that the Government should take fresh initiatives to educate and train more and more farmers with the help of State Governments/Manufacturers and NGOs through sharing of expertise experience and funds is welcome. The Government is committed to the spread of farmer education, particularly on aspects of IPM, including economic viability and other benefits of the IPM approach and its stress on reduced usage of chemical pesticides, herbicides and fungicides.

Since the Government has taken up IPM approach as the main stay for control of pests and diseases and for sustainable agricultural development in the country, it would welcome and support any initiative, particularly from the Pesticide Industry and the Private Sector in general, in the field of spread of farmer education.

The Government will also encourage the Pesticide Industry to earmark funds for holding farmer awareness sessions, where the Central Government would also participate. The pesticide industry

can also explore the possibility of establishment of pesticide quality testing laboratories at the district level where the consumption is high so as to ensure supply of quality pesticides to Indian farmers.

The Government it also broadening the base for training facilities by allowing Krishi Vigyan Kendras to organise such Integrated Pest Management Farmers' Field Schools in addition to Central Integrated Pest Management Centres in the Xth Five Year Plan."

43. The Committee find that there is an urgent need to expand training programmes for farmers to educate them about the use of pesticides. They are not satisfied with the initiatives being taken by the Government in this direction. The Committee are surprised to note that the Government are expecting proposal/invitation from the private sector including the pesticide manufacturers and associations on the issue of collaboration and joint efforts in the matter of expansion of farmers education. While strongly condemning this approach of the Government, the Committee desire that the Government should take concrete initiatives on priority basis as per the objectives of National Agriculture Policy and after preparing a framework in this regard they should invite the Agricultural Institutions, State Governments, Pesticides Manufacturers and NGOs to seek their help in organizing the programmes to train and educate the farmers. The Committee also desire that the Government should encourage the promotion of farmer's clubs and self-help groups.

#### I. AGRO-CLINIC AND AGRI-BUSINESS SCHEME

##### Recommendation No. 19 (Para No. 5.25)

44. The Committee had desired that the Government should do everything to strengthen and spread the concept of agri-clinic and agri-business of the Ministry of Agriculture. The Committee had however, found that at that time there was no incentive to educated youth for showing interest in such programmes. They had, therefore, suggested that the Ministry of Agriculture should take all initiatives at their own level in coordination with other Ministries to provide all the possible incentives to the young educated persons interested in such programmes.

45. In their reply, the Government have stated as under:—

“A new Central Sector Scheme ‘Establishment of a Network of Agri-Clinics and Agri-Business Centres’ was launched during the year 2001-2002 by the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation. The present scheme aims at utilizing the services of unemployed agriculture graduates to provide extension service to the farmers on payment basis by setting up their private ventures and thus use the large pool of agriculture graduates available while creating opportunities for their self-employment. The proposed Agri Clinics/ Agri Business centres are expected to provide various services to the farmers on payment, which will help them in reaping the optimum benefits of the latest production technology. These centres will be run on the revenue earned by providing services to the farmers, especially small and marginal ones. The farmers in the North-Eastern States and hill States will also be able to benefit from the schemes. Twenty-one economically viable activities, including setting up of Vermiculture units, production of bio-fertilisers, bio-pesticides, bio-control agents etc. have been identified. The Scheme was launched during the financial year 2001-2002. Wide publicity was given to the Agri Clinics and Agri Business Centres Scheme by Small Farmer Agri Business Consortium (SFAC) calling for applications from the eligible and willing entrepreneurs for undergoing training in the various Institutes selected for this purpose. There has been very good response to the scheme and till 31st January, 2003, 16159 applications were received. 2313 candidates have already been trained in the 1st and 2nd cycle and in the 3rd cycle, 1804 candidates are undergoing training in 60 selected institutions across the country. It is proposed to provide 25%/33.33% of the project cost in form of back ended capital subsidy, with special provision for North Eastern States by the Government through National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD). Planning Commission has approved implementation of the training component of the scheme during the Tenth Five Year Plan. The subsidy component of the scheme is under consideration of the Commission.

46. The Committee are happy to note that the Government have taken some valuable initiatives in the direction of implementing the scheme of Establishment of a Network of Agri-Clinic and Agri-Business. 1804 candidates have already started their training but the Planning Commission has not approved the implementation of

subsidy component of the scheme. Since this scheme relates to unemployed agriculture graduates who essentially require financial assistance to initiate their work under these schemes, the Committee desire that the Government should take all initiatives for approval of subsidy scheme on priority basis. The Committee also desire that the Government should explore all other possibilities to assist such youth participating in these schemes.

## CHAPTER II

### RECOMMENDATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ACCEPTED BY THE GOVERNMENT

#### Recommendation No. 5 (Para No. 2.16)

The Committee observe that global agro-chemical consumption is dominated by fruits and vegetables whereas, it is at very low level in India. The Committee also note the huge loss of fruits and vegetables in the fields as well as during storage. During every season due to heavy loss of fruits and vegetables, common man has either to pay very high prices for good quality items or he has to purchase disease affected items. The Committee is not in favour of excess use of pesticides on these crops, which can cause high pesticide residues. However, they desire that the Government should pay special attention on these crops and shortlist effective pesticides with low pesticide residues and popularize the use of those pesticides for specific crops in each agro-chemical region. This may be helpful in good plant protection of these crops beneficial both for farmers as well as common man.

#### Reply of the Government

The Government of India is popularizing the use of pesticides with low cost and low pesticides residues and emphasizes the use of bio-pesticides, which are safe and beneficial to the farmers. To achieve this goal, the Government has also taken initiative to popularize IPM, an eco-friendly approach encompassing cultural, mechanical, biological and need based judicious use of safer chemical pesticides and bio-pesticides and bio-control agents to minimize environmental pollution and to maintain ecological equilibrium. Farmers are being trained in this approach through IPM farmers' Field Schools (FFSs)-demo-cum-training programme organized on various crops including fruits and vegetables regularly through establishment of 26 Central IPM centres located in 22 States and one UT. States/UTs are also popularizing IPM with the farmers.

The Government is already taking measures to ensure that pesticides are not used in excessive quantities in fruits and vegetable

crops. While granting registrations of pesticides, the Registration Committee approves the detailed guidelines on dosage and mode of application etc. as well as details of the crops, including fruits and vegetable crops, for which such pesticides are registered. If followed, low but effective dosage of pesticides can help significantly reduce loss of fruits and vegetables not only during cultivation but also in storage.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

#### **Recommendation No. 6 (Para No. 3.13)**

The Committee observe that the Indian agro-chemical market is just 2% of the total market. Moreover, the usage of agro-chemicals is low in the developing regions of Asia, South America and Africa. These markets, therefore have a promising growth potential. India is able to meet 95% of its demand of pesticides domestically. Indian pesticides are being exported at very large scale and there is a continuous increase in export. The current exports of pesticides from India amounts to about Rs. 1500 crores and it can increase several folds in coming years. Indian Industry has built up a good reputation as reliable supplier. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Government should provide all the possible incentives to the exporters of pesticides in getting an early registration and other clearances for production and export of pesticides and also take up the matter at diplomatic level so that the markets in developing regions of Asia, South America and Africa could be tapped and more foreign currency for the country could be earned.

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

The Government of India has taken several steps to boost export of pesticides viz.

- (i) Simplification of data requirement, which is minimal, for mandatory registration of insecticides;
- (ii) Fast track scrutiny of applications for export registration and clearance of cases on priority by the Registration Committee on fortnightly basis; and
- (iii) Computerization of Registration System.

