

Public Accounts Committee (1975—76)

FIFTH

ASSAM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

TWENTY FIRST REPORT

(Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Advance
Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for
the year 1972-73 relating to Emergency Agricultural
Production Programme 1972-73, and the Crash
Scheme for Rural Employment.)



10 MAR 1976

(Presented to the Assembly on.....)

ASSAM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY SECRETARIAT
DISPUR : GAUHATI-6.

CALL NO.

NO. R 2017

DATE OF REC. 1.12.76

ASSAM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY LIBRARY

CONTENTS

	Page
1. Composition of the Public Accounts Committee..	..
2. Introduction i--ii
 A. Emergency Agricultural Production Programme 1972-73	
3. Formulation of the Emergency Agricultural Production Programme.	.. 1—10
4. Organisation for implementation... 10—11
5. Special minor irrigation works... 11—15
6. Electric lift irrigation scheme 15—21
7. Reasons of Lower out-put from the Irrigation schemes 21—25
8. Diesel Pumpsets 25—31
9. Shallow Tubewells 32—37
10. Threshers 37—40
11. Tractors 41—42
12. Inputs... 42—45
13. Seeds 45—47
14. Wheat Seeds 47—49
15. Boro Seeds 49
16. Mustard Seeds 49—56
17. Pulses Seeds 56—58
18. Pesticides and Aerial spraying 58—63
19. Fertilisers 63—69
20. Loans to farmers 70
21. Results of the programme 70—83

B. Crash Scheme for Rural Employment—

22. Size of the Projects	83—84
23. Projects sanctioned but not executed/executed without sanction, ...	85—86
24. Incomplete Projects	86—87
25. Specifications, Surveys, estimates and measurement of work done. ...	87—89
26. Mustar rolls... ..	89—90
27. Rates of wages... ..	90—92
28. Physical achievements against target	92—93
29. Selection of Areas	93—94
30. Maintenance of assets	94
31. Employment	95—96
32. Integration with District Development Plans	96—97
33. Ratio between the expenditure on labour and materials. ...	97—28
34. General	98—100
35. Report on the Evaluation Study made by the Directorate of Evaluation. ...	101—103
36. Summary of recommendations/observation	104—130
37. Appendix	131—142
38. Annexures	143—187

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE, 1975-76

CHAIRMAN—

Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi

MEMBERS—

Shri Romesh Mohan Kouli

Shri Subhankar Singha

Shri Chandra Bahadur Chetani

Shri Pushpadhar Chaliha

Shri Manabendra Nath Sarma

Shri Rajendra Nath Phookan

Shri Hashimuddin Ahmed

Shri Ambarish Lahari

SECRETARIAT—

Shri P. D. Barua, Secretary

Shri N. Deuri Bora, Under Secretary

Shri Bimal Goswami, Committee Officer

INTRODUCTION

I, Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi, Chairman, Public Accounts Committee, having been authorised by the Committee to present this Report on their behalf, present this Twenty-first Report on the Advance Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1972-73 relating to Emergency Agricultural Production Programme 1972-73 and the Crash Scheme for Rural Employment.

2. The Advance Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1972-73 was laid on the Table of the House on 16th September, 1974.

3. The Public Accounts Committee was reconstituted on 8th September, 1975 under Rule 242 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Assam Legislative Assembly.

4. The Committee under Rule 204 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Assam Legislative Assembly, constituted a Sub-Committee with the following Members to examine the technical issues in connection with the Emergency Agricultural Production Programme in its meeting held on 29th October, 1975 :—

- | | |
|---------------------------------|-----------|
| 1. Shri Promode Chandra Gogoi, | Chairman. |
| 2. Shri Pushpadhar Chaliha, | Member. |
| 3. Shri Chandra Bahadur Chetri, | Member. |

Shri Romesh Mohan Kouli was also included in the Sub-Committee in the meeting of the Committee held on 24th December 1975.

The Sub-Committee held sittings on 24th November, 15th, 16th, 17th, 26th, 27th, 28th and 30th December, 1975 and examined the Deputy Director, Agriculture, (Soil Testing, Seed Testing and Survey) Seed Testing Officers, Soil Testing Officers, the Regional Director, Central Ground water Board, Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India, Kalapahar, Gauhati and also the Laboratory in the Agricultural University at Barbheta.

5. The consideration of the Audit Paragraphs included in this Report and the examination of the Departmental witnesses in connection thereto were made by the Committee on 6th, 8th, 9th, 21st, 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 27th, 28th and 29th October, 11th, 12th November, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 19th, 20th December, 1975, 19th and 20th January, 1976.

6. The Committee while examining the Paragraph 13 at pages 19—20 of the Report seized of the discrepancies in the acreage certified to have been covered by Aerial spraying in Lakhimpur District on Mustard Crop. The Committee therefore decided to make a spot study with a view to ascertaining the position of the (i) Aerial spraying in particular ; (ii) Installation of Shallow Tubewells and Pump-sets and (iii) Operation of Threshers and working of Tractors, etc., in

general. The Committee therefore undertook a tour to Dhemaji, North Lakhimpur, Majuli and Jorhat during the period from 13th to 21st November, 1975. The tour impression of the Committee is appended to the Report as Appendix.

7. The Committee considered the Draft Report at its sittings held on 22nd, 23rd, 24th, 30th and 31st January, 1976 and finalised the Report on 2nd February, 1976.

8. The Committee places on record their appreciation of the assistance rendered by Shri R. C. Suri, Accountant General, Assam, Nagaland and Meghalaya etc. and by the Officers of his office.

9. The Committee also like to place on record its appreciation of the valuable services rendered by the officers and the staff of the Assembly Secretariat specially by Shri P. D. Barua, Secretary, Assam Legislative Assembly and Ex-officio Secretary to the Public Accounts Committee and convey their thanks for rendering assistance to the Committee and also the Secretaries and the Directors of both Agriculture and the Panchayat and Community Development Departments for their co-operation.

DISPUR :
The 2nd February, 1976.

PROMODE CHANDRA GOGOI,
CHAIRMAN,
PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE.

A. EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION PROGRAMME 1972-73.

Paragraph 1 at page 1 of the Advance Report of the C.A.G. 1972-73.

Formulation of the Emergency Agricultural Production Programme.

1.1. In early August 1972, the Government of India apprehended that severe drought in certain parts of the country and erratic monsoon in others would adversely affect the kharif foodgrain crop by 10-12 million tonnes and approved an emergency agricultural production programme (henceforth referred to as EAPP) during the rabi 1972-73 season and summer 1973 season to recoup the loss in the kharif crop. The principal features of the EAPP were:—

- (i) For the rabi 1972-73 and summer 1973 crops, additional production of 15 million tonnes of foodgrains over 1971-72 level was expected; additional production envisaged in Assam was 2 lakh tonnes of rice and 0.70 lakh tonnes of wheat.
- (ii) To achieve the increase in foodgrains production, it was proposed to increase the area under wheat and rice.
- (iii) Medium-term loans would be given to the State Government for undertaking quickly executable minor irrigation works.
- (iv) Short-term loans would be made available to States for enabling them to give loans to cultivator for fertilisers, seeds, etc. Interest at 5 per cent annually was payable on medium and short-term loans; medium term loans were repayable in equal instalments over 15 years and short-term loans were repayable in two instalments, i.e., 50 per cent within six months and another 50 per cent within 9 months from the date of disbursement of the loan. Medium-term loans for minor irrigation works were subject to the following conditions:—

(1) Full account would be taken of the budget provisions made in the States for other schemes, e.g. Small Farmers Development Agency, Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labour Projects, Drought Prone Areas Programme, Crash Scheme for Rural Employment, farming and similar schemes and these would be dovetailed with the EAPP.

(2) The assistance to States would be related to specific identifiable schemes over and above the provisions already made in the States' annual Plans for 1972-73.

(3) The loans to States would be given in instalments, the first instalment of 25 per cent being given as an advance immediately, while subsequent instalment were to be released on the basis of the progress of actual expenditure and performance from time to time. Mere transfer of funds from State Government to institutions like Agro-Industries Corporations, State Electricity Boards, etc., would not be treated as expenditure.

(4) The schemes selected for execution were to be such as could be completed by March 1973, or by 31st May 1973 at the latest. Funds for completing the schemes spilling over into 1973-74, were to be provided by the State Governments from their own resources.

1.2. The Committee wanted to know what were the progress report of the Emergency Agricultural Production Programme. The Departmental witness replied that the reports were sent to Government of India from time to time. On a query as to whether Department made any review of the progress of the Emergency Agricultural Production Programme either at the end of 1972-73 or in between the programme was formulated or when the season was over, the Departmental witness replied in the affirmative.

1.3. The Committee therefore wanted to know as to what was the system and procedure of assessing the loss of foodgrains during the floods. The Departmental witness stated that reports were received from the Districts and Subdivisions about the areas which were affected by floods and the loss was assessed by the Revenue Department. The normal yield per acre was taken and the loss was worked out.

1.4. On the basis of reference made by the Agriculture Department that the assessment of damage and loss was made by the Revenue Department, the Secretary, Revenue was examined on 23rd October, 1975 who stated that whenever flood occurred in the State the District Officers were required to make an assessment of lossess and damage and submit a report in a prescribed form to the Government in the Revenue Department. There were instructions in the Revenue Manual in this regard. These instructions were mainly for the purpose of giving relief on account of natural calamities. From time to time, on the basis of the experience the Department had issued further administrative instructions for collecting datas regarding damages caused by floods.

1.5. On a query as to how on July, 1972 the loss of foodgrains was assessed to be 3.75 lakhs quintols of paddy; the Secretary, Revenue replied that it might be partly Ahu and partly Sali. The average yield in Assam per hectar was about a ton of Sali and Ahu less than a ton. But there was separate method of calculation of yield. There were different societies and there was also a State Forecast Committee and a Committee on Agricultural statistics. These Committees assess what was the area under crop. It mainly based on the agricultural statistics collected by Lot Mondols and their field staff. The Subdivisional Committee reviews the report and submit to the State Forecast Committees and this Committee after examining the statistical information received from various sources would arrive at

a decision about the area under crop. Meanwhile, the Director of Economic and Statistics would conduct a crop experiment and on the result of that the average yield rate per hectare was worked out and report was submitted to the Government of India. The Agriculture Department must have worked out the average yield based on the crop area reported to be flood damage. In assessing the losses and damages no official consultation was made by Revenue Department with the Agriculture Department. Whatever consultation was required it was to be done by the Deputy Commissioners and Sub-divisional Officer because in each Subdivision a Committee existed. The Revenue Department was only to furnish figures officially.

1.6. On being questioned as to how the Department assessed the value of crops damaged and what was the basis; the Departmental witness stated that the District Officers, make assessment on the average prices of damage by usual inspection. The Department was not primarily interested in the tonnage of crops affected. The Department was interested for removal of human sufferings and as soon as the area affected was reported to Government, the Government issued instructions for taking steps for replantation of crops in the flood affected areas.

1.7. On being asked as to whether a special machinery could be set up to make assessment properly of the actual crop damaged and relief to be given, regardless of the expenditure involved; the Departmental witness stated that a much bigger machinery could be set up; but the Department feel that it might not be necessary considering the strain on the resources. Greater stress might be given, the Department witness opined, on extending timely relief even on the basis of existing statistics and co-ordinated agricultural development, otherwise, given resources, it was quite possible for the Department to have much better machinery and report accurate figures but then that degree of accuracy in the matter of this nature, perhaps the Department does not insist on.

1.8. On being questioned as to the assessment of damage to crops made by the Mondols whether there was any machinery atleast to examine about the inspection report of the Mondols to which the Secretary, Revenue replied that the respective Deputy Commissioners and Subdivisional Officers were instructed to ensure that the responsible Government Officers were placed in charge of co-ordinating flood relief measures. They do engage officers consisting of B. D. Os. S. D. Cs. Even EAC and A. D. C. were engaged for the purpose. There were officers whose duty was to ensure that there was no under reporting of damage or that relief was given properly. But the Department was not in a position to say whether a particular damage report given by a particular Mondol had really been checked or not by an Officer. The Secretary further stated that the Department felt that the existing executive instructions even though supplemented, these instructions were framed in 1959 possibly keeping the views of the Revenue Department in the picture. There were various aspects of the relief operations which were not merely revenue relief. The Health Department, Veterinary Department and

Public Health Engineering Department have a big role to play. Relief whether it was of sinking of a tubewell or extending medical relief or veterinary relief all these need money. The Department suggested to the Government that an Emergency Relief Manual should be prepared laying down in details the duties and responsibilities of all concerning Government Officers in times of relief.

1.9. The Committee wanted to know what was the districtwise break up of loss 3.75 lakh tonnes of paddy as assessed as a result of flood during June to August, 1972 the Department furnished a written statement as follows:—

STATEMENT OF FLOOD DAMAGE OF SALI PADDY DURING 1972-73.

Subdivision	Area in acres	Quantity of paddy lost.
(1)	(2)	(3)
Dhemaji	1,10,000	79,000
North Lakhimpur...	1,06,416	76,000
Jorhat... ..	6,000	3,600
Golaghat	2,916	1,750
Marigaon	58,000	40,600
Tezpur	27,119	18,983
Mongaldoi	3,616	2,531
Gauhati	1,52,657	91,594
Barpeta	30,057	18,034
Nalbari	5,211	3,126
Dhubri	13,328	5,400
Goalpara	35,464	17,750
Kokrajhar	16,666	8,350
	<u>5,61,480</u>	<u>3,66,418</u>

RECOMMENDATION

1.10. The Committee recommends that there should be strong machinery, if necessary by reorganising the existing personnel to review the progress of implementation of various schemes undertaken by Department. The Committee regrets to note that assessment on losses was not made on realistic basis and there was no co-ordination between the Departments. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the entire system of assessment of losses be examined by the Department with a view to devising a system by which the Department can get a more realistic picture of the losses, without any further delay.

1.11. The Committee further recommends that in place of the existing executive instructions and subsequent piecemeal modification, a comprehensive Manual be prepared containing all the instructions relating to relief measures to be taken at the time of natural calamities like floods etc. The manual should contain instructions to check up the Reports submitted by Mondols and Gram Sevaks, etc., by the responsible officers so that there may not be mis-representation of facts.

Paragraph 1.2. at pages 2-3 of the Advance Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1972-73.

2.1. It was stated that one part of the plan prepared in August, 1972 was the partial restoration of Sali paddy through issue of seedlings, fast maturing variety of seeds and foliar spraying of fertilizers-cum-pesticides. These measures were to restore production by 0.90 lakh tonnes of paddy. The cost for foliar spraying was estimated at Rs. 170 lakhs and issue of seeds/seedlings Rs. 55 lakhs.

2.2. Rabi cultivation over an additional 5.5 lakh acres (other than flood affected areas) which would be partially irrigated. This was expected to give additional production of 2.80 lakh tonnes (2.40 lakh tonnes of foodgrains and 0.20 lakh tonnes each of mustard and pulses) and also provide a base for a fast change-over from a monsoon bound and flood prone kharif crop based economy to an assured Rabi crop economy.

2.3. The Committee wanted to know as to what was the expenditure actually incurred on foliar spraying and on issue of seeds/seedlings for the partial restoration of sali paddy and what were the targets of restoration districtwise and what was the restoration actually achieved districtwise as a result of these measures. The Departmental witness replied that no amount was spent on foliar spraying. The seedlings were given by the Revenue Department.

RECOMMENDATION

2.4. The Committee regrets that the targets were changed frequently by the Department from time to time. It appears to the Committee that all aspects of implementation and resources etc., were not taken into consideration at the time of first fixing of targets. The Committee recommends that in such programme the Department should take all the factors into consideration and fix targets which are realisable. The allocation of resources should also be in accordance with such realistic targets.

Paragraph 1. 3. at page 3. of the Advance Audit Report.

3.1. The plan prepared by the State Government was discussed with a team of Central Government Officers and ultimately the Government of India sanctioned Rs. 452 lakhs as loan assistance for implementation of the programme during 1972-73 medium term loans of Rs. 202 lakhs (for special minor irrigation works Rs. 170 lakhs, purchase of tractors and threshers Rs. 32 lakhs) and short term loans of Rs. 250 lakhs for purchase and distribution of Seeds, Pesticides and Fertilisers. Out of these, short-term loan of Rs. 50 lakhs (paid to the State in December 1972) was refunded to the Government of India in March 1973 interest accrued : Rs. 0.63 lakhs as it could not be utilised for the programme.

3.2. The Committee wanted to know what were the reasons due to which the amount of loan of Rs. 50 lakhs was refunded to the Government of India and in case the Government was not to utilise this amount, why the amount was obtained initially. The Departmental witness replied that on the basis of records available the Department found that in February, the Director of Agriculture informed that the money would not be required. But he could not furnish any specific reason.

3.3. The Secretary, Finance was also examined on this Paragraph on 8th October, 1975. In course of examination it was found that on 18th December, 1972 the Government of India sanctioned this amount of Rs. 50 lakhs and the State Government was informed of it. The amount was surrendered on 30th March, 1973 as not required by telegram. This had created an infructuous liability of Rs. 0.63 lakhs.

RECOMMENDATION

3.4. The Committee regrets to note that due to delay in surrendering the amount of Rs. 50 lakhs, an amount of infructuous liability of Rs. 0.63 lakhs on account of interest on the above loan was incurred. The Committee therefore, recommends that responsibility be fixed on the Officer or Officers for whose negligence the delay in surrendering the amount occurred.

3.5. The action taken should be reported to the Committee within two months from the date of presentation of this Report before the House.

Paragraph 2. 1. at page 3 of the Advance Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1972-73.

4.1. During discussion with the team of Central Government Officers (August 1972) for finalisation of loan assistance, additional production planned was 3.7 lakh tonnes of food grains consisting of 2.36

lakh tonnes of wheat, 1.14 lakh tonnes of clean rice and 0.20 lakhs tonnes of pulses. The target of additional production was, however, increased in the Emergency Programme for 1972-73 Rabi Crops prepared by the State Government as shown below:—

Crop	1971-72		1972-73		Addl. Planned	Production in 1972-73
	Area	Production.	Area	Production.	Area	Production
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Area—In Lakh Acres						
Production—In Lakh Tonnes						
Wheat	1.00	0.48	4.85	9.14	3.85	2.66
Boro Paddy	0.78	0.47	1.66	1.53	0.88	1.06
Mustard	3.38	0.63	4.74	0.90	1.36	0.27
Pulses	2.05	0.28	2.92	0.45	0.87	0.17
Total—	7.21	1.86	14.17	6.02	6.96	4.16

4.2. The Committee wanted to know as to what was the actual additional land districtwise brought under Rabi cultivation under this programme, the Departmental witness referred to the written statement indicating the actual increase in the area cultivated and the foodgrain production (Districtwise which took place mainly as a result of efforts during the EAPP 1972-73 is annexed as Annexure I.

4.3. The Departmental witness further stated that the actual area under irrigation was 50,000 acres. It was also given to understand that in spite of reduction in the target there was short fall as the target was unrealistic and adhoc. So far as the wheat production was concerned the target was definitely unrealistic. Boro Target was not unrealistic. The targetted Boro areas was 66,000 hectares and the achievement was 45,000 hectares. This 66,000 hectares was inclusive of early Ahu area. The mustard area was reduced from 4.74 lakh acres to 4.40 lakh acres. The reasons for reduction were that Mustard Seeds were not available. During the process of implementation it was found that the Seeds were not available, the cultivators could not be motivated and the other reason was that the area, the Department thought, was not available. After the review the area was reduced and therefore the statement stood modified.

4.4. It was observed by the Committee that the targets of the programme were changed by the Department from time to time. The Department furnished the following written statement of targets fixed at different times.

Statement of Targets fixed at different times of the EAPP 1972-73

- (1) Targets fixed after discussion with the Central Team at Shillong on August 27, 1972.

Crops					Additional area (Lakh acres)
Wheat	3.70
Boro Paddy	0.50
Mustard	1.00
Pulses	1.00
					<hr/> 6.20

- (2) Targets revised by the State Government in Consultation with the Cabinet on 29th September, 1972.

Crops					Additional area (Lakh acres)
Wheat	3.85
Boro paddy	0.88
Mustard	1.34
Pulses	0.78

Reasons for change in Targets :

- (1) The wheat target was increased by 0.15 lakh acres because it was thought that more area after harvest of Sali would be available.
- (2) Boro paddy target was increased by 0.38 Lakh acres to include early Ahu area after mid—February.
- (3) Mustard target was increased by 0.34 Lakh acres because it was thought that more area would be available in the flood damaged areas.

Crops					Total Area (Lakh acres)
Wheat	3.70
Boro paddy	1.50
Mustard
Pulses

4.5. From the above statement it appeared that even after the reduction of the targets after review the Department failed to achieve the reduced target. The reasons put forward by the Department were not at all convincing. One of the reasons for failure to achieve the target was stated to be due to inadequate staff to implement the programme. But from the written statement regarding staff provide Annexure II submitted by the Department, it appeared that the officers and staff recruited during Emergency Agricultural Production Programme in addition to normal staff was not small; and with that number of staff the Department should have been able to function properly.

RECOMMENDATION

4.6. The Committee is unhappy to note the failure on the part of Department to achieve the reduced targets even after review.

4.7. The Committee regrets that the targets were changed frequently by the Department from time to time. It appears to the Committee that all aspects of implementation and resources etc., were not taken into consideration at the time of first fixing of targets. The Committee recommends that in such programmes the Department should take all the factors into consideration and fix targets which are realisable. The allocation of resources should also be in accordance with such realistic targets.

Paras 2.2 & 2.3. at page 4.

5.1. Besides, funds provided by the Government of India, the State Government sanctioned Rs.1,13,58 lakhs for implementation of EAPP—Rs. 86.10 lakhs for pay and allowances of staff handling inputs and aerial spray of pesticides and Rs.27.48 lakhs for pay and allowances and contingencies relating to special minor irrigation works. Of this, Rs. 86.45 lakhs were provided by reappropriation from Plan Schemes—Rs.27.48 lakhs from special minor irrigation works and Rs. 58.96 lakhs from purchase and distribution of Seeds. It was stated that savings in these schemes were as a result of restrictions on expenditure and curtailment of expenditure on purchase of pumpsets and other minor irrigation works due to implementation of EAPP. This diversion from Plan Schemes was contrary to the directions of Government of India that provisions of the State Plan were not to be reduced.

5.2. Actual expenditure reported to have been incurred during 1972-73 under different heads was Rs. 494.32 Lakhs as indicated below:—

						Rupees in lakhs
Special minor irrigation works	1,70.00
Seeds	1,32.77
Fertilisers	60.00
Pesticides	2,53
Tractors and Threshers	32.00
Staff and Contingencies	97.02
Total						4,94.32

5.3. The Committee wanted to know as to why were Rs.86.45 Lakhs provided for EAPP by re-appropriation from plan schemes—Rs.27.48 lakhs from special minor irrigation works and Rs.58.97 lakhs from purchase and distribution of seeds and why was expenditure on purchase of pumpsets and other minor irrigation works curtailed from that provided in the plan and why were restrictions placed on expenditure for these?

5.4. The Departmental witness replied that this was done for maintenance of Pumps and for pay and allowances of staff for which no provision was made under EAPP and therefore, the provision had to be reduced.

5.5. On a query as to whether the Department curtailed the programme at its own initiative or at the instance of the Finance Department, the Departmental witness stated that certain schemes could not be implemented and therefore money was available. If the Department would not have spent the money, it would have to be surrendered.

5.6. On being questioned as to whether as a result of curtailment of expenditure the supply of Seeds to the farmers was curtailed to which the Departmental witness replied in negative.

RECOMMENDATION

5.7. It appears to the Committee that reduction in the proportion of money for seeds must have resulted in reduced supply of seeds to the farmers under the normal plan schemes.

5.8. The diversion and reduction of money from the plan provisions of the State was contrary to the direction of Government of India. In spite of that the Department placed restrictions on expenditure, curtailed the expenditure on schemes and utilised the estimated money by reappropriation from other plans and schemes which appeared to be irregular.

5.9. Though the Department stated that the money was available from the Plan Funds because it could not implement certain schemes, the Department was unable to satisfy the Committee on the reasons for non-implementation of this scheme. As a result, the schemes under the Annual Plan suffered and were not fully implemented. The Committee recommends that where special programme is in addition to normal plan schemes, the Government should ensure that the implementation of normal plan schemes do not suffer.

ORGANISATION FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Paragraph 3.1 at page 4

6.1. EAPP was implemented in the State through 161 projects. Where the project covered an area less than 5,000 acres in a development block, the block itself was treated as a project; where the acreage exceeded 5,000, separate projects were created. Each project had a Block Development Officer or Sub-divisional Agricultural Officer as the project leader with a full complement of staff such as extension officer, field assistants, demonstrator, overseer, mechanics, clerical staff, etc.

6.2. Implementation-cum-Co-ordination committees were constituted at State level, subdivisional level and project level. The State level committee was to keep a constant watch over the progress of the programme in the State and arrange speedy issue of sanctions needed for its implementation. Sub-divisional level committees were to review the progress of the schemes in the subdivisions and to resolve problems which might arise in implementation of the programme. Project implementation committees were to advise and ensure that programme was progressing well in the individual projects.

6.3. The engineering wing of the Directorate of Agriculture which executes all minor irrigation works in the State and the general wing were strengthened for implementation of the programme. Earlier, the engineering wing was headed by a Joint Director; this post was kept in abeyance and a new post of Chief Engineer in the rank of Additional Director of Agriculture was created temporarily. Two posts of Superintending Engineer, three additional posts of Executive Engineer and nine posts of Assistant Engineer with corresponding staff, at each level were also created.

6.4. In the general wing of the Directorate, one post of Special Officer in Assam Agricultural Service Class I, seventy posts in Class II of the same service and a number of posts of Assistant Agricultural Inspector and Superintendent of Accounts were created for purchase and distribution of Seeds, fertilisers and pesticides. Expenditure on additional staff for these two wings till 31st March 1973 was Rs.8.50 lakhs. These temporary posts were originally sanctioned upto 28th February 1973 but were subsequently extended upto 30th September 1973.

6.5. The Committee wanted to know whether the temporary posts sanctioned for EAPP were still continuing to which the Departmental witness replied that all the posts continues beyond 31st March, 1973. Department needed them to wind up the scheme and realisation of loans and also to maintain the tempo. Some of the posts continued till 31st May, 1975.

RECOMMENDATION

6.6. The Committee is not satisfied with the explanations of the Department that such a large technical and other staff have been retained only for realisation of loans etc.

6.7. The Committee finds no justification to retain the staff beyond 31st May, 1973, when the scheme was prepared till the end of Financial year, 1972-73.

Paragraph 5 at Pages 6-7—SPECIAL MINOR IRRIGATION WORKS

7.1. The Audit Paragraph brings out that the loan of Rs.170 lakhs given by the Government of India was allocated as under : —

			Number		Amount (In lakhs of rupees)
Electric Pumpsets	210	...	100
Diesel Pumpsets	500	...	50
Shallow tube-wells	200	...	20

7.2. Additional areas to be irrigated by each category of pump set in various districts as fixed by the Directorate in November 1972 were.—

District	Engineering Division	Electric Pump sets	Diesel Pump sets (Area in acres)	Shallow tubewell
Kamrup	(a) Gauhati	11,100	6,900	...
	(b) Nalbari	4,500	3,500	...
Goalpara	(c) Goalpara	6,000	6,000	..
Darrang	(d) Tezpur	2,700	1,850	...
Cachar	(e) Silchar	9,450
Sibsagar	(f) Jorhat	2,700	3,300	...
Nowgong	(g) Nowgong	6,000	2,000	..
North-Lakhimpur	(h) Lakhimpur	4,000
		42,450	23,550	4,000

7.3. An order to supply 210 electric pump sets (200 of 20 H. P. and 10 of 40 H. P.), 500 diesel pumpsets (10-15 H. P.) and 200 pumpsets for shallow tubewells (5 H. P.) was placed on 4th September, 1972 on the Assam Agro Industries Development Corporation stipulating delivery of 25 per cent by 31st October, 1972, 50 per cent by 30th November, 1972 and balance by 7th December, 1972. Neither the make of pumpsets to be supplied nor the authority to whom the supply was to be made was indicated in the order. Against this order, 301 electric pumpsets (40 H. P. 24, 20 H. P. 277) 527 diesel pumpsets and 53 pumpsets for shallow tubewells were received between October, 1972 and March, 1973 in the central store of the Directorate at Gauhati; two diesel pumpsets and 147 pumpsets for shallow tubewells were supplied directly to the Sub-divisional Agricultural Engineer, Barpeta and Executive Engineer, Lakhimpur Agricultural Engineering division respectively. Rupees 70 lakhs were paid by the Directorate as advance to the Corporation; final payments have not yet been made (September, 1973).

7.4. The Committee wanted to know whether the Department settled the advance of Rs.70 Lakhs paid to the Assam Agro Industries Development Corporation for purchase of electric and diesel pumpsets for shallow tubewells and what were the quantities for which orders were placed and quantities actually received. The Departmental witness stated that the accounts have not been finally settled as yet Rs. 69.93 lakhs have been settled and something remained still. The Department furnished the following written information regarding the quantities for which the orders were placed and quantity actually received.

PURCHASE OF PUMPSETS, ETC.

Items	Quantity ordered	Quantity supplied	Remarks
1. 20 H.P. electric pump sets 2.5 cusecs discharge.	270 sets	270 sets	Excluding 1 (one) No. 10 HP. Kirloskar and another
2. 40 H.P. electric pump sets 5 cusecs capacity:	22 sets	22 sets	18 HP. Savia pump sets were rejected due to poor performance. The Department also did not make any payment against these two rejected pump sets.
3. 5 HP. diesel pump sets for 200 shallow tubewells in Lakhimpur District.	200 sets	200 sets	
4. 5 HP. to 16 HP. Mobile Diesel pump sets.	550 sets	548 sets	

RECOMMENDATION

7.5. The Committee regrets that even after more than 2 years of completion of the programme the final accounts with the Agro-Industries Development Corporation have not been settled. The Committee recommends that the Agriculture Department should take immediate steps to settle the accounts with the Assam Agro-Industries Development Corporation and report submitted to the Committee within three months from the date of submission of the Report.

Paragraph 5.4 at Page 7

8.1. From the records of Assam Agro-Industries Development Corporation it was seen that in response to a notice inviting tender (August 1972) for purchase of 200 electric pumpsets (20 H.P.), the local authorised dealer of Kirloskar pumpsets offered 30 per cent discount on the listed price if all 200 pumpsets were purchased from them. Pumpsets were, however, purchased from different firms (including 75 Kirloskar pumpsets), without availing the discount so offered, at Rs. 8.65 lakhs against Rs. 742 lakhs required for purchase of 200 Kirloskar pumpsets if discount was availed of. Reasons for not availing of the discount were not on record.

8.2. In reply to a question as to why the offer of 30 % discount given by the dealer of Kirloskar pumps was not availed of the Agriculture Department stated that the firm which offered 30% discount could not supply all the pumpsets. In reply to another question regarding the stipulated dates of delivery the Agriculture Department stated that so far as electric pumps were concerned there was no delay in delivery. The Deptt. having mentioned that purchase of pumps were made from the Corporation, the Secretary of the A.A.I.D.C. was examined. He also stated that the dealer of Kirloskar pumps could not stick to the delivery schedule. The Committee after examining the statement showing the dates of delivery of pumps by the dealers of pumps found that only the dealer of Kirloskar pumps made supply within the time schedule. In reply to another question the Secretary, A.A.I.D.C. stated that 15 more pumps were procured from one of the dealers of Kirloskar pump.

8.3. The Secretary, A.A.I.D.C. stated that 64 number of pumps were supplied in January 1973 by M/S Frontier Engineering and the last instalment was supplied by M/S Associated Engineering in January 1973. As regards action taken against the firms which did not supply in time the Secretary, A.A.I.D.C. stated that no action could be taken in view of urgency of the matter. In reply to another question as to why the pumps were purchased even in January 1973 when the sowing season was over, the Secretary, A.A.I.D.C. stated that they were committed to the Agriculture Deptt. to supply the pumps. In reply to another question whether formal extension of time to firms which failed to supply within the stipulated time, the Secretary, A.A.I.D.C. stated that extension was granted verbally. He further added that extension was granted in consultation with the Agriculture Deptt. which was confirmed by their acceptance of the pumpsets even after the expiry of the time

RECOMMENDATION

8.4. The Committee is not satisfied with the explanation given by the Department and the Corporation that the discount offered by the dealers in Kirloskar firm was not availed of for ensuring delivery of the Pumpsets within the time limit stipulated by the Agriculture Department. The Committee finds that only Kirloskar dealers had supplied the Pumpsets in time and the others had delayed the supplies. The Committee therefore recommends that the responsibility for loss to the Government be fixed by the Department.

8.5. The Agriculture Department's reply that there was no delay in delivery of electric pumps was not borne out by facts. The Committee is therefore compelled to recommend that responsibility for submission of mis-statement of facts should be fixed and action taken against the officers responsible should be reported to the Committee within April 1976.

Paragraph 5.5 at page 7

... ..

9.1. Out of the diesel pumpsets supplied by the Corporation, 20 pumpsets of one make were supplied at an additional cost of Rs.2,000 each inspite of poor past performance reported by the Directorate.

9.2. The Committee wanted to know why the 20 pumpsets were purchased at an additional cost even though the past performance of the pumpsets of this make had been reported as poor by the Director of Agriculture. The Secy., Corporation stated that because of urgency these were supplied—moreover these were of improved variety and the past defects were removed. The Secretary, Agriculture pointed out that there was no record to show that the Corporation satisfied itself that the quality have been improved and the defects rectified. The Corporation stated that as the pumpsets were of bigger size and higher H. P. these were purchased at an extra cost of Rs. 2000/— each. The Departmental

witness on being asked as to whether bigger pumps give better service, stated that they had no records in this regard. In reply to another question the Secretary, Corporation stated that 35 numbers of Foreign pumps supplied to the Agriculture Department though spare parts of these foreign pumps were not available.

RECOMMENDATION

9.3. From the evidence given by the Departmental witness, it appears to the Committee that the different H.P. capacities Pumpsets were purchased without assessing as to what H.P. capacities Pumpsets would be suitable for the programme and the conditions in this State. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Department should assess the H.P. capacity or capacities of Pumpsets which are suitable for Assam.

9.4. The Departmental witnesses were not able to satisfy the Committee that the defects pointed out earlier by the Agriculture Department in the Indec Pumps had been rectified. Purchase of Indec pumps resulted in extra expenditure and the Committee recommends that the responsibility for this should be fixed.

9.5. The Committee considers that the supply of foreign pumps without adequate supply of spares was also not judicious. The Committee would like the Department to submit detailed report on the performance of Indec foreign pumps.

Paragraph 6 at pages 7-8 ELECTRIC LIFT IRRIGATION SCHEME

10.1. Thirty-one electric lift irrigation schemes were prepared to irrigate 42,450 acres to be brought under wheat cultivation. Pumpsets needed and supplied in different districts were as under —

District	Engineering Division	Requirement of sets (20 H. P.)	Sets issued (20 H. P.)	(40 H.P.)	Excess (+) Less(-). (in terms of 20 HP.)
Kamrup	Gauhati	74	60	5	(—) 4
	Nalbari	30	19	..	(—) 11
Goalpara	Goalpara	40	76	4	(+) 44
Darrang	Tezpur	18	9	...	(—) 9
Cachar	Silchar	63	42	...	(—) 21
Sibsagar	Jorhat	18	12	6	(+) 6
Nowgong	Nowgong	40	25	...	(—) 15
Dibrugarh	Dibrugarh	...	22	..	(+) 22
		283	265	15	

10.2. Issues to Goalpara and Sibsagar district were, thus, in excess of requirement. In Dibrugarh, issues were without any requirement. Twenty-one sets out of 301 procured were not distributed and were lying in the Central store at Gauhati (September 1973).

10.3. The Committee wanted to have a statement showing the details of (1) the Scheme namely location, number of pumpsets to be installed and the command area (2) when were the pumpsets installed and channel completed (3) when were the pumpsets energised (4) the period during which the pumpsets were used during 1972-73 and the area actually irrigated, number of hours actually worked by the pumpsets as compared with the capacity of the pumpsets (5) reasons for low working of pumpsets (6) details of working of the pumpsets alongwith the area actually cultivated in the subsequent year. The Department furnished a written reply to the Committee which was appended to the Report as Annexure III.

10.4. Being asked to explain the lower and higher issues to the different districts, the Departmental witness stated that along with the Lift Irrigation Scheme under the Emergency Agricultural production programme, the Department was also executing Lift Irrigation Scheme under the normal Plan programme. The total issue of pumpsets to different districts make up the requirements of both the schemes under the Emergency Agricultural production programme and the normal Plan schemes.

OBSERVATION

10.5. The Department did not indicate the command area of each scheme, hours run, reasons for low working of the schemes. It appears from the statement that Rajabazar Scheme (4 pumpsets) was energised in December, 1974 and Matijuri Scheme (10 sets) was energised in February-March 1975. Earlier in November 1974 the Department reported to the Committee that all the sets (30) in Polla scheme were energised. Now in November 1975 the Department against the scheme as indicated that 2 Nos. were not yet energised the areas irrigated by the schemes were 5164 and 5251 acres in 1972-73 and 1973-74 respectively against the proposed command area of 42450 acres.

10.6. The Committee was not satisfied when the specific requirements for Emergency Agricultural Production Programme were decided for each district, there should not have been deviations from the decided programme.

RECOMMENDATION

10.7. From the evidence of both the Departmental witness and the witness on behalf of the Assam State Electricity Board it appears that there was lack of adequate co-ordination between the Agriculture Department and the Assam State Electricity Board regarding timely selection of sites and the programme of energisation of the schemes. Further adequate measures were not taken which were necessary for successful implementation of the emergency scheme.

10.8. The Committee considers that the Department did not maintain any record to show the hours run by each set and the Department did not analyse each scheme to work out the reasons for low utilisation. The Committee further recommends fixation of responsibility for submission of incorrect information regarding energisation of pumpsets in respect of Polla Lift Irrigation Scheme.

Paragraph 6.2 at page 8

11.1. Records showing dates of installation and energisation of pumpsets were not maintained in the Directorate. It was however, seen from a report prepared by Chief Engineer (Agriculture) on 24th January, 1973 after joint inspection with the Chief Engineer, Assam State Electricity Board that 268 pumpsets had been installed, of which only 117 sets were energised by that date. According to the package of practices (manual of instructions for sowing, watering, etc., published by the Directorate), sowing season of wheat is from 10th November to 7th December and wheat crop requires, in all seven waterings of which the vital one is at the crown root initiation stage, i.e., after 20-25 days of sowing. Any amount of irrigation after that stage is of no avail if irrigation at crown root initiation stage had not been provided. Thus, 151 pumps were not energised by the time water was most needed.

11.2. The Committee in course of examination of the Departmental witness found that the delay in energisation of the electric pumpsets was one of the reasons for which the implementation of the schemes was delayed. To ascertain the actual reason, the Chief Engineer of the A. S. E. B. was examined on 8th October, 1975. The Chief Engineer, A. S. E. B. stated that the location of the schemes were made known to the Board only on 24th October 1972 and that they had intimated the Agriculture Department that by 15th December, 1972 they would be able to complete only 38 pumpsets.

11.3. On being asked as to whether the Department installed diesel pumpsets in view of the fact that the A. S. E. B. expressed their inability to energise all the pumps by the scheduled date, the Departmental witness stated that in many cases this had been done.

11.4. In reply to question the Departmental witness stated that though review on the progress of energisation of pumpsets was conducted from time to time there was no record available in this regard.

11.5. In reply to another question the Departmental witness stated that the progress reports submitted to the Government of India was on the basis of installation of pumpsets and not on the basis of area irrigated and that they did not take into consideration the number of sets energised.

RECOMMENDATION

11. 6. The Department should not have undertaken 31 electric lift irrigation schemes involving installation of 283 pumpsets of 20 H.P. to irrigate 42450 acres of land when it was known to the Department that the A. S. E. B. would not be able to energise more than 38 pumpsets by 15th December, 1972 due to delay in selection of sites by the Department. The Department placed orders to the Agro-Industries Dev. Corporation for supply of pumpsets on the 4th September, 1972 and submitted proposals for taking up the schemes to the Government on 27th September, 1972. Till submission of proposals for the individual electric schemes the Department was not in a position to select the sites for which this could not be intimated to the A. S. E. B. before 24th October, 1972.

11. 7. The Committee expresses its regret that the Department did not move as expeditiously as expected in implementing such emergency schemes as the very name signifies. The Committee therefore recommends that thorough investigation in to the delay for energisation after pumpsets etc. for fixation of responsibility should be made at what stage the delay occurred in implementing the schemes for which the benefits of loan granted by the Central Government could not be fully utilised.

11. 8. The Committee considers that the review conducted by the Department was of no use as the Department did not maintain any record. The Committee also noted with much distress the method of incorrect reporting to the Government of India adopted by the Department and suggested that appropriate action should be taken against the officers responsible for the incorrect reporting as these reports showed distorted picture of performance of the programme.

Paragraph 6. 3. at page 8

12.1. Ninety-four electric pumpsets were to be installed on 50 barges. Of the barges ordered from Assam Agro Industries Development Corporation, only 38 were received up to March 1973.

12.2. In reply to a question regarding the stipulated time by which the suppliers were asked to supply the barges, the Corporation stated that no specific date was given. The Departmental witness in reply to another question stated that the pumpsets could not be installed in all respects due to delay in receipt of barges.

RECOMMENDATION

12.3. The Committee regrets to note that the Corporation did not conduct the business as expected of them. They should have fixed the date by which the supplies were to be made since the Department specifically stated that the barges should be supplied by December 1972. A thorough investigation should be conducted to fix up the responsibility as to the omission in indicating the stipulated date of supply in the supply order for barges.

PARAGRAPH 6.4 AT PAGES 9-10.

