

**PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE**  
(1967-68)

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY LIBRARY  
ASSAM, SHILLONG

**First Report**

(FOURTH ASSEMBLY)

[Report of the Public Accounts Committee on the Appropriation Accounts, 1964-65 and Audit Report, 1966 and Finance Accounts 1964-65 of the Government of Assam relating to Health, Animal Husbandry and Veterinary, Fishery, Revenue, Home (Police), Home (Jails), Education (General), Education (P. T. M.), and Sericulture and Weaving Department]



**ASSEMBLY SECRETARIAT**  
**SHILLONG**

September, 1967

---

Bhadra-Asvina 1889 (Saka)

1967  
PRINTED AT THE ASSAM GOVERNMENT PRESS  
SHILLONG

**COMPOSITION OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS  
COMMITTEE, 1967-68**

**Chairman**

1. Shri Gaurisankar Bhattacharyya.

**Members**

2. M. Shamsul Huda.
3. Shri Malia Tanti.
4. Shri Tilok Gogoi.
5. Shri Surendra Chandra Baruah.
6. Shri Dulal Chandra Barua.
7. Shri Durgeswar Saikia.

**Secretariat**

1. Shri N. C. Handique, Secretary-in-charge.
2. Shri P. D. Barua, Under-Secretary.
3. Shri N. Deuri Bora, Committee Officer.

**REPORT OF THE PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE ON THE  
AUDIT REPORT, 1966, APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS,  
1964-65 AND THE FINANCE ACCOUNTS, 1964-65**

**Introduction**

I, the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee do present on behalf of the Committee, its Report on the Appropriation Accounts, 1964-65 and Audit Report, 1966 and Finance Accounts, 1964-65 of the Government of Assam in so far as they relate to the Departments of Health, Animal Husbandry and Veterinary, Fishery, Revenue, Home (Police), Home (Jails), Education (General and P.T.M.) and Sericulture and Weaving.

2. The Accounts and the Report were laid on the Table of the House on the 13th September, 1966. The Committee examined these at its sittings held on 17th, 18th May, 25th, 26th, 27th and 28th July, 1967. A list of Officers examined and time taken for examination has been appended to this Report as Appendix I.

3. The Committee considered and finalised the Report at its sittings held on 25th September, 1967.

4. A statement showing the summary of the main conclusions/recommendations together with comments of the Committee is given in Part II of this Report.

5. The Committee places on record its appreciation of the assistance rendered to it in the examination of these accounts by the Accountant General, Assam and Nagaland and his staff. The Committee also expresses its thanks to the Officers of the Departments concerned for the co-operation extended by them in giving information to the Committee during the course of evidence.

SHILLONG:

The 25th September, 1967.

**GAURISANKAR BHATTACHARYYA,**  
Chairman,  
Public Accounts Committee.

## HEALTH DEPARTMENT

### Paragraph 18 at page 34 of the Audit Report, 1966

1.1. The Audit Paragraph brings out that a sum of Rs.14,823 <sup>2003</sup> ~~2200~~ withdrawn by the Civil Surgeon, Lakhimpur from the treasury during March, 1963 for repairs, etc., of a State Dispensary (Rs.9,823) and for reservation of beds and payment of financial assistance to displaced T. B. patients (Rs.5,000). No repair work was done as the contractor entrusted with it (in November, 1962) did not start the work. Payment of financial assistance was also not made to the displaced T. B. patients. The entire amount was refunded into treasury in April, 1964 after having been retained for one year.

1.2. The Committee wanted to know from the Departmental witness as to whether in this case there was violation of Subsidiary Order 50 of the Assam Treasury Rules according to which the funds could not be withdrawn unless required for immediate disbursement and if it was such a case what action was taken against the persons concerned for breach of the financial rules.

1.3. The Departmental witness stated in evidence that such withdrawal in advance of requirement was certainly done in contravention of the existing rules. The Director of Health Services had been asked to call for explanation of the officers. On query, the Departmental witness replied that the money was kept by the Civil Surgeon concerned in his cash chest and he had no personal account.

### Comments and Recommendations

1.4. The Committee views it with concern that in spite of its recommendations in the past, such a case of irregular drawal of money has occurred in the Health Department. The Department has not yet taken any action against the officers for violation of financial rules.

1.5. The Committee would like the Department to take necessary steps as would ensure that financial rules are not contravened. Action taken against the concerned officers should be intimated to the Committee within one month from the date of presentation of this Report to the House. In future, sanction for drawal of funds should be issued well ahead of March so that funds can be utilised in proper time.

The Finance Department should also note and make provisions for appropriate disciplinary action in such cases of violation of established financial rules.

### Paragraph 42 at pages 45-46 of the Audit Report, 1966

1.6. The Audit paragraph brings out that a test-audit of the accounts of Civil Surgeons of Shillong, Dhubri, Tezpur and Silchar conducted during 1964-65 indicated excess payments totalling Rs. 98,406 to a supplier of medicines, etc., during 1959-60 to 1964-65.