As far as providing incentives to the exporters and efforts at diplomatic level are concerned, the Department of Chemicals &

Petrochemicals is in constant touch with the pesticide industry and industry associations. The Department takes up, from time to time, issues on behalf of the industry with other Departments including the Department of Commerce, the Ministry of External Affairs and India's diplomatic Missions abroad.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

#### **Recommendation No. 13 (Para No. 4.51)**

The Committee are highly concerned about the problem of spurious pesticides. Spurious pesticides are the pesticides manufactured by unauthorized individual/company and these are not approved by the Registration Committee. Spurious means that the active ingredient inside the product would not be as per the label and these pesticides are not effective against the insects and pests. Any spurious pesticide causes monetary loss to the farmer who buys such product. The Committee observe that usually the spurious pesticides are sold using the name of reputed products and companies. If spurious products are sold in their name they lose the sale. If a sample is failed by the Agricultural Department officers, the *bona fide* manufacture is not permitted to sell in that area for six months, Legal action also goes against the person or company whose name appears on the label. The Committee find that in this way, the reputed and standard companies are being harassed. Usually, the farmers are not able to distinguish between genuine and spurious products. The Committee treat this situation as very alarming. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the proposed amendments in the Insecticides Act should provide for very stringent Punishment for manufacturer of spurious insecticides. The Committee specifically desire that the punishment/penalties should commensurate with the nature of fault so that harassment of genuine manufacturer may stop and punishment is made more stringent for the persons responsible for production of duplicate/spurious pesticides. Punishment should also be provided for the Insecticide Inspectors if they are found to be deliberately ignoring the manufacture or sale of spurious goods in their area.

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

The Department of Agriculture & Cooperation has already taken a positive note of the suggestions made by the Committee and the

amendments to the Insecticides. Act are under consideration of the Government. The Department has proposed stringent punishment for manufacturers of spurious pesticides. The punishments are being proposed to be commensurate with the nature and gravity of offence. Further, the Government is also actively considering a provision for punishment for Insecticides Inspectors, should they indulge in vexatious acts.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

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

(Please *see* Para No. 32 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation No. 14 (Para No. 4.52)**

The Committee welcome the proposed Amendments regarding licensing for pesticides. The Committee agree with the proposal of the Government that in future, the license to sell pesticides will be provided only to those who are graduates or post-graduates in Agriculture and there will be no need of license for retailers to sell the household insecticides. In Committee's view this will give a big opportunity of employment to educated persons and it will benefit the user also. The Committee also desire that these amendments should be implemented with immediate effect. The Committee also desire that the present retailers should also be educated about the effective use of important pesticides so that they may be able to guide the farmers properly. In this regard the Government should prepare a time bound programme in coordination with manufacturers and NGOs.

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

On this issue, it is submitted that necessary provision has been incorporated in the proposed amendments to the Insecticide Act, 1968 to ensure that the existing retailers are also educated in the manner prescribed within a fixed time frame. These amendments will come into force after they are passed by the Parliament.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]



**Recommendation No. 15 (Para No. 4.53)**

The Committee's attention has been invited towards the experience of the industry that marginal failures of reputed manufacturers have been resulting into serious consequences of litigation at huge costs affecting both the State Governments and the industry. The Committee are anguished to note that the hundreds of cases where the products have been declared misbranded by State laboratories have been passed by the Central Government Insecticides Laboratories. The Committee feel that chemical analysis of products need prolonged experience and knowledge besides best/right quality of reagents/standard samples and laboratory equipment. The Committee find that State laboratories greatly lack in all these techniques and procedure which more often result in improper analysis. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Government should persuade the State Governments to provide better analytical facilities in their laboratories so that the consequences of litigation may be avoided in future due to improper analysis in the State laboratories.

**Reply of the Government**

No doubt, skilled (properly trained) analysts should only be involved in analysis and Good Laboratory Practices (GLP) be followed. However, sometimes routine transfers in states create problems in this area. For this purpose, the states have been advised to develop human resource by getting their potential officers trained in Pesticide Formulation Analysis (PFA) and Instrumental Analysis at NPPTI, Hyderabad so that the routine transfer do not cause shortage of skilled staff in the laboratories. Skilled staff takes care of GLP easily.

The State Governments have also been persuaded to provide better analytical facilities in their Pesticide Testing Laboratories by taking help of the Central Government Scheme of grants-in-aid for strengthening of SPTLs.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

**Recommendation No. 16 (Para No. 4.54)**

The Committee note that there is a proposal of amendment in the Insecticides Act, 1968 regarding three year protection of rights relating to import of technical pesticides and formulations. The Committee

understand that in view of multinational dominance in pesticides industry, such protection may show an adverse impact on small manufacturers and formulators which are more than 400 in numbers. Moreover, there will be revenue loss also. The Committee, therefore, do not favour any such amendment which goes against majority of small scale manufacturers and formulators. The Committee do not agree with the justification given by the Ministry that such protection will appear automatically through Intellectual Property Right in WTO. The Committee desire that the Government should not come with any such amendment on their own and examine the view of manufacturers and formulators seriously and consider the impact of such decision on farmers before going for any such amendment.

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

The proposed Amendments to the Act have not yet been finalized. However, it is submitted that this issue had been raised vehemently and repeatedly, by the various Pesticide Associations as well as other Ministries and Departments, most of whom expressed reservation on this issue. Due to these objections, the proposed provision of three year protection to holders of original registration from other 'me too' registrants has been dropped from the proposed amendments.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

#### **Recommendation No. 17 (Para No. 4.55)**

The Committee have been informed that the proposed amendments in the Insecticide Act, 1968 would include many other things like provision for cancellation/suspension of Registration Certificates by Registration Committee, provision of qualified persons for distribution/retail points, categorization of various types of offences and prescribing graded punishments therefore and exempting retailers from the requirement of licence for sale of household insecticides. While consultations among various authorities and with the Pesticide Industry have taken place many times, the concrete proposals in this regard are yet to be finalised. The Committee recommend that the proposals should be formulated soon and the Amendment Bill brought before the Parliament at the earliest.

### **Reply of the Government**

On this issue, it is submitted that all possible efforts are being made to finalize the proposed amendments and to lay the Bill before the Parliament at the earliest.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

### **Comments of the Committee**

(Please see Para No. 37 of Chapter-I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation No. 20 (Para No. 5.26)**

The Committee note that complete reliance on the use of pesticides in controlling agricultural pests and associated environmental, societal economic and human health problems have forced scientists, extension agents and farmers to develop and adopt Integrated Pest Management (IPM) technology. The Committee find that potential alternatives to chemical pesticides are available in the nature which should be commercially exploited for pest control. In spite of traditional knowledge and early breakthrough in research, the pest control potential of various natural products remained untapped due to the advent of synthetic pesticides with a broad spectrum of activity. The Committee understand that there still persists a need for development of better, biodegradable insecticides and growth regulators to combat the target species without doing damage to beneficial insects, wildlife and man. The research and use of bio-pesticides and biocontrol agents is now picking up fast. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Government should analyse the weak points of IPM programme and take more initiatives to encourage the use of bio-pesticides. The Committee would also desire that the Government should identify the organisations for development of more bio-pesticides like the neem-based pesticides and provide incentives to develop such pesticides having better shelf-life and least photo-degradability.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Government is committed to promoting the Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approach as the cardinal principle and the main plank of the plant protection strategy in the overall crop production programme as IPM is an eco-friendly approach encompassing the use

of specific cultural, mechanical and biological practices in cultivation along with increased reliance on bio-pesticides and bio-control agents and judicious but limited use of agro-chemicals with a view to minimize the environmental pollution and health hazards associated with indiscriminate and high use of pesticides.

For successful implementation of IPM programme and to encourage the use of potential bio-control agents (predators & parasites) and bio-pesticides, it is necessary to provide the same with the quality products in time. To encourage the use of bio-pesticides local entrepreneurs have been encouraged to develop bio-pesticides like Neem, Nuclear Polyhydrosis Virus (NPV) etc. for which incentive have also been earmarked in the 10th Five Year Plan through Agri-business centres/ Agri-clinics.

The Government is in agreement with the recommendations of the Committee that the weak points of IPM Programme should be analysed on a continual basis so that the weak points thereof including uneven spread and uneven results in different States are monitored and corrective steps taken to ensure the success of the IPM Programme. A number of steps have been taken in this regard which include periodic monitoring of the programme. The Central Sector Plan Scheme 'Promotion of Integrated Pest Management' has been evaluated twice during IXth Five-Year Plan by the National Institute of Rural Development, Hyderabad and Agro-Economic Research Centre, Viswa Bharati, Shantiniketan and both these evaluation reports have recommended continuation of the scheme. Monitoring and evaluation is a continuous process in DAC.