13.1 Results of the working of some of the schemes are summarised as under :—

District	Scheme	Command area	Pumpsets installed	Pumpsets energised	Pumpsets worked	Area irrigated (in acres)	Crop
Kamrup ...	Kamalpur ...	4,500 ...	30 ...	4 on 29th December 1972; balance after 5th February 1973.	28 sets started working only from 21st February 1973.	2,121 in February/March 1973.	Ahu
	Rangia ...	2,100 ...	14 ...	10 sets on 10th and 11th January 1973; 4 in March 1973.	6 sets at Dipteswari, Uttar Bordoloi and Khundra Garkona not worked as reportedly there was no demand for water; log books for only 2 sets were available.	30	Ahu
	Pollah ...	4,500 ...	30 ...	28 sets in February 1973; 2 not energised.	Working and area could not be ascertained as log books were not available.
	Malabari ...	3,000 ...	20 ...	7 in December 1972; 13 in February 1973.	6 did not work as there was reportedly no demand for water. Log books were not available
Goalpara ...	Godadhar ...	900 ...	6 ...	All in December 1972.	2 worked; 4 not worked reportedly for lack of demand.	17	Boro

District	Scheme	Command area	Pumpsets installed	Pumpsets energised	Pumpsets worked	Area irrigated (in acres)	Crop
Cachar	Titaguri	1,500	10	All in December 1972 January 1973	6 did not work for lack of demand. All worked	100	Wheat (45), Boro (55).
	Sithila	1,500	10	All in January 1973	All worked	500	Crop-wise details not available.
	Tokiyamari	900	6	All in December 1972	No worked	Nil	...
	Bidyapur (Extension)	600	4	All in April 1973	All worked	400	Crop-wise details not available.
	Matijuri	1,500	10	None energised	None-worked, 4 sets energised
Sibsagar	Lala (Extension)	1,200	8	4 in March 1973 4 not energised (September 1973)	could not be worked as through and channels not completed till 31st May 1973.
	Ramkrishnanagar	1,350	9	3 in February 1973, 4 in April 1973, 2 not energised (September 1973)	Working not available.
	Patherkandi (Extension)	1,200	8	3 in February 1973, 5 in March, 1973	Working not available.
Sibsagar	Korona	900	6	All in January 1973	All worked	200	Crop-wise details not available.
	Marangi	900	6	All in February 1973	All worked	67	Do.
	Nahatia	900	6	All in April 1973	All worked	333	Do.

13.2. The Departmental witness stated that the target date for energisation of pumpsets was the 15th December, 1972 but the A. S. E. B. stated that they would be able to energise only 38 sets by 15th December, 1972. This seems that the Department either tried to misguide the Committee or Department did not maintain any such records. At the instance of the Committee investigation of a few cases as to the actual causes of low irrigation was conducted by the Department. The results of investigation furnished by the Department were as below :—

REASONS OF LOWER OUTPUT FROM THE IRRIGATION SCHEMES :

1. Inadequate and defective water courses :—

Though repeated instructions are given, the cultivators do not take steps for construction of canals for effective distribution of water. As a result there is wastage of water and hence higher output is not possible.

2. Soil Condition :—The pumpsets are generally required to work in sandy loan fields with relatively poor water retension capacity as a result the full command area (i.e. as per capacity of the pumpsets is not generally possible from these irrigation schemes.

3. Scanty source of water and distant source :—Irrigation is sometimes required (i.e. specially in case of Mobile Diesel pumpsets) to be arranged from a distant source, which involves loss of water during transmission. Sometimes double pumping is required when a source gets dried up due to unprecedented drought towards April-May.

4. Lack of Training of cultivators :—As the cultivators are not trained in effective utilisation of water and are not aware of the optimum requirement of water, over irrigation is resulted and also total area coverage is reduced.

5. Inadequate motivation :—Due to which full command area per pumpsets is not obtained.

6. Non-availability of bigger compact areas :—Due to which mobile pumpsets are to be issued for smaller holdings of 4/5 acres. As a result full command area is not obtained.

13.3. Though the Committee asked the Department to investigate the low irrigation in respect of a few selected schemes, the Department has not furnished the names of the schemes which were

studied by it. The reasons given by the Department appear to be general and vague. The Department has also mixed up the reasons for low working of mobile diesel sets and the Electric Lift Irrigation Scheme. Further, from the reasons furnished by the Department, it appears that the Lift Irrigation Schemes were taken up by the Department without proper assessment of the successful working and Irrigation of Command areas by these schemes and without taking adequate measures to motivate the cultivators, train them in the use of water or to take other measures necessary for successful working of the schemes.

13.4. The Department intimated the Committee the area irrigated during 1972-73 and 1973-74. In this report there was no mention of the actual area irrigated by each scheme as compared to the command area. The areas irrigated during 1972-73 and 1973-74 were almost the same (1972-73:—5164 acres, 1973-74:—5251 acres. In reply to a question regarding low utilisation the Departmental witness, stated on 8th October 1975 that "in some cases it might be that crop was not there, or it might be that installation was at a later stage and so the people did not take the water or it might be that at the time it was installed the crop did not need any irrigation". This reply was not at all convincing as atleast the 117 set energised upto 24th January 1973 were capable of irrigating 17,550 acres in 1973-74 whereas the actual area irrigated in 1973-74 was only 5251 acres.

RECOMMENDATION

13.5. The Committee regrets to comment that the Department completely failed to get the utilisation of the potential created by the schemes. A thorough investigation regarding the failure of the Department to get the benefits of irrigation utilised by the cultivators need be made for fixation of responsibility. It should also be investigated whether the Department took into consideration the various difficulties, which they have now expressed, in the working of the schemes and whether adequate measures were taken by the Department to ensure irrigation of the total command area. While conducting investigation it should also be considered whether the Department or Departments took adequate measures to motivate the cultivators.

Paragraph 6.5 at page 11

14.1. For energisation of these pumpsets, Assam State Electricity Board was advanced Rs. 23.72 lakhs till March 1973. Under arrangements with the Board, the Directorate was to bear the cost of low tension distribution service connections from 11 KV transmission lines of the Board and the sub-stations. It was, however, noticed that sites of pumpsets as originally agreed with the Board were subsequently changed by the Directorate with the

result that the Board had to lay new 11 KV transmission lines. The Board submitted final claim for Rs. 32 lakhs for low transmission/distribution lines, sub-stations and service connections in March 1973. Claim for cost of new 11 KV lines laid by the Board (estimated cost: Rs. 23.06 lakhs) has not been received by the Directorate till September 1973.

14.2. The Board was also requested to reserve 4 Magawatt of power for these pumpsets. Figures of drawal were not available with either the Board or the Directorate.

14.3. In reply to a question the A.S.E.B. stated that they were to get Rs. 31.34 lakhs more for the E.A.P.P. Schemes. This constituted Rs.23.06 lakhs for 11 KV line and Rs.8.28 lakhs for low tension distributions service connection from 11 KV transmission lines. The Department obtained administrative approval from the Government in November, 1972 before receipt of estimates from the Board which were received in February 1973. The action of the Department for obtaining administrative approval before selection of sites and receipt of estimates from the Board was highly irregular.

14.4. The Committee asked the Chief Engineer, Assam State Electricity Board to supply a statement showing the power supplied to each of the 31 Schemes during, 1972-73, 1973-74 and 1974-75 and the revenue received thereon. The Assam State Electricity Board could not furnish the statement as called for till 27th February, 1976.

RECOMMENDATION

14.5. The Committee therefore considered that the Assam State Electricity Board should not have incurred expenditure in excess of deposit received by them especially when they failed to energise the pumpsets when water was most needed during the Rabi season of 1972.

14.6. The Committee regrets to note that the Assam State Electricity Board failed to furnish the information asked for by the Committee and recommends an investigation to be conducted by the Chairman of the Board and result be communicated to the Committee within two months from the date of presentation of this Report.

14.7. The Committee further recommends that the Directorate of Agriculture should not have made material modification of the Schemes resulting in an extra expenditure of Rs. 23.06 lakhs being the cost of new 11 KV lines after being approved by Government.

14.8. The Department should settle up the claims of Rs.31.34 lakhs immediately and the action taken be intimated to the Committee within two months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

Paragraph 6.6 at page 11

15.1. EAPP was to be in addition to the normal plan of the State. However, this direction of Government of India was not followed and plan provisions and targets were reduced.

15.2. The State Plan for 1972-73 provided installation of 19,000 (5 horse power equivalent) electric pumpsets during the year and funds provided for these and spillover schemes were Rs.51 lakhs. The target was subsequently (December, 1972) reduced to 100 pumpsets (20 horse power capacity). Even this target was not achieved and only 86 new pumpsets were installed. Expenditure on these as well as spillover schemes was Rs.39.48 lakhs.

15.3. Installation of electric pumpsets was taken up in the State during 4th Five-Year Plan and 435 sets (20 horse power capacity) in 47 lift irrigation schemes with command area of 65,200 acres were installed upto 1972. Of the sets installed, as many as 234 sets with command area of 35,100 acres were not energised till the end of December 1972. Since the Directorate had no record showing date of installation and energisation of pumpsets, it could not be seen whether the remaining pumpsets have been energised (September 1973).

15.4. The Committee wanted to know the provision of the annual plan for 1972-73 for installation of electric pumpsets on lift irrigation schemes, the Departmental witness replied that Rs.51.00 lakhs was provided for this purpose. In reply to another question regarding the present position of energisation the Departmental witness, stated that out of 234 pumpsets, 216 sets have since been energised. The Committee thereafter examined the Joint Secretary of the Planning Department as to why contrary to the Government of India's direction plan provision and targets were reduced and whether the Planning Department had been consulted before affecting the reduction.

15.5. The Departmental witness from the Planning Department stated that right from the formulation stage of the E.A.P.P., the Planning Department was never consulted. He further stated that only November 1972 when, as per decision of the State Level Agriculture Programme Implementation Committee they were asked to find out from overall plan savings about Rs. 56 lakhs for the programme. In reply to another question of the Committee, the witness confirmed that at no stage they were formally consulted. In reply to a question that it was necessary to consult the Planning

Department be stated that they should have been consulted but they were never consulted. In reply to a question as to why contrary to the Government of India's direction when the plan provision was affected whether the Department was consulted the witness from the Planning Department stated that they were consulted only when the question of giving additional money arose and they gave Rs.30.00 lakhs out of Rs. 54 lakhs available.

15.6. In reply to a question that the Draft Plan for 1973-74 was submitted by the Planning Department the witness stated that "after all we have no technical competency of judging what is right and what is wrong.....". The Planning Department was requested by the Committee to furnish targets and achievements in regard to electric lift irrigation schemes, pumps, shallow tubewells and other inputs for 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74 which they did not give. He further stated that the target for 1972-73 for diesel pumpsets was 500 for electric pumpsets it was 1000 and for tubewells and filter point it was 300 and achievement as reported by the Agriculture Department was 500 for diesel pumpsets, 1140 for electric pumpsets and 300 for tubewells and filter point and promised to submit a complete list.

15.7. The Committee thereafter, found out from the Draft Annual Plan for 1973-74 that the target for electric pumpsets in 1972-73 was 19000 (5 HP equivalent).

RECOMMENDATION

15.8. The Committee considers that the action of the Department in curtailment of normal plan provisions and targets to implement the E. A. P. P. Scheme was not justified.

15.9. The Committee recommends that the failure to get all the 435 pumpsets, which were installed, energised in time be investigated and the responsibility fixed.

Paragraphs 7.1 and 7.2 at Pages 11-12 — Diesel Pumpsets

16.1. The Government of India gave a loan of Rs.50 lakhs for purchase of 500 diesel pumpsets to provide irrigation to 26,000 acres for wheat cultivation in flood affected areas.

16.2. The areas planned to be irrigated was brought down to 23,550 acres without proportionately reducing the number of pumpsets to 471. As against this, 529 pumpsets were purchased. Requirements of

Pumpsets and numbers actually distributed to different Districts were:—

District	Area (in acres)	Sets required	Month of receipt in Central Stores	Month of issue from Central Store	Sets distributed	Excess (+) Less (-)
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Goalpara	6,000	120	October 1972—February 1973	November 1972—March 1973	182	(+) 62
Kamrup	10,400	208	October 1972—January 1973	December 1972—March 1973	(*) 115	(-) 93
Nowgong	2,000	40	October 1972—February 1973	November 1972—February 1973	62	(+) 12
Sibsagar	3,300	66	October 1972—February 1973	November 1972—February 1973	24	(-) 42
Dibrugarh	October and November 1972	November 1972	14	(+) 14
Lakhimpur	October 1972—March 1973	October 1972—January 1973	60	(+) 60
Darrang	1,850	37	October 1972—January 1973	November 1972—March 1973	33	(-) 4
Cachar	October and November 1972	January 1972—March 1973	49	(+) 49

(*) (Includes 9 sets to Central Workshop, Gauhati).

16.3. Thus, pumpsets issued to Goalpara and Nowgong were in excess of requirement; 123 pumpsets were issued to Dibrugarh, Lakhimpur and Cachar even though no additional area was to be irrigated in these districts.

16.4. The Committee asked as to what were the reasons for purchase of 529 diesel pumpsets as compared to the need for 471 pumpsets. The Joint Secretary, Agriculture stated that actually we had purchased altogether 548 pumpsets and not 529. The Government of India had given Rs. 5 lakhs but did not specify the number of pumpsets to be purchased. In purchasing the pumpsets the Department had taken into account the command area of each pumpset and accordingly the purchases were made. Apart from that the Department had taken into account the ground condition also. Certain areas were there where pumpsets of very small capacity were needed. In overall assessment the Department had found that pumpsets between 10 to 20 H.P. would be better. Altogether 548 pumpsets were purchased of 5, 10 to 20 H.P. capacity to cover the entire scheme. The Committee asked the Department that when the loan of Rs. 170 lakhs were given by the Government it was thought that Rs. 100 lakhs would be spent for 200 electric pumpsets. Rs. 50 lakhs would be spent for purchase of 500 diesel pumpsets to cover additional areas for wheat cultivation in flood affected areas. Subsequently in November, 1972 the area of operation was reduced to 23,500 acres. And since there was reduction of area from 26,000 acres to 23,500 acres there should have been a reduction in the number of pumpsets also. Why it was not done, the Departmental witness stated that there was a relationship between the number of pumpsets and the areas to be irrigated no doubt but there was nothing sacrosanct about the number of pumpsets. The pumpsets of different strengths were used to bring the command area under irrigation. On being asked as to what was the extent of command area and whether at the time of preparation of the scheme the Department had not made any objective assessment; the Departmental witness stated that the command area was exactly 23,500 acres and that it was thought that 10 to 20 H.P. pumpsets would be available in the market and hence the calculation was made on the basis of the 52 acres per set covering an area of 26,000 acres. It was also found that pumpsets of lower capacity had greater mobility and hence they were more useful than other varieties. The Committee then asked as to why the Diesel Pumpsets were issued to Goalpara and Nowgong in excess of requirement to which the Departmental witness replied that the Department had taken 12,000 acres as target of the Goalpara and this was done as per circular issued by the Chief Engineer, Agriculture. This calculation was done before implementation of the scheme in the field. Subsequently, the Department had found that electric lift was to cover 6000 acres. In reply to a question as to when and why the changes were made, the Departmental witness replied that in fact there was no change about the area to be covered. Pumpsets of lower capacity were the peculiar need of the Districts. The number of pumpsets were more as pumpsets of lower capacities were to be used to cover the entire command area. That means the total capacity of the pumpsets was to correspond to the needs which the Department

wanted to achieve. The number of pumpsets issued to Goalpara were sufficient to irrigate the area. Though the number of pumpsets supplied was more because of issue of pumpsets of lower capacity.

16.5. The Committee then asked the reasons for issue of pumpsets to Dibrugarh, Lakhimpur and Cachar even though no additional area was to be irrigated in these Districts. The Joint Secretary, Agriculture stated that in Dibrugarh and Lakhimpur Districts the demand came subsequently and so the Department had to provide for irrigation. In Cachar District Boro paddy was cultivated in fairly large areas and so there was demand for it which was not originally anticipated. Asked as to whether pumpsets were diverted from one District to another and therefore it must affect the implementation of the programme in other District; the Departmental witness admitted that it might have affected. These points were discussed in the Sub-Divisional Implementation Committee also but as there was a great public demand these things had to be done.

RECOMMENDATION

16.6. The Committee is unhappy to note that due to wrong estimation of requirement of pumpsets in different Districts, the services of pumpsets could not be fully utilised at the time when the irrigation was needed most. As such the emergent production programme was greatly affected. It appears that the Department did not work out the requirement on the basis of experience gained and the requirement were not realistic. The Committee recommends that before undertaking programme of this magnitude, the Department must make realistic assessment of requirement of pumpsets based on the needs of the districts.

Paragraph 7.3 at Page 13

17.1. Whereas diesel pumpsets of 10 horse power capacity were needed for EAPP, sets of different capacities were purchased as enough sets of that capacity were stated to be not available. As the Directorate had no data regarding actual performance of, or area irrigated by pumpsets of different capacities, it was not possible to ascertain whether the pumpsets of lower capacity served the purpose adequately.

17.2. The Committee wanted to know how did the Department ascertain that 10 HP sets were not available in the market. The Departmental witness stated that the progress of purchase was reviewed by the Purchase Board of the Corporation and it was found that sufficient number of 10 HP sets were not available. The Committee wanted to have a copy of the minutes of the Purchase Board. The Department did not submit the same till 30th January 1976. In reply to another question whether there was any competent officer who had gone into the market to enquire

about the availability of 10 HP set, the Departmental witness replied as below:

"The Agro Industries Development Corporation is a State owned Corporation and Secretary, Agriculture is the Member of the Corporation and in order to cope with the short-coming a report is submitted to Government". The Committee considers that the Department did not reply to the specific point as they did not ascertain the availability from the market.

17.3. When the Committee asked the Department about their opinion whether pumpsets of lower category could serve the purpose the Department replied in the affirmative. The Committee then enquired why did the Department purchase 10 or 15 or 20 HP sets then. The Department replied that 5 H.P. sets were not always available. According to the department 5 H.P. set was good but due to scarcity of 5 H.P. set and due to their large demand they had to purchase 10, 15 or 20 H.P. Pump. He also added that in all cases 5 H.P. set would not do well. In reply to another question why did the Department purchase pumpsets of higher category when they agreed that pumpsets lower category served the purpose better, the Departmental witness referred to their earlier reply and added that 10 H.P. sets were also easier for moving. The Committee enquired whether the Department made any assessment or study about which area or which district can be supplied with 5 or 10 or 15 or 20 H.P. pumpsets. The Departmental witness stated that for boro cultivation bigger pumpsets were required and added that they always liked to go for bigger sets. In reply to another question the Departmental witness stated that a 5 H.P. set can irrigate approximately 30 acres.

RECOMMENDATION

17.4. The Committee takes serious view of the Department's failure to submit a copy of the minutes of the Purchase Board of the Corporation as asked for and that the Department did not maintain any data regarding the actual performance of different categories of sets though the Department had been maintaining the diesel pumpsets for the last 15 to 20 years. The Committee therefore, recommends that a thorough probe about the working of Department in this regard need be made as to why the Department failed to maintain any records regarding performance of each category of sets and areas to which such categories of sets were suitable to find out appropriate category of sets to be utilised.

Paragraph 7.4. at Page 13

18.1. Test check of working of these pumpsets in four districts showed:—

District	Area to be irrigated (in acres)	Sets available including new supply	Sets worked	Sets not worked	Area irrigated	
					Wheat	Other corp
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Kamrup	10,400	117	117	...	430	733
Goalpara	6,000	278	242	36	1,680	1,921
Sibsagar	3,000	56	25	31	...	184
Cachar	...	90	90	2,053

18.2. The Committee wanted to know the reasons for low working of the diesel pumpsets as the actual area irrigated was far below the area which was to be irrigated ; the Departmental witness stated that there were lack of demand from the cultivators, the people did not want to pay if the Department give them free water then of course they require and the other reasons for low working were breakdown and non-supply of the pumpsets in time.

18.3. The Departmental witness in reply to a question stated that before preperation of the programme the area to be irrigated was not surveyed as it was prepared in hurry. In reply to another question the Departmental witness stated that each pumpset could cover 40 acres and in some cases it could cover 15 to 20 acres. The Committee worked out from the paragraph that the coverage per set was about 10 acres in Kamrup, 15 acres in Goalpara, 7 acres in Sibsagar and 23 acres in Cachar. In reply to another question the Departmental witness stated that 15 to 20 sets could not be utilised fully but the Committee finds from the Paragraph that only in four districts out of 541 sets 67 sets did not work.

18.4. The Committee asked the Departmental witness to state whether the sets in North Lakhimpur and Dhemaji were lying unused. The Departmental witness in reply stated that the performance in Lakhimpur District was not good the Department could not furnish the figures of actual utilisation when asked for but stated that it was below standard.

18.5. The Department did not furnish the statement except for Lakhimpur where also the number of applications received for pumpsets was not mentioned by the Department. As the Department has not been able to furnish this, the Committee cannot accept the reason given by the Department that there was lack of demand for these pumpsets. The Department was asked to state whether it made any study about actual working of the pumpsets in any of the districts to find out the reasons for low utilisation and also whether any study was made as to why all the pumpsets in the districts were not utilised. The Departmental witness replied that no such examination or study has been done by the Department.

18.6. In reply to another question the Departmental witness stated that 35 sets in Lakhimpur (14 for North Lakhimpur and 21 for Dhemaji) were issued to cover 195 bighas. The Committee finds that for 65 acres 25 sets were issued. The Committee thereafter asked as to why against 40 sets earmarked 35 sets were issued. The Departmental witness replied that the issue was regulated according to demand the Committee called for copies of correspondence about transfer of sets from one place to another.

18.7. On being asked the Department furnished the performance report of North Lakhimpur District. vide Annexure IV

The report shows the following:—

Location	No. of set	Sets used in			Area irrigated in acres		
		1972-73	73-74	74-75	1972-73	73-74	74-75
Dhemaji	13	6	2	3	11.2	1.2	6
North Lakhimpur.	27	14	24	10	55	79	55

OBSERVATION

18.8. The Committee observed that even in this district also a large number of sets were not utilised. Then the Chief Engineer further stated that the Department had issued 35 pumpsets for Lakhimpur out of which 14 were for North Lakhimpur and 21 for Dhemaaji to cover an area of 196 bighas.

18.9. The Committee observed that whereas 40 sets were earmarked for the district, only 35 were supplied. On being asked as to how the requirement were worked out, the Departmental witness stated that pumpsets were supplied on the basis of requisition made by the Sub-divisional Advisory Bodies. On further being asked to furnish the reasons for transfer of sets earmarked for one district to another and all the copies of correspondences on the basis of which such transfers were made, the Department promised to do so. The Committee regrets that till to-day (30th January, 1976), the Department has not furnished any such paper.

18.10. The Committee observed from the performance report of Lakhimpur District furnished by the Department that 35 pumpsets had been lodged in the district but the area irrigated during 1972-73 was only 195 bighas. This shows extremely low utilisation of the pumpsets as compared to the capacity earlier stated by the Departmental witness. This also results in wastage of pumpsets which would be usefully utilised elsewhere. The Department was not able to satisfy the Committee regarding the low utilisation of the pumpsets.

18.11. From the statement the Committee also observed that the utilisation of all these pumpsets in the subsequent years continued to be low.

RECOMMENDATION

18.12. The Committee recommends that a thorough investigation be made regarding the distribution of pumpsets in the different districts to ascertain whether the distribution was based on the needs assessed and communicated by the district officers and whether the pumpsets distributed were related to the area which required irrigation under this programme in each district.

18.13. The Committee also recommends that the Department should actually study the low utilisation of pumpsets in the District, to ascertain the causes for it and to take remedial measures as otherwise the low utilisation results in wastage of money and assets.

18.14. The results of this investigation should be submitted to the Committee within three months from the date of submission of this Report to the House.

18.15. The Committee would like the responsibilities for low utilisation, non-utilisation and maldistribution of pumpsets to be fixed and then results of investigation and the fixation of responsibilities be submitted to the Committee within three months from the date of submission of this report to the House.

Paragraph 8.1. at Page 13— SHALLOW TUBEWELLS.

19.1. In North Lakhimpur and Dhemaji Subdivisions of Lakhimpur District, 1600 hectares (4,000 acres) were to be irrigated with 200 shallow tubewells (North Lakhimpur : 100, Dhemaji : 100). Sites for tubewells were selected in consultation with anchalik panchayats : no records were available in the Directorate or district agricultural offices to show that feasibility studies regarding availability of water were made before finalising the sites for these tubewells.

19.2. While all tubewells in North Lakhimpur subdivision were installed by December 1972, in Dhemaji, only 37 were installed by December 1972 and the remaining 63 by March 1973 ; the benefit of irrigation by the latter pumpsets was, thus, not available at the time it was needed for the wheat crop.

19.3. The Committee wanted to know as to whether the Directorate of Agriculture did conduct any feasibility studies regarding the availability of water before finalising the individual sites for the shallow tubewells ; the Departmental witness replied that the Department based its programme on the report of the Geological survey of India on the availability of ground water in the State and this report indicated the area where ground water was available. On a query as to whether they had indicated the sites where the shallow tubewells were to be installed and whether it was successful, the Departmental witness replied in affirmative and stated that in some cases the tubewells did not work because water was not available and they also admitted that there were failures in some cases. The performance of the tubewells was not very good. On being asked as to what were the reasons due to which 37 shallow tubewells could not be installed in Dhemaji Subdivision, the Departmental witness stated that the report shows that tubewells were not working because there was no demand during the last rabi season and in that particular year the Department was not prepared.

19.4. In reply to a question as to whether the Department did not make any study about the actual working of the pumpsets in any of the district to find out what were the reasons for low utilisation and also whether any study had been made as to why in Goalpara, Lakhimpur and Sibsagar districts all the pumpsets were not utilised the Departmental witness replied in negative. Thereafter the Committee asked the Department to furnish the information. The Additional Chief Engineer, Irrigation (Agri.), Assam in his letter No IAG/A/20/137, dated 31st December, 1975 furnished the following written information :—

“(1) A detailed report about functioning of Diesel Pumpsets in Lakhimpur District is placed in Annexure IV.

(2) As per records available, there was a meeting in the Office of the Joint Director of Agriculture, Jorhat on 19th August, 1972 to assess the extent of flood damage and to provide necessary relief for growing Rabi Crop in Majuli area. In that meeting it was resolved that 50 pumpsets should be earmarked for Rabi Irrigation in Majuli area. Similarly in Goalpara District, the total requirement of new

Diesel pumpsets was 430 sets (copy of requisition from Executive Engineer placed below at Annexure V though we have supplied only 182 sets. As such no excess issue was made from this end. The reasons for idleness of 36 pumpsets in Goalpara District was that the indents for the pumpsets was given on the basis of programme, envisaged, but the same could not be achieved in full.

19.5. The Superintending Engineer has furnished these particulars on the basis of records available in the Log Books and cultivation registers maintained for the Shallow Tubewells. The statement shows that the actual loss of working hours due to breakdown was only 697 hours.

RECOMMENDATION

19.6. The Committee is distressed to note that the Department, without ascertaining the demand for water, the soil condition and availability of water, installed the shallow tube-wells. The Committee recommends that investigation should be made about low irrigation provided by the shallow tube-wells and responsibility should be fixed on the concerning officers for whose fault the benefit of irrigation could not be made available during the programmed period.

19.7. The Committee also recommends that the reasons for continued low irrigation by these shallow tube-wells in the subsequent years be also investigated, and the Department should take immediate remedial measures to improve their utilisation.

19.8. The Committee recommends that the cultivators should be trained in effective use of water. Adequate steps should be taken to motivate the cultivators. Schemes should be prepared keeping in view the soil condition and availability of source of water.

Paragraph 3.2 at Page 14

20.1. Table below gives project-wise details of tubewells installed, worked and area irrigated :—

Name of projects	Installed	Installed but not worked	Area irrigated (in acres)
SUBDIVISION-NORTH LAKHIMPUR			
North Lakhimpur	17	..	131
North Lakhimpur II	4	...	20
North Lakhimpur III	6	2	6
Nowbaicha I	16	3	25
Nowbaicha II	11	2	24
Bihupunia	20	1	39
Narayanpur	26	...	137
	100	8	382
DHEMAJI			
Dhemaji I	18	16	17
Dhemaji III	14	...	9
Bordoloni I	15	...	7
Bordoloni II	3	10	18
Dhakuakhana I	29	..	9
Dhakuakhana II	11	28	2
Jonai	10	10	2
	100	64	62

20.2. Thus of the 200 tubewells intalled, 72 did not work at all; in 41 cases even the engines were not fitted. The 128 tubewells commissioned work for an average of 42 hours each till 31st March 1973, the low utilisation being due mainly to break-downs and lack of demand. Area actually irrigated for rabi crop was 180 hectares (444 acres) only.

20.3. The Committee in course of examination enquired when the shallow tubewells were installed in North Lakhimpur and Dhemaji, the Additional Chief Engineer, Irrigation (Agriculture) stated that these were installed by December, 1972 and others in 1973—January—43, February—10 and March—10.

20.4. Form the written statement submitted by the Additional Chief Engineer, Irrigation (Agriculture) in his leter No. IAG/A/20/137, dated 31-12-75 which is appended to the Report as Annexure VI it appeared that earliest installation was dated 10th Dec. 1972 and the latest was dated 30th August, 1973. The Director of Agri. in reply to a question why in Dhemaji, 64 were installed but not worked, admitted that these were installed almost when the season was over. On a query as to why in 41 cases even the engines were not fitted, the Departmental witness replied that if there was any possibility of working, the Department would fit them. The Departmental witness further stated that they were trying to create demand. The Department had a bigger extension work in the area. One Deputy Director had been posted for linking of credit through bank. In reply to a question as to when there was no demand for 64 tubewells why the Department installed 100 tubewells in Dhemaji Subdivision, the Departmental witness stated that Department apprehended that there would be demand in future. On a query as to whether these 200 sites were selected by the local selection Committee, the Departmental witness stated that the Subdivisional Committee met 9 times and they decided the placement of the tubewells.

20.5. On being questioned as to whether any Officer belonging to the Agriculture Department were members of the Subdivisional Committee and whether sites were selected as per advice of the Executive Engineer belonging to Agriculture Department; the Departmental witness replied in affirmative and stated that the Block Development Officers, Gaon Panchayat President and the Anchalik Panchayat Presidents were the members of the Site Selection Committee. In reply to a question whether practical hours of working was less because of delay in installation, the Departmental witness replied in affirmative.

20.6. The Committee in their on-the-spot study tour visited some of the shallow Tubewell pumpsets on 14th and 15th November, 1975 in Dhemaji Subdivision and passed certain remarks vide Tour Impression at Appendix.

20.7. The Additional Chief Engineer, Irrigation (Agriculture Assam) sent the following performance report in his letter No.IAG/A/20/166, dated 16th January, 1976 which is given below :—

"I have the honour to inform you that we have checked and tested the Shallow Tubewells and our findings as follows :—

(a) **Moridhalghat** :—The discharge is quite satisfactory (about 7000 GPH) and it was run for more than 4 hours. The total depth is measured and checked with M. B. The difference is found to be 0.8 metre which may be due to deposition of sand etc. Certificate from President, G. P. is enclosed.

(b) **Dhunaguri-I** :—The well was run for 6 hours and the discharge is found to be 7000 GPH approximately. The difference in depth is found to be 1.00 metre, the reason for which is same as above. Certificate from President, G. P. is enclosed.

(b) **Dhunaguri-2** :—The well was run for 6 hours and the discharge is found to be 7000 GPH approximately. The difference in depth is found to be 1.50 metre, the reason for which is same as above. Certificate is enclosed.

(c) **Choukhamatigaon pather** :— This tube well was tested on 3rd January, 1976 and the discharge was found to be 5000 GPH (Approx.). But on 4th January, 1966, the well could not delivery water. The reason for which are now under investigation. We are trying to rectify the defects and details will be intimated to you later on. One of the villagers reported that a piece of pipe has been inserted in the well by some miscreants. If this is so, the tube well have to be withdrawn.

2. (a) **Silapathar** :—The well was tested on 19th December, 1976 and a report from SDAE (M) Dhemaji is attached herewith. There is no major variation in depth.

(b) **Chaukhamatigaon Pathar** :—As under item No. (1).

3. The tube well installed at Neamatichuk covered 6 bighas of Boro Paddy and 16 bighas of IR-8 under irrigation. This was done as per demand from the BDO Dhemaji and bills were raised for that purpose. Obtaining bonds from the cultivators is the duty of the BDO. However the BDO is requested to produce the bond forms to us and he promised to produce the same within a week's time. Log Book is available with us and the name of the Operator is Sri Bimal Bor-thakur and Heramba Borah. There is such instance that a cultivator who signed a bond for one bigha for irrigation but no water supplied to him.

SHALLOW FILTER POINT AT SILAPATHER (SOCIETY GAON)

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--|
| 1. Static water table observed | 11.5 ft. from ground level. |
| 2. Discharge recorded | 5000 gallons/hours (approx.) |
| 3. Hours run | 2 hours (approx.) from 12/15 to 2.30 p.m. with 15 minutes break. |

In this context a copy of certificate as has been obtained from the land owner, who is also President of Kulajan Gaon Panchayat.

RECOMMENDATION

20.8. The Emergency Agricultural Production Programme was initiated in August, 1972. Even if the view points of the Department are taken into consideration that in North Lakhimpur and Dhemaji Shallow Tubewells were very few and the time at the disposal of the Department was very short, it appeared to Committee that even in subsequent 3 (three) years also there is no utilisation and there is no improvement, the condition remains more or less the same.

20.9. The Committee is not satisfied with the explanation given by the Department and regrets to note that nothing was done by the Department in the subsequent years also to improve the working of these tubewells and to utilise the tubewells for irrigation. This indicates absolute lack of caution on the part of the Department.

20.10 The Committee also recommends that continued non-utilisation or low utilisation of these shallow tube-wells should be thoroughly investigated and the responsibility fixed.

Paragraph 8. 3. at page 15

21.1. Whereas in North Lakhimpur subdivision all tubewells taken together worked for 4,352 hours only, these were under repairs for 3,447 hours and were stated to have not been worked for 75 hours because of lack of demand. In Dhemaji subdivision, all tubewells taken together worked only for 960 hours. Details of hours during which these remained under break-down and the hours during which there was no demand were not available. Reasons for the large number of break-down hour in North Lakhimpur Subdivision have not been investigated.

21. 2. The Committee wanted to know as to whether the Department made any analysis the reasons for extremely low working of the shallow tubewells, the Departmental witness replied that no such analysis was made. On a query as to whether the Directorate or the Department investigated about the break-down of tubewells the Departmental witness stated that it was investigated. But the Department could not furnish the Committee with the result obtained on this investigation.

RECOMMENDATION

21.3. The Committee recommends that the action taken on the Report of the investigation about the break-down of tubewells be furnished to the Committee within two months from the date of submission of this Report to the House.

Paragraph 8.4 at page 15

22.1. The Paragraph brings out that against 400 tubewells to be installed during the annual plan only 118 tubewells were installed.

22.2 The Committee therefore wanted to know what were the reasons for this shortfall. The Departmental witness replied that there existed a provision for Rs. 4 lakhs for 400 tubewells. Obviously with this meagre fund provision it was not possible to install all the 400 tubewells. The Planning Commission allotted only 4 lakhs of rupees for the purpose and so with this money the Department had installed 118 numbers.

RECOMMENDATION

22.3. The Committee is constrained to observe that the Annual Plan for the shallow tubewells appears to have been made without any realistic co-relation between the physical target and the availability of fund.

22.4 The Committee recommends that the plans prepared should be realistic and possible of achievement.

Paragraph 9.1 and 9.2 at Page 15—THRESHERS.

23. It was assessed in August 1972 that 100 threshers would be needed to harvest the wheat crop in the flood-affected areas, for which the Government of India gave a loan of Rs. 5 lakhs in September 1972. Subsequently, State Government requested the Government of India for a further loan of Rs. 15 lakhs to purchase another 300 threshers as farmers in Assam were not adept in use of threshers and the pre-monsoon rains set in at about the time wheat is harvested. This loan was given in March 1973. The threshers were to be issued to farmers on hire during the harvesting seasons (mid-March to mid-April.)

24.1 Orders for one hundred threshers were placed in September 1972 and further orders for 300 threshers in March 1973 with the Assam Agro Industries Development Copn. Details of threshers (make, capacity, etc.) and the date by which these were to be supplied were not indicated in the orders. Against 400 threshers ordered, 365 were actually supplied (100 threshers of 300-700 kilogrammes clean grain per hour capacity and 265 threshers of 150-200 kilogrammes clean grain per hour capacity) 265 threshers by April 1973 and the rest between May and September 1973. Only 203 were issued to district agricultural officers by March 1973. Another 83 were issued from May to September 1973. The remaining 79 were not issued till September 1973.

24.2 This brings out that against 40 threshers ordered from the Assam Agro Industries Development Corporation, the Corporation supplied only 325 threshers 265 threshers by April, 1973 and the rest between May and September, 1973. Out of the threshers supplied only 203 were issued to District Agricultural officers by March, 1973 and another 83 from May to September, 1973.

24.3 The Committee wanted to know as to what was the basis on which the requirement of threshers was worked out by the Department as 400, the Departmental witness stated that only 20% of the anticipated wheat production might be required to be threshed and on that basis the requirement of threshers were worked out. On a query as to what were the reasons for which 79 threshers were not issued the Departmental witness admitted that order was placed late and subsequently cancelled.

OBSERVATION

24.4. The Committee is unhappy to note that due to delay in placing the orders the Threshers could not be purchased in time, as such the benefit of the scheme could not be availed of.

Paragraph 9.3 at Page 16

25. 1. Test check of utilisation of threshers revealed :—

- (a) Of 63 and 28 threshers shown as issued in the records of Gauhati Central Store to Goalpara and Lakhimpur agricultural engineering divisions, 26 and 7 respectively were not received in those divisions.
- (b) Forty-two threshers (Goalpara 14, Silchar 2, Jorhat 23, Lakhimpur 3) were not used at all.
- (c) Quantities of grain threshed were extremely small as will be seen from the following table :

Subdivision	Number of threshers	Quantity threshed in quintals
Gauhati	10	247
Dhubri	7	12
Kokrajhar	7	214
Goalpara	12	424
Jorhat	5	36
North Lakhimpur	15	511

- (d) Performance of almost all threshers was much below capacity reportedly because they were sub-standard and suffered frequent mechanical break-downs.

25.2. The Committee asked the Departmental witness that these threshers were required for threshing during the harvest season i.e., middle of March to middle of April, how many threshers were actually utilised for threshing of the harvest in different districts and quantities which were actually threshed by these districtwise in the year 1972-74 and 1974-75 and also what was the percentage of utilisation, how much had been spent for repair and wherefrom the parts had been purchased. The Additional Chief Engineer Irrigation assured to supply the information.

25.3. On being asked as to whether quality of the threshers was of sub-standard whether the Department made any enquiry after getting the Report from the Executive Engineer, Agriculture, North Lakhimpur; the Departmental witness stated that enquiry was made and a report was sent by the Project Officer, Agriculture with a copy to the Additional Chief Engineer but due to shifting of offices the file had been missing and action could not be taken. The Assam Agro Industries Development Corporation was asked to take action.

25.4. On a query as to whether the Department had obtained any report from the Executive Engineer, Agriculture, North Lakhimpur or a certificate from about the performances of threshers before the final payment was made, the Departmental witness replied that the Executive Engineer, S.A.O., S.A.E. etc. as the case may be were the officers to certify about the performance of the threshers. The output of the threshers depends upon the efficiency of the operators and also upon the quality of the crops. The Joint Director of Agriculture (Engineering) Assam, Khanapara in his letter No. Agri./Audit/PAC/1641/Pt/10, dated 8th January, 1976 stated about the low output of threshers which runs as follows:—

"There was a report from Executive Engineer (Agri) North Lakhimpur regarding low out-put of a particular brand of threshing machines submitted to Chief Engineer (Agri). But as per information available, the report was not placed before him. However, the figure of low out-put as given by Executive Engineer (Agri) North Lakhimpur could not give a correct picture as low out-put may be for the following reasons:—

1. Inexperienced hand in operation of machined as well as feeding the machines at required speed.
2. Correct operating speed of machines not checked.
3. Crop not thoroughly dried before threshing.
4. Practice of harvesting paddy with minimum stall not followed.
5. Performance of these machines shown marked improvement from subsequent year's report.

25.5. On being asked whether after getting unsatisfactory report the Corporation decided to release 15 percent of the balance and the other 5 percent to be kept with the Corporation why then the Department released all the amounts, the Departmental witness stated that that was released. Thereafter, the Committee asked the Department to furnish the copies of the report submitted by the different officers and the decision of the Corporation to release the remaining 15 percent and the other 5 percent. The Joint Director of Agriculture (Engg.) Assam, Khanapara in his letter No. AGRI/AUDIT/PAC/1641/PT/10, dated 8th January, 1976 stated as follows:—

"As regards release of 5% kept as security deposit, it was released by the Agro Industries Development Corporation Ltd. as per recommendation dated 3rd April, 1974 of the Chief Project Engineer. An attested copy of this recommendation as annexed as Annexure VII.

25.6. The Committee enquired as to what were the penal provisions in the tender notice of they supplied low standard threshers though the Department accepted the tenders on competitive basis, the Departmental witness stated that 80 percent of the payment was already made immediately after the delivery and there was the penal provision and earnest money of Rs. 2000 in the form of D.C. was to be deposited. So this security money could be constituted as a base for penal provision. If the quality is poor that money will not be released.

25.7. On a query as to whether these threshers were suitable and could serve the purpose of varieties of crops under the climate of Assam, the Departmental witness stated that these were not specifically meant for Assam climate. The Departmental witness further stated that at the time of purchase of these threshers it was not suggested that the threshers should be suitable for the climate of Assam. The Department will have to suggest some designs now.

25.8. In reply to a question as to whether there was any training programme for operating the threshers, because in absence of trained operators the farmer operated the threshers, the Departmental witness stated that for running the engine, one operator is provided and the farmers are shown as to how to handle the threshers.

RECOMMENDATION

25.9. The Committee is distressed to find that even inspite of penal provision in the tender notice and in the face of receipt of complaints that it was of sub-standard and performance were also unsatisfactory, the penal provision was not observed. The Committee also came to know that the type of threshers purchased was not suitable to climate of Assam and the Department did not investigate this aspect of the matter before the purchase was made.