1.7. It was found that according to the agreement entered into with the supplier, he was to be paid for at the rates approved by the Purchase Board of the Department. But in 122 cases payments were made at higher rates resulting in excess payment of Rs. 71,194. No records were produced to Audit indicating the considerations, if any, for payments in excess of the approved rates.

1.8. It was also seen that for the articles costing Rs. 10,060 the supplier was paid twice by the Civil Surgeon, Shillong, once (in September, 1962 to February, 1963) on the original bills of the firm and again (in September 1962 and March, 1963) on the duplicate copy of the bills. Although the double payment was reported to Government in July, 1964 by Audit there was no information regarding recovery of the amount and fixation of responsibility till April, 1967.

1.9. Further, it was found that though according to the terms of agreement, the rates of medicines, etc., were F. O. R. Railway Station, nearest to the destination, the supplier was paid Rs. 17,152 on account of packing, forwarding and insurance charges. No records could be produced to Audit indicating consideration for these payments.

1.10. The Committee at the outset desired to know the action taken by the Department on the respective Civil Surgeons for excess payment of Rs. 98,406. The Departmental witness stated that objection relating to Silchar had been settled and departmental proceedings against the other three Civil Surgeons had been started in January, 1966 and in April, 1966. Asked as to whether the extent of liability had been assessed and accepted and the double payment adjusted, the Departmental witness replied that the Company had agreed to refund the excess payment. The extent of liability however, had not been assessed.

1.11. The Committee enquired as to why the company had been considered so indispensable. The witness stated that since the company was a very reputable firm for many years and the mischief was done by some employees of the firm, the Government thought it proper to resume business with it. In January, 1966, the Government stopped every purchase from the firm and when the company changed its local management after one year, the Government decided to resume business with it.

1.12. In answer to a question as to whether the particular allegations against the company were found to be correct or not, the witness stated that in general they were correct. Then the Committee asked as to what was the actual reason for revising its earlier decision to stop further orders pending finalisation of the enquiry into the matter and resume business with the firm. The witness stated that the local management of the firm had changed and the present management had given an assurance that such things would not recur and the Government was satisfied with the assurance.

### Recommendations

1.13. In this case, the evidence brought by the department before the Committee indicates that Firms' business practices have certainly not been beyond reproach. They have employed various doubtful means to obtain extra payment from the Government.

In spite of such serious irregularities, the Government resumed its business dealing with the firm on the plea that the firm had changed its local management and had accepted the liability to refund the excess payment to the firm and the firm had given an assurance to the effect that such irregularities would not recur. In the opinion of the Committee, these are not very convincing grounds. As has been revealed, in its past dealings also, the firm proved itself to be unreliable.

1.14. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Government should carefully investigate whether resumption of business with the firm was justified or whether the firm ought to be black-listed for such serious irregular deals with the Government. The Committee should be apprised of the result of the investigation.

The action taken against the Civil Surgeons should be intimated to the Committee within six months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

1.15. The Committee would like the Department to examine the system of purchase/supplies to various districts and Subdivisional Institutions, the mode of payments to the supplier in order to ascertain as to whether there is any loop-hole in the system itself so as to avoid further loss.

A report on the aforesaid points should reach the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

**Paragraph 68 at pages 60-61 of the Audit Report, 1966**

1.16. This paragraph shows that Medical and Surgical equipment worth Rs.4.02 lakhs remained unutilised for about 2—3 years in the Medical College, Gauhati because of the bottle-neck created by non-installation of three-Phase electrical line which was entrusted to the Public Works Department.

**Recommendation**

1.17. The Committee recommends that the Department should issue instructions that all impediments (like absence of various installations and fittings to the hospital buildings) should be removed expeditiously so that medical and surgical equipments can be put to use soon after their purchase.

**Paragraph 61 at page 55 of the Audit 1966—Delay in effecting Settlement with Treasuries for remittances**

1.18. The Committee desires that the Department should take immediate steps to settle the outstanding items without delay and report to the Committee about the settlement within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

**Paragraph 65 at page 59 of the Audit Report, 1966—Excessive Stock**

1.19. The Committee has been given to understand by the Departmental witness that they had proposed to regularise the objections raised by Audit by raising the limit of Gauhati Division No.1 and fixing a stock limit for Aijal Division. A report in this regard should be sent to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

**Paragraph 69 at page 61 of the Audit Report, 1966**

1. 20. In March, 1956, an amount of Rs.0.63 lakh was drawn by the D. C., Kamrup for the purchase and installation of a sterilizer machine in the Emigration Hospital, Gauhati. The Sterilizer purchased in May, 1956 at a cost of Rs.0.46 lakh remained unutilised (January 1966) even after 9 years of its purchase, in a temporary shed constructed at a cost of Rs.0.02 lakh. It was stated by the Government to the Audit that the machine could not be put to use for want of accommodation and a boiler. The Audit paragraph further indicates that the unspent balance of Rs 0.15 lakh has been retained (since December, 1956) under "Revenue Deposit" a head of account to which the transaction does not pertain.