The Project Directorate of Biological Control (ICAR), Bangalore has been identified for mass production of bio-control agents/bio-pesticides and grants-in-aid are given for the purpose. The Division of Agro-chemicals, IARI, Pusa, ICAR has been identified for production of Neem based bio-pesticides. IPM concept is being promoted through 26 Central Integrated Pest Management Centres located in 22 States and one UT. These Centres are engaged in mass production and field releases of bio-control agents and training of extension functionaries and farmers in IPM skills by conducting Farmers' Field Schools. Grants-in-aid are released to the States and U.Ts. for setting up of State Bio-control Laboratories for mass production of bio-control agents. As a result, the use of Neem based bio-pesticides has increased from 83 MT (technical grade) during 1994-95 to 686 MT (technical grade) during

1999-2000. Similarly, the use of *Bacillus Thuringiensis* (Bt) has increased from 40 MT (technical grade) to 71 MT during the same period.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

**Recommendation No. 21 (Para No. 5.27)**

The Committee note that Institute of Pesticide Formulation Technology was established as a non-profit making organisation on May 31, 1991. The main function of this Institute is development and production of state of the art user and environment friendly pesticide formulations. Since its inception, IPFT has been pursuing steadily to establish a healthy rapport with the pesticide industry for the production of user and environment friendly pesticide formulations for large-scale exploitation thereby promoting safer and efficient pesticides formulations. The Institute has been progressing in the direction of financial self-reliance. IPFT has been able to meet 27% of the revenue expenditure out of its income from operation in 2000-1. They have proposed a grant of Rs. 116 lakhs to make the lab complex functional. The Institute has been trying to enter into various collaborative projects on applied research in association with different agencies like ICAR, CSIR, DBT, Ministry of Environment etc. and these projects have been submitted to the Government. The Committee would like to point out that in one earlier recommendations they had recommended for creation of a separate cadre of technological officers and scientists in the Institute and express their happiness that due to creation of this cadre IPFT has been able to consolidate its position effectively and they are now trying to get GLP, ISO 9002-8000 and ISO 14000-18000 status within a year. The Committee hope that this will certainly bring the capability of the Institute within few laboratories having recognition and this will also improve the earning of the Institute. They, therefore, recommend that the Government should provide all the desired grants and approved the pending proposals of IPFT within the shortest possible time. The Committee also desire that the Ministry should take all initiatives to implement all the recommendations of Expenditure Reforms Commission with regard to IPFT without any delay. They also recommend that the status of this institute should be raised to national importance equal or similar to that of National Institute of Pharmaceutical Education and Research (NIPER).

### Reply of the Government

Adequate funds are being made available to IPFT. The Department has made a total provision of Rs. 17 crores during the 10th Plan looking into the activities of IPFT in the various areas of pesticide eco & environment friendly formulation development analytical method development, residue and persistence studies of pesticides in soil and water, plant and foliage and allied data generation. Moreover IPFT is contemplating to set up a state of art laboratory catering to the analysis of chemical entities under the OPCW regime and also a laboratory of analyzing bio-pesticide and pesticide residues, analysis in drinking water.

During 2003-04 a budget provision of Rs. 3.58 crores has been made for IPFT as detailed:

(a) For day-to-day activities of IPFT	Rs. 75 lakhs.
(b) Neem Project	Rs. 50 lakhs.
(c) RENPAP Activities	Rs. 20 lakhs.
(d) Development of ETP and cleaner technologies	Rs. 01 lakhs
(e) Capital Fund	Rs. 2.12 lakhs
Total	Rs. 358. lakhs.

In terms of the recommendations of the Expenditure Reforms Commission a High Powered Committee to review the functioning of IPFT was constituted. The Report of that Committee was received and has been accepted. Necessary action is being taken for its implementation. The present activities of IPFT have not reached a level to declare it as an institute of national importance.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

#### Recommendation No. 22 (Para No. 5.28)

The Committee find that there are several chemicals which are banned in other countries but are being used in our country. These chemicals have an established adverse effect on human health and/or the environment. The Committee do not agree with the justification

given by the Ministry of Agriculture about the use of these pesticides. In Committee's view, the safety should not be compromised at the cost of cheaper substitutes. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Government should undertake a scientific study in respect of each pesticide which is banned or restricted in other countries and discard/ban all such chemicals which have deleterious effect on human health.

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

It is submitted that there is hardly any pesticide that is banned across the globe, but is in use in India. The pesticides which are banned in some country are, at the same time, in use in many other countries which basically highlights the fact that ban of pesticides or otherwise is linked with local conditions. Therefore, the fact that a pesticide is banned in some of the countries, should not be the only guiding principle to ban the same in India. However, the pesticides banned in other countries, along with other pesticides, are reviewed by the Government of India through various Expert Committees from time to time for continuing their use in the country or otherwise. The Government constituted Expert Committees under the Chairmanship of Dr. S.N. Banerjee (1984), Dr. K.V. Raman (1995) and Prof. R.B. Singh (1998) to review the continued use or otherwise of Pesticides. Based on the recommendation of the Expert Committees, the use of pesticides is continued, restricted or banned.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

#### **Recommendation No. 24 (Para No. 6.20)**

The Committee note that Bio-technology has revolutionized agriculture around the world. In India, it has started playing greater role in India's Agriculture Research. The Committee appreciate the work of Indian scientists in India field of Bio-technology during the last 11-12 years. They have played an important role in implementation of Integrated Pest Management Programme. But, the Committee are not satisfied with the performance in field demonstration of the standardized, cost-effective and commercially viable mass-production technologies of bio-pesticides/bio-control agents. The Committee desire that the Department of Bio-technology should continue their efforts vigorously to develop more technologies of bio-control agents/bio-pesticides. However, only laboratory based researches and meetings/

seminars are not the ultimate objective of such important researches. All these should reach to the user level. Therefore, the Committee desire that the Department of Bio-technology should develop better coordination with Ministry of Agriculture and State Governments to demonstrate and spread their R&D efforts regarding the use of bio-pesticides in all agro-climatic zones of the country.

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

Department of Bio-technology has made concerted efforts towards the development of bio-pesticide technology in a systematic way during a period of 12-13 years by launching various programmes. DBT had established a National Bio-control R&D Network in 1989 to study the control of pest diseases and weeds of economically important crops in the country. A number of R&D projects have been implemented at various ICAR/CSIR National Institutes and State Agricultural Universities (SAUs) throughout the country. The main aim of this network programme is to develop better bio-pesticide formulations as well as to develop cost effective commercially viable and their large scale frontline field demonstrations in varied agro climatic zones.

For the large scale adaptation of the bio-pesticide technology under IPM and their adoption by the farmers, the Department of Bio-technology has launched a time bound goal oriented Mission Mode Programme on "Development, production and demonstration of bio control agents under IPM" during the year 1993-95. Under this programme, 20 production units and two repository centres were set up in 14 States of various agro climatic zones and substantial area of land was covered managing pests and diseases of economically important regional crops of different States representing various agro climatic zones of the country.

The economics of IPM have been established by working out the cost benefit ratio in several crops in IPM/Non IPM plots/trails. Through this programme, the cost of crop protection was optimized and income/profit was maximized. Successful demonstration trails were organized as per recommendations of the State Department of Agriculture in various States.

The Department has also launched a major R&D programme in 1998-99 for the purpose of integrating the use of bio-pesticides/natural enemies along with other components of IPM and INM for increasing agricultural productivity in existing crop ecosystems of various agroclimatic zones. Through this programme, demonstration of



preservation of Eco-system has been done in identified clusters/adopted villages by developing IPM modules in different cropping system. This programme has been implemented at 14 centres in 12 States. The cost benefit ratio of IPM and INM modules, worked out at large scale trials showed significant tilt in favour of adopting the technology by farmers in different crops.

Popularization of bio-pesticides technology is one of the important component of the overall bio-control programme in order to create general awareness among the farmers for the large scale use of bio-control agents under IPM and also to develop farmers' oriented technology packages for large scale adaptation. At the instance of DBT, popularization is being done in various States by organizing several extension activities and by imparting training to the farmers.

Throughout the implementation of this programmer, DBT has worked in close coordination with the Ministry of Agriculture and State Governments. Department has constituted an expert Task Force on 'Biopesticides and Crop Management' for the purpose of proper review and monitoring of the on-going projects and recommendation of the new projects. The Task Force includes members from Ministry of agriculture and various State Agriculture Universities/ICAR institutions.