25.10. The Committee therefore recommends that thorough investigation should be made as to why 20 p.c. and 5% releases were made inspite of receipt of reports from the field officers to the effect that the threshers were of sub-standard and its performance was not satisfactory and also that these were not suitable for the climate of Assam. Responsibility should be fixed on the Officer/Officers for whose fault such an infructuous expenditure was made.

25.11. The Committee also recommends that Department should take steps to train the cultivators to operate the threshers and investigation should be as to whether the existing machines can be designed to suit the climatic condition of Assam.

25.12. The action taken by the Department should be intimated to the Committee within a course of three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

Paragraph 10 at page 16—TRACTORS.

26.1. With the loan of Rs.12 lakhs, the Directorate purchased 30 tractors from Assam Agro Industries Development Corporation for Rs. 10.30 lakhs. Of these, 26 were indigenous and 4 imported; imported tractors involved an extra expenditure of Rs. 0.56 lakh.

26.2. These tractors were issued to 7 agricultural divisions (Jorhat 9, Nowgong 3, Gauhati 5, Goalpara 6, Tezpur 1, Lakhimpur 5, Silchar 1); basis of distribution was not available. Test check in four divisions showed very low utilisation as under :—

Name of the Agricultural Division	No. of Tractors issued	No. of standard working hours available according to capacity	No. of hours worked	Acreage horrowed	Acreage ploughed
Jorhat	9	3,822	1,180	1,899	...
Goalpara	6	2,214	1,240	1,227	1,972
Silchar	1	332	152	99	..
Gauhati	5	1,650	870	822	..

26.3. The Committee wanted to know whether indigenous tractors were not available, the Departmental witness stated that at that time no other indigenous tractors of reputed variety were available; so the Department decided to buy finally 12 imported tractors through State Trading Corporation and 4 (Four) Ford Tractors of 50 H. P.

26.4. On a query as to what were the utilisation of five Tractors started under Emergency Agricultural Production Programme the Departmental witness stated that according to Log Book, it was 822 Bighas against 1620 Bighas. In reply to a question as to whether Department investigated the reasons for low utilisation of these Tractors the Departmental witness replied in negative. It depends on demand; if there was demand these could be fully utilised. On being questioned as to why there was lack of demand for the Tractors the Departmental witness stated that demand was low because mainly the Tractors were required for dry raising; in the areas where there was less demand for tractors, such type of land was not available.

26.5. In reply to a query as to what was the reason for low demand in Majuli area, the Departmental witness stated that at Majuli there were lots of difficulties such as transport difficulties. Asked as to whether the yield after tractorisation was more or less the same in the subsequent year, the Departmental witness stated that cropping without Tractor, if the preparation of the land is alright, also produces good results. Tractorisation makes deep ploughing and the sub-soil if exposed to sun, loses its fertility. In reply to a question as to whether the Department think that the soil of Assam is not suitable for tractorisation, the Director of Agriculture stated that personally he felt that mechanised cultivation was not suitable for Assam. At this stage the Committee asked the Departmental witness to furnish a statement showing the total number of Tractors available in each District, utilisation of these Tractors and the areas horrowed and ploughed and the Joint Director of Agriculture (Engg) Assam in his letter No. Agri/Audit/PAC/1641/Pt/10, dated 8th January, 1976 had forwarded a statement showing the issues of tractors during the period of Emergency Agricultural Production Programme by the

Executive Engineer stores division, Gauhati as per his records in the stock book which is appended to the Report as Annexure VIII. But this statement did not contain the utilisation and areas sown and ploughed and except the distribution of tractors to the various Subdivisions of the State.

RECOMMENDATION

26.6. The Committee is constrained to note that the Tractors are purchased on an unrealistic assessment as it appears from the low utilisation. The purchase of 4 imported Tractors appears to be unjudicious as in course of time it will have to be idle outlay for want of Foreign parts and the expenditure incurred will prove to be infructuous. In view of the opinion expressed by the Director of Agriculture that mechanised cultivation is not suitable for Assam, the Committee recommends that the Department should carefully go into the question whether tractorisation is good or not before making any fresh purchase of tractors, and submit a report to the Committee.

26.7. The Committee, therefore, recommends that these should be thoroughly probed about the lack of demand and low utilisation of the Tractors. The Committee is unhappy to note that the Department failed to furnish the required information and urge upon the Department to furnish the same within one month from the date of submission of this Report to the House.

Paragraph 11 at Page 17—

INPUTS.

27.1. The Government of India gave a short term loan of Rs.200 lakhs for seeds (Rs. 70 lakhs), fertiliser (Rs. 120 lakhs) and pesticides (Rs.10 lakhs). In addition, the State Government allocated Rs. 10 lakhs to meet the element of subsidy (difference between the purchase price and issue rate of Rs. 150 per quintal) on certified wheat seed. Fertilisers and pesticides were purchased from Agro Industries Development Corporation and seeds from Assam Seeds Corporation. Requisition for these inputs were made by projects to the Directorate which, in turn, placed orders on the two Corporations. Supplies were made by the Corporations direct to projects under intimation to the Directorate. Projects were to maintain detailed accounts of inputs received, distributed on loan or cash basis to farmers and balance in stocks. The Directorate has, however, not compiled consolidated accounts of supplies received, issued and in stock in the projects (November 1973).

27.2. The Committee wanted to know as to why the Department did not compile the consolidated accounts of receipt, issues and stock of Seeds, Fertilisers and Pesticides in the projects. The Deptl. witness stated that so far as Seeds were concerned they compiled the accounts and added that against the advance of Rs. 12341.841.60 paid to the Corporation, Corporation submitted bills for Rs. 1.19.26.189'97 being the value of Seeds supplied by them against which the Department accepted the bills for Rs. 11474782.07 leaving bills for Rs.551407.90 still to be finally settled. The Managing Director of the Assam Seeds Corporation stated in reply to a question how the Corporation could supply all the quantities claimed by them though the Agriculture Department did not receive these quantities. That the quantities supplied were being finalised. The Committee thereafter wanted

to know from the Department the reasons for which accounts could not be finalised, though 2½ years had already passed. In reply to another question it was stated that accounts would be finalised by 31st March, 1976.

27.3. In course of examination, the witness from the Agriculture Department stated that out of 82783 quintals of germination tested seeds 8306 quintals were in stock at the end of the programme. The Committee wanted from the Department a statement showing the Seeds of different variety not distributed and the seeds of each variety found short. The Department did not submit the same to the Committee till the 31st January, 1976 though more than two months have already elapsed.

27.4. In reply to another question whether there was any report of selling wheat seeds, at the time of distribution, in the black market the Departmental witness informed the Committee that there were few such complaints. In reply to another question whether there was any defalcation case for misuse in the Subdivision or district level and what was the amount involved and how many such cases were there, the Departmental witness stated that there were only 2 or 3 cases and the cases were under enquiry and the proceedings had been drawn up.

27.5. In reply to a question as to what action was taken against those officers who were at fault, the Departmental witness stated that action had been taken against two—one officer was placed under suspension and one case was under enquiry. The Departmental witness stated that the charges against them were misuse of seeds. The Departmental witness did not state the action taken against the other officer. The Committee thereon wanted to have the particulars viz. on which date complaints were received, date of taking decision to proceed against the officers. The Departmental witness did not submit the particulars till 31st January, 1976 to the Committee. In reply to another question the Department stated that out of the left over stock of wheat (germination tested) of 8306 quintals about 654 quintals were damaged and 294 quintals were short. The Committee informed the Department that the 948 quintal of seeds (value Rs. 85000.00) found short and damaged were far in excess of the permissible limit 5% reported by the Department. The Managing Director of the Corporation, the then Joint Director of Agriculture, stated that improvised godowns at the time had to be hired for storing. According to him godowns having katcha flooring and thatched roofing were hired for storing which resulted in the damages and shrinkages and it was really unavoidable. The Committee having expressed its unwillingness to accept that all over Assam such storage facilities were not available the Departmental witness stated that they were investigating specific cases and taking action. They further mentioned that some were damaged by flood but where these were in excess of the limit they would be taking action against the officer at fault.

27.6. The Committee wanted to be informed what reasons were advanced by the concerning Block Development Officer for losses or damages and also the blockwise figures of such losses and damages. In reply to the question regarding the discrepancy between the seeds supplied by the Corporation and the Department had not furnished these details.

27.7. The Departmental witness reported to the Committee that Rs. 50.74 lakhs were adjusted for supply of fertiliser and the balance was under scrutiny and for pesticides the outstanding bill were for Rs. 54000.00.

27.8. The Committee wanted the Department to furnish the details of quantities of fertiliser received and distributed to farmers upto August 1975 and the Committee further wanted to know how much fertiliser or pesticides were received by the Department and what were the balances along with shortages and damages. The Department did not submit the information till 31-1-76.

27.9. In regard to another question whether in fertiliser there were also cases of shortages and damages, the Departmental witness stated that in fertiliser it would be more. In reply to the reasons for these heavy shortages and damages, the Departmental witness stated that this was due to sale of fertiliser being gone down much. In reply to another question as to why the further purchase was not stopped and the undisposed of stock of fertiliser issued to the farmers first the Departmental witness stated that the sale of fertiliser was entrusted to Agro Industries under the normal scheme and they were, therefore, selling the fertiliser directly to the cultivators in subsequent period and they were not willing to take back the left over stock. The Committee thereafter wanted to ascertain from the Department as to why so much quantity of fertilisers was purchased under Emergency Agricultural Production Programme and what was the present undisposed of stock. In regard to the first question the Departmental witness could not furnish any reply and in reply to the second question the Departmental witness stated that they had not this information with them.

RECOMMENDATION

27.10. The Committee is constrained to observe the failure of the Department to submit (i) a statement showing the seeds of different variety not distributed till the end of Emergency Agricultural Production Programme and the quantity of each variety found short ; (ii) a statement showing the dates of receipt of complaint for misuse of seeds, dates of decision to draw up proceedings against the officers at fault ; (iii) reasons advanced by concerning Block Development Officers for losses and damages and also the blockwise figures of such losses and damages ; (iv) how much fertilisers or pesticides were received by the Department and what were the balances along with shortages and damages as well as (v) failure of the Department to finalise the accounts of the seeds and fertiliser supplied by the Seeds Corporation even after 2½ years ; (vi) reasons for purchase of huge quantity of fertiliser under Emergency Agricultural Production Programme ; (vii) the position of the present left over stock and the Committee considers that the Department either intentionally withheld the information for keeping the legislature and public at large uninformed of the short comings and indifference of the Department due to which huge wastages occurred or disregarded the direction of this august body. The Committee is, therefore, compelled to recommend a thorough enquiry by an independent authority, about

the working of the Department with specific reference to the mode of maintenance of accounts records by the Department and whether the withholding of the information from the Committee was intentional or due to non-maintenance of adequate records by the Department. Whatever may be the reasons the Committee recommends that responsibility be fixed and the persons responsible be brought to book.

Paragraph 12.1 at page 17—SEEDS.

28.1. Orders were placed in September 1972 with Assam Seeds Corporation for 1.20 lakh quintals of wheat seed (certified : 0.20 lakh, germinated : 1.00 lakh), 0.03 lakh quintals of mustard seeds and 0.07 lakh quintals of pulses seed to be supplied during November and December 1972. Rupees 1,32.77 lakhs (including Rs. 9.35 lakhs on account of subsidy element on certified wheat seed) were paid to the Corporation between October 1972 and March 1973. The Corporation submitted claims aggregating Rs. 1.30 lakhs for supply of 1.01 lakh quintals of wheat seed (certified : 0.20 lakh, germinated : 0.81 lakh), 1,729 quintals of mustard seed, 6,467 quintals of pulses seed, 2,225 quintals of boro seed and 225 quintals of potato seed. Accounts with the Corporation have not been finalised (December 1973).

28.2 The Department furnished the following information in reply to the claim of the Seed Corporation :

		Supply received		Issued to cultivators	
		In quintals			
Wheat	...	82783	73527
Mustard	...	1209	940
Pulses	...	5076	4669
Paddy	..	1915	1503
Potato	..	225	225

28.3. In reply to a question as to the discrepancies between the supplies made by the Corporation and supplies received by the Agriculture Department, the Managing Director of the Seeds Corporation stated that the Agriculture Department stopped the supply when it was in the process of supply. He further stated the Director of Agriculture and he would sit together and settle up the matters. The Departmental witness did not furnish the figure of certified seeds received and issued.

28.4. In reply to the question regarding the discrepancy between the seeds supplied by the Corporation and the seeds actually received by the Agriculture Department, the Managing Director stated that the Director of Agriculture and he would sit together and reconcile the discrepancies. The Departmental witness did not furnish the figure of certified seeds received and issued. The Food Corporation of India also could not supply the quantities.

28.5. In reply to another question as to whether the Corporation agreed that the short supply of seeds by the Corporation had made to suffer the Emergency Agricultural Production Programme, the Departmental witness stated that the wheat programme did not suffer as the area under wheat subsequently came down. As regards loss in supply of mustard and paddy seeds the Departmental witness stated

that it affected the programme and added that the Corporation could not supply M 27 variety of mustard, according to him of course the season was over by that time and also stated that the quality of paddy seeds was inferior for which the Department had stopped the supply.

RECOMMENDATION

28.6. The Committee is surprised to note that the Department could not get the discrepancy between seeds supplied and received reconciled within 2½ years and only now the Corporation was proposing to sit together and reconcile the discrepancies and recommends that a thorough investigation as to the failure of the Department to settle up the accounts so long be made for fixation of responsibility and the persons responsible be brought to book.

28.7. The progress made for settlement of accounts also be made known to the Committee from time to time and the position after final settlement of accounts reported to the Committee by the 15th April, 1976 as the Department promised to settle up the accounts within the financial year.

Paragraph 12.2 at page 17

29.1. According to the records of the Corporation, there were no requisitions from 29 projects covering an area of 1.22 lakh acres, and hence no seeds were supplied to them. Details of seeds used in these projects and the sources of supply were not ascertainable.

29.2. In Haflong project (North Cachar Hills), additional area to be covered under wheat was 50 acres under mustard 500 acres, and under pulses 130 acres. Seeds were not supplied to that district and the scheme was not implemented.

29.3. In reply to a question the Departmental witness from the Agriculture stated that those 29 projects were parts of blocks and the seeds were made available to those projects by the Block Development Officers. In reply to another question as to whether the requisitions placed by Block Development Officers were projectwise the Departmental witness replied in the affirmative when the Departmental witness was asked by the Committee that in such cases there must have been mentioned for which project what quantities had been requisitioned the Departmental witness stated that the requisitions were blockwise. The Committee considers the reply of the Department as not based on records. The Committee thereafter asked the Department to give a statement for the 29 projects indicating which Block Development Officers requisitioned how much for distribution in his Block. The said statement called for by the Committee was not received till 31st January, 1976.

29.4. The Committee wanted to know what were the reasons for which the project could not be implemented at Haflong. In reply the Deptl. witness said that they could not cover Haflong as the local people did not like to have the seeds from outside and the local people preferred the local variety. In reply to another question as to why in view of above position the Department selected Haflong. The Departmental witness admitted that their hope to make an attempt in Haflong did not materialise.

RECOMMENDATION

29.5. The Committee views non-submission of the statement showing the requisitions placed by the Block Development Officers for each of the 29 projects with the Seeds Corporation seriously. Earlier also, the Committee had commented on the non-submission of details asked for by the Committee. This seriously hampered the work of the Committee. The Committee recommends that the Government should issue effective instruction to all the Departments to submit the details and notes asked for by the Committee within the stipulated time. The Committee also recommend that in all cases of non-submission of information and data to the Committee, Government should take strong action against the persons concerned.

29.6. The Committee desires that this statement asked for should be submitted by the Department within a month from the date of submission of the Report before the House.

Paragraph 12.3 at page 18—WHEAT SEED.

30.1. Twenty eight thousand quintals of high yielding variety wheat seed were needed for 70,000 acres (where irrigation facilities were to be provided) on the basis of the standard of 40 kilogrammes per acre as determined by the Directorate. However, only 19,974 quintals were ordered and 19,744 quintals supplied. Supply was, therefore, not adequate.

30.2. Test check of receipts and issues in Kamrup, Goalpara, Cachar, Sibsagar and Mikir Hills districts showed that :—

- (i) As against 55,025 quintals of seed supplied to the projects in these districts, 2,648 quintals worth Rs. 3.63 lakhs were not distributed to farmers.
- (ii) Quantity of seed supplied by the Corporation to 25 projects was either in excess of or short of quantities required for which requisitions were placed by these projects.
- (iii) 274 and 489 quintals were stated to have been short received in projects of Rangia and Barpeta Subdivisions (Kamrup) respectively.
- (iv) In Bangong, Bajali, Gobardhan projects (Goalpara) 275 quintals of wheat seed was supplied between 8th December and 22nd December 1972, i.e., after the sowing season. In Golaghat East and Golaghat Central projects (Sibsagar), 122 quintals were issued to farmers after the sowing season.
- (v) In Sibsagar district, 4,246 quintals of seed were issued in excess of standard requirement for coverage of additional area in the district.

30.3. The Departmental witness in reply to a question as to why only 19,974 quintals were ordered for supply when the requirement was 28000 quintals, stated that the certified seeds to the extent required were not available in that year. In reply to another question as to how the Department could know this before hand, the Departmental

witness stated that the N. S. C. people contacted them and they could known from them.

30.4. In reply to another question the Departmental witness stated that certified seeds were issued both in the irrigated and non-irrigated areas. The Committee finds that issue of certified seeds to non-irrigated areas should not have been made as per package of practices prepared by the Department for implementation of the E.A.P.P. there was a specific stipulation that certified wheat seeds would be issued to those cultivators whose land would be covered by irrigation facilities and who would follow package of practices.

30.5. In reply to another question the Departmental witness stated that the certified wheat seeds were distributed to the farmers in time. The Committee, therefore, wanted to know what was the quantity of undistributed stock of certified wheat seed at the close of the programme the Departmental witness stated that they would find out this and added that they issued instruction to keep the undistributed stock at the cold storage at Khanapara and if it was not possible then it should be sold as cattlefeed. The Departmental witness also agreed with the Committee that those quantities of undistributed stock which could not be kept at the cold storage must have suffered loss. The Committee then wanted to know how much quantities were supplied to the farmers and how many quintals remained undistributed out of the total quantities of certified wheat seeds purchased. The Departmental witness stated that they would supply the information. The Department did not supply the information as to the total quantity of certified wheat seeds supplied to the farmers and the quantity remained undistributed.

30.6. The Committee then wanted to know the reasons as to why 2648 quintals of seeds were not distributed in the five Districts. The Departmental witness stated that the areas in those places were reduced. In reply to a question of the Committee as to how long the Department would take to investigate the cases mentioned at (i) (ii) and (iii) of the sub para since 2½ years had already passed, the Departmental witness stated that investigation in regard to the cases mentioned at (iii) was completed and the shortages were due to stoppage of further supply. The Committee wanted to know why further supply was stopped, the Departmental witness stated this was due to short supply of seeds. In reply to another question as to in how many cases the seeds were supplied by the Seed Corporation after the sowing season the Departmental witness stated that the seeds were supplied between the 8th and 22nd December and it should not be considered as late supplies. When it was pointed out by the Committee that as per instruction contained in the Package of Practices such supplies were treated as late the Departmental witness pointed out that the last date for sowing was revised after that and added that in some cases sowing could be done in the 1st week of January depending of course upon the condition of soil.

30.7. When the Committee wanted to know what measures the Department took to ensure that the seeds were supplied by the Corporation and issued to the farmers in time the Departmental witness stated that they were liasoning with the Seed Corporation to see whether seeds were supplied in time. In reply to another question the Departmental witness stated that they felt there had been considerable improvement.

RECOMMENDATION

30.8. The Committee regrets to comment that the Department did not appear before the Committee being fully prepared as the Department failed to furnish (i) the total quantity of certified wheat seeds supplied to the farmers and the quantity remained undistributed even after 2½ years of the programme being over (ii) if the areas in the five districts were reduced why requisition was made for quantity in excess of requirement (iii) why quantities of seed supplied by the Corporation to 23 projects were either in excess of or short of quantities required though the Department continued to maintain the staff entertained during Emergency Agricultural Production Programme till May 1975 and the Audit Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for 1972-73 was forwarded to the Department in September, 1974.

30.9. The Committee is constrained to recommend an investigation as to why the Department could not square up the accounts of seeds and fertilisers supplied to the farmers and quantities remained undistributed at the end of programme and how the left over stocks were utilised/disposed of.

Paragraph 12.4 at page 18—BORO SEED.

31.1. On the basis of the standard of 12 Kgs. per acre, 10,560 quintals were required for the additional area of 0.88 lakh acres to be brought under Boro paddy but only 2,275 quintals were supplied. In December 1972, it was decided to include early Ahu cultivation in this programme, 50,000 acres were to be covered and seed needed was 5,000 quintals acres were to be covered and seed needed was 5,000 quintals. As against this, 2,244 quintals (valued : Rs. 3.29 lakhs) were procured through the Assam Seeds Corporation and supplied by the Corporation in January and February 1973. Though received too late for sowing, these were issued to farmers on loan. In the absence of records, it was not possible to ascertain how seeds issued had actually be utilised by the cultivators. 157 quintals Boro seed valued Rs. 0.17 lakh were not distributed to farmers.

31.2. The Departmental witness could not state specially the reasons for late receipt of seeds.

RECOMMENDATION

31.3. The Committee recommends investigation be conducted to ascertain as to why seeds were not available at the time these were needed and the reasons for non-distribution of the seeds pointed out in the sub-para.

Paragraph 12.5 at page 19—MUSTARD SEED.

32.1. An additional 1.3 lakh acres was to be brought under mustard cultivation. Subsequently it was decided to cover only one lakh acres; 4,500 quintals of seed were needed for the additional area. However, only 1,729 quintals were obtained from the Assam Seeds Corporation. During test check of records of the Corporation, it was

seen that while according to its schedule of rates the price to be charged for supply of mustard seed was Rs. 195 per quintal, it charged the Directorate Rs. 250 per quintal; this was stated to be due to the increased price of procurement.

32.2. Sowing of mustard has to start by the 1st week of October and not later, as otherwise the crop would be heavily infested with aphides during January. Out of 1,729 quintals supplied; 501 quintals were received in projects after the sowing period; delay in supply was mainly due to delay in receipt of requisitions from the Directorate. Mustard seed valued at Rs. 0.59 lakh was not distributed to cultivators.

32.3. Mustard Seeds supplied by Assam Seeds Corporation were of low germination percentage (only 33 per cent of the supplies has more than the prescribed 80 per cent germination). These seeds were purchased by the Corporation from 5 local supplies at Gauhati during October and November 1972. Though the contracts provided acceptance of seeds after these had been tested in the seeds testing laboratory of the Corporation. Seeds were accepted and payments made without tests.

32.4 The Committee wanted to know from the Department whether the supply of lesser quantity of mustard seeds by the Seed Corporation affected the EAPP. The Departmental witness stated that they did not think for additional production of mustard through supply of seed and added that they based their programme on M 27 variety which was a local variety and known widely in the State. When it was pointed out that additional production was contemplated through increase in yield due to improved variety of seeds and pesticides and due to lesser quantity of seeds being purchased and supplied the yield was affected; the Departmental witness agreed that it had affected to that extent. They added that there were other factors also as this was a bad year for mustard, the season was not good for mustard. In reply to a question as to whether supply was made by the five suppliers from whom the Seed Corporation made the purchases as per sample, the Managing Director of the Corporation stated that at the time of giving samples good samples were provided but at the time of bulk supply it was found that the quality was not as per sample. The Committee wanted to know (i) whether these firms earlier supplied seeds (ii) how did the Corporation satisfy itself that these firms would supply quality seeds (iii) did the Corporation maintain any list of approved seed dealers. The Managing Director of the Corporation stated in reply to (i) Generally bulk supply was made for the first time in reply to (ii) they examined the samples before placing orders and in reply to (iii) they were seed dealers.

32.5. In reply to another question as to what action was taken against those firms whose supplies and samples were of different variety the Managing Director of the Corporation stated that they stopped them from further supplying. In reply to another question he stated that they purchased 2150 quintals and supplied to Agriculture Department 1729 quintals including 400 quintal being their farm produce. The Managing Director of the Corporation

stated that the balance quantity was disposed at Rs 19.00 against the procurement price of Rs. 220.00 per quintal and agreed that the Corporation sustained a loss of about Rs.24000.00 in the process. The Committee wanted to know as to why the Corporation did not take any action against those firms as per agreement who did not supply quality seeds as prescribed and why did the Corporation accept seeds without test, the Managing Director of the Corporation could not give any satisfactory reply.

32.6. The Committee wanted to know when did the Corporation make payment and whether it was made after testing the Managing Director told that the payment was made after the test and they could not observe the provisions of the contract.

32.7. The Committee then examined the Department and wanted to know (i) at whose fault these seeds were accepted and payments were made without tests (ii) what were the findings of the Director of Agriculture. In reply, the Director of Agriculture stated as below:—

"I enquired the matter and I submitted a report to the Government. On that report I specifically mentioned that the defect was with the Quality Control Officer. Generally he did not do anything. He entrusted the work in the field officer and because of that the responsibility was fixed on the Quality Control Officer." The Director of Agriculture further stated that it was detected at early stage and ultimately much of the seeds did not reach the cultivators.

32.8. The Committee thereafter wanted the following informations:—

- (i) Total quantity supplied by the Seed Corporation;
- (ii) Quantity sold by the Agriculture Department out of the left over stock.
- (iii) Quantity sold by the Block Development Officers and the rate at which left over stock were sold.
- (iv) Quantity sold by the Corporation out of 122 quintals lifted by them from different block and the rate at which sold.

The Corporation did not furnish the above information.

32.9. The Departmental witness in reply to another question that the sowing, season is 1st to 10th October stated that there was nothing very rigid and it depended upon the local conditions.

32.10. The Committee desired to have a statement showing the dates of requisition placed with the Seed Corporation which the Department did not supply.

32.11 The Committee on 29th October 1975 appointed a Sub-Committee for examining technical issues in connection with the Emergency Agricultural Production Programme.

32.12. The Sub-Committee on 15th December 1975 examined the officer in-charge of the Seed Test Laboratory to ascertain whether the Seeds purchased by the Seed Corporation during EAPP were tested. He replied that in all 67 samples of mustard seeds were tested during September, 1972 to December, 1972. In reply to another question regarding the average germination capacity of mustard seeds the Officer in-charge of the Seed Testing Laboratory replied that 80% was the average below that was sub-standard. In reply to another question the officer-in-charge of the Laboratory stated that these 67 samples were tested and 44 of these were found as sub-standard.

32.13. The Sub-Committee examined the Secretary, Seed Corporation on 17th December, 1975. He informed the Committee that 8 samples were sent to the Laboratory and the result of test (germination capacity) was 44 p.c., 78 p.c., 70 p.c., 57 p.c., 64 p.c., 58 p.c., 4 p.c., and 47 p.c., respectively. He also added that the Seed Testing Laboratory rejected 6 samples out of 8 samples sent for test; It was also stated that these samples were sent to them after purchase. When the Committee wanted to know whether the seeds in respect of those samples which were rejected were distributed or not the Secretary stated that these were distributed but some were collected back.

32.14. The Sub-Committee wanted to know whether the conditions prescribed in the tender notice regarding submission of samples and satisfactory germination test etc. were observed by the Seed Corporation at the time of purchase. The Secretary admitted that the seed were purchased before the test being conducted.

32.15. The Sub-Committee wanted the reasons for making payment to the following suppliers and the replies given were as against each:

Question	Answer
(i) Why M/S. S. S. N. Trading was paid on 10th October 1972 and 31st October 1972 after getting the test report on 28th October 1972?	There was no objection in the samples.
(ii) Why final payment to Mansur Ali was made before receipt of test report on 4th November 1972?	He was always representing for payment and it was made on good faith.
(iii) What about M/S Satia Bethia and Co., Gauhati?	As above.
(iv) According to your statement only one company M/S Hanuman Trading was declared as standard?	Yes, and Monsur Ali also

32.16. In reply to another question why security money was not forfeited in terms of clause 4 of tender notice in case of those parties who supplied sub-standard seeds, the Secretary stated that they made the final payment. In reply to another question the Secretary stated that in early part of November, 1972 he received complaints from the Director of Agriculture that the Seeds were sub-standard and similar reports were received from Districts and Sub-division in last part of October and early November. When asked by the Committee he stated that the Managing Director received these reports.

32.17. The Sub-Committee, therefore, came to the conclusion that most of the pay orders were passed at the end of October after the complaint regarding quality had been received from the districts and subdivisions. Besides the pay orders were dated 23rd October, 1972, 20th October, 1972 and 21st October, 1972, i.e., during the periods in which the complaints from the Districts and subdivisions were received by the Managing Director.

32.18. The Departmental witness in reply to a question stated that according to Government orders all purchases of seeds should be made through the Assam Seeds Corporation.

32.19. In reply to another question as to what were the conditions imposed by the Director of Agriculture whenever orders were placed with the Corporation the Departmental witness stated that the supply should be completed within 30 days time of making the advance payment and the seeds should be genuine in quality and that recognised standard germination test."

32.20 The Sub-Committee on the 27th December, 1975 examined the Ex-Managing Director of the Assam Seeds Corporation and the present Managing Director of the said Corporation.

32.21. The Director of the Corporation submitted the dates of receipt of complaints from the different Block Development Officer. The complaints were stated to be received between November, 1972 to April, 1973.

32.22 The Ex-Managing Director of the Corporation in reply to a question stated that he knew there was an enquiry made by the Director of Agriculture but he could remember of no confidential report from the Director because no copy was addressed to them. When he was asked to state definitely whether the confidential report was not received he stated that he would check up and intimate on the next day.

32.23. The Sub-Committee thereafter wanted to know from the Ex-Managing Director of the Corporation as to why clause 3 of the tender notice that payment for supply would be made only after satisfactory completion of supply subject to satisfactory completion of supply subject to satisfactory germination of the whole lot for which samples would again be sent to Laboratory for germination test; was not observed. The Ex-Managing Director described that during 1972-73 there was language disturbance and the situation was abnormal. As the seeds had to be sent in a hurry the samples were not sent to Laboratory for test but stated that germination test was conducted at the Central Godown under the guidance of the Quality Control Officer and the germination test was conducted before commencing supply. He clarified that the suppliers used to supply in small consignments and germination test was performed at the time of supply only and no germination test was conducted with the consignments received subsequently because there was no time also. He was further requested to state whether clause 4 of the tender notice was followed to which he answered in the affirmative.

32.24. The Managing Director admitted that clause 3 of the agreement could not be followed as there was rush of work and they had to supply wheat seeds near about a lakh quintals, mustard, peas and pulses seeds all at a time and the Laboratory was also not equipped to meet the requirement of the Corporation because the samples normally took about fifteen days to get analysed in the Laboratory and further some of the staff were deputed from the Laboratory for performing germination test because of large volume of work.

32.25. When the Sub-Committee wanted to know as to when did they send the samples to the seed testing laboratory, Gauhati. The Ex-Managing Director stated that it was done only after the complaints were received and as soon as the first complaints were received the samples were sent for test as directed by the Director of Agriculture. He also stated from his memory that the sample was sent to Laboratory by November 15 and it was done in December.

32.26. The Sub-Committee wanted to know from the Ex-Managing Director as to when the eight samples were sent by the Seeds Corporation to the Seed Testing Laboratory, Ulubari. He told the Sub-Committee that these must be sent afterwards. The Sub-Committee then requested the Ex-Managing Director to state whether the samples supplied by M/S S. N. Trading, Gauhati, Prag Trading Agency, Gauhati, Mansoor Ali, Gauhati, Chetia and Co., Gauhati, Asomi Enterprise, Gauhati, were found to be substandard by the Seed Testing Laboratory. The Ex-Managing Director in reply stated that when the samples were analysed in the their own Central Godown they found different results as below :—

Prag Trading 85 per cent.

Asomi Enterprise 83 per cent.

Chetia 80 per cent.

Monsoor Ali 83 per cent.

32.27. He further stated that the analysis was done by the Quality Control Officer at the Central Godown and that was at the initial stage of procurement.

32.28. He further stated that though no written permission of the Director of Agriculture to test the samples by the Quality Control Officer at the Central Godown was obtained, the Director of Agriculture was informed of this over the phone. The Ex-Managing Director also stated that the month of December was too late for sowing mustard. When requested he further stated that most of the samples were received in October and reports of testing at the Central Godown were received earlier. The Ex-Managing Director also stated that the very system of procurement of seeds through local dealers was wrong and they objected to it but certified seeds were very costly and it was not possible for the Department to supply and for that they hurriedly procured from the market and distributed. He further mentioned that for ideal seed distribution according to him there will be great variations in samples. He also stated in reply to a question that the local seeds could not be called seeds as they were lacking in the quality of seeds.

32.29. The Sub-Committee then wanted to know whether there was any discussion in the meeting of the Board that because of urgency and certain difficulties the Board empowered the Managing Director, to deviate from the Clauses 3 and 4 of the agreement, the Ex-Managing Director stated that this was not discussed in the meeting of the Board. The Sub-Committee then requested the Ex-Managing Director to state whether he ever informed the Board that because of certain extraordinary circumstances he had decided to deviate from Clause 3 of the agreement. He said that he informed the Board but could not produce any such paper. The Sub-Committee thereafter wanted to know whether all these parties namely S. N. Trading Co., Gauhati, Prag Trading Agency, Monsoor Ali, Gauhati, Chetia and Co., Asamiya Enterprise deposited security money, he replied in affirmative. When asked whether the security money of those Companies was forfeited, he stated that it was done in cases of the parties whose seeds were of substandard quality. The Sub-Committee then wanted to know the specific reply. He told that he would check up and furnish it on 29th December 1975. As regards final payments he stated that final payments were made when they received the clearance from the Stores that the things were received.

32.30. In reply to another question as to when it was found that the Mustard Seeds were of below quality the Departmental witness stated that it was known only on 18th November, 1972. He also added that there were certain lapses on the part of the Managing Director, Store Keeper and the Quality Control Officer. The Committee then wanted to know as to why no action was taken against the Managing Director and against those Officers whose lapses were noted by the Director of Agriculture.

32.31. The Departmental witness stated that complaints about substandard seeds were received by the Director of Agriculture during October and November, 1972 and the Government asked the Director of Agriculture to enquire into the matter. It was also stated that action towards the enquiry started on the basis of a note from the Minister, Agriculture on 10th November, 1972. The note was on Mustard seeds, Masur and Mug.

32.32. The Committee after going through the enquiry report submitted by the Director of Agriculture wanted to know as to why no action was taken as per recommendations and only the Quality Control Officer was victimised and no action on the high ranking officer was taken. The Departmental witness in reply stated that the Managing Director was warned on that day, i.e., on 28th October 1975 for his lapses and added that it was decided by the Cabinet that the Agricultural Production Commissioner should enquire into the matter. But in the meantime the Agriculture Commissioner was transferred and no report was submitted by him, which caused delay in taking action. As regards the Quality Control Officer, the Departmental witness stated that he was not a regular Government servant but was re-employed for a short time and when the lapses were detected he was dismissed as he had hardly a few days to go. He further reported that action against the store keeper was pending.

32.33. The Committee then wanted to know the reasons for which the Government could not take any action immediately when report was submitted by the Director of Agriculture on 22nd March 1973. The Departmental witness stated that action was taken on September 1973. The Departmental witness in reply to another question stated that the payments were made simultaneously though the Seeds were established to be of inferior quality.

32.34. It was also stated by the Departmental witness that on 14th November 1972, the Managing Director was requested to submit a report about the complaint made on Lentil seeds and all payments were made before 14th November 1972. He further stated that complaints from the Blocks were coming after the payments were made. The Committee then wanted to know that the Director himself found the seeds to be of substandard quality and why no letter was sent to the Managing Director, Seed Corporation. In reply, it was stated that information was passed on to the Managing Director and there might be written report also. The Departmental witness could not explain as to why all payments were made hurriedly when complaints were being received. The Departmental witness also stated that bills were not certified by anybody. The Committee thereafter wanted to have a copy of the report dated 30 November 1972 submitted by the Managing Director which was stated to be inconclusive. The Department did not furnish the copy of the report as called for.

RECOMMENDATION

32.35. The Committee considers that the very planning of the department to supply improved seeds to get better yield was frustrated when local seeds were decided to be supplied and that too for the first time in the State especially when there was no approved seed dealers in the State. The suppliers took advantage of the situation and cheated the Government. Neither the staff of the Assam Seeds Corporation nor the staff of the Agriculture Department exercised vigilance as expected of them. The Committee also considers that at ever staged there was a tendency to hush up the case of supply of inferior quality of seeds.

32.36. The Committee, therefore recommends that the cases of supply of inferior quality of all seeds be investigated de-novo by an independent authority for fixation of responsibility and submit report within two months from the date of presentation of the report to the House.

Paragraph 12.6 at page 19 — PULSES SEED.

33.1. Against 12,760 quintals needed for 78,000 acres to be covered, only 6,467 quintals of pulses seed were purchased. Seed valued Rs.0.47 lakhs (311.6 quintals) remained undistributed.

33.2 The Committee wanted to know the reasons for procuring lesser quantity of pulses. The Managing Director of the Assam Seeds Corporation stated that one of the reasons was that the coverage of pulses had gone down contrary to their expectation, flood water receded at late and it was thought that 30 per cent would serve their

purpose. Specially for Matikalai and Mug, the time was already late. He also added that the seeds were of inferior quality. In reply to another question, as to why 311.06 quintals of pulses were not issued to the farmer, the Departmental witness stated that in case of Lentil seeds, the quality was inferior. The Committee then wanted to know whether there was any enquiry. The Departmental witness stated that after enquiry, the staff issued the seeds. In reply to a question "Who purchased the substandard quality of seeds" the Managing Director of the Corporation stated that the Food Corporation of India made the purchases and added that as the Lentil seeds were not locally available and as they could not get seeds upto the standard, they purchased these seeds.

33.3. The Committee wanted to know whether responsibility was fixed up. The Departmental witness stated that they did not fix up responsibility on the officers of the Seeds Corporation for keeping Mustard and pulses combined together. He also added that the Quality Control Officer should have certified the quality but without getting the real quality of seeds, he had certified the bills.

The Committee then wanted to know:

- (i) How would have payment been made without the certificate;
- (ii) Whether the particular seeds were certified by the Officer.

33.4. The Managing Director stated that the Quality Control Officer checked the seeds and submitted a germination test report and payment was made thereafter. The germination report showed that the seeds could be accepted.

33.5. The Committee then wanted to know the system of testing the quality and how many lots were tested. The Managing Director stated that it was made in the seed testing laboratories. The Committee thereafter wanted to know that the Quality Control Officer was discharged on the ground of inferior seeds; but he did not only submit a report on Mustard seeds alone. He submitted the germination report for both mustard and pulses and in his report he found 5 per cent germination in one lot and 85 per cent in another lot, and in that case the pulses might be of good quality and how they could dispute. The Managing Director in reply stated that it was the duty of the Quality Control Officer to check up the seeds and send samples to the seed testing laboratory.

33.6. In reply to another question as to what was the default of the Quality Control Officer and why he was dismissed from service, the Managing Director stated that his testing report was found to be incorrect and that was one of the reasons for his dismissal. The Managing Director also stated that the dates of making final payments would be intimated later on. The Corporation did not intimate the date so far.

33.7. The Committee thereafter wanted to know whether the left over stock of 311.6 quintals of pulses seeds were sold and how must quantities were still lying as sub-standard seeds. The Departmental witness stated that they were compiling a report and within this financial year they would submit the report. As regards shortages, he stated that there were certain quantity of shortage also. As the pulses seeds are lying at different blocks, they could not furnish the figure.

33.8. The Committee when wanted to know whether payments were made even after getting the report from the Director of Agriculture the Departmental witness stated that payments were made before receipt of complaints. The Committee thereafter wanted the following informations :—

- (i) When the final payments were made ;
- (ii) When the Complaints were received ;
- (iii) Whether they got certificate from the Quality Control Officer before making final payment and why no action was taken for such a long time.

The Committee regrets that the Department did not furnish the above informations.

RECOMMENDATION

33.9. The Committee considers that the report submitted by the Director of Agriculture on 22nd March 1973 regarding the allegation against the Assam Seeds Corporation for Emergency Agricultural Production Programme failed to bring out the correct picture regarding supply of lentil seeds and recommends that a thorough investigation be conducted for fixation responsibility.

Paragraph 13 at pages 19-20—PESTICIDES. and Aerial Spraying

34.1. Against the allocation of Rs. 10.00 lakhs, pesticides valued at Rs. 2.53 lakhs only were procured through Assam Agro Industries Development Corporation. The Corporation purchased these pesticides from local dealers though there were standing instructions of Government of India for purchase of pesticides from firms registered with its Directorate of Plant Protection. Four hundred fifty litres of Damocron (cost : Rs. 0.54 lakh) were purchased and 430 litres (cost : Rs. 0.52 lakhs) issued to 3 blocks in Cachar district though this pesticide was not recommended by that Directorate.

34.2 Test check of utilisation of pesticides in Kamrup, Goalpara, Sib-sagar, Cachar and Mikir Hills districts revealed that out of pesticides worth Rs. 1.04 lakhs supplied to those districts, quantities valued at Rs. 0.42 lakhs had not been issued. A complain regarding genuineness of one of the pesticides supplied was under investigation.

34.3 In January 1973, 0.91 lakh acres of rape and mustard were sprayed aerially and it was claimed that as a result, 0.02 lakh tonnes of the crop were saved. Certain discrepancies in the acreage certified to have been covered by aerial spraying in Lakhimpur district and found actually sprayed on physical verification are stated to be under investigation (May 1974).

34.4 This Committee wanted to know why 450 litres of Democron were purchased when the Director of Agriculture did not ask for this especially when the requirement in 3 Blocks was only 90 litres against the supply of 430 litres. The Departmental witness stated that there was no harm in using this pesticide. As to the question why 430 Litres of Democron remained in stock. The Departmental witness stated that as there was no outbreak of epidemic disease of serious nature this pesticide was not used. In reply to another question, the Departmental witness could not state how much quantity of Democron was used and how much was in stock at the close of the programme and what was the present left over stock.