1. 21. The Committee at the outset wanted to know as to why no arrangement for installing the sterilizer was made by the Department when the orders for the plant was placed. The Departmental witness stated that it was a mistake on the part of the Department. When asked about the present position regarding purchase of boiler, the Departmental witness stated that the boiler was expected to arrive within six months. The Departmental witness further informed the Committee that the necessity of a boiler was not felt at the time of purchase of the plant as the supplying company did not state that a boiler would be required to run the sterilizer. The Committee then enquired whether the sterilizer was in working order to which the Departmental witness replied in the affirmative. The Departmental witness further informed that the sterilizer was purchased for the Emigration Hospital, Gauhati under a different scheme and this could not be utilised there. After the Medical College was established, the necessity of the sterilizer was felt.

**Comment and Recommendation**

1. 22. This case reveals that the Sterilizer machine purchased in May, 1956 at a cost of Rs.0.46 lakh remained unutilised even after 9 years of its purchase. It transpires from the evidence tendered that the Department was even not aware of the necessity of a boiler to run the sterilizer plant. No accommodation was made for installing the plant, a temporary shed was constructed to keep the sterilizer at a cost of Rs.0.02 lakh. So the sterilizer could not be put into commission for want of a boiler and accommodation. The machine could not be utilized for the Emigration Hospital for which it was purchased.

1. 23. The Committee feels that the matter was not dealt with earnestly by the Departmental Officers to avoid unnecessary locking up of capital. The unspent balance of Rs.0.15 lakh was also not refunded to the Treasury but it was placed under Revenue Deposit.

1. 24. The Committee, therefore, feels that the whole matter calls for an enquiry for fixation of responsibility on the officer or officers concerned for not taking adequate care and caution in purchasing the machine and for its utilisation in time. The result of the enquiry should be intimated to the Committee within three months from the date of placing of this Report to the House,

**Paragraph 3 at pages 112—113 of the Audit Report, 1966**

1. 25. The Audit paragraph indicates that 8 kutcha houses constructed by the Public Works Department at the cost of Rs.9,485 at Daldali (North Cachar Hills District), to serve as Leprosy subsidiary Centre, were handed over to the Medical Department in December, 1963. In 1964, four of the houses (cost Rs 4,212) were destroyed by fire. The remaining 4 houses were reported (in November, 1965) by the Civil Surgeon, Diphu to be unfit for human habitation. The Department thus suffered a loss of Rs.9,485 in this case.

1. 26. In July, 1966, the Department intimated to Audit that the cost of construction of 8 Kutcha houses was Rs.22,627.

The Committee enquired as to whether any investigation was made to find out the cause of fire. The Departmental witness stated in evidence that the matter was referred to the police and the police reported that it was an accidental fire. On a further query, the Departmental witness informed the Committee that the other four houses did not last long and they were destroyed.

**Comment and Recommendation**

1. 27. In this case, there was no Departmental investigation to ascertain the cause of fire and no watch and ward arrangement was made by the Department for security of the houses which should have been made in the normal way. Though the site was selected by a Civil Surgeon it was declared unfit for human habitation subsequently and no alternative site has been selected as yet. The Committee could not understand as to why no Departmental investigation was made to ascertain the cause of fire; this is a lapse on the part of the Department. The entire matter seems to be dealt in the Department without proper care and caution and this calls for enquiry to ascertain whether there was any laxity at any stage in fixing the responsibility. A report on action taken on the recommendation should be sent to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

Grant No.18 at pages 38-39 of the Appropriation Accounts, 1964-65.

1. 28. The Committee recommends that the Department should scrupulously avoid such type of bad budgetting and loose control over the expenditure which seems to have become a habit with the Department.

**ANIMAL HUSBANDRY AND VETERINARY DEPARTMENT**

**Paragraph 26 at page 38 of the Audit Report, 1966**

2.1. The Audit paragraph brings out that out of 29 buffaloes and cows purchased for Rs.38,000 during March 1960 to May 1962 for Berhampur Cattle Farm 14 cows (cost Rs.17,545) stopped yielding milk after December 1962, they were stated to have lost the yielding capacity. The animals were, however, disposed of by auction for Rs.1,047 only during October-December 1963, about one year after they have become useless for the farm. This resulted in an infructuous expenditure of Rs.6,290 incurred on their feed and fodder during this period (December 1962 to December 1963). The loss in auction was Rs.16,498.



2.2. The Committee at the outset wanted to know wherefrom the cows were purchased. The Departmental witness stated that these were purchased from Rohtak (In Haryana).

Asked as to who selected the agency to purchase the cattle, the witness replied that two officers of the Department purchased the cattle and one of them was a professional expert; and further stated that fifty per cent of the cost of the cattle was paid at the initial milk testing of the cattle and the rest was paid after final milk testing at Government farm.

The witness further stated that it was the practice in the Department to allow a rebate in the yielding capacity of milk considering the long journey the cows undertook; altogether five milk tests were done to determine the average milk yield. Immediately after five tests, it was found that the milk yield became less than half and some foul play was detected in the process of milking. On a query, the witness stated that no medical history sheet of the cattle was maintained. With regard to proposal for culling, the culling were due to (i) old age, (ii) unproductiveness of a cow, (iii) Management defects, (iv) different environmental conditions and (v) Parasite infections which were highly prevalent in the State.