There has been good interaction even in policy formulation and regulatory measures between DBT and Directorate of Plant Protection Quarantine & Storage, department of Agriculture & Cooperation, Ministry of agriculture. The Department organized an interactive workshop on "Ecofriendly Technologies of Bio-pesticides and Bio-fertilizers for Crop Management" in April, 2000. A compendium was brought out on this occasion. Information made available in this publication is useful for the entrepreneurs and farmers (copy enclosed).

Thus, through various DBT's programmes, considerable success has been achieved in terms of development of bio-control products/formulations and cost effective commercially viable mass production technologies of various bio-control agents and their bio-efficacy demonstrations in farmers field at multiplication in varied agro climatic zones in substantial area of 88000 ha. in the country. This has been possible due to a complete, effective and strong synergy between DBT and Ministry of Agriculture and Directorate of Plant Protection.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I, dated 18.08.2003]

### CHAPTER III

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

##### **Recommendation No. 1 (Para No. 1.9)**

India is predominantly an agricultural country and maximum population of the country depends on agriculture. The Committee note that food production has increased several folds after independence. This all has happened due to irrigation improvement, high yielding seed varieties, balanced use of fertilizers, high quality plant protection, Integrated Pest Management and education to farmers. The Committee also visualize that Indian economy's dependence on agriculture will not come down in respect of its economy and productivity improvement will be the key issue in future. In Committee's view, higher productivity can be achieved only through a high quality of plant protection. The Committee find that greatest challenge before us is to step crop losses due to pests, which is estimated at about 50% of our total food production and 20-30% of sown crops. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Government should prepare a comprehensive time bound scheme to develop a high quality plant protection system in the country. The Committee also desire that this policy should be compatible with IPM principles, it should prefer the use of low dose, quickly degrading, pest specific and low residue chemicals. Moreover, the policy should also ensure the safety in manufacture, warehousing, transportation and use of chemicals.

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

As per the National Policy on Agriculture, environment friendly approach-Integrated Pest Management (IPM)—has been adopted as the main plank of Plant Protection. In consonance of this Strategy, the dependence on chemical pesticides is being reduced gradually. The Government of India is also promoting the use of bio-pesticides. For this purpose, simplified guidelines/data requirements have been evolved for registration of bio-pesticides. During the validity of provisional registration, use of bio-pesticides is allowed, which is a special dispensation accorded only to the bio-pesticides.

Well-developed quality plant protection system, compatible with IPM principles, already exists in the country. Development of a quality plant protection system is a continuous process which has to be modified and updated, depending on the prevailing insect-pests, disease and weed situation. So far as introduction of new molecules/formulations is concerned, it is basically confined to the private sector and the Government have very little role in developing new molecules. However, the latest trend is in favour of introduction of low dose, Bio-degradable and safer molecules/formulations in the country.

Chapter VII of the Insecticides Rules, 1971, is dedicated to transport and storage of insecticides in transit by rail, road or water. Similarly Chapter V is dedicated to packing and labelling and Chapter VIII for safety in manufacture, etc. As such, the concerns expressed by the Committee are adequately covered under the provisions of the said Rules.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

**Recommendation No. 2 (Para No. 1.10)**

The Committee observe that the matters relating to pesticides are being handled by two Ministries. Chemicals and Fertilizers Ministry promotes the production of chemicals whereas, the Ministry of agriculture regulates, registers and monitors the quality and supply of pesticides. The Committee observe that this type of distribution of responsibility requires very good coordination between the Ministries at every level starting from assessment of demand, registration, quality and quantity of production and supply of pesticides in the market. The Committee find that several problems of pesticides industry can be resolved through improvement of coordination between these Ministries. In Committee's view, after an appropriate assessment of national and international demand of pesticides, the quantity approved for production can be regulated at the stage of Registration itself. It has come to the notice of the Committee that at the stage of registration the demand and capacity of other producers is not considered. Due to this reason similar pesticides are produced by different manufacturers. This situation affects all concerned in the industry and confuses farmers also. The Committee, therefore, desire that both the Ministries should develop a better mechanism to coordinate with each other in the matter of pesticides so that there is better management in assessment, production, supply and quality control of pesticides.

### **Reply of the Government**

Prior to the liberalization process which began in 1991, licences for manufacture of various products were given after a study of the demand supply scenario. However, as part of liberalization process, the pesticide sector was delicensed. Now pesticide companies are free to produce those pesticides for which they hold valid registration from the Registration Committee. Due to multiple producers and a competitive market, the farmer has a benefit of better quality pesticide at lower prices due to competition amongst producers.

2. As regards better coordination between the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation and Department of Chemicals and Petrochemicals, the Government has set up an Inter-Ministerial Group of Officers under the Chairmanship of Secretary (C&PC) to go into various issues concerning the pesticide industry. This Group has representatives from the concerned Government Departments, including Department of Agriculture and Cooperation as also representatives of the pesticide industry. The Group meets regularly to discuss various problems faced by the industry.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I, dated 18.08.2003]

### **Recommendation No. 7 (Para No. 3.13)**

The Committee note that Indian Agrochem industry has been an active exporter for nearly 25 years now and has built up a good reputation as a reliable supplier, mainly of generic, off-patent products. Global product portfolio is changing very fast and India can be a good supplier of new products under special arrangements of sourcing since most of the products would be having patents abroad. Under these circumstances India's image as a supplier of quality products should further be consolidated. The Committee, therefore, recommend that to make India as supplier of high quality agrochemicals, all exporters of agro-chemicals must be brought under ISO certification. The Committee also desire that to avoid the lowering of export prices, the crowding of several manufacturers for same molecule should be controlled.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Department of Agriculture and Cooperation had issued a notification making BIS certification mandatory. However, the operation

of the notification has been stayed by Hon'ble High Court at Ahmedabad. On export front, manufacturers' are going for ISO certification wherever it helps them in export.

Regarding the recommendation to restrict registration of large numbers of manufacturers for the same molecule, it is submitted that the policy of the Government is to promote free market and competition amongst suppliers so that prices of pesticides are kept in control. Moreover, the overall policy being of movement towards a level playing field, it may be difficult to restrict the number of manufacturers for the same molecule. It is also felt that a larger number of manufacturers would help keep prices of pesticides in check and would also ensure production of better quality pesticides, which would also contribute to growth of pesticide exports.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I, dated 18.08.2003]

#### **Recommendation No. 9 (Para No. 4.47)**

The Committee note that under the Insecticide Act, 1968 compulsory registration of all the pesticides is provided. The manufacture, import, export and use of chemical pesticides can be initiated only after proper registration, after a close scrutiny of the data about bio-efficiency and safety of human beings, wild life, birds, domestic animals, beneficial parasites and predators. At present, the registration takes 6-12 month's time. The process has been computerized recently to make it more transparent and less time consuming. After a detailed discussion with the concerned Ministries and Pesticides Manufacturers, the Committee have reached a conclusion that there is an urgent need for taking steps to make this system more balanced, equitable and efficient. The Committee find that during the scrutiny of data regarding a pesticide, current demands are not being appropriately considered. More than one companies are being permitted to produce the demanded quantity of particular pesticide. This is harmful both for industry as well as farmers. Industry is not sure about the quantity of a pesticide they should produce since the same agrochemical is being produced by another manufacturer. Moreover, the farmer is also confused between various options of the same agrochemical. Due to this situation, a manufacturer is always in doldrums. The Committee welcome the computerization of the system done by the Ministry of Agriculture to streamline the procedure of sanctioning various

formulations. The Committee, however, desire that the registration process should be modified further to make it more practical in terms of time and tests required. Cumbersome paperwork and bureaucratic hassle must be reduced. The modified system should be consistent with current demands, concerns of manufacturers, farmers, consumers and environmental groups in a pragmatic manner.