34.5 As regards genuineness of one of the pesticides supplied by the Assam Agro-Industries Development Corporation, the Departmental witness stated that they wanted to purchase phosphomiton instead they got Maliathion. It was also mentioned that the case had been given to Police for investigation. It was further stated that one Mr. A.Z. Jaman of Gauhati supplied Maliathion instead of phosphomiton. The Committee thereafter wanted to know:-

(i) When it was discovered that the pesticide was not phosphomiton ?

(ii) When was the complaint received ?

34.6. In reply, it was stated that complaint was received in February 1973 and after delivery, 95% payment was made and balance 5% was also paid lateron. The Committee considered that the Department failed to furnish the specific information called for.

34.7 The Department also could not state how was the firm selected and what was the result of investigation by Police.

34.8 The Committee considered that the Department did not pursue the case with all seriousness and therefore the culprit could not be brought to book and loss sustained by Government could not be recovered.

34.9 The Department in reply to a question as to whether pesticides worth Rs. 0.42 lakh were still lying in Godown stated that the Stock might have been used by this time.

34.10 The Committee considered that the Department did not get themselves fully prepared before appearing the Committee.

34.11 The Committee wanted to know whether the Department had completed the investigation in the discrepancy in connection with aerial spraying, if so what was the result. The Departmental witness in reply stated that it was still under investigation and they would require another three months or so to complete the investigation. In reply to another question the Departmental witness stated that the matter had been referred to the Police and after a long time they got a reply that it was essentially a technical matter and that they did not have such persons and suggested that a technical officer should be attached to them.

34.12. The Committee wanted to know (i) when did the Director of Agriculture conducted enquiry to the matter; (ii) When was the report submitted; (iii) Did the Director of Agriculture suggest recovery of the amount when he suspected that the aerial spray of 39800 acres of land under Mustard, there was a discrepancy of 32000 acres of land. The Director of Agriculture stated in reply that he did not make any comment but simply forwarded the report on 12th December, 1973. The Joint Secy. of Agri. Department stated that the said report was not received by the Government. He also added that the Director of Agriculture was asked to submit a report which he sent through a D.O. letter which was not received by the Government. He further stated that the non-receipt of the report might be due to shifting of office, as the office was not completely shifted to Gauhati, but as per direction of the Secretary, the letter was addressed to Gauhati office. He also added the Director of Agriculture submitted a preliminary report in July 1973 and thereafter the matter was referred to the Political Department. The Committee wanted to know (i) why no action was taken on the basis of the report; (ii) Why the Director of Agriculture did not make any recommendation and (iii) Why it was referred to the Political Department though the recommendation of the Director was very clear and specific that some of the Officers were involved in the misappropriation. The Departmental witness in reply stated that it required further investigation which involved some criminal practices and as such it was referred to the Political Department. On 8th September 1973. The Department could not state whether the reminder was issued to the Political Department. It was further stated that the Political Department did not take any action till 5th December 1974 and therefore the file was called back on 6th December 1974 and again referred to the Political Department on 9th December 1974, followed up by a reminder on 21st January 1975. The reply was received from the Political Department on 21st October 1975. The Committee wanted to have a copy of the reply dated 21st October 1975 from the Political Department.

The Department did not furnish the copy.

34.13 The Deptl. witness further stated that the matter was discussed with the Chief Secretary and a decision was taken to refer the matter to the Chief Minister's Special Vigilance Cell. But the Special Vigilance Cell expressed their inability to take action on it as they had no such competent Officer. They asked to place the services of the competent Officer to help in investigating the case.

34.14. The Committee examined the Chief Secretary on 11th November 1975 and wanted to know why the Political Department did not take any action on the cases referred to them.

34.15 The Chief Secretary in reply narrated that there were two cases one was about aerial spraying and the second was about supply of pesticides of different quality and of lower value. As regards second case he stated that charge sheets were submitted in November, 1974. He further stated that both the cases were linked up and there were

some confusion whether it was acreage or drug. The Political Department therefore, thought that the matter was with the Anti-Corruption Branch and the Deputy Inspector General C.I.D. investigated the matter but this important point was lost sight of. Later on it was made clear but the Anti-corruption Branch wanted to have an expert as the examination involved technicalities and the Agriculture Department was to send an expert. He also said that the expert had been selected and the Anti-corruption Branch would be able to find out all the facts.

34.16. The Committee then wanted to know on whose table the file referred to by Agriculture Department was lying from 8th September 1973 to 6th December 1974. The Chief Secretary stated that on 27th September 1973 a decision was taken to refer the case to D.I.G., C.I.D. He also added that the discrepancy in acreage in aerial spraying was not given so much importance.

34.17. The Committee considers that the Political Department did not take any action on the report submitted by the Director of Agriculture and the file had been lying pending at different level since September, 1973.

34.18. When the Committee expressed its desire to get the investigation completed within two months the Chief Secretary stated that it might take sometime more as other issue might crop up. The Chief Secretary agreed to submit the report about area actually sprayed by 1st February, 1976.

34.19. The Agriculture Department was requested to furnish the following informations which they did not submit:

- (1) What is the dosage prescribed per acre for aerial spraying of mustard crop;
- (2) What was the quantity of pesticides purchased and supplied to the District Agriculture Officer, and actually carried by the helicopter for spraying the pesticides on mustard crops;
- (3) Under the contract for aerial spraying, the payment was to be made on the basis of physical measurement of the area sprayed, or on the basis of the revenue records. In case revenue records were not correct and physical measurement was not possible, payment was to be made on the basis of load carried by the helicopter. There was no mention in the Contract regarding the authority which would physically measure the acreage sprayed, were any instructions issued by the Director of Agriculture nominating the authority which would certify the acreage actually sprayed? In case the authority specified for certifying the payment was the Assistant Plant Protection Officer, why did not the deptt. include the District Agriculture Officer for certifying the acreage?
- (4) Was not the Assistant Plant Protection Officer, before certifying the payment, to verify the area actually sprayed from the District Agriculture Officer?

(5) It appears to the Committee that in case the Assistant Plant Protection Officer certified the payment to the firm on the basis of the load carried by the helicopter, was it not possible in this case to ascertain the area actually sprayed or the area from the revenue records were these aspects specifically examined by the Assistant Plant Protection Officer before certifying the payment?

(6) How many sorties were made by the helicopter in that spraying operation and what was the time required by the helicopter in spraying the acreage which was certified by the Assistant Plant Protection Officer?

(7) What was the rate for aerial spraying paid to the firm? Was the aerial spraying done by the firm according to the specification or, was the mustard crop stated to have been aerially sprayed was effectively (fully or partially) sprayed?

34.20. The following further points were brought to the notice of the Committee by Audit:—

(1) Though the Director of Agriculture in October, 1972 asked all the District and Subdivisional Agricultural Officers to submit proposal for aerial spraying on mustard crop indentifying the areas need spraying, he on 5th January 1973 arbitrarily fixed the areas to be sprayed in different district. There were considerable variations between the areas to be sprayed and areas actually sprayed as below:—

Subdivision	area to be sprayed in acres	Area actually sprayed
North Lakhimpur	16,000	22,400
Dhemaji	19,200
Jorhat
Nowgong	20,000	19,200
Mangaldoi	10,000	9,900
Goalpara/Dhubri
Kokrajhar	20,000	Nil
Barpeta	24,000	Nil
Tezpur	Nil	8,500

(2) Spraying on 25600 acres (North Lakhimpur 6400 acres, Dhemaji 13200 acres) was done without any authority from the Director of Agriculture.

(3) The District Agriculture Officer, Jorhat did not countersign the spray certificates in respect of 19200 acres claimed to have been sprayed in Jorhat Subdivision. The certificate was rather signed by the Subdivisional Agricultural Officer.

(4) Payments for area sprayed were made on the basis of load carried and sorties flown and not on the basis of actual measurement or on the basis of revenue records though the agreement provided that payment would be made on actual measurement or on the basis

of revenue records and in case correct revenue records were not available the areas were to be determined on the basis of land carried on sorties flown.

(5) Two kinds of pesticides, viz., Roger LVC, 7600 litres at Rs.5.66 lakhs and Democron 100, 2900 litres at Rs.3.45 lakhs were purchased though according to reports of the field Officers Roger LVC had given complete satisfactory results. Use of Democron 100 which is a costlier pesticide resulted an extra expenditure of Rs.0.69 lakhs. According to report of Assistant Plant Protection Officer, North Lakhimpur 5200 litres of Roger L.V.C. were utilised on 41600 acres but District Agricultural Officer, North Lakhimpur reported spraying of only 18150 acres. Thus there was an excess of utilisation of 2932 litres.

(6) An area of 3000 acres was sprayed in North Lakhimpur on 7th January 1973 whereas 2000 litres of Roger L.V.C. despatched by Agro Industries Corporation from Gauhati on 4th January 1973 were received at North Lakhimpur by the Asstt. Plant Protection Officer only on 8th January 1973.

(7) 2600 litres of Democron and 4800 litres of Malatheaon were available with the District Agricultural Officers, Dibrugarh and Gauhati before commencement of aerial spraying of Mustard. Malatheaon was not utilised because it was not an effective pesticides on aphid. Non-utilisation of Democron resulted in an excess expenditure of Rs. 3 lakhs.

(8) The Package of Practices prepared by the Director of Agriculture for implementation of EAPP envisaged that if effective control measures were taken against attack of aphid, the yield of mustard crop would increase from 7-8 quintals/hectres to 14-16 quintals/hectres. Despite aerial spraying and supply of improved seeds, the additional yield was only 0.57 quintals/hectres.

34.21. The Public Accounts Committee on 24th January, 1976 therefore examined the Agriculture Department.

When it was pointed out to the Department that the total expenditure on pesticides was Rs.9,20,377.50 and not Rs.8,39,288.00 as stated by the Department, they admitted that there were some discrepancies but the exact position would not be possible to supply as the connected files were seized by the Anti-corruption Branch. The Departmental witness in reply to another question stated that the work of aerial spraying on mustard was awarded to M/S. Jacks Aviation on the basis of tender called for aerial spraying of sali crop. It was also admitted by the Department that the aerial spraying on mustard was entrusted to M/S Jacks before it was approved by Government in April, 1973. The Departmental witness in regard to the selection of areas for aerial spraying stated that the areas were selected by the Director of Agriculture on the basis of past experience as the District and Subdivisional Agricultural Officers did not submit specific proposals. It was also stated that the areas selected by the Director were not sprayed at Dhubri, Kokrajhar and Barpeta.

The areas in those three places were considered to be late for spraying as the sanction of the Government of India received late. When it was pointed out that the Government of India's administrative approval came on 15th December 1972 and allocation for these places were made after that date, the Departmental witness expressed their inability to answer as the files were not with them. When asked to state under whose orders the operators were directed not to spray in those places the Departmental witness replied that the Joint Director in-charge issued instruction. The Departmental witness, when asked as to whether there was any written instruction in this regard, deposed "I do not presume that there was any instruction at all". When the Committee further enquired whether there was any verbal instruction, the Departmental witness did not give any reply.

34.22. The Committee wanted to know whether there was any records to show that spraying at those places were not necessary. The Departmental witness stated that it was their information. When asked as to why spraying was done in Tezpur and whether there was any demand, the Departmental witness stated that there was no written demand but it was done on the judgment of the Director of Agriculture and added that in case of other districts the same thing happened. It was also stated that spraying was done as a preventive measure and before occurrence of the aphid attacks. In reply to another question the Departmental witness stated that the crop maturing time in Upper Assam is January/February while in Lower Assam it is December and also added that in Lower Assam the crop was almost ready for harvesting when the spraying was to be done and in Upper Assam it was in flowering stage.

34.23. The Departmental witness stated that aerial spraying was done in North Lakhimpur on 22400 acres in Jorhat on 19200 acres. Nowgong on 9900 acres Mangaldoi on 11500 acres, Dhemaji on 19200 acres and Tezpur on 8500 acres.

34.24. In reply to another question whether there was demand from the District Agricultural Officer, the Departmental witness stated in North Lakhimpur and Dhemaji the Joint Director-in-charge made an aerial survey on 14th January, 1973 and he decided the area to be sprayed. When asked as to whether the deviation was authorised by the Director, the Departmental witness replied that for execution of the scheme he was almost a Director.

34.25. The Committee thereafter asked the Department to submit a copy of interim report submitted by the Anti-corruption Branch to the Government. The Department could not submit the copy of the report as called for. The Departmental witness in reply to a question stated that spraying could be done even in flowering stage.

34.26 On being asked as to why spraying could not be done in 3 instalments the Departmental witness stated that there was no time to do it earlier. The Department when asked to state whether it was reported to the Government of India that because of delay they were unable to make effective spraying the Departmental witness replied that there was no record but it was only recorded to have been discussed and added that the Government of India's sanction was received on 26th December 1972. The Department was asked to state when the proposal was sent to Government of India in October, 1972 why the case was not pursued thereafter the Departmental witness replied that they would check up.

34.27 The Committee wanted to know whether there was any direction that the D.A.O. should countersign the bills. The Department replied that somewhere it was there but the District Agriculture Officer, Jorhat did not countersign and in case of North Lakhimpur and Dhemaji they stated they had no record.

34.28 The Department stated that the discrepancy regarding area of spraying in Dhemaji between the report of the A.P.P.O. and D.A.O. was suspicious.

34.29 In reply to another question the Deptl. witness stated that Democron specially needed for that area. When the Committee asked how spraying could be done in North Lakhimpur one day earlier of receipt of pesticide the Department stated that they would check up. The Departmental witness could not state when 2600 litres Democron available with the District Agricultural Officer, Dibrugarh which was not stated to be used in aerial spraying was utilised. In reply to a question whether 2,600 litres available with the District Agricultural Officer, Dibrugarh, had been utilised in that or subsequent years, the Departmental witness furnished a statement on 31st January, 1976 stating that out of that quantity of Democron, in November, 1975 there was 282 litres of Democron with the District Agricultural Officer, Dibrugarh. He could not, however, state the year-wise utilisation of the stock which was with the District Agricultural Officer in December, 1972. He further stated that this Democron had been utilised not in aerial spraying but in ground spraying of paddy crop.

34.30 The Committee wanted to know whether the expected additional yield as a result of aerial spraying were what was the actual. The Departmental witness stated that the expected yield should not be double. When the Department was asked to state how in North Lakhimpur and Dhemaji the additional yield could be 3000 Kg when in the State as a whole it was only 69 Kg. the Departmental witness stated that the figures were not correct. The Departmental witness also stated that the area under mustard in North Lakhimpur and Dhemaji together being 17000 hectares and in the entire State being 157000 hectares and when there was no increase in yield at Goalpara, Kamrup and Nowgong the increases in yield in North Lakhimpur and Dhemaji must not make any large impact.

34.31 The Committee considers that increase in yield as stated by the Department to be 310 Kg. in North Lakhimpur was intentionally manipulated to indicate the results of spraying. The Committee is constrained to express its doubt about the fixation of areas to be sprayed especially in Lakhimpur District as 41600 acres by the Joint Director in-charge (North Lakhimpur : 22400 acres Dhemaji 19200 acres) when in the three blocks of Dhemaji the area under mustard was 16000 acres. When asked to explain the reasons for purchase of two varieties of pesticides when the expenditure on Democron was higher than that on Roger which had given equally good results, the Departmental witness could not give any satisfactory answer. The Committee observes that had the cheaper variety of pesticide (Roger) been used instead of Democron, the Department would have saved nearly Rs. 2 lakhs.

34.32. The Committee after conducting the spot verification, tour came to the conclusion that the officers of the Agriculture Department were not keen to collect (i) the information regarding the actual area aerially sprayed from the revenue records as expect the Jonai area revenue records for Lakhimpur and Sibsagar districts were available (ii) or the actual area under mustard in these two Districts when the information was available with the Block Development Officers and Assistant Settlement Officers with deliberate intention not to fulfil the first part of clause 8 of the agreement entered into with M/S Jock Aviation.

34.33 The Committee further considers that the Political Department did not take any action whatsoever on the case referred to them with all seriousness and either intentionally or unintentionally sat over the case for years together. The Committee is not ready to accept the plea that there were certain confusion in the matter for which the Political Department delayed the case. The case referred to the Political Department by the Agriculture Department was a very simple one and easily understandable.

34.34 The Committee also observe with great distress that the Agriculture Department failed to furnish a copy of the interim report submitted by the Anti- Corruption Branch as asked for and promised by the Department.

34.35 During its tour of Dhemaji the Committee gathered from local evidence that there was no aerial spraying in Dhemaji at all though the firm had been paid for spraying 19,200 acres. Further, in North Lakhimpur and Majuli, the local evidence was that the areas for which payment was made to the firm were not sprayed.

RECOMMENDATION

34.36 The Committee recommends that an independent enquiry be conducted by the Government into the following aspects to find the truth and to fix the responsibility for the lapses due to which the Government had to incur losses : —

(1) Purchase and use of pesticides—Whether all the pesticides shown as utilised in aerial spraying were actually used particularly when there was evidence that the area actually sprayed

was far less than the area claimed to have been sprayed; purchase of expensive pesticide instead of cheaper alternative needs also be investigated.

(2) All discrepancies in the areas certified by the A.P.P.O. as sprayed and the areas actually sprayed be investigated; this will include besides investigation in North Lakhimpur Subdivision, investigation in Jorhat and Dhemaji.

(3) Reasons for not making payment to the aerial porters on the basis of either actual measurement or according to the Revenue records which were available and making payments on theoretical basis of certain load and pesticides used etc; non-obtaining of certificates from the District Agricultural Officers should also be investigated.

(4) Variations from the approved programme should be investigated to find out whether the areas not originally programmed needed aerial spraying or this was done by the firm on its own accord; omission to spray areas which were approved by the Director of Agriculture need also be investigated.

(5) Appointment of M/S. Jacks Aviation for spraying without inviting tenders and without obtaining the approval of the Government.

(6) All discrepancies regarding dates of receipt of pesticides in the district offices and the dates of spraying.

(7) Delay in starting aerial spraying operation and not doing the spraying in accordance with the package of practices prepared by the Directorate of Agriculture.

(8) Reasons for the increase in the yield in that year being far lower than the yield envisaged in the package of practices even though nearly Rs. 10 lakhs were spent on aerial spraying besides other measures.

3137 The Committee is utterly dissatisfied with the delay in the Commencement of the enquiry into the discrepancies in North Lakhimpur, Dhemaji side in the Lakhimpur Subdivision as well as with the slow progress of the enquiry. The Committee regrets to note that

even though the Agriculture Department asked the Political Department to get the matter investigated, no action was taken by that Department for more than a year. The Committee recommends that the responsibility for the delay in this regard be fixed.

34.38 The enquiry into the purchase of sub-standard pesticides also needs be expedited. At the same time, the Committee recommends that the responsibility for placing orders on bogus firm and accepting sub-standard material should also be fixed if it is not already covered by the enquiry in hand.

34.39 The Committee recommends that all these enquiries be completed and reports submitted to the Committee within a period of two months of placing of this Report before the House.

34.40 The Committee recommends that the Department should immediately investigate all the shortages as well as the utilisation of the left-over stocks and furnish a report to the Committee within a month of the submission of this Report before the House.

Paragraph 14 at Page 20 — FERTILISERS.

35.1 Central assistance allocated for fertilisers was Rs 120 lakhs. In September, 1972, the Directorate placed an order on the Assam Agro-Industries Development Corporation for 10,000 tonnes of fertilisers; date by which supply was to be completed was, however, not mentioned in the orders. According to the Corporations records, 8,619 tonnes of fertilisers worth Rs. 57.59 lakhs were supplied to individual Projects. In the absence of consolidated accounts, the Directorate has not been able to settle claims of the Corporation and advance of Rs.60.00 lakhs paid remains unadjusted (September, 1973).

35.2 Fertiliser has to be applied before, or when crops are sown and on wheat a top-dressing has to be applied after one month of sowing. Fertiliser Valuing Rs. 5.67 lakhs were supplied by the Corporation to the Projects between February and June, 1973, i.e., more than one month after sowing.

35.3 Test check of receipts and issues in five districts revealed that out of 6,094.4 tonnes of fertilisers worth Rs. 39.94 lakhs received, only 4,457.4 tonnes worth Rs.29.26 lakhs were issued and the balance 1,637 tonnes valued Rs. 10.68 lakhs were in stock at the end of March 1973. Of the balance, stocks worth Rs.0.30 lakh were sold after March 1973 and shortages worth Rs.0.26 lakh were also noticed.

35.4 The Committee wanted to know (i) How did the Department determined the requirements of fertilisers for the programme? (ii) Were order placed with AAIDC for the full quantity?

35.5. In reply, the Depttl. witness stated that full package of practices might not be practicable for 70000 hectares which would be brought under irrigation and their requirement was accordingly calculated for 12000 tonnes. In reply to another question as to why order for 10000

tonnes was placed when requirement was for 12000 tonnes, the Departmental witness stated that they were not sure whether the farmer would be able to consume 12000 tonnes and as fertiliser were scarce it was ultimately found that even 10000 tonnes would not be available.

35.6 When the Committee wanted to know whether the requirements of 12000 tonnes was brought to the notice of Government of India, the Departmental witness stated that ultimately Government of India diverted some thousands tonnes from West Bengal. The Departmental witness stated that a quantity of 1728 tonnes was allotted to Assam Government by the Government of India and one farm sold some fertiliser to some one else other than A.A.I.D.C., the Committee wanted to know what action was taken and who was the authorised dealer. The Director of Agriculture stated that the A.A.I.D.C. was the authorised dealer and instead of supplying the fertiliser to A.A.I.D.C., they supplied some one else, the same of which was also not known to him.

35.7. The Departmental witness was also not in a position to reply to a question as to whether it was in the knowledge of A.A.I.D.C. and whether it was possible due to lack of vigilance.

35.8. In reply to another question as to whether the fertiliser were sold to Tea Garden by the Agriculture Department, the Departmental witness stated that fertiliser were being sold by A.A.I.D.C. and they could not sale fertilisers to tea gardens from Agricultural quota. The Committee thereafter wanted information as to the quantity of the fertiliser diverted to tea garden, the Departmental witness stated that it was not possible to furnish the information.

35.9. The Committee thereafter was of the opinion that diversion to tea gardens in Assam was more than 20% according to which the Departmental witness stated that the position required investigation for confirmation.

35.10. The Departmental witness in reply to a question stated that only Rs.50.74 lakhs were adjusted till September, 1975. In reply to another question as to the reasons for which the balance amount was not adjusted even after 2½ years of the close of E.A.P.P., the Departmental witness stated that they would complete it during the financial year. The Departmental witness could not state the extent of shortage and the quantity of left-over stock at the close of the E.A.P.P. as the compilation was not done.

RECOMMENDATION

35.11 The Committee recommends that the Department should immediately investigate all the shortages as well as the utilisation of the left-over stocks and furnish a report to the Committee within a month of the submission of this Report before the House.

35.12 The Committee further recommends that a thorough investigation be conducted to ascertain the fertiliser allotted by the Government of India could be sold to an authorised dealer. The Committee also expresses its displeasure to find that this case was not so long investigated by Government.

Paragraph 15 at page 20—LOANS TO FARMERS.

36.1. Supply of inputs to farmers was to be either in cash or on loan against loan bonds recoverable within six months from the date of issue of inputs. The irrigation charges were recoverable from the cultivators after the harvest. The amount of loans and interest thereon could be repaid either in cash or in kind in the form of produce obtained from the inputs. It was expected that all loans would be realised by June 1973. However, of the loan of Rs. 1,58.15 lakhs recoverable from the farmers for supply of inputs and irrigation charges, only Rs. 7.42 lakhs were realised till June, 1973.

36.2. The Department did not prepare the up-to-date loan accounts and could not state the up-to-date amount recovered. The Department did not specifically stated the steps taken by them to recover the amounts.

RECOMMENDATION

36.3 The Committee regrets to observe that the Department failed to take adequate action to recover the short term loans though the Department stated earlier that the additional staff entertained during Emergency Agricultural Production Programme continued to be maintained to effect recovery of loans since the short term loan granted by the Government of India must have been repaid and immediate steps to recover the loans be taken.

36.4 The Committee recommends that the Department should take immediate steps to recover these loans and submit a report to the Committee within three months of the submission of the Report before the House.

Paragraph 16 at page 21—RESULTS OF THE PROGRAMME.

37.1. It seems to be clear that neither the minor irrigation works nor the inputs could have had, in fact, much-effect on the rabi crop production in the State. Many of the pumpsets and tubewells were not installed or installed but not energised and worked when water was most needed for these crops. Areas irrigated by these works were negligible as compared with targets. Tractors and threshers also contributed little. Inputs procured were far less than requirements. Considerable quantities remained either undistributed or were made available after the sowing season or when these were not needed.

37.2. Foodgrains produced and area under different crops during the three years previous to 1972-73 were as under :—

Crop	1969-70		1970-71		1971-72	
	Area	Production	Area	Production	Area	Production
	(Area in lakh acres ;			Production in lakh tonnes)		
Wheat	0.29	0.07	0.60	0.12	1.00	0.48
Boro paddy	0.69	0.33	0.65	0.32	0.78	0.47
Mustard	3.36	0.49	3.43	0.56	3.38	0.63
Pulses	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	0.29	2.05	0.28

N. A.—Not available.

37.3. Additional production of food-grains expected with the implementation of schemes financed by Government of India had been estimated at 3.70 lakh tonnes. The Directorate has no record to show that the additional area brought under cultivation or foodgrains produced as a result of the different schemes taken up as part of the Programme.

37.4. Additional acreage and production of different foodgrains planning for 1972-73 and stated to have been actually achieved were:-

Crop	Area		Production	
	Target (In lakh acres)	Actual	Target (In lakh tonnes)	Actual
Wheat	3.85	1.80	2.66	1.12
Boro paddy	0.88	0.35	1.06	0.26
Mustard	1.34	0.57	0.27	0.02
Pulses	0.78	0.18	0.15	0.15

37.5. The Committee when wanted to know the reasons for 42% performance as compared with the targets, the Department stated that the targets were very ambitious, and there were few other factors which contributed to the achievement of only 42%. In explaining the reasons the Department stated that firstly the coverage under wheat was lower than expected by about 2.05 lakh acres secondly the coverage under boro paddy was also much less than what was expected and thirdly the achievement in irrigation was much less than that expectation. The Department added that despite the achievement being much lower than the target they considered it to be success as the year 1972-73 was a very bad year.

37.6. The Committee considers that the year being bad, the Emergency Agricultural Production Programme was taken up to boost up production to meet the shortfall.

37.7. The Departmental witness when enquired as to reasons for shortfall in yield of wheat in irrigated areas compared with the target, stated that it was 8.8 quintals per acre whereas the All India yield in 1973-74 was only 4.56 quintals per acre. The Committee wanted to know what was the total additional area brought under irrigation out of the proposed additional area of 70000 acres and was it 48000 acres as stated earlier by the Department. The Committee also wanted to know whether the additional area brought under irrigation was irrigated by the lift irrigation schemes taken under the Emergency Agricultural Production Programme or it was only a common area of all the schemes, and also how the area of 48000 acres were determined. The Departmental witness in reply stated that about 56503 acres were irrigated and out of that wheat was about 20000 acres from all sources i.e., Emergency Agricultural Production Programme and others.

37.8. The Committee considers that out of 70000 acres to be provided irrigation through the schemes taken up during Emergency Agricultural Production Programme only 28% of the targeted area could be achieved.

37.9 The Department was asked to submit a statement showing the acreage, production and yield per acre of boro paddy, mustard and pulses during the five years ending 1974-75. The Department did not furnish the same till 31st January 1976.

37.10 The Committee after going through the replies furnished by the Department considers that there was absence of (i) effective co-ordination between the Department/Corporation (ii) Accurate reporting of the progress of various measures under the Emergency Agricultural Production Programme and the actual performance.

37.11 The Department admitted that their reporting system and method of evaluation were to be improved and stated that they had geared up their machinery to make correct assessment.

37.12 In reply to a question as to why the Department could not achieve the target, it was stated as below :—

“This programme was taken up in a hurry. During the most critical period of implementing the programme most of the subdivisional towns were under curfew. Movement of men and materials were extremely difficult. Many of the field officers and Deputy Commissioners and Subdivisional Officers were all being pressed into law and order duties. But even in spite of that we had tried to do as much as we could but unfortunately we could not achieve the targets.”

The Department furnished the following written statement of achievement and reasons for not being able to achieve the targets :—

* * *

* * *

* * *

(4) Achievement—

Crops			Total area (Lakh acres)	Production (Lakh tonnes)
Wheat	2.80	1.60
Boro (+ early Ahv)...			1.63 (1.13+0.50)	1.03
Mustard	3.94	0.64
Pulses	2.33	0.45

Reason for not being able to achieve the targets are as follows :—

- (a) Wheat: (1) Area earlier contemplated to be covered by wheat after damage of Sali paddy were replanted by late sali and thus the area fell down by 1.85 lakh acres.

(2) Wheat was a new crop and thus the Department could not anticipate actual area that would be available for wheat. The experience gained during last 3 years shows that in Assam not more than 2.50 lakhs acres would be available for optimum wheat growing.

(b) Boro Paddy: (1) Traditional Boro paddy area available is about 1.13 lakh acres. Boro paddy is classified as summer paddy which includes early Ahu paddy from mid-February.

(2) Early Ahu area covered was 50,000 acres and hence under summer paddy (boro) the area achieved was 1.63 lakh acres.

(c) Mustard: (1) Mustard seeds were not available as the quality of seeds procured by the Seeds Corporation was inferior and stopped from distribution.

(2) Normal area under mustard in Assam being about 3.75 lakhs acres the target of 1 lakh acres additional was somewhat high. This was taken on the assumption that flood damaged paddy area would remain fallow and would be available for mustard. But large-scale replanting of flood damaged paddy area took place.

(d) Pulses: (1) Normal pulses area in Assam being about 2.12 lakh acres fixing of a target of 2.92 acres was somewhat high and the achievement of 2.33 lakh acres was thus not a bad achievements.

RECOMMENDATION

37.13 The Committee had given its recommendations on various aspects of the Programme in the early stage. In this recommendation the Committee has suggested a number of investigations into the lapses and the failures. As expressed in the earlier paragraphs, the Committee considers that all efforts were not made to make the Programme a success and that there was lack of co-ordination between the Department and the Corporation and that there were lapses.

37.14 In conclusion, the Committee recommends that the Department should ensure better utilisation of the lift irrigation schemes, diesel pumpsets, threshers, tractors and shallow tubewells for irrigating more areas.

37.15 The Committee would like to have a report on the efforts made by the Department towards this direction in three months time from the placement of this Report before the House.

CRASH SCHEME FOR RURAL EMPLOYMENT

Paragraph 1 at pages 22-23 of the advance C.A.G. Report, 1972-73

1.1 The Government of India formulated in February 1971 a crash scheme for rural employment to relieve unemployment and under-employment mainly in those rural areas which were not covered by either substantive development programmes or special employment oriented schemes or where such programmes had either not fully spread by then or afforded limited benefits. The crash scheme was to provide, quickly and directly, employment to atleast some specific number in each of the districts of the country. It was fully financed by Central assistance in the form of grants. The intention was to find employment, by spending Rs.12.5 lakhs in a district annually, for a thousand persons in each district for ten months in a year. The additional employment was to be generated through execution of labour-intensive projects which could create durable and productive assets. Any project that was useful for the development of the district could be undertaken. Wages were to form not less than 80 per cent of the total cost. For individual works, the wage element of the cost could be reduced to 60 per cent, provided expenditure on wages on all works in a district was not less than 70 per cent of the amount allocated. The balance was for materials and equipment required to make the works durable. The guidelines issued by the Central Government stipulated that individuals from families of which no other adult member was working should be preferred. Work was to be provided as near their place of habitation as possible.

1.2. Government of India intimated the decision to launch the programme to the State Government in February, 1971 so that field operations might commence from April, 1971.

1.3. The State Government were requested to proceed immediately to formulate districtwise projects and submit them as soon as possible and preferable by 15th March 1971, to the Government of India which would sanction the projects and release necessary funds for the year 1971-72.

1.4. From 1972-73 onwards the State Governments and subordinate authorities in the States were authorised to sanction works of the classes specified in the guidelines issued by Government of India or of the types already approved in 1971-72.

1.5. The State Government had been informed that the scheme was likely to continue for the years 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74. In March 1972 the State Government were authorised to formulate proposals for works for the two years 1972-73 and 1973-74.

1.6. The Committee wanted to know as to whether crash scheme was still in operation in Assam and the expenditure incurred in each year Districtwise.

1.7. The Departmental witness stated in his evidence that the scheme was started in 1971-72 and continue upto 1973-74. The scheme was not in operation at present. With regard to the break up of the expenditure incurred, the Department furnished a written statement which is given below :—

**DISTRICTWISE EXPENDITURE (ACTUAL) IN EACH YEAR
IN RESPECT OF C. S. R. E SCHEME**

General Areas		1971-72	1972-73	1973-74
1. Kamrup	...	12,32,000	13,01,000	11,18,000
2. Nowgong	...	9,71,000	11,80,000	8,77,000
3. Sibsagar	...	10,74,000	12,35,000	9,84,000
4. Darrang	..	10,80,000	11,00,000	10,12,000
5. Goalpara	..	9,55,000	11,43,000	11,89,000
6. Lakhimpur	..	4,94,000	10,68,000	8,54,000
7. Dibrugarh	...	6,76,000	9,96,000	10,22,000
8. Cachar	..	10,99,000	12,19,000	8,80,000
Total		75,81,000	92,42,000	79,36,000

Hill Areas		1971-72		
9. Mizo Hills	...	6,61,201.11
10. Mikir Hills	...	3,37,672.15	8,88,062.63	6,14,251.26
11. N. C. Hills	...	81,772.39	6,25,692.74	5,37,334.59
Total	...	10,80,645.65	15,13,755.37	11,51,585.85

Grand Total	...	86,61,645.65	1,07,55,755.37	90,87,585.85
--------------------	-----	---------------------	-----------------------	---------------------

1.8. It appears from the statement that the Department has spent a total sum of Rs. 1,07,55 lakhs in 1972-73 although the Audit Report mentions that a sum of Rs. 1,14 88 lakhs was spent in 1972-73.

1.9. The Committee then wanted to know from the Departmental witness what were the instructions issued from time to time by the State Government to the officers implementing the scheme in Assam. The Departmental witness stated in reply that they issued instructions in August 1971 to the B. D.Os. connected with the implementation of the scheme.

1.10. On being asked as to whether the instructions were followed by the Block Development Officers, the Departmental witness stated that only in three cases the Department had taken disciplinary action against the officers concerned. He further stated that some Block Development Officers were placed under suspension and some cases were under inquiry of the Anti-corruption Department.

1.11 On being asked as to whether any instructions were issued to the Deputy Commissioners for supervision of work prior to 1972, the Departmental witness stated that the instructions were issued only in 1972.

1.12 The Committee then wanted to know as to whether a review was conducted by the Department to see the progress of the scheme. The Departmental witness stated that no evaluation was done as the Department had no machinery to undertake the work of evaluation.

RECOMMENDATION

1.13 The Committee regrets to note that prior to 1972, no instructions were issued by the Department to the Deputy Commissioners and Subdivisional Officers who were to supervise the implementation of the scheme in the districts. It also appeared from the evidence that even after instructions were issued to the Deputy Commissioners and Subdivisional Officers, inspections were not conducted by the supervising officers regarding implementation of the various works undertaken under the scheme. The Committee also regrets that though nearly Rs. 3 crores were spent, the department did not systematically review the implementation of the scheme, in these years.

1.14 The Committee is unable to understand the argument of the department that it did not have any machinery to do so. During the course of implementation of the scheme the Department received various complaints against some of the Block Development Officers and other officers connected which were stated to be under investigation even after a number of years have elapsed.

1.15 In view of above the Committee raises a doubt as to whether Rs. 3 crores spent actually resulted in generation of that much employment as has been claimed and in completion and creation of durable assets. The Committee, therefore, recommends a thorough districtwise investigation into the state of works which were undertaken and the assets claimed to have been created as well as the employment claimed to have been generated and submit a report to the Committee within 3 months from the date of presentation of the Report before the House. The Committee also recommends that all cases of complaints against the executing officers be finalised within a course of two months from the date of presentation of the Report before the House and a final report about action taken be submitted to the Committee. The Committee would further like Government to investigate, the reasons for not reviewing the progress from time to time and to fix responsibility on officer/officers concerned in the department as well as for lack of proper control and supervision on the executing Officers. Finally, the discrepancy between the figures of expenditure stated by the Department and as appearing in the Audit Report should be reconciled and a report submitted to the Committee at an early date.

Paragraph 2 at page 23-24 of the Advance G. A. G. Report: 1972-73

2.1. In July 1971, the State Government submitted to the Government of India proposals for projects totalling Rs.128.50 lakhs as follows :—

Districts	Construction of Roads	Irrigation and reclama- tion	Excavation of tanks	in lakhs of Rs. Improve- ment of land	Soil conser- vation	Total
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1. Goalpara	9.04	0.40	3.92	6.54	...	20.00
2. Kamrup	8.85	2.86	5.92	5.51	0.70	23.84
3. Nowgong	6.15	1.60	2.85	2.40	..	13.00
4. Darrang	7.25	0.80	1.25	3.70	...	13.00
5. Sibsagar	9.37	2.65	2.20	1.65	0.10	15.97
6. Dibrugarh	4.10	0.15	0.75	5.55	...	10.55
7. Lakhimpur	4.09	0.26	1.50	1.60	0.75	8.20
8. Mikir Hills	6.20	...	0.10	0.70	...	7.00
9. North Cachar Hills.	...	3.94	3.94
10. Cachar	9.75	0.95	1.15	1.15	...	13.00
Total	64.80	13.61	19.64	28.90	1.55	1,28.50

2.2. The State Government had proposed allocations to each district on the basis of number of development blocks in each. The Government of India gave administrative approval for projects estimated to cost a total of Rs.1,19.54 lakhs during 1971-72. Amount actually paid for 1971-72 was Rs.59.77 lakhs. Estimated expenditure on schemes administratively approved by the Government of India during 1972-73 was Rs.1.25 lakhs against which Rs.1,12.77 lakhs were paid.

2.3. The Committee wanted to know from the Departmental witness what administrative and organisational arrangements were made by the Government to ensure implementation of the Crash Scheme. The Departmental witness stated in his evidence that no separate arrangement by entertaining any extra staff was made and the schemes were executed through its agency at Block level. But there was some sort of a cell in the Directorate of P & C. D. consisting of one Planning Officer and two assistants. On being asked as to whether the cell was responsible for implementation of the programme, the Departmental witness could not give a satisfactory reply. The Committee then wanted to know as to why only Rs.59.77 lakhs and Rs. 112.77 lakhs could be obtained from the Government of India for the year 1971-72 and 1972-73 respectively against administratively approved projects worth Rs. 119.54 lakhs for 1971-72 and Rs. 125 lakhs for 1972-73 and whether the lower releases by the Government of India were due to non-implementation or slow implementation of certain projects by the State Government. The Departmental witness stated in his evidence that the release of money by the Govt. of India depended on furnishing the progress of expenditure statement by the State Government. There was delay in sending the progress report as the collection of materials took some time. He further stated that the Government of India had fully reimbursed the money spent by the State. It was also stated by the Departmental witness that the total allocation given for each District could not be spent as no schemes could be prepared for the Hill Districts.

2.4. On being asked as to whether it was a fact that as only Rs.81 lakhs (as stated by the Department) could be spent by the State Government during 1971-72 and the balance out of Rs. 119.54 lakhs could not be given to State Government by the Government of India because of lack of satisfactory progress, the Departmental witness deposed "The Department could not execute the whole work, particularly the shortfall in the matter of execution of work was in the Hill Districts; the Department in Hills areas could not organise labourers and execute all the schemes."

RECOMMENDATION

2.5. The Committee observes that though the State Government was informed of the scheme as early as March 1971 and sent a list of projects in July 1971 to Government of India, the Government was not fully prepared to implement the scheme when Government of India gave the final clearance. It further observes that though the Government of India wanted the scheme to be implemented on a crash basis and large amounts were to be spent, no special arrangement was made to ensure proper and timely implementation of the scheme except a small cell consisting of one Planning Officer and two assistants created in the Directorate. The Committee cannot help coming to the conclusion that this resulted in lower releases of funds by the Government of India.

2.6. The Committee came across the instances of giving sanction of the schemes in the last month of the year. This only reflects the importance and urgency given by the Department in implementing schemes in time.

2.7 The Committee is not convinced with the reasons furnished by the Department such as unfavourable climatic condition in the State etc. for its inability to execute the scheme fully. The Committee, therefore, recommends that Government should examine as to whether there was any laxity on the part of the Department for not being able to utilise the funds offered by the Government of India to the State of Assam for implementing the crash programme and fix responsibility on Officer/Officers concerned.

Paragraph 3 at page 14

3.1. Between August 1971 and March 1972 the State Government sanctioned individual Projects totalling Rs. 1,15.56 lakhs, against which Rs. 99.35 lakhs were allocated, Rs.42.57 lakhs being released only on 22nd March, 1972.

3.2. During 1972-73, the State Government sanctioned projects estimated to cost Rs. 120.47 lakhs, funds to same extent being allocated. Of these projects costing Rs. 8.66 lakhs were sanctioned on 30th and 31st March 1973.

3.3. The administrative unit for the implementation of the scheme was the community development block. Works were sanctioned and executed in all the 130 blocks in the State.

3.4. This review covers the working of the Scheme during 1971-72 and 1972-73 and is based on test check of records in the Directorate of Panchayats and Community Development and in 42 blocks in Kamrup, Cachar and North Cachar Hills Districts.

3.5. During 1971-1972 the State Government sanctioned projects totalling Rs. 115.56 lakhs. The Committee wanted to know the reasons for which the allocations made by the State Government was lower than Rs. 115.56 lakhs and whether the lower allocation affected the implementation of the scheme. The Departmental witness in his evidence stated that the shortfall was due to the fact that the scheme was started in the year 1971-72 and the approval of the Government of India was obtained in the month of August and the works were started sometime in September. He further stated that the working season in Assam was only 5 or 6 months as against 8 or 10 months in other States. It was pointed out to the Departmental witnesses that object of the scheme was to provide employment throughout the year but nearly 42% of the funds were released only on 22nd March, 1972. The Committee therefore wanted to know whether 42% of employment was provided in the month of March during that year. The Departmental witness replied in affirmative. On being asked as to how it was possible to spend Rs. 42 lakhs within a period of 8 days, the Departmental witness deposed "Definitely not, it is not possible to spend such big amount of money in course 8 days. It is obvious that certain amount of irregularities were there".