2.3. The following statement collected from the evidence reveals the full picture of the deal in this regard—

	Rs.	p.
1. The total purchase price of the cows ... ..	17,545	00
2. Expenditure on feed and upkeep ... ..	37,588	00
3. Total amount received from sale of milk ... ..	17,979	00
4. Value of calves (10 numbers) ... ..	1,000	00
5. Total sale proceed from auction calves at Rs.25 ... ..	250	00
6. Net loss ... ..	35,857	00

### Recommendation

2.4. The Committee is constrained to observe that the matter call for a thorough enquiry at the departmental level for fixing responsibility for lapse on the part of officers or officer concerned for which Government had to incurred large amount of loss. The Department should also immediately examine and outline a detailed procedure for such purchases, management of the Farm, and on other ancillary matters so as to safeguard the financial interest of the Government.

**Paragraph 27 at pages 38-39 of the Audit Report, 1966—Scheme for establishment of Goat and Duck farm**

2.5. The Audit paragraph brings out that under the Livestock Production Scheme, a Goat and Duck Farm was set up at Silkuri in Cachar District in January, 1963. Six hundred and twenty-four Goats were purchased during March, 1963 at a cost of Rs.21,840. Of these, 506, costing Rs.17,710 died between March and August, 1963. The Disease Investigation Officer, who investigated into the causes of death, reported (August, 1963) that the environmental condition of the Silkuri Farm was not congenial for rearing Goats in large number and advised that the goats should be removed immediately to a place where better care and management were available. Of the remaining 118 goats, 9 were transferred to the Veterinary Officer, Diphu and 109 costing Rs.3,815 were sold in public auction in 1964 for Rs.979.

2.6. The Committee wanted to know as to why goats were purchased in large number for the farm without ascertaining suitability of the place for rearing goats. The witness while explaining the matter stated that the site was selected by a team of experts. Asked to whether it was a fact that the Disease Investigation Officer who investigated into the causes of death reported that the environmental condition of the farm was not congenial for rearing goats, the witness stated that the Officer was expert only in Cattle disease and not an expert in Goat disease. The witness further stated that unfortunately an epidemic prevailed in the farm, whereupon the Department decided to close down the farm and transfer and sell out the goats. Asked as to how that place had been utilised, the witness replied that the farm had been utilised as a duck and poultry farm. The Committee then wanted to know why the Department failed to furnish correct information to the Accountant General in reply to the draft paragraph sent for comments. The witness stated that the earlier comments sent to the Accountant General were not based on correct assessment.

2.7. The Committee does not see any reason why the Department was not careful in giving proper and correct comments on draft paragraph. The Department should be careful in future.

2.8. The Committee then enquired whether the goats afflicted by disease were sent to any hospital for treatment. The departmental witness stated that 9 goats were sent to Diphu Hospital. Then the Committee wanted to know as to why the goats were sold at such a low price. The Departmental witness replied that they were sold in auction. The Departmental witness then described how the goats were sold and who conducted the sale.

### RECOMMENDATION

2.9. According to the Report of the Disease Investigation Officer who reported in 1963, the environmental condition of the farm was not congenial for rearing goats in large number. The Officer advised that the goats should be removed immediately to a better place. The report of the Officer was accepted by the then Director of Animal Husbandry and Veterinary. The Departmental witness contended that the investigation Officer was an expert in Cattle diseases and not an expert in goat diseases and that an epidemic

broke out in the farm due to which such mortality resulted. The Committee cannot accept the present views of the Department since they in their earlier report to the Accountant General did not state the above facts, nor does the Department inform the Audit subsequently that their earlier report was not based on proper assessment and that the report was not correct. The following are the informations obtained by the Committee from records:—

1. On 21st of February, 1964—30 Goats were sold in auction at Rs.300.
2. On 30th March, 1964 another lot numbering 34 was sold at a price of Rs.304 and the total receipt was Rs 979.
3. On the first auction there were only five bidders.
4. On the second sale, the same number of bidders were there.
5. The book value of the last lot was Rs 1,575.
6. The senior officers of the Department were reported to have conducted the sale.
7. The site of auction was 23 miles from Silchar Town.

The Committee recommends that the whole matter should be probed into by an independent agency to ascertain whether there was any laxity in (1) choosing the site, (2) the cause of death of goats, (3) the manner of auction conducted and (4) whether the project was properly investigated before executing the scheme. Report of the enquiry together with a report on the action taken by Government thereon should be sent to the Committee within 3 months of the date from submission of this report to the Assembly.

**Paragraph 87 at page 71 of the Audit Report—1966—Scheme for Grant of Loans for Live-stock Industry**

2.10. According to the Audit Paragraph, the Scheme provided for disbursement of loans to private institutions and Political Sufferers for live-stock industry, Loans amounting to Rs.2.34 lakhs were disbursed to Private institutions during 1957-58 to 1961-62. A sum of Rs.0.75 lakhs was drawn in March, 1963 for being advanced to Political Sufferers, but the amount was refunded into the treasury after one year of its drawal in March, 1964. The withdrawal of funds in March, 1963 was made apparently to avoid lapse of the allotted funds. A sum of Rs.2.38 lakhs (Principal Rs.1.91 lakhs and interest Rs.0.47 lakh) was outstanding on March, 1965. According to the terms and conditions, a loan is required to be secured adequately and is not to exceed 50 per cent of the value of the property offered as security. The loans in the instant case were, however, disbursed without assessing the value of the security offered by the borrowers.