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

The Simplification of data requirement, fast track scrutiny of applications and computerization of Registration System has already made registration of insecticides more balanced, equitable and efficient. It is, however, necessary to encourage healthy competition among companies to produce pesticides so that the farmers get quality pesticides at reasonable price. The manufacturers generally produce the quantities, as per the market demand condition. It will not be legal for the Registration Committee to reject the application of other manufacturers on the ground that some manufacturers are already registered for the same agro-chemical. It is also submitted that the procedural streamlining and simplification is an on-going process in the functioning of Registration Committee as Registration Committee is itself competent to make their own rules for undertaking the duties and jobs assigned to them.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I, dated 18.08.2003]

#### **Recommendation No. 12 (Para No. 4.50)**

Section 24 of the Insecticides Act relates to 'Reports of Insecticide Analyst'. The Committee have received reports through the representatives of Pesticides Associations that the data produced by the Ministry of agriculture during Annual Conference on Crop Protection indicated that samples of insecticides failed by the State Laboratories were very often passed by the Central Insecticides Laboratory. This all creates a doubt on the test reports of the State Laboratories. The Committee express their great concern about reliability of test reports of State Laboratories and feel that any sample failure directly affects the reputation of the Company. This is why the genuine manufacturers are gradually losing faith in the performance of tests at

these laboratories. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Government should make a provision in the Insecticides Act, 1968 for joint analysis by an independent laboratory in the residence of the representatives of both the manufacturer and the departmental laboratory in case of any doubt in the analysis of any sample. The Committee also recommend that in case of the results being contrary to the reports of the departmental laboratory, the responsibility should be fixed on the concerned analyst for giving a wrong report. In Committee's view this will make the analyst as well as industry more responsible and alert.

### **Reply of the Government**

The Central Government is already running a scheme of establishing/strengthening of State Pesticides Testing Laboratories (SPTLs) in the States with 100% Central assistance for non-recurring expenditure on buildings and equipments. During the Annual Zonal Conferences of Rabi and Kharif the functioning of SPTLs is also discussed and States are asked to take advantage of this Central Scheme. Besides this, there is a provision in the Insecticides Act that the dealer/manufacturer can request for retesting of the sample from the Central Insecticide Laboratory of the Central Government established under Section 16 of Insecticides Act within 28 days of the communication of the test result of SPTL. Under the Act, the Central Insecticides Laboratory is established as a referral laboratory and its test findings are final. In a way, CIL performs the role of an independent laboratory because neither the Insecticides Inspector nor the Insecticide Analyst of the State Government is involved in the process of testing at CIL. Since the testing function is a regulatory function as mentioned above, it is better that it remains with the Public Sector. There is also a provision in the Insecticides Act that the Government can assign the functions of the CIL to any other prominent laboratory *e.g.* that of CSIR or ICAR.

The Committee has pointed out the anomaly of differences in result of testing from different laboratories. To deal with this possibility, the provision of re-testing at the CIL has been kept in the Act. However, different results from the testing at different laboratories seem related to various human technical skills, procedural aspects, time gap in two testings, possibility of change of samples, etc. The Ministry considers this issue a management issue and the Department of Agriculture and Cooperation has taken up many initiatives to address this issue. The Government has intensified its efforts for improving the testing facilities

at the State level by getting technical audit of the State Pesticides Testing Laboratories to ensure that proper instruments and equipments are in place for conducting of pesticide sample analysis by instrumentation method. The State Governments have also been asked to evolve and put in place fool-proof coding systems so that the chances of nexus between the industry and the laboratory analyst and other staff are minimized. Further, the skills of the analyst in the State Pesticide Testing Laboratories are being improved through suitable training programmes. The State Governments have also been asked to get NABL certification for the State Pesticides Testing Laboratories which will also improve the administrative management of the said laboratories. Government has to ensure that quality pesticides are supplied to the farming community and to ensure that aim regulatory mechanism is a must. Regulation against erring manufacturers and dealers has to be independent of persons involved in manufacturing or sale of pesticides. The Government has taken steps to streamline the regulatory mechanism to see that manufacturers and dealers are not unduly harassed.

A system of joint analysis, if established, would result in a deluge of applications for re-analysis from parties whose samples have failed the tests at various State Pesticides Testing Laboratories, which may be beyond the capacity of the Central Insecticide Laboratory. Further, the Central Insecticide Laboratory is a referral laboratory and is the only laboratory where samples are being referred for testing and it would be virtually impractical to increase the work load thereof by such magnitude. The system of joint testing would increase the probability of malpractices and corrupt practices in testing of pesticides, as the identity of the analyst would be known to the pesticide manufacturers and this could result in a nexus which is avoidable. Another practical difficulty associated with the joint testing will be that the labs will become crowded place, having many outsiders in the lab area, endangering the scientific environment of the labs. As there are bound to be differences in the views of and methodologies to be followed by two analysts, it would be difficult to arrive at a common understanding of exact methodology and test procedures or equipment calibration and usage and in almost each case a third analyst may be required to sort out the differences which will not be a practical proposition. Because of practical problems in joint testing and disclosure of samples, Department of Agriculture and Cooperation presently do not favour the idea of joint testing.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]



## CHAPTER IV

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

#### Recommendation No. 3 (Para No. 1.11)

To regulate the pesticides sector is mainly related to State Governments. As such Agriculture is a State subject but overall governance of pesticides related matters is under Central Government. It has been brought to the notice of this Committee that Ministry of Agriculture has been issuing several instructions from time to time to regulate the important issues relating to pesticides but due to reluctant approach of State Governments, those are not being implemented. Since States have to play most important role in regulation of pesticides related matters, the Committee, desire that the Central Government should develop a better coordination mechanism with the State Governments through establishing a Coordination Committee involving all the States so that the policies of the Central Government may be implemented in all the States properly.

#### Reply of the Government

Regarding coordination of the Central Government with State Governments, it is submitted that the requisite mechanism is already in place in the form of two National level Conferences and two Zonal Conferences, which involve participation of all the State Governments and where all issues relating to implementation of the Insecticides Act and rules made thereunder are discussed and problems faced by the State Governments in the process of implementation are addressed. In addition, references on specific issues including directions are issued to the States, as and when required. Besides, the Central Government organizes several training programmes for updating the knowledge of State Governments functionaries responsible for enforcement of the provisions of the Insecticides Act, 1968 relating to supply of quality pesticides. Technical auditing of State Pesticides Testing laboratories is also done to assess their efficiency and grants-in-aid are released for strengthening these laboratories as well as for establishment of new

laboratories. Therefore, a separate Committee for the same purpose does not seem to be warranted.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

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

(Please see Para No. 9 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation No. 4 (Para No. 2.15)**

The Committee observe the consumption pattern of pesticides and find enough scope of improvement in it. The Committee have specifically observed that insecticides have traditionally accounted for majority of agro-chemicals. They have also observed the beginning of wider use of weedicides and fungicides. The Committee however, do not agree with the justification given by the Ministry of Agriculture that lower rate of consumption of pesticides in most of the States is a healthy sign since it signifies lesser pest outbreaks as well as adoption of environment friendly approach of plant protection by the farmers. The Committee note that there is an annual loss of Rs. 90,000 crores per annum due to pests. Pests are affecting the standing crops or grains in each State. They may be little variation in consumption quantity of pesticides from one State to another State depending upon size of State and specific crops but logically the gap should not be much wider. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Government should undertake a scientific study to assess the consumption pattern of pesticides in each State. Thereafter, based on the study, steps should be taken to remove the imbalance in the consumption pattern of pesticides. The Committee also desire that the Government should take special initiatives to popularize the use of herbicides and fungicides with low residues to minimize the losses due to vigorous growth of herbs in fields and growth of fungi on fruits and vegetables.

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

There are many reasons for different use patterns of pesticides in different States. The use of pesticides depends on the nature of crop, weather conditions, awareness of farmers, availability of distribution network including cooperatives, etc. However, DAC maintains that the reduction in the use of pesticides in India is a healthy sign, especially in view of the growing concerns that high pesticides consumption has

been a major cause for physiological disorders in people exposed to them for long periods and that contamination of ground water and food products on account of pesticides has resulted in presence of undesirably high level of pesticide residues therein and has also become a major reason for rejection of our exports of agricultural produce.

The Government is promoting organic farming and Integrated Pest Management approach in agriculture with a view to reduce the dangers of pesticide and other chemical residue. Although the use of weedicides and fungicides is increasing, the DAC is taking initiatives to popularize the use of bio-pesticides in treating seeds/soil. The emphasis is on timely spraying of fungicides on fruits and vegetables to minimize crop loss due to pests and diseases.

There is no shortage of availability of pesticides in any of the States and the consumption of pesticides in the States is dependent on the above mentioned factors.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

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

(Please see Para No. 15 of Chapter-I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation No. 8 (Para No. 3.15)**

The Committee express their great concern over the issue of questionable quality of some foreign countries being dumped into Indian markets at ridiculous prices without proper back up data on toxicity. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Government should be very vigilant and active on this front and take quick action by either restricting the imports or imposing appropriate anti-dumping duties to stop such illegal imports of non-registered agro-chemicals from foreign sources.

