

Statement

Statewise procurement of wheat during 1979-80 Rabi Marketing Season

		(In '000 tonnes)
State		Quantity
1	Bihar	87.9
2	Gujarat	0.3
3	Haryana	1388.7
4	Himachal Pradesh	1.5
5	Jammu & Kashmir	21.6
6	Madhya Pradesh	100.2
7.	Punjab	4192.3
8.	Rajasthan	301.0
9.	Uttar Pradesh	1883.2
10.	West Bengal	3.4
11.	Chandigarh	0.1
12.	Delhi	11.8
	All India	7992.0

Grievances of Scientists of I.A.R.I.

*2. SHRI K. P. SINGH DEO;
SHRI JANARDHANA
POOJARY;

Will the Minister of AGRICULTURE be pleased to state:

(a) whether some senior Scientists of the IARI have refused to appear before interview boards;

(b) if so, what are their grievances; and

(c) the steps Government propose to take to bring about a solution of the matter?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN): (a) Some representations were received by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research that certain scientists of the Indian Agricultural Research Institute do not want to attend the 'personal discussion' (interview) for the five-yearly assessment conducted by the Agricultural

Scientists Recruitment Board. The representations are not, however, from senior scientists.

(b) The grievances mentioned by them are:

(i) No proper criteria/guidelines of assessment for promotion are prescribed so as to justify the uniformity and equality in the promotions.

(ii) Personal discussion was not confined to the work done as stipulated in ARS rules and was highly discouraging.

(iii) Reasons for not granting promotion, so far have not been communicated.

The grievances reported by these scientists are not genuine. A few of these scientists have already appeared before the Board for the personal discussion. Personal discussion is optional for the scientists and it is left to the discretion of the scientists themselves. The Board considered the cases of all the scientists who had submitted their assessment proformae whether they appeared for personal discussion or not.

(c) In view of 'b' above, the question does not arise.

Study Team on Food for Work Programme in West Bengal

*3. SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY.
Will the Minister of RURAL RECONSTRUCTION be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government had sent a study team to West Bengal to make a study and give report on the food for work scheme in rural Bengal;

(b) if so, whether the said study team has submitted any report; and

(c) the main points submitted in the report?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE (SHRI R. V. SWAMINATHAN): (a) and (b) Yes, Sir.

(c) A statement containing the main points of the report is laid on the Table of the House.

Statement

Main points in the Report of Study Team after visit to West Bengal

1. The Food for Work Programme was being run in three different names, namely, Rural Works Programme, Rural Reconstruction Programme and Food for Work Programme. While nodal responsibility of Rural Works Programme was of the Development Department, of the Food for Work Programme and Rural Reconstruction programme it was that of the Relief and Rehabilitation Department. The State Government was making sufficient provision of cash funds for rural works programme, but for the Food for Work Programme and Rural Reconstruction Programme hardly any such provision was made.

2. The works execute under the Rural Works Programme were to be a durable nature. However, for works under the Food for Work Programme durability was not considered necessary. This impression was wide-spread particularly at the field levels.

3. Tanks owned by individuals were taken up for improvement under the Food for Work Programme, contrary to the Guidelines on the subject which lay down in the most unequivocal terms that only the projects of community benefit can be taken up under this programme.

4. Foodgrains allocated under the Food for Work Programme were utilised for the reconstruction of individual houses washed away during the floods. Also, sand deposits on the fields of individual farmers were removed with the help of foodgrains given under the Food for Work Programme. Both these were contrary to the existing instructions.

5. The majority of works inspected by the team did not conform to the

technical specifications and prescribed standards. The link roads in district Howrah were mostly very narrow measuring 4 ft. to 7 ft. at the top. Many of these roads looked like village pathways. In this respect guidelines issued even by the State Government have been defied.

6. According to the Guidelines on Food for Work Programme, Steering Committee headed by district Magistrates|Collectors have to be set up at the district-level. Apart from districts officers concerned representatives of the Zila Parishad or district Panchayats, all local members of Parliament and State Legislatures are members of this Committee. The Committee is required to plan and approve the works to be taken up under this programme and watch the progress of its implementation. But these Committees have not been constituted so far in any district. The result is that there is no supervision, technical or administrative, over the works executed by the Panchayats. For this reason works executed are of low quality and sub-standard type.

7. Neither the district level officers nor the block level officers have been assigned any responsibility for the supervision and monitoring of the works executed under the Food for Work Programme.

8. In the system being followed in West Bengal at present, the entire responsibility is left to the Gram Pradhan for the execution of works as well as the distribution of food-grains without providing him necessary administrative and technical support. Distribution is through the coupon system. A novel institution of Job workers has been created for the distribution of coupons and execution of works.

9. A number of specific suggestions have been given in the tour note of the Study Team to rectify the various defects pointed out above for consideration by the State Government.