2.11. The Committee wanted to know whether the loanees had been continuing the industry and what were the institutions receiving the loans and whether the loanees were all political sufferers. The Departmental witness stated that they could not ascertain whether the loanees had been continuing the industry since they had no organisation to follow up the loan cases. The witness also informed that among the

loanees there were few political sufferers but most of them were "breeders". Asked as to whether the loans advanced to the loanees were utilised for the purpose for which these were advanced, the witness stated that there was no agency to do the checking but recently they had been thinking to take it up. The Committee then enquired whether Government proposed to levy penal interest on the defaulters. The witness stated in reply that there was no provision for penal interest and the compound interest might be taken as penal interest.

2-12. The Committee then desired to know as to why the amount of Rs.1.75 lakhs withdrawn by the Department could not be disbursed. The Departmental witness replied that the money could not be disbursed because the rules regulating the grant of loans were not yet framed.

### Comments and Recommendation

2-13. In this case, it transpired from the evidence as well as from the records at the disposal of Audit that the Department embarked on an immature Scheme without finalising the preliminary requisites for successful implementation of the Scheme. Funds were withdrawn for disbursement to loanees without finalising the necessary rules for disbursement. The loans were advanced to individuals only a few of whom were stated to be political sufferers though the Scheme provided for disbursement of loans to political sufferers for live-stock industry. The Scheme did not provide for any loan to any individual who was not a political sufferer. The Scheme also provided that the live-stock farm established by the loanees should be inspected periodically by the Department which was not apparently done by the Department. The Departmental witness could not say whether the loanees fulfilled conditions imposed on them by the terms of the loan. It was also not properly checked by Department whether half-yearly returns were submitted by the loanees. A large sum of money was withdrawn on 30th March by the Department in utter violation of existing financial rules in order to avoid lapse of grant. The Committee recommends that such breach of rules by the Department which resulted in blocking of money should be severely dealt with and action should be taken against the defaulting officer or officers. The records available with Audit indicate that the Department could not furnish even in April, 1965 any record showing the securities obtained from the loanees. This is a serious matter and requires to be enquired into. According to the terms and conditions, a loan is required to be secured adequately and is not to exceed 50 per cent of the value of the property offered as security. It was also not known whether personal security was obtained by the Deputy Commissioner before disbursement of the loans.

Therefore, the Committee finds that there has been laxity of proper supervision at all stages, in realisation of loans in time, in finalising matters in time which resulted in slow disbursement of the loans and unsuccessful implementation of the Scheme.

The Government should enquire into the matter thoroughly so as to ascertain the (I) causes of improper realisation of the loans, (II) the actual utilisation, of the loan, (III) causes of non-finalisation of necessary rules in time (IV) whether there was any deviation from the original Scheme in selecting the class of loanees, etc. and other ancillary matters and to fix responsibility on the officer or officers for whose fault the Scheme utterly failed. A report in this regard should reach the committee within three months from the date of Presentation of this Report to the House.

The Committee recommends that in all such schemes care should be taken to see that preparation for the follow-up programme is made in order to ensure that the purpose of the scheme is successfully carried out.

A statement showing the up-to-date position of realisation of loans should be submitted immediately to the Committee through the Accountant General, Assam.

### **Animal Husbandry and Veterinary (Fishery) Department**

#### **Paragraph 36 at page 43 of the Audit Report, 1966**

3-1. Jongalbalahugarh fish farm in the Nowgong District was reclaimed and renovated in 1957-58 at a cost of Rs.3.68 lakhs. A further non-recurring expenditure of Rs.1.07 lakhs was incurred by the Department during 1958-59 to 1964-65. The farm was expected to yield a net profit of Rs.13,000 per annum. The proforma accounts to assess the financial results were not prepared for any year. It has, however, been noticed by Audit that the revenue of Rs.0.74 lakh earned up to the end of March, 1965 (from 1954-55) was not even sufficient to cover the maintenance expenditure (Rs.0.90 lakh excluding interest on Capital, depreciation on assets, etc.)

3-2. The Committee wanted to know how the production of Fish was originally estimated by the Department. The witness replied that the original estimate was a guesswork and ultimately experience showed that the estimate was on the high side. Asked as to why the Department could not earn the estimated profit in spite of price of fish being very high, the Departmental witness replied that the Department fixed Rs 3.50p. per Kg. of fish during fishing season and Rs.4.50p. per Kg. during scarcity period. The witness further stated that among other factors due to non-availability of Catla seeds, the annual production had been greatly affected. The stocking programme could not be carried out successfully due to natural calamities such as draught, etc. Then the Committee wanted to know about the reason for low yielding capacity of the Coconut trees in the farm unlike the trees in the neighbouring areas belonging to private individuals. The witness stated in reply that the matter had been referred to the Agriculture Department for advice and some of the trees had been suffering from some kind of disease.