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

With the aim of preventing imports of inferior quality pesticides, a prohibition is already in place in import of any insecticide without registration in terms of Section 17 (1) (c) and Section 18 (1) (a) of the Insecticides Act. Moreover, the Registration Committee grants

registration certificate only after ensuring that the pesticide being imported conforms to various parameters stipulated thereon, including those relating to bio-efficacy and toxicity.

As regards the anti-dumping duties, requests for imposition of such duties are dealt with by the Department of Commerce as per the procedure laid down and after detailed investigations.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

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

(Please see Para No. 18 of Chapter I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation No. 10 (Para No. 4.48)**

Section 9 of Insecticides Act, 1968 deals with registration of pesticides. Under the Act, compulsory registration of pesticides is provided. The manufacture, import, export and use of chemical pesticides can be initiated only after proper registration. The Committee note that as a regular system of streamlining process, the guidelines for registration of insecticides under Section 9 (3) and 9 (4) have been streamlined. The computerization of formats, labels, leaflets, etc. has been done and checklists for expeditious scrutiny of application for registration have been introduced. Secretary in the Ministry of Agriculture has informed that the Ministry will simplify the process of registration further. It has come to the notice of the Committee that the Ministry is considering a provision regarding allotment of provisional registration valid for two years and the final certificate will be issued after satisfaction of the Committee about the necessary manufacturing facilities having been set up and production started by the company/firm/entrepreneur and production of ISI certificate. The Committee do not favour the imposition of any such condition in regard to issuing of temporary registration since this will simply hinder and complicate the registration process and also create suspense in the mind of manufacturer. The Committee, therefore, desire that the Ministry should not incorporate these provisions in the proposed amendment of the Act. The Committee also desire that provisions should be made in the Act whereby registration for import of pesticides is made only if the importer has manufacturing facilities. The producer of such imported pesticides should also be disclosed.

### Reply of the Government

On the direction of the Standing Committee on Agriculture, the amendment to the Insecticides act, 1968 is under consideration of DAC. The views and comments of various Departments/Ministries have already been obtained. A provision regarding temporary registration is being contemplated to ensure that any body applying for registration has an intention of manufacturing. This has been proposed so that only genuine applicants apply for registration of insecticides. It has been noticed in the recent past that a large number of applicants have obtained registration but they have not established manufacturing facilities. Besides such an arrangement would help in improving the quality of insecticides produced in the country. Also ISI certification is being considered to ensure supply of quality pesticides to farmers. These amendments to the Act will, in any case, be presented before the Cabinet as well as will have to be considered by the Parliament.

As the import of insecticides is not always for manufacturing a formulation, but also for direct sale, hence it will not be practical to insist that the importer should have manufacturing facility while granting registration for import.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 25 of Chapter-I of the Report)

### Recommendation No. 11 (Para No. 4.49)

The Committee note that at present 45 Pesticides Testing Laboratories are functional in 18 States and one Union Territory. The Central Government have also established two Regional Pesticides Testing Laboratories to supplement the resources of States/UTs who do not either have a Pesticides Testing Laboratory or adequate analysis capacity or adequate analysis facility for monitoring the quality of Pesticides. There is also a Central Insecticides Laboratory. Samples which are referred by the Courts of Law or referred on the directions of Courts of Law are analysed at this laboratory. However, the Committee find that these laboratories have to test samples drawn from 50,000 MT (in terms of technical grade pesticides) of as many as 165 types of pesticides. Obviously the number of laboratories functional

at present is not adequate. This has been admitted by the Ministry of Agriculture also. The Committee, therefore, recommend that the number of Pesticides Testing Laboratories should be substantially increased. They desire that such Laboratories should also be set up at district level to expedite the process.

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

Committee's recommendation that the number of pesticides testing laboratories should be substantially increased is welcomed by the Department of Agriculture & Co-operation (DAC). It is pertinent to mention here that the Government of India is concerned about monitoring the quality of pesticides reaching the farming community, Consequently, the Central Government has been extending financial assistance to the States for strengthening of existing and setting up of new Pesticide Testing Laboratories since Eighth Five Year Plan. So far, Rs. 6.79 crore have been released to 20 States and one UT for the purpose. It is proposed to continue this component in the 10th Five-Year Plan also. Therefore, the emphasis is on creation of better facilities for analysis of samples in State Pesticide Testing Laboratories (SPTLs) and on creation of more such facilities in various States of the country. However, the issue of setting up of such laboratories at the district level depends on the concerned State Governments.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

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

(Please see Para No. 28 of Chapter-I of the Report)

## CHAPTER V

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

#### **Recommendation No. 18 (Para No. 5.24)**

The Committee observe that major exposure to pesticide occurs in the fields during their application. The Committee also note that all the instructions regarding safety clothing, first aid and antidotes are printed on labels and indicated. They know that there is a network of extension functionaries in the State Departments of Agriculture who is supposed to do this work. But the Committee are of the view that teaching of farmers has a very little impact. In Committee's view farmers can be benefited only through what they are demonstrated in the field and training to educated farmers. The Committee agree with the difficulties in training large number of people. They, however, desire that the concept of promotion of farmer's clubs and self help groups to train a number of farmers who can train more people in groups should be encouraged. Pesticides manufacturers associations have also shown their interest in arranging such programmes with the support of Central Government Agricultural Institutions and State Governments. Under these circumstances, the Committee desire that the Government should take all initiative in this matter on priority basis to educate and train more and more farmers with the help of State Governments, Manufacturers and NGOs. The Committee feel that only this kind of joint effort through sharing of expertise, experience and funds can give good results.

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

A booklet in English and Hindi has been prepared with pictorial presentations on safe use of pesticides and do's and don'ts. This booklet has been given a wide circulations and being used by the farmers.

Doctors at grassroots levels are trained on different aspects of pesticides including diagnosis management and treatment of pesticides poisoning. Till toady, 1,318 doctors have been trained during the period 1995-2002.

In addition, 26 Central Integrated Pest Management Centres located in 22 States and 1 UT are involved in imparting training to farmers in IPM including safe and judicious use of pesticides by organizing Farmers' Field Schools for different crops involving them for the whole season of the crop. Farmers trained in the Farmers' Field Schools further propagate IPM and awareness about pesticides to the fellow farmers in due course. Apart from FFSs being organised by CIPMCs of the Central Government, some of the State Governments also organize FFSs from their own resources.

The Government is in agreement with the view of the Committee that there is a need for expanding the training programmes for farmers so that more and more farmers can be trained with the help of NGOs, States Governments, Krishi Vigyan Kendras and farmers groups as also pesticide manufacturer. It may be clarified at the outset that the Government has not received any concrete proposal/invitation from the Private Sector, including the Pesticide manufacturers and associations thereof, on the issue of collaboration and joint efforts in the matter of expansion of farmers education.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

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

(Please *see* Para No. 43 of Chapter-I of the Report)

#### **Recommendation No. 19 (Para No. 5.25)**

The Committee desire that the Government should do everything to strengthen and spread the concept of agri-clinic and agri-business of the Ministry of Agriculture. The Committee however, find that at present there is no incentive to educated youth for showing interest in such programmes. They, therefore, suggest that the Ministry of Agriculture should take all initiatives at their own level in coordination with other Ministries to provide all the possible incentives to the young educated persons interested in such programmes. The Committee treat this as the most appropriate step for the welfare of Agriculture Sector as well as unemployed youth.