3.6. The Committee further wanted to know the reason for incurring expenditure more than Rs. 60 lakhs in the month of March out of total expenditure of Rs. 114.88 lakhs incurred during the year 1972-73. The Department wanted time to furnish the reply. The Committee also wanted to know as to why during 1972-73 the man-days generated was less than the previous year although the expenditure incurred on the scheme was higher by 28 lakhs. The Director of Panchayat and Community Development stated in his evidence that it might be due to higher rate of wages. On being asked as to whether uneven flow of employment generation was due to the inadequate staff, inadequate administrative machinery then existing, the Departmental witness deposed "Without going into the matter at great depth, at this stage, I cannot pronounce a definite view on this question"

RECOMMENDATION

3.7 The Committee regrets to note that the Departmental Officers did not come prepared with full information before the Committee even though more than adequate time had been given by the Committee and as a result of which some of the pertinent points could not be clarified to the Committee. During the year 1971-72 and 1972-73 there was lower release of funds by the State Government than the actual amount sanctioned for the projects by the State Government. The reasons furnished by the Departmental witness could not satisfy the Committee. The department has also not been able to satisfy the Committee regarding the release of large funds only towards the bag end of the year. There was complete lack of co-ordination between the concerned Departments and lack of appreciation of the importance of the scheme. Huge sums of money were shown as expended within a period of 8 days during the latter part of March. It also transpired from the evidence that the Department was also not sure about purposeful utilisation of money during such a short period. No effort was made by the Department even now to ascertain the reasons for lower release of funds which might have affected the implementation of the scheme. The Committee is convinced that the department failed to build adequate machinery at the relevant period to spend crores of rupees given by the Government of India to implement the scheme. Besides the uneven flow of employment generation, spending of such large amounts within a month or even a shorter span of few days might have resulted in many irregularities. The Committee therefore recommends that Government should investigate and submit a report to the Committee within two months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House on the following points:-

(i) Reasons for release of large funds for the scheme towards the bag end of the year resulting in uneven flow of employment and depriving the unemployed the benefit of continuous employment.

(ii) Whether the money released towards the bag end of year was prudently spent and there were no irregularities committed. The Committee apprehends that this would have resulted in the wastage and employment being given to other than the needy unemployed.

(iii) Reasons due to which nearly 35 p.c. to 40 p.c. of the total employment in each year was provided in the month of March.

(iv) Whether Rs. 42.57 lakhs released on the 22nd March, 1972 were actually spent during that year and how much employment was generated.

(v) While investigating the matter the Government should examine whether fictitious figures of employment were not shown during that period through manipulation of master rolls. The Government should also fix responsibility for the above lapses.

Paragraph 4 at page 24

4.1. Expenditure on the Scheme in the whole State was Rs. 86.61 lakhs and Rs. 1,14.88 lakhs in 1971-72 and 1972-73 respectively.

4.2. Funds for execution of sanctioned projects in Mikir Hills and North Cachar Hills districts were given to the respective district councils. During test check, it was found that Rs. 2.21 lakhs (North Cachar Hills : Rs. 1.16 lakhs, Mikir Hills : Rs. 1.05 lakhs) and Rs. 4.35 lakhs (North Cachar Hills : Rs. 3.54 lakhs, Mikir Hills : Rs. 0.81 lakh) remained unspent with the district councils out of the funds given during 1971-72 and 1972-73 respectively (September, 1973).

4.3. The Committee wanted to know what had happened to the amounts of Rs. 2.21 lakhs and Rs. 4.35 lakhs which remained unspent and whether it meant that implementation of the Scheme was not to the extent funds were sanctioned and given. The Committee also wanted to know whether the Government had looked into the matter as to why the District Councils could not spend the amount and had remained the same with them. In reply the Departmental witness stated that due to paucity of labour, communication difficulty and social attitude of people the scheme could not be fully implemented, in the North Cachar Hills and Mikir Hills Districts. He further stated that the difficulty arose at the time of execution. He also stated that out of the funds allotted for 3 years Rs. 55,583 and Rs. 2,67,798 still remained unspent with the District Councils of North Cachar and Mikir Hills. The Committee then wanted to know whether the allegations against the Block Development Officer, Maibong were enquired into. The Departmental witness stated that on receipt of the Audit Report they requested the Director to make an enquiry and to report. The enquiry was still in progress. The departmental witness could not however, satisfy the Committee on the inordinate delay.

4.4. On being asked whether there were any other cases where funds were released by the Government in 1971-72 and 1972-73 drawn by the District / Block Officers but not spent during those years, the Departmental witness could not give categorical reply.

RECOMMENDATION

4.5 The Committee is constrained to observe that the Department failed to take adequate and effective action to generate employment in the hill districts. Large sums of money are still lying with the District Councils unutilised.

4.6. The Department should ascertain and furnish the Committee with the information regarding unspent balances, if any, lying with others or regarding money spent for which full accounts have not been rendered so far. It is also distressing to note that the investigations into the allegations against the Block Development Officer, Maibong, although investigated have not yet been finalised.

4.7 The Committee has already recommended that investigation of all cases of allegations and complaints be completed within a period of 2 months and report submitted to the Committee.

Paragraph 5 at page 25

5.1. Expenditure in the whole State on different classes of projects executed during 1971-72 and 1972-73 as reported by the State Government to the Government of India, was as follows:—

Name of Projects	Expenditure during 1971-72.		Expenditure during 1972-73		Average Percentage for two yrs.	
	Amount	Percentage (Rupees in lakhs)	Amount	Percentage (Rupees in lakhs)		
1. Construction and improvement of road	32.23	41.6	63.06	60.3	52.4	
2. Land reclamation	16.38	21.2	11.22	10.7	15.2	
3. Minor irrigation	7.58	9.8	7.55	7.2	8.3	
4. Panchayat land developed	4.15	5.4	2.06	2	3.7	
5. Pisciculture	12.90	16.6	11.57	11.1	13.4	
6. Soil conservation	0.58	0.8	0.28	0.3	0.5	
7. Afforestation	0.28	0.4	0.20	0.2	0.3	
8. Flood protection	0.87	1.1	6.12	5.8	3.5	
9. Community orchards	1.90	2.4	1.55	1.5	2.0	
10. School rooms	0.53	0.7	0.68	0.6	0.6	
11. Drainage and anti-water logging	0.27	0.3	0.1	
Total	77.40	100	104.56	100	100	

5.2. The Government of India advised (August 1972) the State Governments to give preference to minor irrigation works like excavation/deepening/desilting of irrigation canal and tanks, etc., over road works, etc., so as to help the special food production drive undertaken to counteract the effect of erratic monsoon. These instructions do not appear to have been observed as only 14 minor irrigation works (estimated cost :—Rs.3.24 lakhs) were sanctioned after August 1972 as against 216 other works (estimated cost:—Rs. 35.71 lakhs) sanctioned between September, 1972 and March, 1973.

5.3. The Committee wanted to know as to why the instructions of the Government of India issued in August, 1972 for giving preference to minor irrigation works were not implemented. Departmental witness deposed "Although there was instruction that minor irrigation should be preferred, since schemes like road schemes etc., were found more useful everywhere, these schemes were prepared by the Block Development Officers but it is a fact that so far as preference to irrigation scheme is concerned that particular instruction was not carried out to the extent necessary."

5.4. On being asked as to whether the Department informed the Block Development Officers about the instructions of the Government of India in these context, the Departmental witness could not show any record to the Committee.

RECOMMENDATION

5.5. The Committee observes that although the Government of India advised the State Government to give preference to minor irrigation works over road works in order to step-up food production to enable the Government to counteract the affect of erratic monsoon, there was no record to show that these instructions were implemented by the Department while framing and sanctioning the individual projects. The Committee recommends that Government should investigate the non-observance of the instructions of Government of India and fix responsibility for their lapse within a period of two months from the date of presentation of the Report before the House.

Paragraph 6 at pages 25-26 ... SIZE OF THE PROJECTS

6.1. It had to be ensured that the projects were not too small; for in that case their number would be very large and would pose problems of logistics and supervision. To be worth while the size of a project was ordinarily to be such that it would employ a minimum of 50 persons continuously for 15 weeks. (In that event each work would cost about Rs. 22 500 to Rs. 25,000). If owing to local circumstances smaller projects had to be undertaken the cost of the smaller projects was, not, in any case, to be less than Rs. 5,000 each and their number was to be such that not more than 20 per cent of the funds allotted to a district were spent on them.

6.2. In Assam many petty projects were undertaken; of 2,112 projects (amount Rs. 2,36.06 lakhs) sanctioned during the two years, 621 projects (amount Rs. 21 lakhs) cost less than Rs. 5,000 each and 1,254 projects (amount Rs. 1,23.82 lakhs) cost between Rs. 5,000 and Rs. 22,500. Thus 61 per cent of the funds sanctioned were for projects costing less than Rs. 22,500. Further, many of the 237 projects each costing more than Rs. 22,500 individually comprised of a number of small works executed in different location. In Lakhimpur and South Karimganj blocks (Cachar) sanctioned projects (estimated expenditure: Rs. 75,000 each) for improvement of village road comprised of improvements to 52 and 17 village roads respectively. Construction of village roads (estimated expenditure: Rs.50,000) in Raja Bazar block (Cachar) comprised of 13 different roads. Similarly, sanctioned projects for construction/improvement of roads in Hajo (Rs.49,000) and Baska (Rs.30,000) Blocks (Kamrup) comprised of 14 and 10 roads respectively.

6.3. The Committee wanted to know the reasons for undertaking small projects which did not conform with the guidelines issued by the Government of India. The Departmental witness stated that the Government of India's instructions given in the year 1971-72 were not very clear and as a result large number of small schemes involving amount less than Rs.5,000 were taken up and as compared to 1971-72 such small schemes were much fewer in 1972-73. On being asked as to whether it was possible to give continuous employment to the unemployed rural people through these petty projects as was the intention of the scheme, the Departmental witness could not satisfy the Committee and only stated that employment in Assam was possible for five months only. The Departmental witness also could not satisfy the Committee that such large number of petty projects were adequately supervised.

RECOMMENDATION

6.4 The Committee observes that inspite of clear guidelines given by the Government of India that the project should not be too small which might pose problems of logistic and supervision, the Department undertook 621 projects costing less than Rs. 5,000 each and Rs. 1,254 projects costing less than Rs. 22,500. Further, many of 237 projects each costing more than Rs. 22,500 individually comprised of a number of small work executed in different locations. The Committee is not satisfied with the replies furnished by the Department that ten months continuous employment was not possible in the State. There was no special machinery set-up to supervise the execution of such huge number of petty projects. The Committee is also doubtful about the durability of these petty Projects and apprehends that a portion of the expenditure would have been infructuous. The Committee therefore, recommends that in future the Departments should strictly follow the guidelines given by the Government of India in such schemes so that expenditure incurred does not become infructuous. The Department should also examine in detail the completed Projects in each district under this scheme and report to the Committee within a period of three months as to whether the completed projects have in fact given durable assets to the Government. The report should also contain the present conditions of assets created.

Paragraph 7 at page 26—PROJECTS SANCTIONED BUT NOT EXECUTED OR WORKS EXECUTED WITHOUT SANCTION.

7.1. During test check in blocks in Cachar, Kamrup, North Cachar Hills districts, it was seen that certain sanctioned works were not executed and funds diverted to projects not sanctioned.

7.2. In North Karimganj block (Cachar) 18 roads (estimated cost : Rs. 0.50 lakh) sanctioned during 1971-72 were not constructed and instead 59 roads (actual cost : Rs. 0.71 lakh) constructed at other places. In Sonai block (Cachar) sanctioned fishery projects (estimated cost : Rs. 0.14 lakh) were not taken up and instead a road-cum-bund (actual cost : Rs. 0.08 lakh) was executed. In Narsingpur block of the same districts, 9 roads (actual cost : Rs. 0.09 lakh) were constructed without sanction. In Hajo block (Kamrup) sanction channels (estimated cost : Rs. 0.04) were not taken up; instead 15 roads (actual cost : Rs. 0.29 lakh) were constructed without sanction.

7.3. In these blocks, the total estimated cost of sanctioned projects not-executed was Rs. 1.40 lakhs and of projects executed without the sanction, Rs. 1.54 lakhs.

7.4 The Committee wanted to know what were the reasons for not taking up projects which were sanctioned in North Karimganj, Sonai, Narsingpur and Hajo Blocks and whether any investigation has been made. The Departmental witness stated in his evidence that all these diversion were subsequently approved by the Government. On being asked as to who authorised the implementation of projects other than the sanctioned one, the Departmental witness stated that diversion was done without the approval of the Government, but approval of the Government was obtained subsequently. The Departmental witness could not furnish to the Committee the particular difficulties faced by the B.D.Os in implementing the sanctioned projects.

RECOMMENDATION

7.4. It appeared from the Audit Report that Government sanctioned certain schemes in Cachar and in Kamrup Districts which were not executed by the Block Development Officers and instead certain schemes which were not sanctioned by the Government were executed in different locations. It transpired from the evidence tendered by the Departmental witness that the diversions were not authorised by the competent authority and this only subsequent approval of the Government was obtained, for the in lieu projects taken up by the Block Development Officers. The Committee feels that while sanctioning the previous scheme the Government might have taken into consideration the local need of the places selected by the Government and by diverting such scheme to other locations, the Department has deprived those people from the benefit of employment as well as of those projects. The Committee would have appreciated the diversion, had the Departmental witness stated the difficulties faced by the executing Officers in implementing the sanctioned schemes. The Committee is also not aware what led the Government to sanction the new schemes subsequently. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Department should furnish a statement to

the Committee stating reasons for these diversions of funds as well as such diversions, if any, in other districts for further examination. The Government should also take action for not obtaining its approval before diversion.

Paragraph 8 at pages 26-27—INCOMPLETE PROJECTS

8.1. Test check also revealed that 128 projects in Cachar district were left incomplete after expenditure of Rs. 6.15 lakhs had been incurred during 1971-72 and 1972-73.

8.2. The work has not been restarted reportedly due to non-availability of fund. Block-wise details are as under :—

Name of the Block	No. of roads works left incomplete		Expenditure	
	1971-72	1972-73	1971-72 (In lakhs of rupees)	1972-73
1. Kalicherra	2	..	0.31	...
2. Rajabazar	8	1	0.29	0.06
3. Sonai	5	2	0.75	0.13
4. Badarpur	8	5	0.33	0.88
5. South Karimganj	10	...	0.38	...
6. North Karimganj	...	3	...	0.14
7. Ramkrishnanagar	2	...	0.08	...
8. Hailakandi	...	4	...	0.28
9. Patharkandi	..	1	..	0.14
10. Udarband	3	3	0.33	0.15
11. Lala	4	...	0.23	...
12. Narsingpur	16	8	0.44	0.28
13. Katlicherra	...	3	...	0.25
14. Lakhipur	23	6	0.25	0.21
15. Katigora	9	...	0.14	...
16. Salchapra	...	2	...	0.10
Total	90	38	0.53	2.62

8.3. The Committee wanted to know the reasons for which these projects remained incomplete even after two years of operation of the scheme. The Departmental witness stated in his evidence that except two blocks, schemes had been completed in all other blocks. On being asked as to whether the completion reports were submitted by the Block Development Officers concerned, the Departmental witness stated that there was no system of getting completion report.

RECOMMENDATION

8.4. It appears from the Audit Report that 90 numbers of road works and 38 numbers of road works were left incomplete in years 1971-72, 1972-73 in the District of Cachar only. There would be similar cases in other District, which were not test checked by Audit. The Committee regrets to note that there was no system of completion reports for these projects. In the absence of these reports, the Committee is not satisfied that all the projects were completed in accordance with the approved plans and specification. The Government should investigate to ascertain the reason for which such a large number of works remained incomplete with a view to see whether there was any laxity on the part of the executing officers. The Department should also furnish a statement to the Committee showing the up-to-date position of all the schemes undertaken in various Districts. The Department should also indicate in the statement (i) the dates of completion of the projects (ii) numbers of schemes remaining incomplete and (iii) reasons thereof. Within a course of three months from the date of presentation of the Report to the House.

Paragraph 9 at page 27-28—

SPECIFICATIONS, SURVEYS, ESTIMATES AND MEASUREMENT OF WORKS DONE.

9.1. If expenditure on works is to be controlled, an estimate with requisite details should be prepared and sanctioned technically by a technical authority. For preparation of the estimate there should be some survey, even if not in as much detail as is done for bigger projects. For minor irrigation works, the likelihood of availability of water was also to be ascertained. It was specified that the estimates, specifications and all other details should be on the same scale and standards as had been laid down by the State Government for similar works.

9.2. In Kamrup, Cachar and North Cachar Hills districts, estimates were prepared by the block overseers without check by any higher authority and works were generally executed without prior technical approval. Estimates of road construction/improvement, projects taken up during 1971-72 were not technically sanctioned; technical sanctions were not available for 78 out of 225 projects taken up in 1972-73. Technical sanctions were not obtained before taking up minor irrigation, and reclamation and soil conservation works. Though most road works were for improvement of existing kutchha roads, the existing alignment

of roads and specific improvements contemplated were not mentioned in the estimates which also did not provide for consolidation of earthwork. In Kamrup district estimates for 14 road works (amount Rs. 1.63 lakhs) did not specify the length of the roads and the places to be connected. It was also seen that measurements were not recorded in all cases in the measurements books and attendance of labourers was recorded by labour leader, mohurrir, etc., without any check by responsible officials.

9.3. The Committee wanted to know as to what instructions were issued to the Deputy Commissioners/Block Development Officers for the preparation of estimates and survey. The Departmental witness stated in his evidence that a circular was issued with the instructions that no work would be taken up till detailed estimates were submitted. On being asked as to what were the specifications laid down by the Government for similar works the Departmental witness deposed "The Blocks have been in existence for so many years the specifications are supposed to be available with them and so we did not think it necessary to inform them about the specifications separately". The Committee then wanted to know from the Departmental witness as to whether instructions were issued for check of estimates by higher authority and execution of works only after technical approval. The Departmental witness stated that for certain projects technical sanction was obtained subsequently to avoid delay in executing the project. On a query, as to whether the Department was in a position to state specifically with reference to cases of Kamrup, Cachar and North Cachar as pointed out in the Audit Report that technical sanctions were obtained prior to execution of works, the Departmental witness stated that all the cases could not be checked up.

9.4. On being enquired as to whether the investigation had been conducted on the cases pointed out in the Audit Report stating the deficiencies in the estimates absence of mention of alignment and absence of consolidation of earthwork etc., the Departmental witness stated that no investigation had been conducted. The Committee then wanted to know as to why the attendance recorded by the labour leader was not checked by the higher officer and whether any instructions were issued in this regard. The Departmental witness stated that the instructions were clear. The Departmental witness further stated that it was difficult to say whether in all blocks measurements were recorded or not and it was also very difficult to say why the instructions were not followed by the Block Development Officers.

RECOMMENDATION

9.5 The Committee observes that in this case inspite of existing instruction estimates were prepared by the block overseers without check by higher authority an works were generally executed without any technical approval. Audit has brought out deficiencies in the estimates but the Department has not conducted any investigation in to these. The Committee views this seriously. From the Departments evidence, it appears that there was no clarity regarding specifications of these works so that these could be durable. It is distressing to note that in the cases pointed out in the Audit Report measurements were not recorded in the measurement Books inspite

of existing instruction to that regard. It is also surprising to note in some cases attendance recorded by the labour leader was not checked by the higher Officers. No attempts were made by the Department till date to investigate all these cases pointed out in the Audit Report. The Committee also could not understand how Department could satisfy themselves in absence of proper estimates and surveys that works were useful and durable. Even though these matters were reported to Government through the Draft Paragraph long before the Audit Report was submitted to the House, the Department did not care to investigate such serious irregularities pointed out by the Audit to fix responsibility on the persons concerned till now. The Committee, therefore recommends that the Government should investigate all the lapses brought out in the Audit Report as well as investigate all the individuals cases mentioned in the Audit Report and fix responsibility on the Officer/Officers concerned for their negligence and for lack of proper control and supervision. The Department should investigate all such cases where measurement books were not maintained for reporting to the Committee. A report stating the action taken by the Government should be submitted to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of the Report of the House.

Paragraph 10 at page 28—**Muster Rolls.**

10.1. For payment to labourers, daily attendance was to be taken and checked by a supervisory official. From the record of daily attendance, muster rolls were to be prepared and passed by the appropriate authority. Disbursement were to be acknowledged by the payees and also certified by a supervisory official. Wages were to be paid on the basis of work done; the muster roll was to show the quantity of work done as recorded in the measurement books.

10.2. It was seen that in seven blocks (Rani, Baska, Changa, Dimoria, Paschim Nalbari, Chamaria and Tamulpur) in Kamrup and Dying Valley block in North Cachar daily attendance registers/muster rolls were not maintained and labourers were paid (Rs. 7.32 lakhs) at the monthly wage rate of Rs. 100 through monthly acquittance rolls.

10.3. Rupees seven thousand were paid to two officers in Rangia block (Kamrup) and block development officer of North Karimanj block (Cachar) for payment of labour charges; but no muster rolls, acquittance rolls/attendance sheets in support of the same were available.

10.4. In North Karimaganj block (Cachar) the block development officer was placed under suspension from 24th January 1973 for alleged fictitious and unauthorised payments to labourers, non-accountal of funds and payments for work not executed fully.

10.5. The Committee wanted to know why attendance Registers and Master Rolls of seven blocks were not maintained as mentioned in the Audit Report. The Departmental witness stated in his evidence that the attendance Register and Muster rolls were verified and after verification it had been found that Muster Rolls were duly maintained in all the Blocks. Unfortunately these were not produced to audit. On being asked as to why these records could not be produced at the time of audit the Departmental witness stated that it was not know to him as to why these could not be Produced at the time of

audit. The Committee then wanted to know whether the detail accounts in support of the disbursement of Rs. 0.07 lakh were furnished by the Officer concerned and what was the present position. The Departmental witness stated that he was not in a position to indicate the present position because the Block Development Officer concerned was under suspension and the relevant papers were with the State Enquiry Officer in respect of North Karimganj Block. The Committee then requested the Department to produce the Attendance Register/Muster Rolls concerning the seven blocks in Kamrup District within 31st January 1976. The Department could not produce the records.

RECOMMENDATION

10.6. The Committee observes that in this case the Departmental Officers did not produce the important records at the time of Audit and feels that had these been actually maintained, the records could have been produced before the Audit. The Committee takes a serious view in the matter and recommends the circumstances due to which the records were not produced to Audit should be thoroughly investigated and the responsibility for the lapse in this regard be fixed. The Committee also recommends that the enquiry stated to be conducted against the Block Development Officers concerned should be finalised immediately without further delay. Action taken by the Department on the recommendation should be intimated to the Committee within a course of two months from the date of presentation of the Report to the House.

Paragraph 11 at page 29—RATE OF WAGES.

11.1. The rate of wages to be paid in a district was to be the off-season rate for agricultural labour in that district and was not to exceed Rs. 100 per month or Rs. 4 per day taking a month to consist of 25 working days.

11.2. While sanctioning the projects, the State Government instructed the implementing authorities that the wage rate for these projects was not to exceed Rs. 100 per month. It was seen that in 42 block wages were paid initially at rates ranging between Rs. 3.25 and Rs. 3.50 per day for days worked during 1971-72 and till end of November 1972 being equal to the locally prevailing rates. A survey conducted by the Directorate of Economics and Statistics (1971-72) showed Rs. 3.60 as the average wage for field labourers in rural areas of Assam during 1971. In December, 1972 Government issued instructions, that wages for sundays be paid if the labourers had been employed continuously provided that total wages in a month did not exceed Rs. 100. On receipt of these instructions, the blocks paid arrears on the basis of Rs. 100 per month less payments already made. This had the effect of increasing the daily wage rate to Rs. 4 per day (for 25 working days in a month). Similarly, for the periods after receipt of these instructions, wages were paid at Rs. 100 per month irrespective of the locally prevailing wage rate. Extra expenditure on this account during 1971-72 and 1972-73 was Rs. 2.52 lakhs.

11.3. In 13 blocks of Kamrup and Cachar districts, value of work done at the schedule of rates was Rs. 8.27 lakhs and wages paid were Rs. 10.77 lakhs.

11.4. The Committee wanted to know whether there was any separate instructions issued to the blocks to make payment of arrears to the labourers on the basis of Rs. 100 P.M. and less payment already made. The Departmental witness replied in negative. On being questioned as to how did the blocks make arrear payment and why wages paid to labourers after December, 1971 not co-related with the locally prevailing rates and how did the Department ensure that instruction issued by the Government were followed by the blocks correctly, the Departmental witness deposed "The instructions given by the Department was to the effect that when the work is continued for one week the wages may be paid for Sunday also. Some of the Block Development Officers, it seems, paid the labourers extra for the Sunday also for which the wages are admissible." The Committee also wanted a written reply from the Department on the following points by 31st January, 1976.

- (1) On what authority the State Government issued circular No. PDA/329/71/33, dated 17th December, 1971 authorising the Blocks to make payment of wages for Sundays/Holidays if the workers were employed continuously, contrary to the guide-lines.
- (2) Was payment of wages regulated strictly according to off season rate for agriculture labourers in the District? If so, how the off-season rate were ascertained?
- (3) Were all the labourers who were paid arrears of wages on receipt of State Government Circular, dated 17th December, 1971 in employment at the time of payment? If not, how payments were made to them.
- (4) Were payment to the labourers made on monthly basis at the rate of Rs. 100 from irrespective of whether they worked on all the days of a month? If so, was approval of Government of India obtained for payment of wages for the day the labourers did not work?
- (5) Was the wage paid on daily rate basis or in accordance with any prescribed Schedule of rate? If in the latter how could the value of work at the schedule rate (Rs. 8.27 lakhs) be less than the wages paid there under (Rs. 10.77 lakhs).

No reply was received from the Department till date.

RECOMMENDATION

11.5. The Committee could not understand as to why and under what authority the State Government authorised the blocks to make payment of wages for Sundays/holidays (Non-working days) if the workers were employed continuously. These instructions are contrary to the guidelines for payment of wages. As a result

of such instructions Government had to incur an extra expenditure on this account during 1971-72 and 1972-73 to the tune of Rs. 2.52 lakhs. The Committee also expresses its doubt as to whether all the labourers who were paid arrears of wages on receipt of Government order, dated 17. 12. 71 were actually in employment at the time of payment. The Committee recommends a thorough investigation into (a) the payment of arrears without authority resulting in extra expenditure of Rs. 2.52 lakhs, and (b) genuineness of the arrears paid and whether these were paid to the persons for whom these were claimed and (c) payment of wages in excess locally prevailing rates and fix responsibility for the lapses. The Committee is also surprised to note that in 13 Blocks in Kamrup and Cachar Districts value of work done at the schedule of rate was R. 8.27 lakhs and wages paid were Rs. 10.77 lakhs. The wages were to be co-related with the work done but payments were not made accordingly resulting an extra expenditure of Rs. 2.50 lakhs on wages. This matter may be investigated properly to fix responsibility for the extra payment made. The Committee regrets to note, the inability of the Department to supply further information to the Committee in time. Due to this, the Committee could not examine in details the irregularities brought out in the Audit Report. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Government should investigate the whole case in the line of the questionnaire issued by the Committee and the result of the investigation should be intimated to the Committee within one month from the date of presentation of the report to the House.

Paragraph 12 at page 29— Physical achievement against target

12.1 Test check of records in the blocks in three districts showed variation between physical achievement reported by the State Government and the achievement recorded in the blocks in respect of certain classes of projects particularly construction and improvement of roads and reclamation of land. The State Government reported that 362 kilometres (target : 944 kilometres) and 499 kilometres (target: 510 kilometres) of road lengths were constructed or improved during 1971-72 and 1972-73 respectively, whereas as per records of the blocks 599 kilometres (target: 814 kilometres) and 637 kilometres (target: 769 kilometres) had been constructed or improved during these two years. Similarly, for land reclamation the State Government reported that 230 hectares (target: 240 hectares) and 415 hectares (target: 538 hectares) of land were reclaimed whereas the figures were 298 hectares (target: 999 hectares) and 126 hectares (target: 248 hectares) in the records of the blocks during these two years.

12.2 The Committee wanted to know how did the Department reconciled the variation between the physical achievement reported by the State Government to the Government of India and the achievement recorded in the Blocks in respect of certain classes of projects particularly construction and improvement of roads and reclamation of land. The Departmental witness admitted that their figures are subject to margin of errors as there were imper-

fections at all levels, certain amount of imperfections had taken place in his Department also. On a query as to what was the assurance that the figures sent to the Government of India were correct and whether these figures tallied with the figures maintained by the Blocks, the Departmental witness stated that the figures were not verified by the Department.

RECOMMENDATION

12.3. From the evidence, the Committee cannot but draw the conclusion that the Department was callous in assessing the actual physical achievement against the target fixed for different projects and as a result incorrect report was submitted to the Government of India. It is surprising to note how the Department could prepare a report which does not tally with records maintained by the Blocks. The Committee takes a serious view on the matter and recommends that Government should now compile a realistic report about the physical achievement for the years 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74 and submit to the Committee within a course of three months from the date of presentation of the Report to the House.

12.4 The Committee further recommends that the Government should examine whether there was any laxity on the part of the Department for not being able to reconcile the discrepancies between the figures compiled by the Department and figures of the Blocks.

Paragraph 13 at page 30— SELECTION OF AREAS.

13.1 In the three districts it was noticed that numerous projects in the nature of improvement of roads renovation of fishery tanks, horticulture gardens, etc., were executed at the block headquarters. In Kamrup and Cachar districts estimated cost of such projects (41) was Rs. 5.92 lakhs. It is not clear whether the renovation and improvement of such assets, usually financed from the normal departmental budget should be considered either as generating additional employment in rural areas or creating new assets of benefit to the community. Government has stated (May, 1974) that since there was insufficient budget provision under Community Development, these projects had to be included under this Scheme.

RECOMMENDATION

13.2 It transpired from the evidence tendered by the Departmental witness that projects which were to be financed from the normal budget were executed under the Crash Schemes since there was insufficient budget provision under Community Development and the guidelines given by the Government of India were according to the Department, only illustrative. The Committee could not accept the contention of the Department for not adhering to the guidelines given by the Government of India.

13.3. The Committee does not consider that such schemes at all generated additional employment or created any new assets. The Committee hopes that in future the Department should not deviate from the objective of such programme so that benefit to the Community is not deprived of.

Paragraph 14 at page 30—MAINTENANCE OF ASSETS

14.1. As the purpose of producing durable assets would be defeated if adequate arrangements were not made for their maintenance, the Government of India had suggested that, while sanctioning the projects, it would be desirable for State Governments to designate the authority or agency which would be responsible for maintenance of the assets to be created. No arrangements for maintenance have been made yet (May, 1974) in the three districts.

14.2. No permanent records like register of roads, minor irrigation works and of lands developed had been prepared by the blocks nor had instructions for their maintenance been issued by the State Government.

RECOMMENDATION

14.3. It transpired from the evidence as well as from the Audit Report that the Department had not made adequate arrangement for the maintenance of the durable assets created under these schemes. The Committee is surprised to note that Department has not been able to prepare a complete list of the assets created under the scheme. Although the Department issued two circulars in April, 1972 and again in October 1975 to the various Anchalik Panchayats to maintain the assets, there was no machinery to see whether the Government instructions were carried out. The very fact of repetition of instructions shows that assets were not properly maintained. In fact, the departmental witness admitted that apart from issue of instructions, it did not know whether the assets were being actually maintained. The Committee is distressed to note that there was no arrangement made by the Department for maintenance of the assets created under the scheme at the cost of crores of rupees. Even now, no satisfactory arrangements appear to exist. As a result the Committee apprehends that most of the assets have already become wastes. The Committee, therefore, recommends that Government should immediately prepare a complete list of assets created under the scheme and assess the state of each asset to make satisfactory arrangements for maintenance of the assets. A report showing the action taken by the Government should be sent to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of the Report to the House.

Paragraph 15 at Page 30 — EMPLOYMENT.

15.1. Suitable arrangement had to be made by building up records of unemployed and under-employed persons and devising machinery for selecting persons actually to be employed to ensure that employment was offered to those most in need. No records of unemployed or under-employed persons were, however, maintained and labourers were selected from lists forwarded by the respective Gaon Panchayats.

15.2. The Committee wanted to know whether any data/information was collected in the different Blocks of the unemployed and under-employed persons to ensure that employment was offered to those most in need. The Departmental witness stated in his evidence that no data were collected and in that respect local leaders were consulted.

RECOMMENDATION

15.3 The Committee observes that in absence of any suitable records of unemployed and under employed persons the Department was not in a position to ensure that employments under this scheme was offered only to those most in need as specified in Government of India's guidelines.

15.4 The labourers were selected from the list forwarded by the respective Gaon Panchayats. The Committee observes that the scheme could not fulfil its objective for failure of the Department to build up a machinery for selection of needy unemployed and under-employed persons to offer the benefits of the scheme.

Paragraph 16 at pages 30-31

16.1. Test check of records raised doubts whether employment generated as reported to Government of India by the State Government was wholly correct. The State Government reported generation of 39.93 lakhs mandays to the Government of India during 1971-72 and 1972-73. Of this, 30 blocks reported generation of 0.06 lakh mandays which were altered in the Directorate of Community Development to 4.66 lakhs mandays, by dividing the expenditure on labour in these blocks by the daily wage rate. Check of muster rolls, etc., in 6 out of these 30 blocks showed that as against 1,455 mandays reported by them the actual mandays recorded were 81,153. The Directorate had included 83,537 mandays for these blocks, the excess reported being 2,384 mandays.

16.2. The State Government had reported that 5.33 lakhs mandays of employment were generated during 1971-72 in Cachar, Kamrup and North Cachar Hills Districts, excluding the 6 blocks mentioned earlier.

Test check showed an excess of 0.48 lakh mandays reported.

16.3. Similarly, State Government reported 2.66 lakhs mandays generated in Cachar District during 1972-73 as against actual generation of 2.61 lakh mandays; excess reporting was 0.05 lakh mandays.

16.4. The scheme envisaged continuous employment of labourers for at least 10 months in each year. In none of the 42 blocks test checked excepting for 2 blocks, was employment provided continuously for 10 months in 1971-72 and 1972-73 owing mainly to execution of a large number of small projects and delayed sanction or execution of projects. Further, there was heavy concentration of expenditure in March. Employment generated during March 1972 (6.56 lakhs) and March 1973 (7.51 lakhs) was 33.3 and 37.1 per cent respectively of the total employment generated during 1971-72 (19.72 lakhs) and 1972-73 (20.21 lakhs).

16.5. Government has stated (May 1974) that continuity of employment was not ensured because of two problems (i) labourers were shy to go to distant places from their homes and (ii) disadvantages involved in camping outside their home.

16.6. The Committee regrets to note that the Committee could not fully examine the case referred to in Paragraph 16 as the Departmental witness did not come prepared with requisite information. The Audit Report has pointed out certain serious irregularities in compilation of mandays generated and reporting of fictitious figures to the Government of India. It also appears from the Audit Report that there was heavy concentration of expenditure in March 1972 and 1973. The employment generated during March, 1972 and March 1973 was 33.3 per cent and 37.1 per cent respectively of the total employment generated during 1971-72. The Department has failed to furnish informations called for by the Committee within the scheduled time and no communication has been received whatsoever.

RECOMMENDATION

16.7 The Committee, therefore, recommends that Government should investigate as to why the Department did not take any step to examine the irregularities pointed out in the relevant paragraph of the Audit Report during such a long time and take suitable action against the defaulting officers. The irregularities should now be investigated without any further delay. The officer/officers responsible for reporting fictitious figures of employment in Block level and Directorate level should be brought to book and disciplinary action taken against them.

16.8 The action taken by the Department may be reported to the Committee within two months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

Paragraph 17 at Page 32 —

INTEGRATION WITH DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT PLANS.

17.1. According to the Government of India, the projects undertaken under the crash scheme were to be related to the

district plan or, in its absence, to the obvious elements thereof. In the absence of detailed records and the district plans it was not possible to check that the projects undertaken were in addition to the normal plan programme and were integrated with area plans.

17.2. In reply to a question, the departmental witness, admitted that there were no district plans but stated that all the projects were useful to the districts.

RECOMMENDATION

17.3. The Committee recommends that the Government should investigate as to whether the projects undertaken were in addition to the normal Plan Programme and were integrated with the area plan.

Paragraph 18 at pages 32-33—RATIO BETWEEN THE EXPENDITURE ON LABOUR AND MATERIALS,

18.1. Total expenditure incurred on labour and materials during 1971-72 and 1972-73 as reported by the State Government to the Government of India and for the three districts test checked was :—

Year/State/District	Labour (Rupees in lakhs)	Materials	Total	Labour (Percentage)	Material
1, For the entire State	61.63	15.77	77.40	76.6	20.4
„ Kamrup	9.14	2.03	11.17	81.8	18.2
2, „ Cachar	8.95	2.00	10.95	81.74	18.26
4, „ North Cachar Hills,	1.84	0.35	2.19	84	16
1972-73					
1, For the entire State	87.39	17.18	104.57	83.6	16.4
2, „ Kamrup	9.88	2.26	12.13	81.4	18.6
3, „ Cachar	9.88	2.30	12.18	81.12	18.11
4, „ North Cachar Hills.	6.01	1.58	7.59	79.18	20.82

18.2. In December 1972 an embankment 3kilometres long, for flood protection of paddy land against erosion by Mahur river from Vibra to Maibang (North Cachar Hills) was taken up (estimated cost : Rs. 4.82 lakhs). Though the estimate provided for three line sausages with boulders and wire netting, the district council decided to execute the work with three line sausages with boulders and wirenetting for 1 kilometre and with bamboo pallisading for another 3 kilometres to make it more labour intensive and sought for revised administrative approval. Revised administrative approval and technical sanction are awaited (September 1973). The work was completed in April, 1973 at a cost of Rs.4.53 lakhs ; measurement books recorded execution of work for 1 Kilometre with

three line sausages with boulders and wirenetting and for another 3 kilometres with bamboo pallisading. The block development officer stated (September 1973) that the entire work was executed with three line sausages with boulders and wirenetting and excess expenditure on materials was shown as labour payments by preparation of muster rolls. Daily attendance of labourers was not recorded and measurements were not test checked by any superior officer.

18.3. The Committee wanted to know that in view of low percentage of expenditure on materials how was the durability of the assets produced ensured. The Departmental witness stated in his evidence that although in some cases material component was less than 20% yet the schemes were considered durable. The Committee was not satisfied with the reply given by the Department. The Committee then wanted to know whether the revised administrative approval and technical sanction were accorded for embankment of 3K.M. long in N. C. Hills. The Departmental witness replied in negative. The Committee then wanted to know the information on the following points:—

- (1). When the entire work was executed with three line sausages with boulders and wire nettings how the measurement book recorded execution of work for 1 kilometre with three line sausages with boulders and wirenetting and another 3 K.M. with bamboo pallisading? Who is responsible for recording such incorrect and misleading measurement in the measurement book?
- (2). Why the expenditure on materials was shown as labour payment by preparation of muster rolls? Does this not amount to falsification of records? Who permitted this?
- (3). Is there no system of check measurement by any higher officer? If so, why this was not done?

RECOMMENDATION

18.4. The Department assured to furnish a detailed report for perusal of the Committee. The Committee, therefore, desires that a detailed report be submitted to the Committee by the Department within one month from the date of presentation of the report to the House.

GENERAL

19.1. In order to appreciate fully the actual usefulness of the assets created the Committee wanted to know the following:—

- (i) Rupees 7.58 lakhs and Rs. 7.55 lakhs were spent during 1971-72 and 1972-73 on minor irrigation works. What was the average for which minor irrigation potential was created? What was the actual increase in the irrigated area under this scheme?
- (ii) Rupees 27.60 lakhs were spent on land reclamation in these two years. What was the area actually reclaimed and what was the actual increase in the cultivated area?
- (iii) What were the reasons for spending nearly 50% of the funds on road construction? How many of these are still in existence.

19.2. The departmental witness promised to furnish written replies by 31st January, 1976.

19.3. The Committee also wanted to know about the observations made by the teams of Central Government officer and the comments of the Government of India on the implementation of the scheme in Assam. In particular, the Committee wanted to know the following :—

(i) Is it a fact that the Central Government has asked the State Government to refund the amounts spent on works costing less than Rs. 5,000 each?

(ii) Did the Central teams of officers visit to Assam and gave reports on the implementation of the scheme? Copies of these may be furnished. It appears that one such team commented as follows :—

(i) Wages were paid on monthly basis.

(ii) The workers do not work on sundays but get paid.

(iii) The payment is not governed by out turn of the work.

(iv) Muster rolls were not found.

(v) The roads were constructed without arrangements for soling compaction, metalling or surfacing with hard murram.

What action was taken on these reports?

Has the Government studied whether continuing employment was generated?

Here again, the department has failed to give the written replies which were promised to be given by 31st January, 1976.

19.4. The Committee also asked the following further questions, informations—

(i) Regarding the releases of money made by Government in March, 1971 and 1972, the Committee would like to know the details of amounts which were drawn by the Block Development Officers in March but were actually spent in the subsequent years.

(ii) Is it not a fact that the mandays theoretically calculated with reference to drawals in March were included in statistics of mandays employment generated without actual generation?

(iii) Before implementing the scheme in the State, what administrative strengthening was done at the headquarter and the Block levels. What was the expenditure on administration and supervision of the scheme?

- (iv) When works of this magnitude were undertaken, did not the Government consider it necessary to make special arrangement for supervision, etc. ?
- (v) The department may furnish the Committee monthwise employment generated during the 3 years.
- (vi) The department may furnish for the year 1973-74.
 - (a) Month-wise expenditure on the scheme.
 - (b) Month-wise mandays employment generation.
 - (c) Category-wise break-up of projects sanctioned.
 - (d) How many of these were costing less than Rs.5,000 each and how many were costing between Rs.5,000 and Rs.22,500 each ?
 - (d) How many projects remained incomplete as on 31st March, 1974 ?