#### **Recommendation**

3-3. The Committee recommends that the proforma accounts should be prepared regularly and submitted to the Committee through the Accountant General within a period of six months from the date of placing this Report to the House. The Department should take suitable steps to improve the working of the farm so that the Farm can atleast be run at no profit no loss basis if not on profit. The action taken should be reported to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

The Committee further recommends that Government should consider whether it would not be worthwhile to convert this farm into a nursery farm instead of commercial farm as at present.

**Paragraph 37 at page 43 of the Audit Report, 1966**

3.4. The Audit Paragraph brings out a loss of Rs.18,669 incurred by the Government during 1957-58 to 1964-65 in connection with the maintenance of two fishery tanks at Bhagabazar and Behara in Cachar District. The total recurring expenditure during the period was Rs.22,501 Capital expenditure on these tanks during the period amounted to Rs.84,565.

3.5. With regard to the Islamabad tank in Bhagabazar, it was stated by the Department that growth of major carps in the tank was not satisfactory and the Department decided to utilise the tank for culture of Tilapia by which and also by restricting the maintenance cost, the project would be profitably maintained. The Department also indicated that Rajadighi tank in Behara was very large and deep and as such fishing could not be done properly. Attempts were being made to improve fishing and to restrict the maintenance costs so that the project could earn profit.

3.6. The Committee wanted to know the recurring expenditure incurred by the Department in these two tanks, but this could not be furnished to the Committee. Asked as to whether the Fishery Department had any concrete scheme to restrict the maintenance cost, the Departmental witness stated that the Fishery Department handed over the tank to the Panchayat in lieu of some suitable tanks as a Nursery seed Farm. The farm would be utilised as a breeding centre for common fish as well as raising the major carp seeds in the adjacent nurseries.

3.7. The Committee then wanted to know as to whether factors like depth of tanks and their suitability for establishment of good fishery were taken into consideration where the scheme was taken up. The Departmental witness could not categorically confirm that the disadvantages were known to them at that stage. On a query, the Departmental witness could only state that Islamabad tank in Bhaga Bazar had since been handed over to the Panchayat.

**Comments and Recommendation**

3.8. It transpired from the evidence that these Fishery Projects were taken up by Government in a hurry without proper examination. The Committee regrets to note that the economic aspect of these projects were not taken into consideration at the initial stage. It seems that these schemes were taken up in the first Five-Year Plan because funds were available with the Department which had to be spent so that they did not lapse, as a result of which an amount of Rs.84,565 on capital expenditure apart from recurring expenditure proved to be almost infructuous. The Committee has also come to know that this matter was gone through by the Estimates Committee which made some valuable recommendations. The action taken by the Department on the recommendations of the Estimates Committee should be intimated to this Committee for their appraisal.

**Para 78 at pages 65-66 of the Audit Report, 1966**

3.9. The Audit Paragraph brings out loss of revenue incurred by the Department in connection with the settlement of a fishery (Dangri River Part II Fishery) by the Deputy Commissioner, Lakhimpur with a lessee for 3 years from the 1st April, 1957 at an annual rent of Rs.16,000. The paragraph also indicates that the fishery could not be operated upon fully during

1957-58 due to an alleged boundary dispute between public and the lessee. The lessee paid only Rs.799 on account of rent of the fishery till November, 1958, when it was decided by the Deputy Commissioner to resale the lease at the cost of the lessee as per terms and conditions of the contract.

3.10. The Committee at the outset, wanted to know the present position of the case. The Departmental witness informed that the surety's land was attached as the lessee had no property. Asked as to whether it was examined to see that the lessee had assets at the time of granting the lease, the witness replied: "Possibly it was seen. That is not done now-a-days. When the fishery is sold by tender, it is generally settled with the highest bidder and it is not seen whether he has got any property or not. The question of security comes in when he cannot give.....in this case the lessee gave cash security and for the rest he put up a surety who had some land".

3.10. The Committee then wanted to know whether the property shown by the surety was fictitious. The witness stated that there was no bidder and Government took it at Re.1. Asked as to under whose possession the land was at present, the witness stated that the land was in the possession of the owner. Enquired as to what was the nature of the boundary dispute, the witness replied that actually it was not a case of boundary dispute. The people of the neighbouring villages did not allow the lessee to fish in the fishery. Asked as to whether people had any legitimate ground for such obstruction the witness replied in the negative and further stated that police action had to be taken.

3.11. It further transpires that the lease of the fishery was cancelled on 19th November 1958 and the Deputy Commissioner gave orders for resale of the fishery at the cost of the *ex-lessee* according to the terms and conditions of the lease. On resale, the Deputy Commissioner recommended the highest bidder, who offered Rs.6,660 for confirmation by the Commissioner. The Commissioner in his letter, dated 25th May 1965 held that the highest bidder was also a lessee of several fisheries and the second highest bidder's bid being less by only Rs.50 from the highest bid the fishery might be settled with the second highest bidder provided he agreed to take the lease Rs.6,550. less 10% rebate. The said bidder agreed to take the fishery. Then it was reported by the highest bidder that the second highest bidder was a defaulter in respect of a fishery settled by the Forest Department and as such according to the term of the sale, he was not entitled to get the fishery. But in spite of that, the fishery was settled with the second highest bidder for the period from 1st September 1959 to 31st March 1960 at Rs.6,600 less 10 per cent rebate.