### Reply of the Government

A new Central Sector Scheme 'Establishment of a Network of Agri Clinics & Agric Business Centres' was launched during the year 2001-2002 by the Department of Agriculture & Cooperation. The present scheme aims at utilizing the services of unemployed agriculture graduates to provide extension service to the farmers on payment basis by setting up their private ventures and thus use the large pool of agriculture graduates available while creating opportunities for their self employment. The proposed Agri clinics/Agri business centers are expected to provide various services to the farmers on payment, which will help them in reaping the optimum benefits of the latest production technology. These centers will be run on the revenue earned by providing services to the farmers, especially small and marginal ones. The farmers in the North-Eastern States and hill States will also be able to benefit from the scheme. Twenty-one economically viable activities, including setting up of Vermiculture units, production of bio-fertilisers, bio-pesticides, bio-control agents etc. have been identified. The Scheme was launched during the financial year 2001-02. Wide publicity was given to the Agri Clinics & Agri Business Centres Scheme by Small Farmer Agri Business Consortium (SFAC) calling for applications from the eligible and willing entrepreneurs for undergoing training in the various Institutes selected for this purpose. There has been very good response to the scheme and till 31st January 2003, 16159 applications were received. 2313 candidates have already been trained in the 1st and 2nd cycle and in the 3rd cycle, 1804 candidates are undergoing training in 60 selected institutions across the country. It is proposed to provide 25%/33.33% of the project cost in form of back ended capital subsidy, with special provision for North Eastern States by the Government through National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD). Planning Commission has approved implementation of the training component of the scheme during the Tenth Five-Year Plan. The subsidy component of the scheme is under consideration of the Commission.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I dated 18.08.2003]

### Comments of the Committee

(Please see Para No. 46 of Chapter-I of the Report)

**Recommendation No. 23 (Para No. 6.19)**

The Committee observe that R&D efforts of Indian companies have been focussed on developing processes to produce generic products and at times also patented products as permitted by Indian Patents Act. The ability to develop and manufacture many sophisticated products in a cost-effective manner has resulted in availability of large number of products at affordable prices to Indian farmers. It has also helped to export a number of products to international markets earning foreign exchange. The Committee are not satisfied with the present expenditure on R&D to the tune of 2-3% of total turnover and that too on process modification and improvement. They note that very few new molecules have been introduced. The Committee observe the future trends of pesticides industry and accept that the prohibitively high cost of research, stiff registration procedures, pressures of adhering to regulatory norm are expected to lead to major changes in the industry. Survival of pesticides industry in the country will basically depend upon strong research capability. In respect of patent for production of pharmaceuticals, food and chemical products, our obligation arises only on 1.1.2005. Thereafter, Indian companies would not be able to manufacture new molecules/new products that are developed by the foreign companies even by adopting different process. The Committee therefore, desire that the Government should persuade the domestic companies of pesticide sector to spend larger amounts on R&D so that pesticides required in the country can be developed by domestic companies. The Committee also urge the Government that to protect the interests of Indian Industry as also the farmers/consumers they should provide all the incentives including duty free import of equipment required for R&D as it is being permitted for the drugs/pharmaceutical sector.

**Reply of the Government**

It is true that while the global agrochemical industry is preparing itself to introduce new formulations and products in the market to meet post-2005 patent regime, the Indian industry is yet to make the desired efforts in this direction. Various national laboratories involved in the sector have not found adequate enthusiasm among the agrochemical companies to fund new research activities particularly to discover new molecules and formulations. There are many reasons for it, which include high cost of registration in foreign countries as also the equipment required for R&D purposes.

An Apex Committee under the Chairmanship of Secretary (C&PC) with representatives from concerned Government Departments, agriculture universities, pesticide industry, R&D institutions in pesticide sector and agrochemical experts is being constituted to evolve an integrated perspective plan for identification of broad spectrum pesticides which should be the focus of R&D activities during the 10th Plan period.

The Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals has recommended to the Commerce Ministry to allow duty free import of R&D equipment for the pesticide industry.

[Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers, Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals, O.M. No. 25016/2/2002-Ch. I, dated 18.08.2003]

NEW DELHI;  
*August 19, 2003*  
*Sravana 28, 1925 (Saka)*

MULAYAM SINGH YADAV,  
*Chairman,*  
*Standing Committee on*  
*Petroleum & Chemicals.*

**APPENDIX I**

**MINUTES**

**SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHEMICALS & PETROCHEMICALS**

**A SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
PETROLEUM & CHEMICALS (2003)**

**First Sitting  
(11.06.2003)**

The Sub-Committee sat from 1100 hrs. to 1300 hrs.

**PRESENT**

Dr. Girija Vyas — *Convenor*

**MEMBERS**

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Shriprakash Jaiswal
3. Shri Mohan Rawale
4. Dr. Ram Lakhan Singh

*Rajya Sabha*

5. Shri Mool Chand Meena
6. Shri A.K.S. Vijayan

**SECRETARIAT**

1. Shri P.K. Grover — *Director*
2. Shri J.N. Oberoi — *Officer on Special Duty*
3. Dr. Ram Raj Rai — *Assistant Director*

**Representatives of Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals**

1. Shri Vinay Kohli — *Secretary*
2. Smt. Harmit Singh — *Director*
3. Dr. D. Sengupta — *Director (IPFT, Gurgaon)*

**Representative of Department of Biotechnology**

Dr. Seema Wahab — Advisor

**Representatives of Department of Agriculture & Cooperation**

- |                     |   |   |
|---------------------|---|---|
| 1. Shri B.S. Minhas | — | Additional Secretary                                  |
| 2. Dr. C.R. Hazra   | — | Agriculture Commissioner                              |
| 3. Shri S.S. Prasad | — | Director (Plant Protection) &<br>Secretary (CIB & RC) |

At the outset, Hon'ble Convenor, Sub-Committee on Chemicals & Petrochemicals welcomed the Members of the Sub-Committee and described the objective of the sitting. Then, after formal introduction of the representatives of Ministry of Chemicals & Fertilisers (Department of Chemicals & Petrochemicals) and Ministry of Agriculture (Department of Agriculture & Cooperation), the Sub-Committee took their oral evidence on action taken by the Government on the recommendations/observations contained in 37th Report of the Standing Committee on Petroleum & Chemicals (2002) on 'Production and Availability of Pesticides'. The Sub-Committee specifically observed that the replies as submitted by the Government were not specific and convincing. The main issues in regard to which the Sub-Committee wanted a clarification included the initiatives taken by the Government for balanced use of pesticides in all the States and proposed provisions for amendment in Insecticides Act, 1968. This included the proposed provision relating to temporary registration of pesticides, joint analysis of samples of pesticides, poor quality of analysis reports of the State pesticides laboratories, stringent punishment to manufacturers of spurious pesticides and fixation of responsibility of Inspectors and Analysts in collection and analysis of samples. The other issues which came up for detailed discussion included the difficulties in implementation of Insecticides Act in States, coordination between Central Government and State Governments in insecticides related matters, role of agricultural universities in analysis of pesticides samples etc. During the course of discussion, the Sub-Committee expressed their anguish over the delay in finalising the amendments in Insecticides Act, 1968. The Ministry of Agriculture informed the Sub-Committee that the Government will finalise these amendments by the Winter Session of Parliament positively.

3. The verbatim record of the proceedings has been kept.

*The Sub-Committee then adjourned.*

APPENDIX II

MINUTES

SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHEMICALS & PETROCHEMICALS

A SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
PETROLEUM & CHEMICALS (2003)

**Second Sitting**

(18.08.2003)

The Sub-Committee sat from 1000 hrs. to 1030 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri Ashok N. Mohol — *In the Chair*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Shri P. Mohan
3. Dr. V. Saroja

*Rajya Sabha*

4. Shri V.V. Raghavan
5. Shri Y. Venkat Rao

SECRETARIAT

- |                     |   |                           |
|---------------------|---|---------------------------|
| 1. Shri P.K. Grover | — | <i>Director</i>           |
| 2. Shri R.K. Saxena | — | <i>Under Secretary</i>    |
| 3. Shri J.N. Oberoi | — | <i>O.S.D.</i>             |
| 4. Dr. Ram Raj Rai  | — | <i>Assistant Director</i> |

In the absence of Hon'ble Convenor of the Sub-Committee on Chemicals & Petrochemicals, Members chose Shri Ashok N. Mohol to act as Convenor in terms of Rule 258 (3) of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha.

2. At the outset, Hon'ble Convenor welcomed the Members to the sitting of the Sub-Committee and explained the purpose of the day's meeting.

3. Thereafter, the Sub-Committee considered and adopted the Draft Action Taken Report on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-Seventh Report (13th Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Petroleum & Chemicals (2002) on 'Production and Availability of Pesticides'.

4. The Sub-Committee authorised the Convenor to finalise the Draft Report and submit the same to Hon'ble Chairman for consideration by the Standing Committee on Petroleum & Chemicals.