Have these been completed ?

Also, what is the total length of roads completed during the 3 years under the scheme ?

RECOMMENDATION

19.5. Though the written replies to some of the questions were furnished by the Department on the evening of 31st January, 1976, when the sitting was over, the Committee was unable to examine the Department on these important aspects due to want of time. Some of these are related to the points raised in the Audit Report. The Committee can make its recommendations in regard to these only after the written replies have been considered. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Government should investigate the matter in the line of the Questionnaire issued by the Committee and the result be intimated to the Committee within three months from the date of placement of the Report before the House.

REPORT ON THE EVALUATION STUDY MADE BY THE DIRECTORATE OF EVALUATION

20.1. The Directorate of Evaluation made an evaluation study of the implementation of the Scheme in Assam. The Report was submitted by the Directorate in May 1975 and the Committee was told by the Director of Evaluation that the report had already been sent to the Department long time back but their comments had not been received. The Committee wanted to examine the Department on the lapses and deficiencies brought out in this report in general and on the following in particular

20.2. The Report has stated in Paragraph 3.2 that the expenditure has been shown differently in different documents by administering authorities.

What are the correct figure of expenditure ?

20.3. In Paragraph 3.5, the Report has mentioned that certain data was not available for study.

2. How is it that even in 1975, correct and authentic data was not available?

20.4. Paragraph 3.6 points out that expenditure on wage per manday was higher in 1972-73 than in 1973-74. It was higher in 1972-73 as compared to that in 1971-72.

What is the explanation for this ?

20.5. Paragraph 3.9 describe the physical achievements and cos's in respect of different categories of assets, cost varied highly from year to year:—

		(In Rupees)		
		1971-72	1972-73	1973-74
		Rs.	Rs.	Rs.
(a) Land reclamation per hectare		437	...	2,892
Goalpara		820	...	1,603
(b) Soil Conservation per hectare ...		6,490	1,268	2,522
(c) Community Orchard per hectare		3,300	6,120	3,254
Goalpara		450
(d) Development of Panchayat land per hectar.		4,162	as compared to	1,205
			on land recla-	
			mation.	
Goalpara		671
(e) Kulcha roads per KM		1,910	3,553	2,966
(f) Drainage		122	192	263

Rs. 32.83 lakh 26.6 lakh 5.61 lakhs

Goalpara Rs.675 against Rs.5749.

How does the Department explain these variations ?

Does this mean that there was no control on expenditure and work done that the figures are not authentic ? The Report has shown doubts regarding the figures of achievements.

20.6. In Paragraph 4.8, the Report has stated that the average cost in Goalpara and State average cost per unit of some of the assets were not at all competable and no convincing explanation was also available for such a big disparity of cost. The Report has further observed that either the achievements shown are not available or nature and quality of work taken up differed very widely from place to place. What is the explanation of the Department? Has the Department investigated?

20.7. In Paragraph 4.8, the Report has observed as follows:—

“It is not clear how the achievements against some items in the State as a whole has been built up, when there is again in the corresponding information against the same item for a district like Goalpara”

This shows that some of the figures adopted by the Department are fictitious.

What has the Department to say in this regard?

Paragraph 5.8 brings out further cost disparities.

How does the Department explain this?

Were not the specifications, standards and quality of work uniform?

20.8. Cost disparities lead the Committee to the conclusion that in many cases excess payments have been made, work done there is far less than the wages paid, there was no supervision, fictitious muster rolls were prepared, measurements were not recorded, etc.

What has the Department to say in this regard?

20.9. As a result of analysis of two works in Chapter VI, the Report has observed (6.3) that actual employment of persons was far less than the employment envisaged (13 against 143 daily) and that the works were delayed (5 months against 1 month) etc. This shows that the number of persons actually given employment was less.

What is the explanation of the Department?

20.10. In this Chapter VI, it has been pointed out that daily wages under this scheme were the highest as compared to other works in these areas (Para 6.11) was it not contrary to the guidelines of the scheme?

It has been stated that people were not provided continuous employment. Why was it so ?

20.11. The Report has also brought out non-payment of wages daily or weekly. Why this happened ? Has it not defeated the purpose of C.S.R.E ?

What steps were taken by Government to remove these ?

20.12. The Report has commented on the maintenance of assets saying that these were not maintained at all. Already some works had deteriorated, foot-paths damaged, etc. The Report has expressed the fear that unless the schemes were properly maintained, completed projects would be a waste and would not turn out to be productive or yielding durable assets.

What action has been taken by Government on these ?

20.13. The Report has observed that the Department has not been able to indicate the actual return from some of the Categories of assets.

What are the reasons for this ?

RECOMMENDATION

20.14. The Departmental witness stated that the report had not been fully examined as yet and he was not ready with the replies. As there are serious deficiencies the Committee recommends that above aspects brought out in the Report be examined by Government without any further delay and a detailed report with action taken on persons responsible for the lapses be furnished to the Committee within three months from the date of placement of the Committee's Report before the House.

PART II

SUMMARY OF

RECOMMENDATIONS, REMARKS, OBSERVATIONS, MADE BY
THE COMMITTEE ON THE ADVANCE REPORT OF
THE COMPTROLLER AND AUDITOR
GENERAL OF INDIA FOR THE
YEAR 1972-73.

AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT

Serial
No.

Recommendation

1 Para 1 at pages
1-2

The Committee recommends that there should be strong machinery, if necessary, by reorganising the existing personnel to review the progress of implementation of various schemes undertaken by the Department.

The Committee regrets to note that assessment on losses was not made on realistic basis and there was no co-ordination between the Departments. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the entire system of assessment of losses be examined by the Department with a view to devising a system by which the Department can get a more realistic picture of the losses, without any further delay.

The Committee further recommends that in place of the existing executive instructions and subsequent piecemeal modifications, a comprehensive Manual be prepared containing all the instructions relating to relief measures to be taken at times of natural calamities like floods etc. The manual should contain instructions to check up the reports submitted by Mandols and Gram Sevaks etc. by the responsible officers so that there may not be mis-representation of facts.

2 Para 1,2 at pages
2-3

The Committee regrets that the targets were changed frequently by the Department from time to time. It appears to the Committee that all aspects of implementation and resources etc., were not taken into consideration at the time of first fixing of targets. The Committee recommends that in such programme the Department should take all the factors into consideration and fix targets which are realisable. The allocation of resources should also be in accordance with such realistic targets.

Serial Reference

Recommendation

No.

3 Para 1.3 at page 3

The Committee regrets to note that due to delay in surrendering the amount of Rs. 50 lakhs, an amount of infuctuous liability of Rs. 0.63 lakh on account of interest on the above loan was incurred. The Committee therefore recommends that responsibility be fixed on the Officer or Officers for whose negligence the delay in surrendering the amount occurred.

The action taken should be reported to the Committee within two months from the date of presentation of this Report before the House.

4 Para 2.1 at page 3

The Committee is unhappy to note the failure on the part of Department to achieve the reduced target even after review.

The Committee regrets that the targets were changed frequently by the Department from time to time. It appears to the Committee that all aspects of implementation and resources etc., were not taken into consideration at the time of first fixing of targets. The Committee recommends that in such programmes the department should take all the factors into consideration and fix targets which are realisable. The allocation of resources should also be in accordance with such realistic targets.

5 Paras 2.2 and 2.3 at page 4

It appears to the Committee that reduction in the proportion of money for seeds must have resulted in reduced supply of seeds to the farmers under the normal plan schemes.

The diversion and reduction of money from the plan provisions of the State was contrary to the direction of Government of India. In spite of that the Department placed restrictions on expenditure, curtailed the expenditure on schemes and utilised the estimated money by reappropriation from other plans and schemes which appeared to be irregular.

Though the Department stated that the money was available from the Plan funds because it could not implement certain schemes, the Department was unable to satisfy the Committee on the reasons for non-implementation of this scheme. As a result, the schemes under the Annual Plan suffered and were not fully implemented. The Committee recommends that where special programme is in addition to normal Plan schemes, the Government should ensure that the implementation of normal Plan schemes do not suffer.

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
6	Paras 3.1 to 3.3 at pages 4-5	<p>The Committee is not satisfied with the explanations of the Department that such a large technical and other staff have been retained only for realisation of loans etc.</p> <p>The Committee finds no justification to retain the staff beyond 31st May, 1973, when the scheme was prepared till the end of financial year 1972-73.</p>
7	Paras 5.1 to 5.3 at pages 6-7	<p>The Committee regrets that even after more than 2 years of completion of the programme the final accounts with the Agro Industries Development Corporation have not been settled. The Committee recommends that the Agriculture Department should take immediate steps to settle the accounts with the Assam Agro Industries Development Corporation and report submitted to the Committee within three months from the date of submission of the Report.</p>
8	Para 5.4 at page 7	<p>The Committee is not satisfied with the explanation given by the Department and the Corporation that the discount offered by the dealers in Kirloskar firm was not availed of for ensuring delivery of the pump sets within the time limit stipulated by the Agriculture Department. The Committee finds that only Kirloskar dealers had supplied the pump sets in time and the others had delayed the supplies. The Committee therefore recommends that the responsibility for loss to the Government be fixed by the Department.</p> <p>The Agriculture Department's reply that there was no delay in delivery of electric pumps was not borne out by facts. The Committee is therefore compelled to recommend that responsibility for submission of mis-statement of facts should be fixed and action taken against the officers responsible should be reported to the Committee within April, 1976.</p>
9	Para 5.5 at page 7	<p>From the evidence given by the Departmental witness, it appears to the Committee that the different H. P. capacities pump sets were purchased without assessing as to what H. P. capacities pump sets would be suitable for the programme and the conditions in this State. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Department should assess the H. P. capacity or capacities of pump sets which are suitable for Assam.</p>

Serial
No.

Reference

Recommendation

The Departmental witnesses were not able to satisfy the Committee that the defects pointed out earlier by the Agriculture Department in the Indec Pumps had been rectified. Purchase of Indec Pumps resulted in extra expenditure and the Committee recommends that the responsibility for this should be fixed.

The Committee considers that the supply of foreign pumps without adequate supply of spares was also not judicious. The Committee would like the Department to submit detailed report on the performance of Indec foreign pumps.

10 Para 6.1 at pages
7-8

The Department did not indicate the command area of each scheme, hours run, reasons for low working of the schemes. It appears from the statement that Rajabazar Scheme (4 pumpsets) was energised in December 1974 and Matijuri Scheme (10 sets) was energised in February-March 1975. Earlier in November 1974 the Department reported to the Committee that all the sets (30) in Polla scheme were energised. Now in November 1975 the Department against the scheme as indicated that 2 Nos. were not yet energised the areas irrigated by the schemes were 5164 and 5251 acres in 1972-73 and 1973-74 respectively against the proposed command area of 42450 acres.

The Committee was, not satisfied when the specific requirements for Emergency Agricultural Production Programme were decided for each district, there should not have been deviations from the decided programme.

From the evidence of both the Departmental witness and the witness on behalf of the Assam State Electricity Board it appears that there was lack of adequate co-ordination between the Agriculture Department and the Assam State Electricity Board regarding timely selection of sites and the programme of energisation of the schemes. Further adequate measures were not taken which were necessary for successful implementation of the emergency scheme.

The Committee considers that the Department did not maintain any record to show the hours run by each set and the Department did not analyse each scheme to work out the reasons for low utilisation. The Committee further recommends fixation of responsibility for submission of incorrect information regarding energisation of pump sets in respect of Polla Lift Irrigation Scheme.

Serial
No.

Reference

Recommendation

11 Para 6.2 at page 8

The Department should not have undertaken 31 electric lift irrigation schemes involving installation of 283 pump sets of 20 H. P. to irrigate 42450 acres of land when it was known to the Department that the A.S.E.B. would not be able to energise more than 38 pump sets by 15th December, 1972 due to delay in selection of sites by the Department. The Department placed orders to the Agro Industries Development Corporation for supply of pump sets on the 4th September, 1972 and submitted proposals for taking up the schemes to the Government on 27th September, 1972. Till submission of proposals for the individual electric schemes the Department was not in a position to select the sites for which this could not be intimated to the A.S.E.B. before 24th October, 1972.

The Committee expresses its regret that the Department did not move as expeditiously as expected in implementing such emergency schemes as the very name signifies. The Committee therefore recommends that thorough investigation into the delay for energisation of the pump sets etc. for fixation of responsibility should be made at what stage the delay occurred in implementing the schemes for which the benefits of loan granted by the Central Government could not be fully utilised.

The Committee considers that the review conducted by the Department was of no use as the Department did not maintain any record. The Committee also noted with much distress the method of incorrect reporting to the Government of India adopted by the Department and suggested that appropriate action should be taken against the officers responsible for the incorrect reporting as these reports showed distorted picture of performance of the programme.

12 Para 6.3 at page 8

The Committee regrets to note that the Corporation did not conduct the business as expected of them. They should have fixed the date by which the supplies were to be made since the Department specifically stated that the barges should be supplied by December, 1972. A thorough investigation should be conducted to fix up the responsibility as to the omission in indicating the stipulated date of supply in the supply order for barges.

Serial Reference
No.

Recommendation

13 Para 6.4 at pages
9-10

The Committee regrets to comment that the Department completely failed to get the utilisation of the potential created by the schemes. A thorough investigation regarding the failure of the Department to get the benefits of irrigation utilised by the cultivators need be made for fixation of responsibility. It should also be investigated whether the Department took into consideration the various difficulties, which they have now expressed, in the working of the schemes and whether adequate measures were taken by the Department to ensure irrigation of the total command area. While conducting investigation it should also be considered whether the Department or Departments took adequate measures to motivate the cultivators.

14 Para 6.5 at page 11

The Committee therefore considered that the Assam State Electricity Board should not have incurred expenditure in excess of deposit received by them especially when they failed to energise the pump sets when water was most needed during the Rabi season of 1972.

The Committee regrets to note that the Assam State Electricity Board failed to furnish the information asked for by the Committee and recommends an investigation to be conducted by the Chairman of the Board and result be communicated to the Committee within two months from the date of presentation of this Report.

The Committee further recommends that the Directorate of Agriculture should not have made material modification of the Schemes resulting in an extra expenditure of Rs. 23.06 lakhs being the cost of new 11 KV lines after being approved by Government.

The Department should settle up the claims of Rs. 31.34 lakhs immediately and the action taken be intimated to the Committee within two months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

15 Para 6.6 at page 11

The Committee considers that the action of the Department in curtailment of normal plan provisions and targets to implement the E.A.P.P. scheme was not justified.

The Committee recommends that the failure to get all the 435 pump sets, which were installed, energised in time be investigated and the responsibility fixed.

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
16	Paras 7.1 and 7.2 at pages 11—13	<p>The Committee is unhappy to note that due to wrong estimation of requirement of pumpsets in different Districts, the services of pump sets could not be fully utilised at the time when the irrigation was needed most. As such the emergent production programme was greatly affected. It appears that the Department did not work out the requirement on the basis of experience gained and the requirement were not realistic. The Committee recommends that before undertaking programme of this magnitude, the Department must make realistic assessment of requirement of pump sets based on the needs of the districts.</p>
17	Para 7.3 at page 13	<p>The Committee takes serious view of the Department's failure to submit a copy of the minutes of the Purchase Board of the Corporation as asked for and that the Department did not maintain any data regarding the actual performance of different categories of sets though the Department had been maintaining the diesel pump sets for the last 15 to 20 years. The Committee therefore, recommends that a thorough probe about the working of Department in this regard need be made as to why the Department failed to maintain any records regarding performance of each category of sets and areas to which such categories of sets were suitable to find out appropriate category of sets to be utilised.</p> <p>The Committee observed that even in this district also a large number of sets were not utilised. Then the Chief Engineer further stated that the Department had issued 35 pumpsets for Lakhimpur out of which 14 were for North Lakhimpur and 21 for Dhemaji to cover an area of 196 bighas.</p> <p>The Committee observed that whereas 40 sets were earmarked for the district, only 35 were supplied. On being asked as to how the requirement were worked out, the Departmental witness stated that pumpsets were supplied on the basis of requisition made by the Subdivisional Advisory Bodies. On further being asked to furnish the reasons for transfer of sets earmarked for one district to another and all the copies of correspondences on the basis of which such transfers were made, the Department promised to do so. The Committee regrets that till to-day (30th January, 1976), the Department has not furnished any such paper.</p>

Serial
No.

Reference

Recommendation

The Committee observed from the performance report of Lakhimpur District furnished by the Department that 35 pumpsets had been lodged in the district but the area irrigated during 1972-73 was only 195 bighas. This shows extremely low utilisation of the pumpsets as compared to the capacity earlier stated by the Departmental witness. This also results in wastage of pumpsets which would be usefully utilised elsewhere. The Department was not able to satisfy the Committee regarding the low utilisation of the pumpsets.

From the statement the Committee also observed that the utilisation of all these pumpsets in the subsequent years continued to be low.

18 Para 7.4 at page
13

The Committee recommends that a thorough investigation be made regarding the distribution of pump sets in the different districts to ascertain whether the distribution was based on the needs assessed and communicated by the district officers and whether the pump sets distributed were related to the area which required irrigation under this programme in each district.

The Committee also recommends that the Department should actually study the low utilisation of pump sets in the District, to ascertain the causes for it and to take remedial measures as otherwise the low utilisation results in wastage of money and assets.

The result of this investigation should be submitted to the Committee within three months from the date of submission of this Report to the House.

The Committee would like the responsibilities for low utilisation, non-utilisation and maldistribution of pumpsets to be fixed and then results of investigation and the fixation of responsibilities be submitted to the Committee within three months from the date of submission of this Report to the House.

19 Para 8.1 at page
13

The Committee is distressed to note that the Department, without ascertaining the demand for water, the soil condition and availability of water, installed the shallow tubewells. The Committee recommends that investigation

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
---------------	-----------	----------------

should be made about low irrigation provided by the shallow tubewells and responsibility should be fixed on the concerning officers for whose fault the benefit of irrigation could not be made available during the programme period.

The Committee also recommends that the reasons for continued low irrigation by these shallow tubewells in the subsequent years be also investigated, and the Department should take immediate remedial measures to improve their utilisation.

The Committee recommends that the cultivators should be trained in effective use of water. Adequate steps should be taken to motivate the cultivators. Schemes should be prepared keeping in view the soil condition and availability of source of water.

20 Para 8.2 at page
14

The Emergency Agricultural Production Programme was initiated in August, 1972. Even if the view points of the Department are taken into consideration that in North Lakhimpur and Dhemaji Shallow Tubewells were very few and the time at the disposal of the Department was very short, it appeared to Committee that even in subsequent 3 (three) years also there is no utilisation and there is no improvement, the condition remains more or less the same.

The Committee is not satisfied with the explanation given by the Department and regrets to note that nothing was done by the Department in the subsequent years also to improve the working of these tubewells and to utilise the tubewells for irrigation. This indicates absolute lack of caution on the part of the Department.

The Committee also recommends that continued non-utilisation or low utilisation of these shallow tubewells should be thoroughly investigated and the responsibility fixed.

21 Para 8.3 at page
15

The Committee recommends that the action taken on the Report of the investigation about the break-down of tubewells be furnished to the Committee within two months from the date of submission of this Report to the House.

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
22 Para 8.4 at page 15		<p>The Committee is constrained to observe that the Annual Plan for the shallow tubewells appears to have been made without any realistic co-relation between the physical target and the availability of fund.</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the plans prepared should be realistic and possible of achievement.</p>
23 Paras 9.1 and 9.2 at page 15		<p>The Committee is unhappy to note that due to delay in placing the orders the Threshers could not be purchased in time, as such the benefit of the scheme could not be availed of.</p>
24 Para 9.3 at page 16		<p>The Committee is distressed to find that even inspite of penal provision in the tender notice and in the face of receipt of complaints that it was of sub-standard and performance were also unsatisfactory, the penal provision was not observed. The Committee also came to know that the type of threshers purchased was not suitable to climate of Assam and the Department did not investigate this aspect of the matter before the purchase was made.</p> <p>The Committee therefore recommends that thorough investigation should be made as to why 20 percent and 5% releases were made inspite of receipt of reports from the field officers to the effect that the threshers were of sub-standard and its performance was not satisfactory and also that these were not suitable for the climate of Assam. Responsibility should be fixed on the Officer/Officers for whose fault such an infructuous expenditure was made.</p> <p>The Committee also recommends that Department should take steps to train the cultivators to operate the threshers and investigation should be made as to whether the existing machines can be designed to suit the climatic condition of Assam.</p> <p>The action taken by the Department should be intimated to the Committee within a course of three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.</p>

Serial
No.

Reference

Recommendation

25 Para 10 at page 16

The Committee is constrained to note that the Tractors are purchased on an unrealistic assessment as it appears from the low utilisation. The purchase of 4 imported Tractors appears to be unjudicious as in course of time it will have to be idle outlay for want of Foreign parts and the expenditure incurred will prove to be infructuous. In view of the opinion expressed by the Director of Agriculture that mechanised cultivation is not suitable for Assam, the Committee recommends that the Department should carefully go into the question whether tractorisation is good or not before making any fresh purchase of tractors, and submit a report to the Committee.

The Committee therefore recommends that there should be a thorough probe about the lack of demand and low utilisation of the Tractors. The Committee is unhappy to note that Department failed to furnish the required information and urge upon the Department to furnish the same within one month from the date of submission of this Report to the House.

26 Para 11 at page
17

The Committee is constrained to observe the failure of the Department to submit (i) a statement showing the seeds of different variety not distributed till the end of Emergency Agricultural Production Programme and the quantity of each variety found short; (ii) a statement showing the dates of receipt of complaint for misuse of seeds, dates of decision to draw up proceedings against the officers at fault; (iii) reasons advanced by concerning Block Development Officers for losses and damages and also the blockwise figures of such losses and damages; (iv) how much fertilisers or pesticides were received by the Department and what were the balances along with shortages and damages as well as; (v) failure of the Department to finalise the accounts of the seeds and fertiliser supplied by the Seeds Corporation even after 2½ years; (vi) reasons for purchase of huge quantity of fertiliser under Emergency Agricultural Production Programme; (vii) the position of the present left over stock and the Committee considers that the Department either intentionally withheld the information for keeping the legislature and public at large uninformed of the short comings and indifference of the Department due to which huge wastages occurred or disregarded the direction of this August Body.

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
		<p>The Committee is, therefore, compelled to recommend a thorough enquiry by an independent authority, about the working of the Department with specific reference to the mode of maintenance of accounts records by the Department and whether the withholding of the information from the Committee was intentional or due to non-maintenance of adequate records by the Department. Whatever may be the reasons the Committee recommends that responsibility be fixed and the persons responsible be brought to book.</p>
27	Para 12.1 at page 17	<p>The Committee is surprised to note that the Department could not get the discrepancy between seeds supplied and received reconciled within 2½ years and only now the Corporation was proposing to sit together and reconcile the discrepancies and recommends that a thorough investigation as to the failure of the Department to settle up the accounts so long be made for fixation of responsibility and the persons responsible be brought to book.</p>
		<p>The progress made for settlement of accounts also be made known to the Committee from time to time and the position after final settlement of accounts reported to the Committee by the 15th April, 1976 as the Department promised to settle up the accounts within the financial year.</p>
23	Para 12.2 at page 17	<p>The Committee views non-submission of the statement showing the requisitions placed by the Block Development Officers for each of the 29 projects with Seeds Corporation seriously. Earlier also, the Committee had commented on the non-submission of details asked for by the Committee. This seriously hampers the work of the Committee. The Committee recommends that the Government should issue effective instruction to all the Departments to submit the details and notes asked for by the Committee within the stipulated time. The Committee also recommends that in all cases of non-submission of information and data to the Committee, Government should take strong action against the persons concerned.</p>
		<p>The Committee desires that this statement asked for should be submitted by the Department within a month from the date of submission of the Report before the House.</p>

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
29 Para 12.3 at page 18		<p>The Committee regrets to comment that the Department did not appear before the Committee being fully prepared as the Department failed to furnish (i) the total quantity of certified wheat seeds supplied to the farmers and the quantity remained distributed even after 2½ years of the programme being over (ii) if the areas in the five districts were reduced why requisition was made for quantity in excess of requirement (iii) why quantities of seed supplied by the Corporation to 23 projects were either in excess of or short of quantities required though the Department continued to maintain the staff entertained during Emergency Agricultural Production Programme till May 1975 and the Audit Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for 1972-73 was forwarded to the Department in September, 1974.</p>
		<p>The Committee is constrained to recommend an investigation as to why the Department could not square up the accounts of seeds and fertilisers supplied to the farmers and quantities remained undistributed at the end of the programme and how the left over stocks were utilised, disposed of.</p>
30 Para 12.4 at page 18		<p>The Committee recommends investigation be conducted to ascertain as to why seeds were not available at the time these were needed and the reasons for non distribution of the seeds pointed out in the sub-para.</p>
31 Para 12.5 at page 19		<p>The Committee considers that the very planning of the Department to supply improved seeds to get better yield was frustrated when local seeds were decided to be supplied and that too for the first-time in the State especially when there was no approved seed dealers in the State. The suppliers took advantage of the situation and cheated the Government. Neither the staff of the Assam Seeds Corporation nor the staff of the Agriculture Department exercised vigilance as expected of them. The Committee also considers that at every stage there was a tendency to hush up the case of supply of inferior quality of seeds.</p> <p>The Committee, therefore, recommends the cases of supply of inferior quality of all seeds be investigated de-novo by an independent authority for fixation of responsibility and submit report within two months from the date of presentation of the report to the House.</p>

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
32 Para 12.6 at page 19		The Committee considers that the report submitted by the Director of Agriculture on 22.3.73 regarding the allegations against the Assam Seeds Corporation for Emergency Agricultural Production Programme failed to bring out the correct picture regarding supply of lentil seeds and recommends that a thorough investigation be conducted for fixation of responsibility.
33 Para 13 at pages 19-20		The Committee recommends that an independent enquiry be conducted by the Government into the following aspects to find the truth and to fix the responsibility for the lapses due to which the Government had to incur losses : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Purchase and use of pesticides whether all the pesticides shown as utilised in aerial spraying were actually used particularly when there was evidence that the area actually sprayed was far less than the area claimed to have been sprayed ; purchase of expensive pesticide instead of cheaper alternative needs also be investigated. <li>(2) All discrepancies in the areas certified by the A.P.P.O. as sprayed and the areas actually sprayed be investigated ; this will include besides investigation in North Lakhimpur Subdivision, investigation in Jorhat and Dhemaji. <li>(3) Reasons for not making payment to the aerial porters on the basis of either actual measurement or according to the Revenue records which were available and making payment on theoretical basis of certain load and pesticides used, etc. non-obtaining of certificates from the District Agricultural Officers should also be investigated. <li>(4) Variations from the approved programme should be investigated to find out whether the areas not originally programmed needed aerial spraying or this was done by the firm on its own accord ; omission to spray areas which were approved by the Director of Agriculture need also be investigated.

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
---------------	-----------	----------------

- (5) Appointment of M/S Jacks Aviation for spraying without inviting tenders and without obtaining the approval of the Government.
- (6) All discrepancies regarding dates of receipt of pesticides in the district offices and the dates of spraying.
- (7) Delay in starting aerial spraying operation and not doing the spraying in accordance with the package of practices prepared by the Directorate of Agriculture.
- (8) Reasons for the increase in the yield in that year being far lower than the yield envisaged in the package of practices even though nearly Rs. 10 lakhs were spent on aerial spraying besides other measures.

The Committee is utterly dis-satisfied with the delay in the commencement of the enquiry into the discrepancies in North Lakhimpur, Dhemaji side in the Lakhimpur Subdivision as well as with the slow progress of the enquiry. The Committee regrets to note that even though the Agriculture Department asked the Political Department to get the matter investigated, no action was taken by that Department for more than a year. The Committee recommends that the responsibility for the delay in this regard be fixed.

The enquiry into the purchase of sub-standard pesticides also needs be expedited. At the same time, the Committee recommends that the responsibility for placing orders on bogus firm and accepting sub-standard material should also be fixed if it is not already covered by the enquiry in hand.

The Committee recommends that all these inquiries be completed and reports submitted to the Committee within a period of two months of placing of this Report before the House.

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
34	Para 14 at page 20	<p>The Committee recommends that the Department should immediately investigate all the shortages as well as the utilisation of the left-over stocks and furnish a report to the Committee within a month of the submission of this Report before the House.</p> <p>The Committee further recommends that a thorough investigation be conducted to ascertain the fertiliser allotted by the Government of India could be sold to an authorised dealer. The Committee also expresses its displeasure to find that this case was not so long investigated by Government.</p>
35	Para 15 at page 20	<p>The Committee regrets to observe that the Department failed to take adequate action to recover the short term loans though the Department stated earlier that the additional staff entertained during Emergency Agricultural Production Programme continued to be maintained to effect recovery of loans since the short term loan granted by the Government of India must have been repaid and immediate steps to recover the loans be taken.</p> <p>The Committee recommends that the Department should take immediate steps to recover these loans and submit a report to the Committee within three months of the submission of the Report before the House.</p>
36	Para 16 at page 91	<p>The Committee had given its recommendations on various aspects of the Programme in the early stage. In this recommendation the Committee has suggested a number of investigations into the lapses and the failures. As expressed in the earlier paragraphs, the Committee considers that all efforts were not made to make the Programme a success and that there was lack of co-ordination between the Department and the Corporation and that there were lapses.</p> <p>In conclusion, the Committee recommends that the Department should ensure better utilisation of the lift irrigation schemes, diesel pump sets, threshers, tractors and shallow tubewells for irrigating more areas.</p> <p>The Committee would like to have a report on the efforts made by the Department towards this direction in three months time from the date of placement of this Report before the House.</p>

Serial
No.

Reference

Recommendation

DEVELOPMENT PANCHAYAT AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT) DEPARTMENT

1 Para 1 at pages
22-23

The Committee regrets to note that prior to 1972, no instructions were issued by Department to the Deputy Commissioners and Subdivisional Officers who were to supervise the implementation of the scheme in the districts. It also appeared from the evidence that even after instructions were issued to the Deputy Commissioners and Subdivisional Officers, inspections were not conducted by the supervising officers regarding implementation of the various works undertaken under the scheme. The Committee also regrets that though nearly Rs. 3 crores were spent, the Department did not systematically review the implementation of the scheme, in these years. The Committee is unable to understand the argument of the department that it did not have any machinery to do so. During the course of implementation of the scheme the Department received various complaints against some of the Block Development Officers and other officers connected which were stated to be under investigation even after a number of years have elapsed.

In view of above the Committee raises a doubt as to whether Rs. 3 crores spent actually resulted in generation of that much employment as has been claimed and in completion and creation of durable assets. The Committee, therefore, recommends a thorough districtwise investigation into the state of works which were undertaken and the assets claimed to have been created as well as the employment claimed to have been generated and submit a report to the Committee within 3 months from the date of presentation of the Report before the House. The Committee also recommends that all cases of complaints against the executing officers be finalised within a course of two months from the date of presentation of the Report before the House and a final report about action taken be submitted to the Committee. The Committee would further like Government to investigate the reasons for not reviewing the progress from time to time

Serial
No.

Reference

Recommendation

and to fix responsibility on officer/officers concerned in the department as well as for lack of proper control and supervision on the executing officers. Finally, the discrepancy between the figures of expenditure stated by the Department and as appearing in the Audit Report should be reconciled and a report submitted to the Committee at an early date.

2 Para 2 at pages
23-24

The Committee observes that though the State Government was informed of the scheme as early as March, 1971 and sent a list of projects in July, 1971 to Government of India, the Government was not fully prepared to implement the scheme when Government of India gave the final clearance. It further observes that though the Government of India wanted the scheme to be implemented on a crash basis and large amounts were to be spent, no special arrangement was made to ensure proper and timely implementation of the scheme except a small cell consisting of one Planning Officer and two assistants created in the Directorate. The Committee cannot help coming to the conclusion that this resulted in lower releases of funds by the Government of India.

The Committee came across the instances of giving sanction of the schemes in the last month of the year. This only reflects the importance and urgency given by the Department in implementing schemes in time.

The Committee is not convinced with the reasons furnished by the Department such as unfavourable climatic condition in the State etc. for its inability to execute the scheme fully. The Committee, therefore, recommends that Government should examine as to whether there was any laxity on the part of the Department for not being able to utilise the funds offered by the Government of India to the State of Assam for implementing the crash programme and fix responsibility on Officer/Officers concerned.

Serial
No.

Reference

Recommendation

3 Para 3 at page
24

The Committee regrets to note that the Departmental Officers did not come prepared with full information before the Committee even though more than adequate time had been given by the Committee and as a result of which some of the pertinent points could not be clarified to the Committee. During the year 1971-72 and 1972-73 there was lower release of funds by the State Government than the actual amount sanctioned for the projects by the State Government. The reasons furnished by the Departmental witness could not satisfy the Committee. The Department has also not been able to satisfy the Committee regarding the release of large funds only towards the fag end of the year. There was complete lack of co-ordination between the concerned departments and lack of appreciation of the importance of the scheme. Huge sums of money were shown as expended within a period of 8 days during the later part of March. It also transpired from the evidence that the Department was also not sure about purposeful utilisation of money during such a short period. No effort was made by the Department even now to ascertain the reasons for lower release of funds which might have affected the implementation of the scheme. The Committee is convinced that the department failed to build adequate machinery at the relevant period to spend crores of rupees given by the Government of India to implement the scheme. Besides the uneven flow of employment generation, spending of such large amounts within a month or even a shorter span of few days might have resulted in many irregularities. The Committee therefore recommends that Government should investigate and submit a report to the Committee within two months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House on the following points:—

- (i) Reasons for release of large funds for the scheme towards the fag end of the year resulting in uneven flow of employment and depriving the unemployed the benefit of continuous employment.
- (ii) Whether the money released towards the fag end of the year was prudently spent and there were no irregularities committed. The Committee apprehends that this would have resulted in the wastage and employment being given to other than the needy unemployed.

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
		(iii) Reasons due to which nearly 35% to 40% of the total employment in each year was provided in the month of March.
		(iv) Whether Rs. 42.57 lakhs released on the 22nd March 1972 were actually spent during that year and how much employment was generated.
		(v) While investigating the matter the Government should examine whether fictitious figures of employment were not shown during that period through manipulation of master rolls. The Government should also fix responsibility for the above lapses.
4 Para 4 at page 24	...The Committee is constrained to observe that the Department failed to take adequate and effective action to generate employment in the hill districts. Large sums of money are still lying with the District Councils unutilised.	The Department should ascertain and furnish the Committee with the information regarding unspent balances, if any, lying with others or regarding money spent for which full accounts have not been rendered so far. It is also distressing to note that the investigations into the allegations against the Block Development Officer, Maibong, although investigated have not yet been finalised.
	The Committee has already recommended that investigation of all cases of allegations and complaints be completed within a period of 2 months and report submitted to the Committee.	
5 Para 5 at page 25	The Committee observes that although the Government of India advised the State Government to give preference to minor irrigation works over road works in order to step-up food production to enable the Government to counteract the affect of erratic monsoon, there was no record to show that these instructions were implemented by the Department while framing and sanctioning the individual projects. The	

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
		Committee recommends that Government should investigate the non-observance of the instructions of Government of India and fix responsibility for their lapse within a period of two months from the date of presentation of the Report before the House.

6 Para 6 at pages 25-26	The Committee observes that inspite of clear guidelines given by the Government of India that the projects should not be too small which might pose problems of logistic and supervision, the Department undertook 621 projects costing less than Rs.5,000 each and 1,254 projects costing less than Rs.22,500. Further, many of 237 projects each costing more than Rs. 22,500 individually comprised of a number of small work executed in different locations. The Committee is not satisfied with the replies furnished by the Department that ten months continuous employment was not possible in the State. There was no special machinery set-up to supervise the execution of such huge number of petty projects. The Committee is also doubtful about the durability of these petty projects and apprehends that a portion of the expenditure would have been infructuous. The Committee therefore, recommends that in future the Departments should strictly follow the guidelines given by the Government of India in such schemes so that expenditure incurred does not become infructuous. The Department should also examine in detail the completed projects in each district under this scheme and report to the Committee within a period of three months as to whether the completed projects have in fact given durable assets to the Government. The report should also contain the present conditions of assets created.
-------------------------	--

7 Para 7 at page 26	It appeared from the Audit Report that Government sanctioned certain schemes in Cachar and in Kamrup Districts which were not executed by the Block Development Officers and instead certain schemes which were not sanctioned by the Government were executed in different locations. It transpired from the evidence tendered by the Departmental
---------------------	---

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
		<p>witness that the diversions were not authorised by the competent authority and that only subsequent approval of the Government was obtained for the in lieu projects taken up by the Block Development Officers. The Committee feels that while sanctioning the previous schemes the Government might have taken into consideration the local need of the places selected by the Government and by diverting such schemes to other locations, the Department has deprived those people from the benefit of employment as well as of those projects. The Committee would have appreciated the diversion, had the Departmental witness stated the difficulties faced by the executing officers in implementing the sanctioned schemes. The Committee is also not aware what led the Government to sanction the new schemes subsequently. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Department should furnish a statement to the Committee stating the reasons for these diversions of funds as well as such diversion, if any, in other districts for further examination. The Government should also take action for not obtaining its approval before diversion.</p>

8 Para 8 at page
26 27

It appears from the Audit Report that 90 numbers of road works and 38 numbers of road works were left incomplete in years 1971-72, 1972-73 in the District of Cachar only. There would be similar cases in other District, which were not test checked by Audit. The Committee regrets to note that there was no system of completion reports for these projects. In the absence of these reports, the Committee is not satisfied that all the projects were completed in accordance with the approved plans and specification. The Government should investigate to ascertain the reason for which such a large unnumber of works remained incomplete with a view to see whether there was any laxity on the part of the executing officers. The Department should also furnish a statement to the Committee showing the up-to-date position of all the schemes undertaken in various Districts. The Department should also indicate in the statement (i) the dates of completion of the projects (ii) number of schemes remaining incomplete and (iii) reasons thereof within a course of three months from the date of presentation of the Report to the House. ...

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
10 Para 9 at pages 27-28		<p>The Committee observes that in this case inspite of existing instruction estimates were prepared by the block overseers without check by higher authority and works were generally executed without any technical approval. Audit has brought out deficiencies in the estimates but the Department has not conducted any investigation into these. The Committee views this seriously. From the Department's evidence, it appears that there was no clarity regarding specifications of these works so that these could be durable. It is distressing to note that in the cases pointed out in the Audit Report measurements were not recorded in the measurement Books inspite of existing instruction to that regard. It is also surprising to note in some cases attendance recorded by the labour leader was not checked by the higher Officers. No attempts were made by the Department till date to investigate all these cases pointed out in the Audit Report. The Committee also could not understand how Department could satisfy themselves in absence of proper estimates and surveys that works were useful and durable. Even though these matters were reported to Government through the Draft Paragraph long before the Audit Report was submitted to the House, the Department did not care to investigate such serious irregularities pointed out by the Audit to fix responsibility on the persons concerned till now. The Committee, therefore recommends that the Government should investigate all the lapses brought out in the Audit Report as well as investigate all the individuals cases mentioned in the Audit Report and fix responsibility on the Officer/Officers concerned for their negligence and for lack of proper control and supervision. The Department should investigate all such cases where measurement books were not maintained for reporting to the Committee. A report stating the action taken by the Government should be submitted to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of the Report to the House.</p>
10 Para 10 at page 28		<p>The Committee observes that in this case the Departmental Officers did not produce the important records at the time of Audit and feels that had these been actually maintained, the records could have been produced before the Audit. The Committee takes a serious view in the matter and recommends the circumstances due to which the records were not produced to Audit should be thoroughly investigated and</p>

Serial
No.

Reference

Recommendation

the responsibility for the lapse in this regard be fixed. The Committee also recommends that the enquiry stated to be conducted against the Block Development Officers concerned should be finalised immediately without further delay. Action taken by the Department on the recommendation should be intimated to the Committee within a course of two months from the date of presentation of the Report to the House.

11 Para 11 at page
29

The Committee could not understand as to why and under what authority the State Government authorised the blocks to make payment of wages for Sundays/holidays (Non-working days) if the workers were employed continuously. These instructions are contrary to the guidelines for payment of wages. As a result of such instructions Government had to incur an extra expenditure on this account during 1971-72 and 1972-73 to the tune of Rs.2.52 lakhs. The Committee also expresses its doubt as to whether all the labourers who were paid arrears of wages on receipt of Government order dated 17th December 1971 were actually in employment at the time of payment. The Committee recommends a thorough investigation into (a) the payment of arrears without authority resulting in extra expenditure of Rs.2.52 lakhs, and (b) genuineness of the arrears paid and whether these were paid to the persons for whom these were claimed and (c) payment of wages in excess of locally prevailing rates and fix responsibility for the lapses. The Committee is also surprised to note that in 13 Blocks in Kamrup and Cachar Districts value of work done at the schedule of rate was Rs.8.27 lakhs and wages paid were Rs. 10.77 lakhs. The wages were to be co-related with the work done but payments were not made accordingly resulting an extra expenditure of Rs.2.50 lakhs on wages. This matter may be investigated properly to fix responsibility for the extra payment made. The Committee regrets to note, the inability of the Department to supply further information to the Committee in time. Due to this, the Committee could not examine in details the irregularities brought out in the Audit Report. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Government should investigate the whole case in the line of the questionnaire issued by the Committee and the result of the investigation should be intimated to the Committee within one month from the date of presentation of the Report to the House.