### Comment and Recommendations

3.12. The Committee is surprised to know that the surety of the lessee is still in possession of his land which was put to auction and then purchased by the Government at Re.1 as there was no bidder. No effective steps have been taken to evict the unlawful occupier of the Government land by the Department which calls for an enquiry for fixation of responsibility. The Bakijai cases started against the lessee for realisation of the balance amount of Rs.17,351 had to be struck off as no property was found for attachment but according to rules it is to be ascertained before settlement that the lessee is financially sound.

3.13. The Committee also finds no justification for grant of remission of the entire revenue of Rs.16,000 as the report of the Sub-Deputy Collector indicates that the lessee earned a revenue of Rs.1,500 during 1957-58. As against Rs.1,500, he deposited only Rs.799.50 p. The settlement on resale was also made to a bidder who has been disqualified for any settlement under the rules.

3.14. In view of the above, the Committee recommends that the entire case calls for a departmental enquiry so as to fix responsibility for the lapses committed by the officers dealing with the ten'ers as well as for not operating the existing law in time in order to safe-guard the financial interest of the Government. Action taken on the recommendation should be reported to the Committee within a course three months from the date of presentation of this report to the House.

### REVENUE DEPARTMENT

#### Paragraph 5(c) at page 10 of the Audit Report, 1966

4.1. The Committee does not see any reason why the Department could not realise the outstanding loans amounting to Rs.1.84 lakhs (without interest). The Committee recommends that the Department should take energetic steps to realise the loans and in future the Department should not issue loans to defaulters unless and until the arrear is fully realised. The action taken should be reported to the Committee in due course.

#### Paragraph 5(d) at page 11 of the Audit Report, 1966

4.2. The Committee feels ~~about~~ that Government should impress upon the Commissioner that he should be very vigorous in the inspection of Deputy Commissioners' establishments and also in the co-ordination of work such as collections of arrears of revenue, loans, verification of balances, etc. The action taken and progress made in this direction should be reported to the Committee from time to time.

#### Paragraph 51 at page 50 of the Audit Report, 1966

4.3. The Committee desires that the arrear amount of Rs.15,000 should be realised from the allottees as early as possible. In future the Revenue Department should be careful in examining the area of the land to be acquired so as to ascertain the actual condition of the land before payment of compensation so that financial interest of the Government is safeguarded adequately by the Departmental Officers who are meant for it.

#### Paragraph 77 at page 65 of the Audit Report, 1966

4.4. The Audit paragraph indicates that in Sibsagar Subdivision, Revenue Officer detected a misappropriation of Rs.32,163 by the Mouzadar of Mourabazar Mouza of land revenue collected by him during 1953-54 and 1954-55. In October, 1956 Government passed orders for suspension and prosecution of the Mouzadar, but these were stayed by them in January, 1957. In March, 1959 the younger brother of the previous Mouzadar assumed charge of the Mouza under instructions from Government but he also misappropriated land revenue to the extent of Rs.49,342 collected by him during 1959-60 and 1960-61. The Mouzadar was placed under suspension in October, 1961, when the charge of the Mouza was taken over by the Sub-Deputy Collector. Out of Rs. 81,505 misappropriated by



the two brothers, a sum of Rs. 5,200 was realised in cash during 1961 and their landed property, the value of which was estimated at Rs. 62,974 by the Department was made 'Sarkari' as no bid was offered by the public for the purchase of the property. The Government stated in November, 1965 that a sum of about Rs. 15,000 was under process of recovery and adjustment against the balance of the defalcated amount. The manner of disposal or utilisation of the pledged landed property was stated to be under consideration of the District Officer.

4.5. The Committee wanted to know as to when the Revenue Officer detected the first case of misappropriation. The witness replied that the Revenue Officer detected the case in May, 1955. On query, the witness stated that the Mouzadar was expected to deposit the revenue within three months, but in the meantime, he requested the Government to allow three more months of time. Thereafter, the Subdivisional Officer, issued notice to deposit the amount within 31st August, 1955 and at that time the misappropriated amount was to the tune of Rs. 18,000. The Government again granted the Mouzadar further time for three months. In the meantime, another inspection of the Mouza was conducted and it was found as a result of the inspection that misappropriation was to the tune of Rs. 29,000. Thereupon the Government issued an order to obtain additional security and to realise the entire defalcated amount by 10th January, 1956. The Mouzadar did not pay the amount and the Sub-Deputy Collector was asked to take over charge of the Mouza, but the Mouzadar was allowed to function as Mouzadar for 15 days on his furnishing an additional security of Rs. 54,000. In June, 1956 the Mouzadar and his brother jointly prayed for transfer of the Mouzadarship with all liabilities in the name of the brother.