*The Sub-Committee then adjourned.*

APPENDIX III

MINUTES

STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM & CHEMICALS (2003)

Seventh Sitting  
(19.08.2003)

The Committee sat from 1000 hrs. to 10.30 hrs.

PRESENT

Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav — *Chairman*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

2. Dr. (Smt.) Suguna Kumari Chellamella
3. Shri Khagen Das
4. Shri Harpal Singh Sathi
5. Shri Paban Singh Ghatowar
6. Shri Bijoy Handique
7. Shri Shriprakash Jaiswal
8. Shri Punnulal Mohale
9. Shri P. Mohan
10. Shri Ashok N. Mohol
11. Dr. Debendra Pradhan
12. Shri Ram Sajivan
13. Dr. (Smt.) V. Saroja
14. Dr. Ramesh Chand Tomar
15. Shri Prabhunath Singh
16. Dr. Ram Lakhani Singh
17. Shri A.K.S. Vijayan

*Rajya Sabha*

18. Shri Balkavi Bairagi
19. Shri Ram Nath Kovind
20. Shri Anil Kumar
21. Shri Kripal Parmar
22. Shri V.V. Raghavan
23. Ms. Mabel Rebello
24. Shri Thanga Tamilselvan



## SECRETARIAT

1. Shri P.K. Grover — *Director*
2. Shri J.N. Oberoi — *Officer on Special Duty*
3. Dr. Ram Raj Rai — *Assistant Director*

2. At the outset, Hon'ble Chairman welcomed the Members to the sitting and explained the purpose of the day's meeting.

3. Thereafter, he invited the Members to give their suggestions, if any, on the following draft Reports being considered for adoption:—

- |       |  |    |    |    |
|-------|--|----|----|----|
| (i)   | **   | ** | ** | ** |
| (ii)  | **   | ** | ** | ** |
| (iii) | **   | ** | ** | ** |
| (iv)  | Forty-Eighth Report on action taken by Government on the recommendations contained in the Thirty-Seventh Report (13th Lok Sabha) of the Standing Committee on Petroleum & Chemicals (2002) on 'Production and Availability of Pesticides': |    |    |    |
| (v)   | **   | ** | ** | ** |
| (vi)  | **   | ** | ** | ** |
| (vii) | **   | ** | ** | ** |

4. After some consideration, the Committee adopted the Reports subject to minor modifications.

5. The Committee, thereafter, authorised the Chairman to finalise the Reports after factual verification from the concerned Ministries/ Departments and present them to the Parliament.

6. The Committee placed on record their appreciation of the work done by all the Sub-Committees of the Standing Committee on Petroleum & Chemicals.

7. The Committee also placed on record their appreciation for the valuable assistance rendered to them by the officials of the Lok Sabha Secretariat attached to the Committee.

- |    |    |    |    |    |
|----|----|----|----|----|
| 8. | ** | ** | ** | ** |
|----|----|----|----|----|

*The Committee then adjourned.*

---

\*\*Matters not related to this Report.

#### APPENDIX IV

#### COMPOSITION OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS (2002)

Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav — *Chairman*

#### MEMBERS

#### *Lok Sabha*

2. Shri Ashok Argal
3. Dr. Chellamella Suguna Kumari
4. Shri Ram Chander Binda
5. Shri Ananda Mohan Biswas
6. Shri Padam Sen Choudhry
7. Prof. Kailasho Devi
8. Shri P.D. Elangovan
9. Shri Dilipkumar Mansukhlal Gandhi
10. Smt. Sheela Gautam
11. Shri Paban Singh Ghatowar
12. Shri Bijoy Handique
13. Shri Shriprakash Jaiswal
14. Shri C. Kuppusami
15. Shri Jagannath Mallick
16. Shri Punnulal Mohale
17. Shri P. Mohan
18. Shri Ashok N. Mohol
19. Dr. Debendra Pradhan
20. Shri Ram Sajivan
21. Shri Mohan Rawale
22. Shri Shyama Charan Shukla
23. Dr. V. Saroja
24. Dr. Chhatrapal Singh
25. Shri Prabhunath Singh
26. Shri Ramjiwan Singh
27. Dr. Ram Lakhan Singh
28. Shri Shankersinh Vaghela
29. Shri Ratilal Kalidas Varma
30. Dr. Girija Vyas

*Rajya Sabha*

31. Shri Balkavi Bairagi
- \*\*\*32. Shri Ram Nath Kovind
33. Shri Anil Kumar
- \*\*\*\*34. Vacant
35. Shri Rajiv Ranjan Singh 'Lalan'
36. Shri Mool Chand Meena
37. Shri Dipankar Mukherjee
- \*\*38. Shri Pritish Nandy
39. Shri Ahmed Patel
- \*\*\*40. Shri Keshubhai Savadasbhai Patel
41. Shri Yadlapati Venkat Rao
42. Ms. Mabel Rebello
43. Shri Gaya Singh
- \*44. Shri Thanga Tamilselvan
45. Prof. Ram Gopal Yadav

## SECRETARIAT

- |                       |   |                             |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri P.D.T. Achary | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri K.V. Rao      | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i>      |
| 3. Shri P.K. Grover   | — | <i>Director</i>             |
| 4. Shri R.K. Saxena   | — | <i>Under Secretary</i>      |
| 5. Dr. Ram Raj Rai    | — | <i>Assistant Director</i>   |

---

\* Nominated w.e.f. 8th April, 2002.

\*\* Nominated w.e.f. 8th May, 2002.

\*\*\* Nominated w.e.f. 14th May, 2002.

\*\*\*\* Vacancy caused consequent upon retirement of Shri Shyam Lal, MP (RS) from the membership of Rajya Sabha w.e.f. 21.11.2002.

APPENDIX V

COMPOSITION OF SUB-COMMITTEE ON CHEMICALS  
& PETROCHEMICALS

SUB-COMMITTEE OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON  
PETROLEUM & CHEMICALS (2002)

Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav—*Chairman*

2. Dr. Girija Vyas—*Convenor*

MEMBERS

*Lok Sabha*

3. Shri P.D. Elangovan
4. Shri Shriprakash Jaiswal
5. Shri C. Kuppusami
6. Shri P. Mohan
7. Shri Ashok N. Mohol
8. Shri Mohan Rawale
9. Dr. V. Saroja
10. Shri Ramjiwan Singh
11. Dr. Ram Lakhon Singh

*Rajya Sabha*

12. Shri Ram Nath Kovind
13. Shri Mool Chand Meena
14. Shri Pritish Nandy
15. Shri Yadlapati Venkat Rao
16. Shri Gaya Singh

SECRETARIAT

- |                       |   |                             |
|-----------------------|---|-----------------------------|
| 1. Shri P.D.T. Achary | — | <i>Additional Secretary</i> |
| 2. Shri K.V. Rao      | — | <i>Joint Secretary</i>      |
| 3. Shri P.K. Grover   | — | <i>Director</i>             |
| 4. Shri R.K. Saxena   | — | <i>Under Secretary</i>      |
| 5. Dr. Ram Raj Rai    | — | <i>Assistant Director</i>   |

**APPENDIX VI**  
(Vide Para 6 of the Introduction)

ANALYSIS OF THE ACTION TAKEN BY GOVERNMENT ON THE  
RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED IN THE THIRTY-SEVENTH  
REPORT (THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA) OF THE STANDING  
COMMITTEE ON PETROLEUM & CHEMICALS (2002) ON  
'PRODUCTION AND AVAILABILITY OF PESTICIDES'

I. Total No. of Recommendations.	24
II. Recommendations which have been accepted by the Government. (Vide Recommendations at Sl. Nos. 5, 6, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 22 and 24)	11
Percentage of Total	45.84%
III. Recommendations which the Committee do not desire to pursue in view of Government Reply. (Vide Recommendations at Sl. Nos. 1, 2, 7, 9 and 12)	5
Percentage of Total	20.83%
IV. Recommendations in respect of which replies of the Government have not been accepted by the Committee. (Vide Recommendations at Sl. Nos. 3, 4, 8, 10 and 11)	5
Percentage of Total	20.83%
V. Recommendations in respect of which final replies of the Government are still awaited. (Vide Recommendations at Sl. Nos. 18, 19 and 23)	3
Percentage of Total	12.5%.