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
12 Para 12 at page 29		<p>From the evidence, the Committee cannot but draw the conclusion that the Department was callous in assessing the actual physical achievement against the target fixed for different projects and as a result incorrect report was submitted to the Government of India. It is surprising to note how the Department could prepare a report which does not tally with records maintained by the Blocks. The Committee takes a serious view on the matter and recommends that Government should now compile a realistic report about the physical achievement for the years 1971-72, 1972-73 and 1973-74 and submit to the Committee within a course of three months from the date of presentation of the Report to the House.</p>
13 Para 13 at page 30		<p>The Committee further recommends that the Government should examine whether there was any laxity on the part of the Department for not being able to reconcile the discrepancies between the figures compiled by the Department and figures of the Blocks.</p>
14 Para 14 at page 30		<p>It transpired from the evidence tendered by the Departmental witness that projects which were to be financed from the normal budget were executed under the Crash Schemes since there was insufficient budget provision under Community Development and the guidelines given by the Government of India were according to the Department, only illustrative. The Committee could not accept the contention of the Department for not adhering to the guidelines given by the Government of India. The Committee does not consider that such schemes at all generated additional employment or created any new assets. The Committee hopes that in future the Department should not deviate from the objective of such programme so that benefit to the Community is not deprived of.</p>

Serial
No.

Reference

Recommendation

carried out. The very fact of repatition of instructions shows that assets were not properly maintained. In fact, the departmental witness admitted that apart from issue of instructions, it did not know whether the assets were being actually maintained. The Committee is distressed to note that there was no arrangement made by the Department for maintenance of the assets created under the scheme at the cost of crores of rupees. Even now, no satisfactory arrangements appear to exist. As a result the Committee apprehends that most of the assets have already become wastes. The Committee, therefore, recommends that Government should immediately prepare a complete list of assets created under the scheme and assess the state of each asset to make satisfactory arrangements for maintenance of the assets. A report showing the action taken by the Government should be sent to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of the Report to the House.

15 Para 15 at page
30

The Committee observes that in the absence of any suitable records of unemployed and under employed persons the Department was not in a position to ensure that employments under this scheme was offered only to those most in need as specified in Government of India's guidelines.

The labourers were selected from the list forwarded by the respective Gaon Panchayats. The Committee observes that the scheme could not fulfil its objects for failure of the Department to build up a machinery for selection of needy unemployed and under employed persons to offer the benefits of the scheme.

16 Para 16 at pages
30-31

The Committee, therefore, recommends that Government should investigate as to why the Department did not take any step to examine the irregularities points out in the relevant paragraph of the Audit Report during such a long time and take suitable action against the defaulting officers. The irregularities should now be investigated without any further delay. The officer/officers responsible for reporting fictitious figures of employment in Block level and Directorate level should be brought to book and disciplinary action taken against them.

The action taken by the Department may be reported to the Committee within two months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

...

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
17 Para 17 at page 32		The Committee recommends that the Government should investigate as to whether the Projects undertaken were in addition to the normal plan Programme and were integrated with the area plan.
18 Para 18 at pages 32-33		The Department assured to furnish a detailed report for perusal of the Committee. The Committee therefore, desires that a detailed report be submitted to the Committee by the Department within one month from the date of presentation of the report to the House.
19 General (Pages 98-100 of the Report)		Though the written replies to some of the questions were furnished by the Department on the evening of 31st January, 1976, when the sitting was over, the Committee was unable to examine the Deptt. on these important aspects due to want of time. Some of these are related to the points raised in the Audit Report. The Committee can make its recommendations in regard to these only after the written replies have been considered. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Government should investigate the matter in the line of the Questionnaire issued by the Committee and the result be intimated to the Committee within three months from the date of placement of the Report before the House.
20 Report on the Evaluation study made by the Directorate of Evaluation. (Pages 101-103 of the Report)		The Departmental witness stated that the report had not been fully examined as yet and he was not ready with the replies. As there are serious deficiencies, the Committee recommends that above aspects brought out in the Report be examined by Government without any further delay and a detailed report with action taken on persons responsible for the lapses furnished to the Committee within three months from the date of placement of Committee's Report before the House.

APPENDIX

(Reference Para 2 at page ii)

TOUR IMPRESSION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

1. with a view to ascertaining the working of the Emergency Agricultural Production Programme with particular reference to (i) Aerial spraying (ii) Installation of Shallow Tubewells and Pumpsets (iii) Operation of Threshers and working of Tractor etc. mentioned in the Advance Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year, 1972-73 and the Public Accounts Committee in its meeting held on 24th October 1975 decided to undertake tours for spot verification at Dhemaji, North Lakhimpur, Majuli and Jorhat as detailed in tour programme at Annexure 1 at pages 143-144

The tour impression of the Committee is given below:—

A. DHEMAJI

1. 2.—The Committee arrived Dhemaji at 9.30 A. M. on 14th November 1975 and held discussion with the non-official members (listed in Annexure 2 at page 145) at Dhemaji Inspection Bungalow. At the very outset the Chairman explained in brief the purpose of the Committee's visit and sought their help and Cooperation in the matter.

1. 3.—Shri Mohan Chandra Bora an Advocate of Dhemaji while welcoming the visit of the Committee gave an idea about the under developed condition of the area and stated that the Emergency Agricultural Production Programme was not properly implemented at Dhemaji.

1. 4. Shri Moni Chutiya, a Councillor of the Mohkuma Parisad, stated that the reasons for failure of the programme were that seeds were not distributed in time and that many tubewells installed were not operated due to defective installation. Shri Chutiya added that Tubewells installed more than once in Sisi Bargaon in Dhemaji Block could not discharge water.

1. 5. In regard to the contention of the Department that there was no demand from the Presidents, Gaon Panchayats of that area for installation of pumpsets. One of the public informed the Committee that the contention of the Department was not correct as he remembered to have forwarded to the Departmental authorities certain applications from the cultivators for the installation of pumpsets.

1.6. Three other members of the public were of the view that it was not possible for the cultivators to avail of the irrigation facilities as the working hours of the Pumpsets did not conform with the working hours of the cultivators.

1.7. According to Shri Khagen Dutta, Chief Executive Councillor of Dhemaji Mahkuma Parishad, most of the cultivators could not avail of the benefit of pumpsets and shallow tube-wells due to wrong selection of site for installation.

1.8. Shri R.P. Doley, President, District Congress Committee, Dhemaji and a resident of Jonai stated that the tubewells installed at Jonai area were not working at all due to defective installation. A resident of Dhemaji Block stated that some of the pumpsets installed at Dhakuakhana were not operated for want of operators.

1.9. Thereafter, the Committee enquired of the public about the aerial spraying on mustard cultivation in Dhemaji areas. The non-official members were unanimous in their reply that to their knowledge there was no aerial spraying on mustard in 1972-73. Shri Khagen Dutta, Chief Executive Councillor Dhemaji Mahakuma Parishad, however, pointed out that he received some complaints from the public about the killing of Bhodiya Muga caterpillar by aerial spraying on Sali cultivation in the month of 'Bhadra' (September-October, 1972) but he was not aware of any aerial spraying on Mustard crop.

1.10. In course of discussion, the non-official members stated that facilities of threshing machines were not at all availed of by the cultivators of the area as the Department could not run the Threshers due to want of technical persons and the cultivators could not be attracted to these Threshers and as a result the Threshers were lying in the Stores unused till date.

1.11. After hearing the views of the non-official members the Committee held discussion with the local officers belonging to Agriculture and other Departments. A list of officers shown at Annexure 3 at page 146, with a view to verifying the correctness of the statement made by some of the non-official members about the installation/working of the Pumpsets, the Committee went to see for themselves the working of three Pumpsets installed in Dhemaji area on 14th November 1975.

1.12. Thereafter, the Committee divided into two groups and visited some of the sites in Dhakuakhana and Silapathar areas. The position obtained as a result of inspection of the Pumpsets on 14th November 1975. and 15th November 1975. is enumerated below:

DHEMAJI AREA

Date of Visit	Name of the area where the Pumpsets were installed Dhemaj area:	Remarks
14th November 1975	1. Moridholghat	<p>The pumpset though installed was not working. The local people having pointed out that the engine the Department for non-payment previously, the Departmental Officers accompanying the Committee admitted that the engine was fitted on the day before the visit of the Committee. When the Committee wanted to know as to why engine was not fitted earlier the Departmental officer stated that it was not fitted earlier as there was no demand for supply of water and that the local people for whom the pumpset was installed did not come forward to pay the hire charges of the operation.</p> <p>On enquiry from the public it was found that the reasons given by the Department for non payment of hire charges were not convincing as the hire charges were initially to be treated as loan and repayable after harvesting of the crop.</p> <p>One of the public leaders stated that although the Pumpset was actually installed on 6th November 1972, the Pumpset was not operated inspite of the request from their side nor the Department asked to execute any bond for loan. On being pressed for operation, the operator asked the local people to meet the Project Officer and the Project Officer was also helpless as the operation of pumpset was possible only for few minutes after which it could not discharge any more water. So on being scared to get into more indebtedness, the cultivators did not come forward to sign the bond.</p>
	2. Jamuguri	<p>One Shri Sishuram Bora was the operator of both the Pumpsets at Moridholghat and Jamuguri. On de-</p>

mand from public one Shri Heremba Prosad Bora was also appointed as casual operator. No log book showing the operation of Pumpset could be shown to the Committee. The Committee found the installation of the Pumpset without any engine. A cultivator of the area stated that he executed a bond to pay the operation charges and also deposited Rs. 50. To his misfortune he said that he had neither received back the money nor did he get any service from the Pumpset for his cultivation. This had frustrated him from taking further help from the Department. When the Chairman wanted to know whether there was any demand for installation of Pumpset in that area, Shri A. Choudhury, S. E. Irrigation (Agriculture) Jorhat produced a copy of such requisition.

3. Namtichowk

The Committee found one Shallow Tubewell in the midst of paddy field without any engine. One of the local people stated that only Shri Krishna Gogoi a teacher, availed of the benefit of this shallow tubewell. He therefore, requested the Committee to get details of this pumpset from Shri Gogoi. The Committee then discussed with Shri Gogoi who had stated that the tubewell was installed in the year 1973 and that it was operated for a month or so and then the engine was taken away. On being asked as to whether hire charges were demanded by the Department he replied that no such demand was made and added that water was supplied free of charge. On being enquired as to whether he was asked to execute any bond Shri Gogoi replied in the negative.

B. SILAPATHER AREA

5th November 1975
4. Chawkam-
tinggaon
(Shallow
Tubewell

Shri Muktanath Chutiya, President, Gaou Panchayat and Shri Moni Kanta Chutiya, Councillor, Dhemaaji Mahkuma Parisad stated that the Shallow Tubewell which was installed after the wheat cultivation season

was over, failed to discharge any water presumably due to non sinking of the pipes to the desired depth. The Committee in its visit, found the Tubewell without any engine. It was reported by the local people that engine was taken away by the Department last year.

5. Dhunaguri I & II

Two residents of Dhunaguri stated that the discharge of water was meagre and that the Pumpsets were also not operated regularly.

The Committee found the Pumpsets without any engine. On a query made by the Committee the local residents stated that engines were taken away by the Department long ago.

6. Akajan and Bormuria Akajan

According to the local people, although there was demand for water, the pumpsets did not work after their installation and as a result, the wheat cultivation in that area could not be successful.

7. Silapathar

Shri Korpul Chandra Pegu, President, Kulajan Gaon Panchayat pointed out that the pumpset failed to discharge any water and added that although the trial boring was not successful the Tubewell was sunk at the same site. Shri Pegu also expressed his doubt about the sinking of the pipes to the desired depth.

C. DHAKUAKHANA AREA

- 15th November 1. Jalbhari
1975 2. Dultagaon
3. Govinpar
4. Arhy Chapari
5. Thekraguri

The public opinion about working of the Pumpsets in Dhakuakhana area was not encouraging. The Committee also inspected 5 Pumpsets installed in that area and found all of the remaining idle without engines.

AERIAL SPRAYING

2. On 15th November, 1975 the Committee discussed with the local officials at Dhemaji Inspection Bungalow the position of aerial spraying on mustard. The Committee told the departmental

officials that according to the local people of Dhemaji, Silapathar and Dhakuakhana areas, there was no aerial spraying on mustard in the month of January, 1973. The Committee asked the departmental officials to produce before the Committee the following papers:—

- (i) proceedings containing the decision of the Subdivisional Level Committee showing the area to be sprayed;
- (ii) Mode of taking measurement as to the area sprayed;
- (iii) Revenue records showing the total area under mustard cultivation vis-a-vis area sprayed.

2.1. The Departmental official could not produce any documentary evidence save and except a statement signed by the Assistant Plant Protection Officer and the Pilot of the aircraft showing the total loads carried and number of sorties flown. On the basis of this statement payment for aerial spraying on mustard over an area of 19,200 acres was made. The total area under mustard in the entire Dhemaji Subdivision was 6217 acres (18652 bighas) as per information furnished by the Block Development Officer (Development Block Post Stage II Dhemaji) (Vide Annexure 4 at page 147) and 4805.67 acres as per information furnished by the Assistant Settlement Officer, Subansiri Circle (Vide Annexure 5 at page 148) 2071.69 acres as per information of the Assistant Settlement Officer, Dhemaji Circle (Vide Annexure 6 at page 149). The Committee wanted to know from the Departmental Officials as to how they worked out the figure 19200 acres certified to have been aerielly sprayed and also asked them to reconcile the discrepancy between the three sets of figures. To this query they could not give any reply. It appeared from the letter of the Joint Director of Agriculture (Jute) addressed to the District Agriculture Officer, Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur which was endorsed to the Assistant Plant Protection Officer Lakhimpur by the District Agriculture Officer vide Memo. No.NL/Agri/ERP/Aerial/73-74/1359, dated 3rd July 1973 (Vide Annexure 7 at page 150) that the total areas covered by aerial spraying in North Lakhimpur and Dhemaji Sub-divisions on Mustard crop were as under:—

Name of Sub-Divn.	Areas covered as reported by D.A.O.	Areas covered as reported by A.P.P.O.
North Lakhimpur	18,000 Acres	22,400 Acres
Dhemaji	150 Acres	19,200 Acres.

2.2. The Assistant Plant Protection Officer in his letter (Memo. No. NL/Agri/ERP/Aerial/73-74/1373, dated 4th July 1973, (vide Annexure 8 at page 152-153) had affirmed that the coverage of area by aerial spraying on mustard was correct. He also stated in the said letter that the whole operation was conducted by him and he asserted that he was satisfied with the spraying as he had tested

the effectiveness of the chemical in the fields. In the said letter the A.P.P.O. had admitted that to measure the area after spraying was not practicable and as such the measurement of the area was done on the basis of chemical used per acre and per sorties of operation.

2.3. The Chairman then read out the Paragraph (8) of the terms and conditions of the Agreement made between the Helicopter Service (P) Ltd. Borigy and the Director of Agriculture, Assam for aerial spraying operation which runs as follows:—

“(8) The acreage charges would be leviable on basis of actual physical measurement of aereages as mentioned in the Revenue reregarding aerial spray on Mustard crop during the year 1972-73 acreage charges would be leviable on the basis of the load carried and sorties flown”

2.4. The Committee then enquired of the revenue officers of the Sub-division and also the Block Development Officers as to whether the Agriculture Department made any reference to them regarding aerial spray on Mustard crop during the year 1972-73 in reply to which they stated that no such reference was made.

2.5. The Committee enquired the S.D.O., Agriculture, Dhemaji and the A.P.P.O., North Lakhimpur as to whether any reference was made to the District Revenue Officers and B. D. Os. as to availability of the revenue records of the area covered by mustard before the operation of the Aerial spraying and after; but none of them could show any record.

2.6. The Committee referred to the letters DADB/G/14/72-73/2003. dated 29th June 1973, (vide ANNEXURE 9 at page 151) and No. BDB/A-60/71-72/73-2132, dated 29th May 1973, (vide ANNEXURE 10 at page 155-156) from the Block Development Officers of Dhemaji and Bordoloni wherein they denied aerial spraying on Mustard during 1972-73 and asked the officers of the Agriculture Department that if the Committee took the view that there was no Aerial spraying on Mustard save and except the record of air flight, how the Deptt. would substantiate that there was aerial spraying on Mustard. The Departmental Officers could not reply to the question posed by the Chairman.

2.7. After the discussion on aerial spraying was over, the Committee wanted to know from the Departmental Officers:—

(i) What attempts were made to publicise amongst the cultivators before conducting aerial spray;

(ii) How the site for installation of pumpsets. Tubewells were selected; whether the Department had any technical know how to help them in the matter of proper selection of site vis-a-vis the installation of Pumpsets etc.

2.8. In reply to question No.(i) the Departmental Officers stated that they had no adequate machinery to give proper publicity. As regards question No.(ii) the Departmental Officers stated that selection of site for installation of Pumpssets/Tubewells etc. was made and approved by the Sub-divisional level Advisory Committee. The Department could not show any record about approval of the site by technical experts.

2.9. On 16th November 1975, the Committee left Dhemaji at 8 A.M. and arrived at North Lakhimpur. After arrival, the Committee had discussion with Shri Govinda Bora, M. L. A., Shri Mohananda Bora Ex-M.L.A., Shri B. Bhuyan, President, D.C.C., North Lakhimpur who were also members of the subdivisional Advisory Committee and M.H. Hazarika, Chairman, North Lakhimpur Municipal Board in the North Lakhimpur Circuit House at about 11 A.M.

2.10. The Committee discussed with the non-official members present about the aerial spraying of pesticides on Mustard Crop during January, 1973 and asked as to whether they had any information about the same; to which they replied that they had no information about the aerial spray in January, 1973 on mustard cultivation in North Lakhimpur Sub-division Shri B.R. Deuri, Chief Executive Councillor, North Lakhimpur Mahkuma Parishad had also stated on 17th November, 1975 that he had no record in his Office to show that there was aerial spray during January, 1973 on Mustard crop. He further stated that the present Secretary of the Standing Committee of the Mahkuma Parishad, who was B.D.O. of Nowboicha Block at that time was also consulted in this respect and the present Secretary of the Mahkuma Parishad confirmed that there was no aerial spraying during that period.

2.11. On a query as to whether there were demands for tractors and tubewells from the public, the non-official Members stated that there were demands but the Department could not make tractors available. The tubewells were run for few hours and then went out of order. The frequent break-down of the engines did not attract the cultivators for utilisation.

2.12. The Committee then held discussion with officers. (A list of officers shown at annexure 11 at pages 157-158. The Chairman asked the Plant Protection Officer of the Agriculture Department about the procedure generally adopted for aerial spraying in a particular area to protect the plants from the ravages of insects. Shri P. R. Nath, Deputy Director, Agriculture (Plant Protection) Khanapara who was present in the discussion stated that on receipt of complaint from public the area to be sprayed is selected by the Sub-division Level Advisory Committee and then a map of the area to be sprayed is prepared by the A.P.P.O. The Revenue Officers of the District or the Subdivision as the case may be, are consulted for preparing the Map and information about standing crops is collected through B.D.Os. Then a notice is served through the B.D.Os. to the public of the affected areas about the date of spraying and flaggings are done indicating the area to be sprayed.

2.13. On being asked as to whether it was obligatory on the part of Agriculture Department to consult the B. D. Os. as to the area covered by crop and also to notify the public regarding the aerial spray as the pesticides may kill the cattle population of the public, the Departmental officer replied that as they had no agencies of their own to do such work, the flagging was done by the B. D. Os. and notices were also served through them.

2.14. The Committee then wanted to know as to whether the Revenue Department and the B. D. Os. were consulted while decision of the aerial spraying was made for Mustard crop in the month of January, 1973. The Departmental officer stated that due to hurry, the procedure could not be followed properly. The Chairman then asked the officers to come prepared with documentary evidence and record which would be examined in the discussion on 17th November, 1975. The Deputy Commissioner was also asked to produce Revenue record of the area under mustard crop and also to collect information from B.D.Os. and Circle Officers as to area and under Mustard cultivation.

2.15. On 17th November, 1975, the Committee was shown round the Tractor repairing Units. Threshers, Station Unit and Engines of the Pumpsets and Tubewells. All these were stored in a temporary sheds. The Committee made test check of Thresher and also Diesel Pumpsets as to whether they were in running condition and found to be in running condition. The Committee enquired of the number of Tractors purchased and used during Emergency Agricultural Production Programme but the official could not show any record nor their physical existence in the sheds as they were reported to have been transferred to some other Units. According to Paragraph 10 at pages 16 of the report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India for the year 1972-73 five tractors were issued to Lakhimpur Agricultural Division during Emergency Agricultural Production Programme. The Committee then asked the Officers to give a detailed note on the matter at an early date.

2.16. The Committee held discussion on the 17th November 1975 afternoon with the officers at the Circuit House, North Lakhimpur. A list of officers shown at Annexure 12 at page 159 were Present.

2.17. The Committee then wanted to know as to whether Revenue records were consulted while making the assessment of the area sprayed under Mustard crop, the Departmental Officers replied in negative. On a query as to what was the basis of arriving at the figure of 22,400 acres of land being aerially sprayed, the Departmental officers replied that it was summarily assessed taking into account also the char areas of the river. According to the figures furnished by the Deputy Commissioner, Lakhimpur the area under Mustard Crop was 55,6482 acres (vide Annexure. 13 at page 160).

2.18. The Committee then asked as to whether there was any intimation made to the Civil and Police authorities about the dates of spraying. the officers of the Agriculture Department stated that

it was not done. The officers further stated that the Joint Director of Agriculture (Jute) made aerial survey. He also took a flight for about two hours to make topographical survey and on the basis which the area was assessed.

2.19. The proceedings of the meeting of the Sub-divisional Level Advisory Committee held on 29th December, 1972 was produced before the Committee by Shri S. N. Das the then District Agricultural Officer, North Lakhimpur and stated that according to the proceedings 19,200 acres were under Mustard crop in North Lakhimpur Sub-division. On scrutiny of proceedings the following anomalies revealed :—

(i) It was not signed by the Deputy Commissioner as Vice-Chairman of the Sub-divisional Level Advisory Committee whereas the proceedings of the meetings held previously and on subsequent occasions were signed by the Deputy Commissioner as Vice-Chairman of the Advisory Committee;

(ii) The proceedings contained a number of alterations not attested by any competent authority. One of the most important alterations was that while the figures proposing the areas under Mustard and wheat crops as recorded originally in the proceedings remained the same. The name of the crop "Mustard" was altered to "Wheat" and "Wheat" to "Mustard". The alterations were not authenticated.

2.20. In this connection, the Committee examined the then Deputy Commissioner, Lakhimpur, Shri N. N. Mookerjee, the present Secretary, Finance on 16th December, 1975. On a query made by the Committee the then Deputy Commissioner stated in his evidence, 'there is no reason why this should not be signed because I was in the district till the end of 1973. If there was any omission, it might have been overlooked and it could have been produced to me during my remaining tenure. I left Lakhimpur in December, 1973. '.....' But one thing I can recollect about mustard spraying. The members of this Committee were not very much in favour of spraying. I do not know whether it is recorded and that it is not that effective. I think it is recorded here also. Then we discussed this matter. I remember this because people were not in favour of this system at that time itself. '.....' On another query, the then Deputy Commissioner stated, 'But I remember that maximum stress was given on wheat. We wanted to grow more wheat. In any case, I think the areas under wheat would be certainly more. We were trying to bring more additional area under wheat.'

2.21. No other records on Aerial spraying were produced before the Committee reportedly due to seizure of some of the records by the anti-corruption Branch of the Police Department and also by the Directorate. The Committee in their subsequent examination of the Department enquired of such records but the Departmental witness could not produce.

2.22. Thereafter the Committee had a discussion with Shri S.N. Das, Deputy Director of Agriculture alone and asked him (i) as to how he arrived at the figure 16,000 being the total acreage covered by aerial spraying and (ii) whether he ascertained that the aerial spraying was actually done on Mustard. Shri Das in reply stated that he made the assessment on the basis of information furnished by his subordinate Officers as it was not possible for him to inspect the entire area covered by aerial spraying. On being asked as to whether he could produce any report from his subordinate Officers in this regard, Shri Das produced a report from the Assistant Inspector of Agriculture which indicated that the Assistant Inspector of Agriculture had seen sometime in February, 1973 that sorties had flown and pesticides sprayed. Then the Committee desired that the Assistant Inspector of Agriculture should meet the Committee. The Assistant Inspector of Agriculture on his appearance before the Committee stated that he went to the site of spraying sometimes in the month of February, 1973 and saw that sorties were flying over his head. As the pesticides sprayed fell on his body he got the smell of democron.

2.23. On 19th November, 1975 the Committee left for Jorhat via Kamalabari. At Kamalabari Inspection Bungalow, the Committee met some of the local officials and enquired about aerial spraying. One Shri K. Kalita of Majuli Development Block stated that he could remember to have seen aerial spraying once sometimes in 1973 but there was no official record to prove it. According to the statement furnished by the Sub-Deputy Collector, Majuli an area of 2122.22 Hectar was under mustard crop in Majuli. (vide Annexure 14 at page 161-162) and according to the written statement submitted by the Department an area of 19200 acres were sprayed in Jorhat Sub-division but the Deputy Commissioner stated that as far as he could remember, Aerial spraying on Mustard was done in Majuli area only. No other official could say anything about aerial spraying.

The Committee then held general discussion with the local officers at Circuit House, Jorhat.

2.24. On the next day the Committee visited the Tractors repairing units at Barbheta. Thereafter the Committee visited the Agricultural University. In the evening of 20th November, 1975 the Committee discussed about aerial spraying in Jorhat Sub-division with the Officers vide list of officers is shown at Annexure 15 at page 163.

2.25. Shri L. A. Bin Hussain, the then A.P.P.O., North Lakhimpur stated before the Committee that the decision of aerial spraying was taken at a short notice and as such the prescribed procedure could not be followed.

2.26. From the statement furnished by the Deputy Commissioners of Lakhimpur and Sibsagar it appeared that except the Jonai area revenue records were available but the Departmental Officers of the Agriculture were not keen to collect these information. The areas under different crops were also readily available as it appeared from the statements furnished by the B. D. Os. and A. S. Os. In view of the above, the Committee could not but come to a conclusion that there was a deliberate omission on the part of Departmental Officers not to fulfil the first part of terms and condition enumerated in Para 8 of the Agreement so far Aerial spraying is concerned. The Committee then paused for an answer from the officers present but there was no reply.

2.27. Thereafter the Committee discussed with Dr. A. Das the then Joint Director Agriculture (Jute) who was in charge of Aerial spraying. Dr. Das in course of discussion stated that he had formal orders authorising him to take up Aerial spraying and that the procedure prescribed in Para 8 of the agreement for Aerial spraying was not properly followed. When the Committee enquired of him as to how he could recommend payment on the basis of load carried and sorties flown without exhausting the other provisions of recording measurement, he stated that the payment was recommended on the basis of report from his Junior Officers. In reply to another question Dr. Das stated that he had obtained verbal orders for making payment on the basis of load carried and sorties flown from the Director of Agriculture to deviate from the operation of Para 8 of the Agreement for Aerial spraying as usually done on previous occasions. In this connection the Committee examined the Director of Agriculture D. A. & H. Director on 3rd December, 1975. The Director Agriculture on a query made by the Committee stated in this evidence that he did not give any verbal order to the Joint Director to deviate from the agreement.

2.28. The Committee also enquired about the fate of five Japanese harvestors purchased during 1970 which were lying idle in the Store and asked the Departmental Officer to give a note about their working or otherwise. The note submitted afterwards is appended to as Annexure 16 at page 164. The S. D. O., Agricultural Engineer (Mechanical) Division, Jorhat has apprised the Committee of the difficulties faced by him for not filling up the post of Executive Engineer (M) Jorhat and asked the Additional Director of Agriculture who accompanied the Public Accounts Committee in their tour to look into the matter on his return to Head Quarters at Khanapara.

The Committee then adjourned.

ANNEXURE I

(Reference para I at page 129)

REVISED TOUR PROGRAMME OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS
COMMITTEE FOR ON-THE-SPOT STUDY OF THE
EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION
PROGRAMME

Date	Time	Subject
1)	(2)	(3)
<u>13.h November 1975</u> Thursday	8'00 hrs.	Leave for North Lakhimpur
<u>14th November 1975</u> Friday	8'00 hrs.	Leave North Lakhimpur
	9'30 hrs.	Arrive Dhemaji
	10'00 hrs,	Discussion with local M. L. As and Public Leaders.
		Discussion with local Officers and visit some of the Projects.
	13'00 hrs.	Lunch at Dhemaji Inspection Bungalow.
	15'00 hrs.	Visit some of the Projects. Halt at Dhemaji Inspection Bun- galow.
<u>15th November 1975</u> Saturday	8'00 hrs.	Visit some of the Projects.
	13'00 hrs.	Lunch
	15'00 hrs. to 18'00 hrs.	Visit some of the Projects
<u>16th November 1975</u> Sunday	8 00 hrs.	Leave for North Lakhimpur
	10'00 hrs.	Discussion with local M. L. As and public Leaders.

(1)	(2)	(3)
		Discussion with the local Officers and halt.
<u>17th November 1975</u> Monday	8:00 hrs. to 12:30 hrs.	Visit some of the Projects.
	13:00 hrs.	Lunch at Circuit House.
	15:00 hrs. to 18:00 hrs.	Visit some of the Projects.
<u>18th November 1975</u> Tuesday	HOLIDAY	RECESS
<u>19th November 1975</u> Wednesday	8:00 hrs.	Leave for Majuli
	9:30 hrs. to 12:30 hrs.	Arrive Kamalabari Inspection Bungalow
		Discussion with local M. L. As and public Leaders.
		Discussion with the local Officers and visit some of the Projects.
	13:00 hrs.	Lunch at Kamalabari Inspection Bungalow.
	14:00 hrs.	Leave for Jorhat.
		Discussion with the local M. L. As and public Leaders.
		Discussion with local Officers.
<u>20th November 1975</u> Thursday	8:00 hrs. to 12:30 hrs.	Visit some of the Projects and also the Tractor repairing Units.
	13:00 hrs.	Lunch at Circuit House, Jorhat.
	15:00 hrs.	Visit Agriculture University at Jorhat.
<u>21st November 1975</u> Friday	8:00 hrs.	Informal discussion of the Members and any other works remaining unfinished and DISPERSAL.

ANNEXURE 2

(Reference para 1.2 at page 131)

DHEMAJI INSPECTION BUNGALOW

14th November, 1975

List of persons present

Name	Designation
1. Dr. Keshab Chandra Sonwal,	Advocate, Dhemaji
2. Shri Rampad Doley,	President, Dhemaji DCC
3. Shri Dina Nath Chutia	Member, A. P. C. C.
4. Smti. Bimala Bora,	Dhemaji Convener Mahi- la Front, Dhemaji.
5. Shri Lakshmi Dutta	Member, Dhemaji Dist. Congress.
6. Shri Suren Gogoi,	Dhemaji.
7. Shri M. C. Bharali,	President, Chilamara Mandal Congress.
8. Shri Mohan Chandra Borua,	Advocate.
9. Shri Naren Gohain,	Member, A. P. C. C.
10. Shri Mani Kanta Chutiya,	Councillor.
11. Shri Khagendra Nath Dutta,	Member.
12. Shri Tulsi Chutia,	Councillor.
13. Shri Bimola Doley.	

ANNEXURE 3

To (Reference para 1.11 at page 132)
DHEMAJI INSPECTION BUNGALOW

14th November, 1975.

List (II) of persons present

Name	Designation
1. Shri Hem Chandra Gayan	S. D. O.
2. Shri R. Satradhar	Ex. Engineer, Dhemaji E & D. Div.
3. Shri J. R. Deuri	Statistical Officer, Dhemaji.
4. Shri N. B. Deb	E. A. C.
5. Shri J. Das	S.D.O. P.W.D. NTR
6. Shri K. C. Choudhury	E.O. (Industries) for Supdt. of Industries
7. Shri G. Toid	S. D. Information & Public Relations Officer.
8. Shri H. K. Goswami	S.D.A.E. (M) Dhemaji
9. Shri S. M. Das	S.O. (P.H.E.) Dhemaji
10. Shri L. Baruah	Sr. Inspector
11. Shri S. K. Puzari	Asstt. Branch Manager, State Coop. Marketing Federation Dhemaji
12. Shri A. H. Khandkar	Jr. Technical Officer, State Bank of India.
13. Shri B. Baruah	Supdt. of Taxes
14. Shri A. K. Chaliha	Spl. Officer, E.M.T.C.
15. Shri A. Ahmed	Spl. Officer, E.M.T.C.
16. Shri N. N. Baroi	A. S. O. Dhemaji
17. Shri N. B. Gohain	S.D.A.O., Dhemaji
18. Shri T. Buragohain	S.D.V.O. Dhemaji
19. Shri S. K. Sen,	Asstt. Registrar Co- operative Societies, Dhe- maji.

ANNEXURE 4

(Reference Para 2.1 at Page 136)

PROFORMA

Total acreage under Mustard Crop 1972-73 (Rabi)	Total acreage of aerial Spraying	Whether any area was certified for aerial spraying if so, for what area.	Name and Designation of certifying Officer	Revenue record in respect of area where Mustard Crop was grown in 1972-73
18652 Bighas	Record not available	Record not available	Not known	Not available.

147

Sd/-

15.11.75

Block Development Officer,
Dhemaji Development Block
Post Stage II
DHEMAJI

ANNEXURE 5

(Reference Para 2.1 at page 136)

To

The S. D. O.,
Dhemaji

Re :— No.20804—12, dated 14.11.75.

Sir,

With reference to your above, I have the honour to furnish the following information for favour of your needful.

1. 4805.67 Acres (i. e 141 Villages)
2. No official record of aerial spraying is found.
3. No official record regarding such certified area is found.
- 4 Not known.
5. The villagewise area abstract where Mustard crop was grown is enclosed herewith (141 villages).

Yours faithfully,

Sd/

15 11.75

Asstt. Settlement Officer,
Subansiri Circle,

ANNEXURE 6

(Reference para 2.1 at page 136)

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SETTLEMENT
OFFICER : : DHEMAJI

No.DH/75-76/504,

Dated 15.11.75.

To

The Sub-divisional Officer, Dhemaji.

REFERENCE : Your No,20804-12, dated 14.11.75.

Sir,

In inviting a reference to the above I have the honour to furnish below the required informations as called for.

For favour of needful.

Yours faithfully,

Sd/
Assistant Settlement Officer, Dhemaji

1. 2071.69 Acres (6266-4-5)
2. Not known.
3. Not issued from this Office
4. Does not arise.
5. Necessary crop abstract statement enclosed.

ANNEXURE 7

(Reference para 2.1 at page 136)

Copy from the J. D. A. (Jute) addressed to the District Agricultural officer, Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur.

With reference to your letter quoted above, I am to say that the spray certificates were signed by the Assistant Plant Protection Officer of your office as follows:—

Name of the Subdivision	Areas Covered.
1. Lakhimpur	22,400 acres.
2. Dhemaji	19,200
	-----"
	Total—41,600 acres.

But from the report submitted vide your letter quoted above it appears as follows:

1. North Lakhimpur	18,000 acres
2. Dhemaji	150 ..

Further you have said that entire quantity of pesticides have been used and from the dose used this statement is not tenable.

You are requested to clarify the whole matter in respect of the use of pesticides at the doses followed and the acreage covered.

The statement shows only names of Sub-divisions which were already known here. The names of Anchalik Panchayat and Gaon Panchayat, Villages char area etc. were asked for and these please be furnished early.

Further, if spraying operation was not satisfactory, this should have been brought to notice of this office earlier and not in the month of April after the harvest of the crop. This may please be noted for future guidance.

Sd/—

Jt. Director of Agriculture (Jute),
Assam, Khanapara, Gauhati—22.

Memo. No. NL/Agri./ERP/Aerial/73-74/1359

Dated 3. 7. 73.

Copy to:—The Assistant Plant Protection Officer, Lakhimpur for information. He will please furnish reply to the Office on the letter point by point as sought for by the Joint Director of Agriculture (Jute) Immediately.

Sd/—S. N. Das,
3. 7. 73

District Agricultural Officer,
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur.

Attested :

Sd/—

18. 11. 75

District Agricultural Officer,
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur.

(Reference para 2.2 at page 135)

OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT AGRICULTURAL OFFICER,
LAKHIMPUR

Memo. No. NL/Agri./ERP/Aerial/73-74/1373

dated 4. 7. 73.

To

The District Agricultural Officer,
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur.

SUBJECT :: AERIAL SPRAY ON MUSTARD.

REFERENCE:: Your letter No. NL/Agri./ERP/Aerial/73-74/1359,
dated 3. 7. 73.

Sir,

With reference to the letter No. cited above, I have the honour to furnish reply as follows:—

1. The coverage of area by aerial spraying on mustard as reported by the undersigned is correct. The whole operation was conducted by me and I HAVE SATISFIED WITH THE SPRAYING AS I have tested the effectiveness of the chemical in the fields and no reports as to unsatisfactory spraying were being received during spraying period from farmers.

As regards the acreage of aerial spraying, I had to survey the Mustard growing areas of the District before undertaking the operation by road as well as by air craft and felt necessity of the operation as to the acreage under the crop is more than the actual area of Mustard in our record, this is due to the fact that Mustard crop is abundantly grown in all the char areas of the District. The same observation was pointed out by the J. D. A. (Jute) during his visit in the sparying period.

2. The report submitted by you is not accordance to my report presented to you on 5. 4. 73 where I have mentioned the pesticides utilised for the purpose to cover the area under "Area covered" column. The correction made on it is not known to me.

To measure the area after spraying is not practicable and as such there is a device to measure the area on the basis of chemical used per acre and per sortee of operation for which all records were maintained.

3. The report presented to you on 5. 4. 73 is only a preliminary report of both the subdivisions. It may be mentioned here that as no body from the Blocks or Projects, were bound to be present in the field during spraying inspite of prior information given to them. When myself and A. I. (H. Q.) use to visit the fields after spraying we were satisfied with the spraying and comments of the farmers. The only reports given by two Blocks after the harvest of the crop can not be accepted correct as I have already stated no body were seen to be present in the fields of spraying area during aerial operation.

Further, I am to state that during aerial spraying operation the day to day progress was intimated to you by me verbally for your information and needful as desired.

Yours faithfully

Sd/—

Asstt. Plant Protection Officer,
Lakhimpur, North Lakhimpur.

Attested

Sd/—

Subdivisional
Agricultural Officer,
North Lakhimpur.

ANNE0URE 9

(Reference para 2.6 at page 137)

OFFICE OF THE DHEMAJI DEVELOPMENT BLOCK

No. DADB/5/14/72-73/2003

Dated 29. 6. 73.

To

The Subdivisional Agricultural Officer, Dhemaji.

SUBJECT :: AERIAL SPRAY ON MUSTARD/72-73.

Sir,

With reference to the subject quoted above, I have the honour to inform you that there was no aerial spray on Mustard during 1972-73.

This is for favour of your information and necessary action.

Sd/—
ILLEGIBLE,
Block Dev. Officer,
Dhemaji.

ANNEXURE 10

(Reference para 2.6 at page 137)

BORDOLONI DEVELOPMENT BLOCK

Total acreage under Mustard Crop	3000 acres (as per statistical register of the Block)
Total acreage of Aerial Spraying	450 acres in Gongamukh, Ghilamora, Mornoi as per office records vide letter No. BDB 79/72/73-2132, dated 29.5.73 (Copy below)
Whether any area was certified for aerial spray if so for what area	Not known.
Name and designation of the certifying officer	Not known.
All relevant revenue records	Not available.
Remarks	

N. B.:—Village wise list of total acreage is not available in the office.

Sd/—
15.11.75
Block Dev. Officer, Bordolom,
Dev. Block.

OFFICE OF THE BORDOLONI DEVELOPMENT
OFFICER ::: BORDOLONI

No.BDB/A-60/71-72/73-2132, Dated Ghilamara, the 29th Nov. 1973.

To

The Subdivisional Agricultural Officer, Dhemaji.

Subject :—Aerial spray.

Sir,

I have the honour to submit herewith the detail report of aerial spraying conducted during the year 1972-73 on Mustard Crops for your information and necessary action.

Date	Place	Area	Crops
29. 9. 72	Gogamukh	300 Acres	Mustard
	Ghilamora	50 Acres	"
	Mornoi	100 Acres	"

Yours faithfully,

Project Officer, Project
No. I Bordoloni Dev. Block, Ghilamara

(Reference para 2.12 at page 138)

DISCUSSION WITH OFFICIALS IN 16TH NOVEMBER, 1975 IN NORTH
LAKHIMPUR CIRCUIT HOUSE (1st sitting)

Official present :

1. Shri R. N. Muhuri
2. Shri M. C. Chayengiya
3. Shri R. Saikia
4. Shri S. C. Bardoloi
5. Shri H. A. Hazarika
6. Shri D. C. Hazarika
7. Shri S. K. Barua
8. Shri M. Saikia
9. Dr. H. Rajkhowa
10. Shri N. N. Mazumdar
11. Shri R. L. Das
12. Shri A. Chowdhuri
13. Shri K. Bora
14. Shri P. R. Nath
15. Shri H. L. Gupta
16. Shri R. C. Bharali
17. Shri A. K. Das

Designation :

- D. C. Lakhimpur
 Addl. D. C. Lakhimpur.
 H. A I/S L. D. C. M
 Public Health Ex. Engineer
 S. D. O. P. H. E. North Lakhimpur
 Asstt. Director of Cottage Industries.
 Deputy Director Agriculture, Gauhati.
 Superintendent of Sericulture.
 District Officer, Lakhimpur.
 Addl. Director of Agriculture.
 Joint Director of Agriculture (Engg)
 Superintending Engineer, Irrigation
 (Agri) Jorhat.
 E.E. Irri (Agril.) North Lakhimpur.
 Deputy Director of Agriculture
 (Plant Protection) Khanapara, Gauhati-22.
 Inspector of Schools, L.D.C., North
 Lakhimpur
 District Agricultural Officer
 F & A.O., Lakhimpur.
 Agriculture Deptt., Khanapara.
 Gauhati-22.

SECOND SITTING OF THE OFFICIAL IN THE CIRCUIT HOUSE, NORTH
LAKHIMPUR ON 16TH NOVEMBER, 1975 (2nd sitting).

Officers present

1. Shri S. K. Barua
2. Shri N. N. Mazumdar
3. Shri A. K. Das
4. Shri P. R. Nath
5. Shri R. L. Das
6. Shri A. Chowdhuri
7. Shri M. C. Chayengiya
8. Shri R. N. Muhuri
9. Shri K. Bora
10. Shri S. N. Bhagabati
11. Shri S. N. Das
12. Shri L. Kakaty
13. Shri U. N. Bhuyan
14. Shri R. C. Bharali
15. Shri T. Baruah,
16. Shri A. Hussain
17. Shri B. Gohain
18. Shri S. C. Bhattacharyya

Designation

- Deputy Director of Agriculture
(Sugarcane). Gauhati.
Additional Director of Agriculture.
F. A. O., Agriculture Deptt.
DDA (Plant Protection). Khanapara,
Gauhati-22.
Joint Director of Agriculture (Engg.)
S. E. Irrigation (Agri) Jorhat
Addl. Deputy Commissioner.
Deputy Commissioner, Lakhimpur.
E. E. Irri (Agriculture), North Lakhimpur.
Sub-divisional Agril. Engineer, North
Lakhimpur.
Deputy Director of Agriculture.
Secretary, Assam Agro-Industries Dev.
Corp. Ltd., Gauhati-7.
Agronomist, Nowgong.
District Agricultural Officer, Lakhimpur.
Sub-Divisional Agril. Office, North
Lakhimpur.
Production Manager, A. S. C., Gauhati.
S. D. A.O., Dhemaii.
Branch Manager I/C AAIDC Ltd.,
North Lakhimpur.

ANNEXURE 12

—: 33 :—

(Reference para 2.16 at page 139)

OFFICIAL PRESENT ON 17TH NOVEMBER, 1975 IN THE AFTERNOON SITTING

Name	Designation
1. Shri K. Bora	E. E. Irri (Agril) North Lakhimpur.
2. Shri A. Chowdhuri	S. E. Irri (Agril.) Jorhat.
3. Shri R. L. Das	J. D. A. (Engg.)
4. Shri A. K. Das	F. A. O. Agril. Deptt.
5. Shri N. N. Majumdar	Addl. Director of Agriculture,
6. Shri S. N. Das	Deputy Director of Agriculture (Backward Areas) Lakhimpur.
7. Shri A. Hussain	Production Manager, Assam seeds Corpn. Ltd., Gauhati.
8. Shri P. R. Nath	Deputy Director of Agriculture (Plant Protection), Khanapara, Gauhati-22.
9. Shri Arun Kr. Saikia	Asstt. Manager, A.S.C. Ltd. North Lakhimpur Karunabari.
10. Shri S. Saikia	Auditor, Directorate of Agriculture. Assam, Gauhati-22.
11. Shri S. K. Barua	Deputy Director of Agriculture (Sugar Cane) Gauhati.
12. Shri L. Kakoty	Secretary, Assam Agro-Industries Dev. Corpn. Ltd., Ulubari, Gauhati-7
13. Shri R. C. Bharali	District Agricultural Officer, Lakhimpur.
14. Shri T. Baruah	Sub divisional Agricultural Officer, North Lakhimpur.
15. Shri R. N. Muhuri	Deputy Commissioner. Lakhimpur.

ANNEXURE 13

(Reference Para 2.17 at Page 139)

INFORMATION IN RESPECT OF BLOCKS OF NORTH LAKHIMPUR SUBDIVISION
1972-73

Name of Block	Total acreage under Mustard crop	Total acreage under aerial spray	Whether any area was certified for aerial spray, if so, what area	Name and designation of the certified officer for aerial spray	All relevant records	REMARKS
1. Lakhimpur Block	1,700 acres	Records not available	Not known	Not known	No records available except for Column I	No records available on aerial spray.
2. Narayanpur	1,110 acres	—do—	—do—	—do—	—do—	—do—
3. Naoboicha	436.82 acres	—do—	—do—	—do—	—do—	—do—
4. Bihpuria	2,318.00 acres	—do—	—do—	—do—	—do—	—do—
<hr/>						
5,564.82 acres						

160

Informations as received from the Blocks.

Sd/-
17-11-75.
Deputy Commissioner,
Lakhimpur.

ANNEXURE— 14

(Reference Para 2.23 at Page 139)

Per Spl. Messenger

GOVERNMENT OF ASSAM
OFFICE OF THE SUB-DEPUTY COLLECTOR : MAJULI CIRCLE
No. JKC. 1719 Dated, Kamalabari, the 19th November, 1975

To

The Chairman,
Public Accounts Committee, Camp-Jorhat.

C/O. Deputy Commissioner, Jorhat.

Sub— Report on aerial spraying on Mustard during 1972-73 and
area under Mustard in 1972-73.

Ref— Your discussion on 19.11.75 at Kamalabari I: B.

Sir,

I have the honour to enclose herewith the list of the revenue villages with total area under Mustard crops during 1972-73. In this connection I beg to inform you that there is no record available in this office regarding any correspondence for aerial spraying on Mustard in Majuli Circle during 1972-73.

Yours faithfully,

S/d—

19th November, 1975

Sub-Deputy Collector,
Majuli Circle,
Kamalabari.

Enclosed : I list.

মাজুলী চক্ৰত ১৯৭২-৭৩ চনত

সৰিয়হ খেতি কৰা গাঁৱৰ সংখ্যা—১৮৩ খন

মাটিৰ পৰিমাণ—২১২২.২২ হেক্টৰ

স্বা—

১৯/১১/৭৫

(Reference para 2.24 at page 139)

DISCUSSION OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE WITH OFFICIAL AT 5 P.M.
IN THE JORHAT CIRCUIT HOUSE ON 20TH NOVEMBER, 1975.

Officers present

Name	Designation
1. Shri A. Hussain	Pro. Manager, A. S. C., Gauhati.
2. Shri M. R. Choudhury,	Branch Managerr, A.S.C. Ltd., Jorhat.
3. Shri A.M. Das,	Joint Director of Agri (W.R.) Gauhati.
4. Shri N.N. Majumder	Addl. Director of Agriculture
5. Shri A. K. Das,	F. A. O. Agril. Deptt., Gauhati.
6. Shri A. Chowdhuri,	S. E., Irrigation (Agri) Jorhat.
7. Shri D. N. Gohain	D. A. O., Jorhat.
8. Shri S. Baruah	E. E. (Agri) Jorhat.
9. Shri P. K. Bordoloi	B. M. Jorhat AS.I.D.C. Ltd.
10. Shri L. Kakoty	Secretary, Assam Agro-Industries Development Corporation Ltd., Gauhati—7.
11. Shri J. N. Sarma.	A. D. C., Sibsagar, Jorhat.
12. Shri R. Ahmed,	Deputy Commissioner, Sibsagar.

ANNEXURE 16

(Reference Para 2.28 at page 140)

PROCUREMENT OF COMBINED HARVESTOR

Five combined harvestors were purchased at the instance of Government of India. These were intended for use in experimental basis as these were quite new to Assam. The harvestors were put to the threshing work only during the last E. A. P. P period. The reasons for non-utilisation of the combined harvestors are attributed mainly to the following.

(1) The machines run on petrol. Due to steep rise of petrol cost, the operating cost of the machine has gone up very high.

(2) The machines run on rubber chain and require perfectly level land for operation. Slight undulation in the field disturbs the height of shearing blades of the machines, thereby getting uneven length of harvested paddy or wheat. Such variation affects the operation of the machines.

By and large, such level compact areas are not generally available

However, this year the machines will be put to rigid test and performance data will be collected.

ANNEXURE I
(Reference para 4.2 at page 7)
EMERGENCY RABI PROGRAMME, 1972-73
(Estimated Coverage under different crops) Area in Thousand Hectres.

A=Actual
Aa=Anticipated achievement
T=Target.

Subdivision	Wheat				Boro				Mustard				Pulse			
	1971-72		1972-73		1971-72		1972-73		1971-72		1972-73		1971-72		1972-73	
	A	T	A.A.	T	A	T	A.A.	T	A	T	A.A.	T	A	T	A.A.	T
I	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13				
Goalpara	..	4.00	10.00 (13.00)	2.50	3.00	4.00	8.00	11.00	9.00	3.00	4.00	4.00				
Kokrajhar	..	2.50	7.00	1.60	3.00	4.00	8.00	8.00	7.00	5.00	5.00	5.00				
Dhubri	..	6.50	21.00 (22.50)	1.50	4.00	5.00	9.00	11.00	10.00	8.87	9.00	9.00				
DT. Total	..	13.00	38.00 (43.00)	5.60	10.00	13.00	25.00	30.00	26.00	16.87	18.00	18.00				
Gauhati	..	4.00	16.00 (19.00)	2.80	5.00	6.50	14.50	16.00	15.00	17.25	18.00	19.00				
Nalbari	..	2.00	12.00 (14.00)	2.50	5.00	5.50	7.50	7.50	7.00	8.00	10.00	10.00				
Barpeta	..	8.50	15.00	1.70	2.00	3.50	11.00	16.50	13.00	5.00	7.00	7.00				
Dist. Total	..	14.50	43.00 (55.00)	7.00	12.00	15.50	33.00	40.00	35.00	30.25	35.00	36.00				
Nowgong including Morigaon	4.00	18.00	16.50 (19.00)	4.00	9.00	11.00	22.19	36.00	26.00	12.84	15.00	19.00				
Mangaldoi	..	3.50	9.00 (9.00)	1.20	2.50	1.50	15.90	17.00	18.00	7.76	8.00	9.00				
Tezpur	..	2.50	11.00 (11.00)	.50	1.50	1.00	8.00	10.00	10.00	6.00	7.00	7.00				
Dist. Total	..	6.00	20.00 (20.00)	1.70	4.00	2.50	23.90	27.00	28.00	13.76	15.00	16.00				

Lakhimpur	0.50	6.00 (12.00)	4.20	-0.04	2.00	0.70	5.00	10.00	7.00	1.80	6.50	3.00
Dhemaji	0.30	4.00 (12.00)	2.10	..	2.00	0.60	3.00	14.00	8.00	1.00	5.50	2.00
DT. Total	0.80	10.00 (24.00)	6.30	0.04	4.00	1.30	8.00	24.00	15.00	2.80	12.00	5.00
Dibrugarh	0.20	2.60 (2.60)	2.10	0.10	..	0.03	4.00	4.00	6.00	1.34	1.40	1.20
Tinsukia	0.20	2.40 (2.40)	1.90	0.01	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.10	1.10	1.00
DT. Total	0.40	5.00 (5.00)	4.00	0.10	..	0.04	6.00	6.00	9.00	2.44	2.50	2.20
Sibsagar	0.20	2.50 (4.00)	2.00	0.04	..	0.60	3.00	3.40	2.50	0.60	1.00	1.00
Jorhat	0.20	6.50 (6.50)	5.50	1.20	7.00	8.60	8.00	0.60	2.50	2.50
Golaghat	0.50	3.00 (6.50)	2.00	0.70	3.00	4.00	3.20	3.00	4.00	4.00
DT. Total	0.90	12.00 (24.50)	9.50	0.04	..	2.50	13.00	16.00	13.70	4.20	7.50	7.50
Silchar	0.05	0.10 (0.20)	0.13	6.50	8.00	10.00	0.40	0.75	0.30	0.60	0.80	0.80
Karinganji	0.05	0.17 (0.20)	0.13	3.60	6.00	7.00	0.30	0.75	0.60	0.60	0.90	0.90
Hailakandi	0.04	0.15 (0.20)	0.10	1.70	3.00	3.00	0.30	0.50	0.50	0.33	0.30	0.30
DT. Total	0.14	0.50 (0.60)	0.36	11.80	17.00	20.00	1.00	2.00	1.40	1.53	2.00	2.00
Mikir Hills	0.20 (2.80)	2.00	1.30	0.85	4.00	1.80	3.20	4.50	5.30	1.12	2.60	2.00
N. C. Hills	0.06	..	0.70	0.35	0.50	0.60	0.40	0.40	0.35
GRAND TOTAL	40.00	148.50 (194.00)	130.00	31.00	60.00	68.00	135.55	176.00	160.00	86.21	110.00	108.00

(Bracketed figures are State figures)

ANNEXURE II

(Reference para 4.5 at page 8)

STATEMENT OF STAFF OF EMERGENCY AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION PROGRAMME

The following posts were created for EAPP

Category of staff	No. Created	No. filled up	Expenditure incurred up to Feb. 1973	Remarks
Special Officer (AAS.I)	1	1	Rs. 4,17,535.00	(1) After the end of the EAPP Scheme, the staff were transferred and retained under HYV Programme and Intensive Rabi Programme vide Government Letter No. AGA.573 (13/72/136, dt. 4th November 1974.
Agricultural Officer (AAS.II)	20	20		
Extension Officer (SAS.I)	60	60		
Asstt. Agril. Inspector (SAS.II)	60	49		
Superintendent	4	4		
Accountant (Headquarter)	4	4		
L.D.A.-cum-Typist (")	4	4		(2) In 1975-76 out of these staff only the following are retain under Agril. Administration Plant Scheme:—
Accountant (District)	8	8		
U.D.A. (District)	12	12		
L.D.A.-cum-Typist (")				
Gade IV (")	12	12		
				Agril. Officer— 1
				Agril. Exten- 6
				sion Officer—
				Asstt. Inspector 44
				Superintendent (Hqtr.) 4
				Accountant (Hq.) 4
				L.D.A. -cum- 4
				Typist (Hq.)
				Acctt. (Dist.) 8
				L.D.A. (Dist.) 10
				L.D.A. (Dist.) 8
				Grade IV 10

STAFF UNDER IRRIGATION (AGRI) WING

Name of posts					Nos. of post created during EAPP under scheme streng- thening of staff under M. I.	
1.	Chief Engineer (Agri)	7	Chief Engineer
2.	Superintending Engineer (Agri)	3	
3.	E. E. (Agri)	3	
4.	S. D. A. E.	4	
5.	Asst. A. E.	7	
6.	Asstt. Geologist	
7.	F. A. O.	1	
8.	Asstt. Hydrologist	1	
9.	Divnl. Acctt.	3	
10.	Overseer (A) Mech.	9	
	(B) Electrical	2	
	(C) Civil	2	
1.	Draftsman (Grade I)	2	
	(Grade II)	
12.	Computer	
13.	(a) Motor Driver	6	
	(b) Rig Driver	
	(c) Truck Driver	
14.	D. A. H. Acctt./Acctt.	3	
	U. D. A/ (275-425)	
	(250-350)	2	
	(200-300)	16	
15.	L. D. A. -Cum-Typist	5	
	L. D. A.	26	
16.	Grade-IV	25	
17.	Mech-I Boring Mechanic.	15	
18.	Mech. II Elect. Mech.— Operator-Cum-Mechanics	95	
19.	Mechanics-III	
20.	P. P. O (Regular)	200	
21.	P. P. O. (Seasonal)	300	
22.	A. P. P. O.	
23.	Stenographer	3	
24.	Helpers	
25.	Asstt. Driller	
26.	Tracer	1	
27.	D. T. W. Operator	

ANNEXURE III

(Reference para 10.3 at page 16)

A. STATEMENT ON LIFT IRRIGATION SCHEMES TAKEN-UP UNDER E. A. P.P.

Name of District	Name of Scheme	When Commenced	When Completed (Scheme as a whole)	When pump installed	Estimated expenditure in lakhs	Actual Expt. in Lakhs	When en-ergised	When worked
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Goalpara,	1. Sithula	17th November 1972	1972-73	December 1972				
	2. Kartimari Extn.	.. Do	1972-73	December 1972	3.25	4.03	January 1973	1972-73
	3. Titagri	.. Do	1972-73	November 1972	5.25	2.75	January 1973	1972-73
	4. Bichapur Extn.	.. Do	1972-73	December 1972	1.30	1.10	April 1973	1973-74
	5. Godadhar	.. Do	1972-73	November 1972	1.95	1.60	December 1973	1972-73
	6. Tokiamari	.. Do	1972-73	November 1972	1.95	2.60	December 1973	1972-73
	7. Polla	.. Do	1972-73	December 1972	9.25	7.75	February 1973	1972-73
Kamrup,	8. Kamalpur	.. Do	1972-73	November 1972	10.58	11.60	December 1973	1972-73
	9. Rangia	.. Do	1972-73	December 1972	5.06	4.82	January 1973 January/March 1973	1972-73
	10. Singimari	.. Do	1972-73	January 1973	3.25	4.50	January 1973	1972-73
Nowgong	11. Malaybari Ext.	.. Do	1972-73	January 1973	8.05	9.10	December 1973	1972-73
	12. Santijan	.. Do	1972-73	December 1972	1.30	1.22	February 1973	1972-73
	13. Ruhimaity	.. Do	1972-73	January 1973	4.01	4.45	January 1973	1972-73
	14. Nikhary	.. Do	1972-73	December 1972	4.95	6.55	January 1973	1972-73

15. Jamuna	..	Do	1972-73	December 1972	0.65	0.91	January 1973	1972-73
16. Haibor	..	Do	1972-73	December 1972	0.45	0.46	January 1973	1927-73
17. Haria	-	Do	1972-73	December 1972	3.52	4.14	January 1973	1972-73
18. Koroka	-	Do	1973-74	January 1972	2.22	2.20	January 1973	1972-73
19. Marangi	-	Do	1973-74	January 1972	2.11	2.17	February 1973	1972-73
20. Nahatia	-	Do	8973-74	January 1972	2.12	2.05	April 1973	1972-73
21. Chiladhari	-	Do	1972-73	January 1972	3.25	3.89	February 1973	1972-73
22. Kolaigaon	..	Do	1972-73	December 1972	1.30	1.28	January 1973	1972-73
23. Kulsik	..	Do	1972-73	December 1972	1.30	0.90	January 1973	1972-73
24. Kaigorah	..	Do	1972-73	December 1972	2.84	3.20	February 1973	1972-73
25. Rajabazar	..	Do	1973-74	December 1972	1.30	0.80	April 1973	1972-73
26. Salchakra	..	Do	1972-73	December 1972	3.52	2.34	February 1973	1972-73
27. Sonai Extn.	..	Do	1972-73	January 1972	2.12	2.46	March 1973	1972-73
28. pathar kandi	..	Do	1972-73	December 1972	3.08	2.10	February/March 1973	
29. R. K. Nagar	..	Do	1973-74	January 1972	3.52	3.30	February/April 1973	
30. Matijuri	..	Do	.. (one work completed in & 1972-73)	January 1972	4.12	4.80	Not Yet energized by 2 Nos. not Yet energized.	
31. Lala Extn.	..	Do	1973-74	January 1972	2.82	2.82	March/Oct. 1973	
					100.07	100.05		

B. DIESEL PUMP SETS

Crop-wise area irrigated during E.A.P.P. (i. e. 72-73) by Diesel pump Sets in bighas

District	No. of sets issued	Wheat	Boro	others
Goalpara	182	12,448	7,827	330
Kamrup	133 (Including one No. rejected after E.A.P.P. & returned to A.A.I.D.C.)	2,855	5,541	68
Nowgong	62	3,962	4,063	2254
Sibsagar	24	350	—	665
Dibrugarh	14	103	—	—
Lakhimpur	60	54	160	16
Darrang	33	961	1,340	—
Cachar	49	—	750	750
549 Sets		20,731	20,461	4083

...

ANNEXURE IV

(Reference paras 18.7 and 19.4 at pages 30 and 32)

PERFORMANCE OF MOBILE DIESEL PUMPSSETS PURCHASED UNDER EAPP (72-73) IN LAKHIMPUR DISTRICT:

Sl. No.	H. P.	Make and Engine No.	(EAPP) Hours worked	Area irrigated during EAPP in bighas (72-73)				Area irrigated during 73-74 in bighas				Area irrigated during 74-75 in bighas				No. in stock under EAPP	No. utilised during EAPP	No. used during 73-74	No. used during 74-75	Name of the Sub-Division		
				Wheat	Boro	Others	Total	Wheat	Boro	Other	Total	Wheat	Boro	Other	Total							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
1	10	HP. Kirloskar-2142		101		8	8	33	2	2	13	6	2	3	DHEMAJI
2	10	" Do-2131	..	176	..	14	14	
3	10	" Do-2141	..	31	..	7	7	85	8	..	8	
4	10	" Do-261	..	8	..	2	2	
5	10	" Do-2143	..	14	..	1	1	24	1	..	1	
6	10	" Do-2135	..	64	1.5	1.5	7	1.5	1.5	83	8	..	8	
							32	1.5	33.5	3.5	3.5	17	17					
1	7.5	HP. Usha C-721003	..	84	5.1	5.1	10	10	usha	7.5-7210312	..	6	6	27	14	24	10	North Lakhimpur
2	7.5	" Do-C-7012544	..	36	50	50	15	15	..	Do	7211020	..	6	6	
3	7.5	" Do-C-721032	..	136	27	27	16	16	..	Do	7210027	3	3	
4	7.5	" Do-C-7211008	..	8.5	1.6	1.6	5	5	..	Do	721032	..	15	15	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23
5	7.5	”	Do—C—720897	0.6	0.6	10	10	Do	..	7290368	..	6	6
6	10	”	Kirloskar—2147	..	78.5	6	..	10	16	10	10	Do	..	7211027	..	20	20
7	10	”	Do—C—2147	..	94	..	6	6	8	8	Do	..	7211017	..	30	30
8	10	”	Do—C—2133	..	160	..	20	20	8	8	Do	..	7211009	..	9	9
9	10	”	Do—C—2166	rewatering	15	15	Kirloskar..	2147	..	32	32
10	10	”	Do—C—2140	..	76	13	..	13	2	2	Do	..	2130	..	37	37
11	10	”	Do—2162	..	40	5	..	5	16	16
12	10	”	Do—2161	..	53	..	12.5	12.5	10	10
13	10	”	Do—2146	..	13.5	..	10.5	10.5	25	25
14	10	”	Do—2134	12	12
15	10	”	Do—2135	15	15
16	10	”	Do—2143	5	5
17	10	”	Do—2130	10	10
18	10	”	Do—2139	5	5
19	7.5	”	Usha—7210027	10	10
20	7.5	”	Do—7204176	8	8
21	7.5	”	Do—7211010	6	6
22	7.5	”	Do—7211307	4	4
23	7.5	”	Do—7211077	5	5
24	7.5	”	Do—7210001	8	8
			79.1	86.3	165.4																	
													238	238								
													164	164	40	20	26	13				

ANNEXURE V

(Reference para 19.4 (2) at page 33.)

Compiled statement of requirement of pump and Tractors showing the proposed area for irrigation and tractorisation during Kabi season in Goalpara District:

	Area proposed for raising addl. area in acres	Additional requirement		Existing stock of Tractor	Existing stock of Power pump
		Tractor	Power pump		
1. Goalpara Sub-Division—					
Wheat ..	4908.37 acres	20	100	10	16
Boro Paddy ..	1000 "	..	36
2. South Salmari and Mankachar Block—					
Wheat ..	21100.00 "	13	120
Boro Paddy ..	3100 "	..	50
3. Kokrajhar Sub-Division—	4000 "	10	120	3	8
4. Dhubri Sub-Division—	4000 "	6	108	1	10
		39	534	14	34
5. H. P. pump to be collected and required from different Blocks.		104 (Approx.)	..

NET REQUIREMENT:—

39 Tractors 430 Pumps.

No.EE(Agr) GP/72-73/3636, dated 27th September 1972

Submitted to the Joint Director of Agriculture (Engg), Assam, Gauhati, for favourable necessary action.

Executive Engineer, (Agriculture),
Goalpara.

ANNEXURE—VI

ANNEXURE VI

(Reference Para 20.4 at page 34)

PERFORMANCE OF SHALLOW TUBE WELLS UNDER
NORTH LAKHIMPUR SUBDIVISION

During 1972-73 Irrigation Season

Sl. No.	Make with Engine No.	Name of Centre	Hours Worked	Hours Idle			Area Irrigated				Date of Placing	Remarks
				No. De-mand	Break down	Want of pol	Ahu	Wheat	Boro	Total		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1	11876 (vota)	Sarjan	122.00	934.00	8	Nil	4.20	8.60	Nil	12.80	19-1-73 to 31-3-73	
2	11869 (vota)	Sribhuyan	123.50	538.50	2	..	80	10.25	..	11.05	1-1-73 to 31-3-73	
3	11877 "	do.	37.50	474.50	8.00	..	8.00	16-12-72 to 31-3-73	
4	11861 "	Narayanpur	69.00	758.00	4	7.00	..	7.00	27-1-73 to 31-5-73	
5	11881 "	Sarjan	86.00	474.00	6.40	10.00	..	16.40	1-1-73 to 1-4-73	
6	11877 "	Sribhuyan	75.00	277.00	7.00	7.00	1-4-73 to 15-5-73	
7	11861 "	Sarjan	31.00	925.00	4	..	2.80	2.80	1-4-73 to 15-5-73	
8	11864 "	Sarjan	160.00	900.00	4	..	3.60	21.60	..	25.20	19-1-73 to 31-5-73	
9	11885 "	Sribhuyan	65.00	302.00	1	..	7.80	4.75	..	12.55	1-4-73 to 31-5-73	
10	11876 "	Sarjan	57.00	518.00	4	..	4.20	..	8.60	12.80	19-1-73 to 4-4-73	
11	Kir. 10.1001/24461	Uzzalpur	71.50	1162.50	1.00	1.00	22-12-72- to 16-5-73	

41	Days	4-300032A	Kumbhar	34'00	1143'00	..	3'00	..	3'00	2'00	58-15-33	to 20-2-73	..	
42	"	3-200123	"	35'00	1143'00	..	4'10	0'80	..	4'00	58-15-33	to 21-2-73	..	
43	"	3-121109	10.1001/27751	Bongalmara	10 27.00	1197.00	4.00	..	41'00	4.00	29-12-72 to 30-5-73	
44	"	3-203A23	A-72090368	Gohamtakala	1 235.00	2075.00	8	..	3.20	2'30	..	43'30	3.20	15-12-73 to 31-5-73
45	"	3-214A25	3.1001/27752	do.	386.00	1046.00	15.20	8.05	..	43'23.25	15-12-72 to 31-5-73	
46	"	3-2015A29	A-72090492	do.	13 304.00	1001.00	7	..	4.00	1.50	5.50	15-12-72 to 14-6-73
47	"	3-2016A25	A-72090511	do.	13 313.00	1023.00	6.20	2.50	..	41'00	8.70	15-12-72 to 24-5-73
48	"	3-2017A25	72090126	Uzzalpur	15 515.50	783.50	64	42.00	8.00	3'00	..	8.00	16.00	15-12-72 to 31-5-73
49	"	3-2018A23	10.1001/24218	Bishnunagar	5 196.00	940.00	9.21	2'00	1.60	15'20	10.81	29-12-72 to 19-5-73
50	"	3-2019A23	12067	Berbhonga	10 303.00	912.00	41	..	10.00	5.00	15.00	26-12-72 to 31-5-73
51	"	3-2020A23	10.1001/17173	Uzzalpur	11 408.00	1036.00	7.60	2'20	..	13.00	20.60	15-12-72 to 31-5-73
52	"	3-2021A21E	720477	Berbhonga	10 327.00	1016.00	33	..	5.00	5.00	10.00	26-12-72 to 31-5-73
53	"	15002 22	7204158	..	4 201.00	998.00	1	16.00	6.00	3'20	..	10.00	16.00	3-2-73 to 31-5-73
54	"	15012 23	12031	..	4 294.00	555.00	55	..	10.00	1'30	..	10.00	20.00	8-2-73 to 30-5-73
55	"	15002 24	Bharat 12073	..	2 59.00	412.00	17	..	2.40	6.00	..	15'20	8.40	31-4-73 to 31-5-73
56	"	15002 25	12040	..	4 143.00	561.00	1.80	9.20	..	17'20	11.00	13-3-73 to 31-5-73
57	"	15010 26	12072	..	2 15.00	249.00	0.80	3'10	..	4'00	0.80	19-1-73 to 4-4-73
58	"	15010 27	12075	..	4 43.00	576.00	5	..	4.50	3'20	4.50	1-4-73 to 31-5-73
59	"	12036	Sribhuyan	..	51.00	437.00	0.45	0.45	19-1-73 to 31-3-75
60	"	12080	Bhogpur	..	60.00	1116.00	5.40	4.20	..	15'20	9.60	3-1-73 to 15-5-73
61	"	28	4777.50	22597.00	258.00	82.00	141.36	103.25	51.60	296.21

E/No.12080
(Bharat) cov-
ers 3 Nos. of
STW's installed
in a compact
area under
Bhogpur centre

E/No.12080
(Bharat) cov-
ers 3 Nos. of
STW's installed
in a compact
area under
Bhogpur centre.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
30	Bharat 12072	.. Bhogpur	50.50	438.00	2.80	2.80	1-4-72 to 31-5-73	..
31	" 12019	.. Borkhamti	117.00	520.00	3	..	1.50	3.10	..	4.60		
32	" 12036	.. do.	88.00	441.50	46.50	..	0.45	7.10	..	7.55	1-4-73 to 15-5-73	..
33	" 12066	.. do.	23.00	668.00	1.50	1.50	1-4-73 to 31-5-73	..
34	" 12075	.. do.	10.00	46.00	1.40	..	1.40	1-1-73 to 31-3-73	..
35	" 12066	.. Bhogpur	38.00	450.00	2.60	..	2.60	3-1-73 to 31-1-73	..
36	Cooper 3-573486	Bangaon	1064.00
37	" 3-563540	.. Bongalmara	143.50	1147.50	8.50	..	8.50	31-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
38	" 3-563760	.. Daulatpur	100.00	1050.00	9.00	9.00	28-12-72 to 15-5-73	..
39	" 3-564783	.. Dhalpur	324.00	259.50	6.60	6.00	..	12.60	15-3-73 to 31-5-73	..
40	" 3-563744	.. Daulatpur	178.00	1015.00	8.50	8.00	..	16.50	29-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
41	" 3-563692	.. Bongalmara	15.00	1221.00	1.00	1.00	3-2-73 to 31-5-73	..
42	" 3-563750	.. Daulatpur	1208.00
43	" 3-564764	.. Borkhamti	101.00	378.50	8.50	..	1.50	1.50	1-4-73 to 31-5-73	..
44	" 3-563755	.. Daulatpur	245.00	1099.00	7.00	6.20	..	13.20	29-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
45	" 3-560100	.. do.	184.50	1041.50	6.00	..	11.00	11.00	29-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
46	" 3-560152	.. do.	92.00	1142.00	4.10	0.80	..	4.90	29-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
47	Usha A-72090357	.. Kutumpur	84.00	1148.00	3.00	..	2.60	5.90	28-12-72 to 30-5-73	..

48	"	A-72090387	..	Panigaon	..	314.00	726.00	10.00	10.00	22-1-73 to 31-5-73	..
49	"	A-7209159	..	Kutubpur	..	49.00	1295.00	10.40	..	4.00	14.40	28-12-72 to 31-4-73	..
50	"	A-72090366	..	do.	..	84.00	830.00	..	200.00	1.00	..	2.00	3.00	28-12-72 to 15-5-73	..
51	"	A-72090416	..	do.	..	92.00	814.00	22.00	184.00	2.10	..	2.20	4.30	28-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
52	Frontier	147	..	Singia	..	42.50	1262.50	33.00	..	6.60	0.60	..	7.20	22-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
53	"	162	..	Uzzalpur	..	600.00	725.00	36.00	..	9.00	4.00	10.00	23.00	13-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
54	"	155	..	2 No. Kowagonga.	..	39.00	1321.00	2.40	6.00	..	8.40	28-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
55	"	158	..	Bongalmara	..	10.00	1226.00	1.40	..	0.20	1.60	31-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
56	"	146	..	Uzzalpur	..	308.00	782.00	66.00	0.10	10.00	19-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
57	Embee	4831	..	Bualguri N/L.	..	40.00	832.00	7.00	..	7.00	28-12-72 to 31-3-73	..
58	"	151	..	Padmapur	..	78.00	410.00	1.20	1.20	1-4-73 to 31-5-73	..
59	"	4521	..	Jalbhortia	..	104.50	247.50	39.50	5.80	..	5.80	15-1-73 to 21-3-73	..
60	"	4547	..	do.	..	45.50	435.50	1.20	..	1.20	15-1-73 to 31-5-73	..
61	"	154	..	Dongibil	..	116.00	1108.00	8.00	8.00	30-12-73 to 31-5-73	..
62	"	4767	..	Bualguri N/L.	..	36.00	1114.00	2.00	4.00	..	4.00	10-12-72 to 31-5-73	..

3757.00 29887.00 261.50 384.00 110.00 72.10 21.10 203.20

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
63	Frontier 4596	.. Bhogpur	25.00	679.00	4.20	..	4.20	3.1-72 to 31-1-73	..
64	" 149	.. Dongibil	122.00	1190.00	11.50	1.85	..	13.35	3-2-73 to 15-6-73	..
65	" 4596	.. Bhogpur	13.00	107.00	9.00	..	9.00
66	" 4625	.. Simaluguri	28.00	372.00	13.10	..	13.10	1-2-73 to 24-3-73	..
67	" 4521	.. Jalbhoria	110.00	772.00	38.00	5.80	..	5.80
68	" 151	.. Padmapur	110.00	140.00	9.00	..	9.00	1-1-73 to 31-3-73	..
69	" 4721	.. Bhogpur	74.50	1071.00	39.00	..	4.00	3.20	..	7.20	3-1-73 to 31-5-73	..
70	" 4766	.. Lakhimpur	276.00	1034.00	34.00	..	4.00	5.00	..	9.00	10-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
71	" 4760	.. Nalkata N/L	174.00	1174.00	5.00	5.00	13-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
72	" 4586	.. Bhogpur	47.00	637.00	4.80	..	4.80	28-12-72 to 31-3-73	..
73	Soxa ISP 1027 (1072)	.. Gorchoga	286.00	336.00	2.00	..	3.33	3.32	51-3-73 to 31-5-73	..
74	" 1062	.. Do	236.00	396.00	13.40	..	6.67	6.67	13-2-73 to 31-5-73	..
75	" 1069	.. Do	23.00	217.00	0.30	0.30	5-5-73 to 31-5-73	..
76	" 1065	.. Do	117.00	75.00	2.00	2.00	7-4-73 to 31-5-73	..
77	Kir 69093306	.. Bhorolua	11.00	378.00	1.60	1.60	25-3-73 to 12-5-73	..
78	" 66094467	.. Bualguri	110.00	1010.00	4.00	4.00	18-1-73 to 8-5-73	..
79	Embec. 4870	.. Nalkata NL/1	51.00	1329.00	1.80	50.00	..	51.80	16-12-72 to 31-5-73	..
80	A-72090417	.. Banto Bongaligaon	21.00	811.00	3.00	..	3.00	28-12-72 to 11-4-73	..
81	A-72090326	.. Gohaintekela	82.00	207.00	2.60	2.60	5-4-73 to 31-5-73	..

No.	Name of Centre	Area	3055.50	19613.00	No.	177.00	196	108.59	114.00	Area	223.54	Example
82	7210033 .. Gorehoga ..	58.00	422.00	32.00	...	31	2.20	...	2.20	29-3-73 to 31-5-73	...	Do
83	Kir-2316 .. Bishnupur ..	114.00	766.00	30	2.57	...	2.57	15-1-73 to 14-5-73	...	in 1955-53 वर्षावसमय समय
84	Sova ISP-1142... Bhagpur ..	13.00	203.00	32.00	...	30	1.00	...	1.00	1-9-73 to 12-9-73	...	Do
85	Frontier 153... Ahmedpur ..	136.00	968.00	30	4.50	...	4.50	29-12-72 to 15-5-73	...	Do
86	11.1001/2161 .. Gorechiga ..	51.00	437.00	14	12.50	...	12.50	1-4-73 to 31-3-73	...	Do
87	Vota-11869 .. Nowboicha ..	73.00	415.00	18	7.00	...	7.00	1-4-73 to 31-5-73	...	in 1955-53 वर्षावसमय समय
88	Vota-11881 .. Sarjan ..	63.00	297.00	18	6.40	...	6.40	1-4-73 to 15-5-73	...	Do
89	Kir-72090390... Gohaintekela ..	227.00	1029.00	13	4.40	...	4.40	15-12-72 to 21-5-73	...	Do
90	4524 .. Borkhamti ..	64.00	480.00	14	3.00	...	3.00	23-12-72 to 31-3-73	...	Do
91	72090458 .. Gohaintekela ..	61.00	1227.00	1.40	...	1.40	15-12-72 to 25-5-73	...	in 1955-53 वर्षावसमय समय
92	72090132 .. Bhorolua ..	84.00	369.00	33	4.20	...	4.20	25-3-73 to 31-5-73	...	Actual Nos. of S. T. W. worked-96
93	66091474 .. Bualguri ..	77.00	251.00	20	5.00	...	5.00	18-4-73 to 31-5-73	...	Since Eng. No. 12080 (Bhar cover 3 Nos. of S.T.W. points installed in a compact area.
94	1066 .. Gorechiga ..	194.00	814.00	2	10.62	...	10.62	20-3-73 to 26-5-73	...	

Grand Total

(Копия в № 2-2 и № 3а)
УИИХКЕ АИ-- (Совхоз).

ANNEXURE VI—(Conc'd).
(Reference Para 25-5 at Page 39)

PERFORMANCE OF S.T.W. FOR NORTH LAKHIMPUR SUBDIVISION
IRRIGATION SEASON 1973-74 (JUNE '73 TO MAY '74)

Sl. No.	Name of Centre.	Make of Engine with H. P.	Engine No.	Hours of worked	Idle No. demand	Hours Break down	Area Irrigated P.O.L.	Cropwise	Period of working days.	Remarks.			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1	Nowboicha project	Usha-5 H.P.	..	A-72090347	..	60	20		1-6-73 to 10-6-73			Achievement shown in 1972-73	
2	Gohaintekela No.2	5 H.P.	A-72090368	..	23	97			1-6-73 to 15-6-73			Achievement shown in 1972-73	
3	Uzzalpur	Frontier 5 H.P.	151	..	44	76			1-6-73 to 15-6-73			Do	
4	Bangalmara	Cooper 5 H.P.	3-563540	..	13	107			Do			Do	
5	Bhoroluwa	Kirlosker 5 H.P.	14/69093306	..	18	1270		7	1-6-73 to 8-11-73				
6	Uzzalpur.	Front. 5 H.P.	..	162	..	18	102		1-6-73 to 15-6-73			Achievement shown in '72-73	Irri. Season.
7	Bhogpur	Bharat 5 H.P.	12075	..	14	106		2	Do			Do	
8	Uzzalpur.	Front. 5 H.P.	150	..	20	180		5	1-6-73 to 25-6-73				
9	Berbhanga.	Usha 5 H.P.	720477	..	30	90			1-6-73 to 15-6-73			Achievement shown in 1972-73	
10	Do	Bharat 5 H.P.	12067	..	21	97			Do			Do	

11	Gohaintekela,	..	Usha 5 H.P.	72090453	..	24	16		11-6-73 to 15-6-73	Do
12	Azad Gorehaga	..	Sova 5 H.P.	1069	..	23	217	1.2	1-6-73 to 30-6-73	
13	Bhogpur	..	Embee 5 H.P.	4721	..	11	109		1-6-73 to 15-6-73	Do
14	Uzzalpur	..	Usha 5 H.P.	72090126	..	44	196		1-6-73 to 30-6-73	Do
15	Gohaintekela,		Usha 5 H.P.	A—72090492	..	46	66		1-6-73 to 14-6-73	Do
16	Do	..	Kir. 5 H.P.	10.1001/27752	..	73	15		1-6-73 to 11-6-73	Do
17	Azad Gorehaga,	..	Sova 5 H.P.	1062	..	23	217	1.00	1-6-73 to 30-6-73	
18	Gohaintekela	..	Usha 5 H.P.	A—72090326	..	6	66	1.6	7-6-73 to 15-6-73	
19	Doulotpur,	..	Cooper 5 H.P.	3—563744	..	5	147		1-6-73 to 19-6-73	Achievement shown in 1972-73
20	Do	5 H.P....	3—563755	..	2	118		1-6-73 to 15-6-73	Do
21	Berbhanga	..	Bharat 5 H.P...	12031	..	6	98		1-6-73 to 13-6-73	Do
22	Bhogpur	..	5 H.P.	12072	..	8	112		1-6-73 to 15-6-73	Do
23	Do	..	5 H.P.	12066	..	4	116	1.00	1-6-73 to 15-6-73	
24	Bontow	..	Cooper 5 H.P.	3-560152	..	4	292	1	16-7-73 to 21-8-73	
25	Sarjan	..	Vota 5 H.P.	11864	..	7	113	2.4	1-6-73 to 15-6-73	
26	Kutubpur	..	Usha 5 H.P.	A—72090416	..	16	112	8	30-8-73 to 15-9-73	
						563	4155	10	17.20	9.60

ANNEXURE VII

(Reference 25.5 at page 39)

Accounts Officer,

The 5% (five percent) amounts which have been deducted as Security Money from the bills of wheat threshers supplied by M/S. Purbanchal Enterprise, M. C. Road, Gauhati, and by M/S. Wakefield Equipments, Patna against our orders, to the Agriculture Department for the CRASH RABI PROGRAMME of 1972-73, may now be released.

Attested
Sd/-ILLEGIBLE,
2.1.76

Sd/-ILLEGIBLE,
Chief Project Engineer.
3.4.74

Project Manager,
Assam Agro-Industries Development
Corp. Ltd., Gauhati-7.

ANNEXURE VIII

(Reference Para 26.5 at page 42)

PLACING OF DEPARTMENTAL TRACTORS 1972-73 FOR
OPERATION (RABI PROGRAMME)

						Old	New
Goalpara	14	6
Nalbari	12	14
Gauhati	12	4
Tezpur	8	X
North Lakhimpur	20	5
Dibrugah	10	X
Jorhat	26	9
Nowgong	20	2
Silchar	21	
Mikir Hills	12	X
N. C. Hills	1	X
						156	30

TOTAL— 186

ACHIEVEMENT OF TRACTORISATION WORK 1972-73

				Bulldozer in hrs.	Ploughing in bighas	Harrowing in bighas
Gauhati	2680	1244	8595
Nalbari	712	5485
Barpeta	2993
Golaghat	4030
Jorhat	221	151	1263
Sibsagar	251	3500
Tezpur	76	799	1943
Mangaldoi	203	992
Nowgong	190	477	2507
Moyang	13	1032
Silchar	1841	473	1090
Hailakandi	40	240
Karimganj	109	105
North Lakhimpur	208	3401
Dhemaji	211	3500
Dibrugarh	411	2051
Diphu	248	812	6151
				5248 hrs.	6113	48,870