4.6. Asked as to whether the Mouzadar was prosecuted, the witness could not furnish the exact information but he stated that the Mouzadar was suspended. The Committee then wanted to know as to whether the properties of these Mouzadars were confiscated and sold. The witness stated that the properties were confiscated and were put to auction but since no bid was offered, the properties were made Sarkari. Asked as to whether the properties were still in the possession of the occupiers, the witness stated in reply that the lands were in occupation of the defaulters and notice under Rule 150 of A. L. R. was served on them and on receiving the notice the sons of the defaulters prayed for settlement of the lands with them. Then the Sub-Divisional Officer was asked to take possession of the property by evicting the defaulters and no further report had been sent to Government as to the present position.

### Comments and Recommendations

4.7. The Committee feels that in this case Government showed unimagineable leniency to the defaulters who misappropriated a huge amount of Government money. The properties of these Mouzadars are still in their possession and no prompt action was taken to evict them.

4.8. The Committee therefore recommends that the whole matter calls for an enquiry by an independent agency so as to ascertain (i) grounds on which undue leniency was shown to the Mouzadars, (ii) causes of delay in evicting them from the lands purchased by Government (iii) if there was any lapse in the inspection of the Mouzas timely, (iv) steps taken to follow up the criminal case referred to police against the second Mouzadar.

4.9. A report of the enquiring agency should be submitted together with a report relating to the action taken by Government thereon within six months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

**HOME (POLICE) DEPARTMENT****Paragraph 39(a) at page 44 of the Audit Report, 1966**

5.1. The Committee would like to draw the attention of the Department to its recommendation contained at page 2 of its Report on Audit Report, 1964, etc., relating to replies to draft paragraphs sent by Audit and urge upon the Department to strictly adhere to the directions of the Committee referred to above.

**Paragraph 39(b) at page 44 of the Audit Report, 1966**

5.2. In this case, the Committee feels that the Department should have asked the Contractor to supply he-goats in place of ram at the same rate. In future, if a Contractor fails to supply meat of a particular variety and instead supplies lower quality meat, he should be paid at the lower rate. Suitable provisions for this should be made in the contract deed after obtaining legal opinion. Finance Department also should take note of this recommendation.

**Paragraph 40 at pages 44-45 of the Audit Report, 1966**

5.3. The Committee would like to know about the result of the departmental proceedings as soon as they are finalised. Progress in the matter should be intimated to the Committee from time to time.

**HOME (JAILS) DEPARTMENT****Paragraph 41 at page 45 of the Audit Report, 1966**

5.4. The Committee would like to be appraised of the final result of the proceedings against the officers at fault and this should be intimated to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of the Report to the House.

**EDUCATION (GENERAL) DEPARTMENT****Paragraph 117 at page 91 of the Audit Report, 1966**

6.1. The Audit Paragraph indicates misappropriation of Government grants for the period from 1958-59 to 1961-62 totalling Rs. 9,280 by the Headmaster of Taradubi Government Aided M. E. School by not entering the amounts in the books of the School. The Headmaster was stated to have absconded in December, 1961. The misappropriation was detected during test-check of the accounts of the Deputy Inspector of Schools, Diphu, conducted in June, 1963.

6.2. The Committee wanted to know as to whether the Headmaster had been found out. The witness stated that he had been arrested and the court case was going on. Asked as to whether there was any machinery to stop such kind of things, the witness stated that without receiving the utilisation certificate of a particular grant no further grant was given. But in some cases, it was not possible to adhere to it strictly. In this case

the Department did not insist on utilisation certificate since it was a non-recurring grant. Normally Inspectors on their tour used to check up these matters. This case was detected by the Inspector. The witness further added that the Audit staff is also not adequate to cope with the increased volume of work and the matter of increasing the staff should be considered by the Examiner of Local Accounts.

Asked about the present position of the case in the court, the witness stated that the case was still in the court.

### **Recommendation**

6.3. Results of the Departmental proceedings, if already drawn up, together with the decision of the court should be intimated to the Committee. The remedial measures proposed to be taken by the Department should also be taken immediately in order to stop recurrence of such cases.

**Paragraph 118 at pages 91-92 read with serial No. 12 of Appendix XI at page 155 non-submission of utilisation certificates.**

6.4. The Committee recommends that while sanctioning grants in subsequent years, the Department should take into account earlier performance of the defaulting institutions so that cases of non-submission of utilisation certificates by these institutions are not allowed to continue further.

**Paragraph 122 at page 93 of the Audit Report, 1966**

6.5. The Audit Paragraph brings out that the accounts of grant to non-Government Educational Institutions are going from bad to worse.

Secondly, the sub-paragraph indicates that as against misappropriation involving a total sum of Rs. 74,945 in 18 Educational Institutions (reported by the Examiner, Local Accounts) only a sum of Rs. 7,976 was recovered upto May, 1966.

6.6. Lastly, it has been indicated in another sub-paragraph that proper utilisation of Government grants (Rs. 4.58 lakhs paid during 1963-64) to 7 units under the Elementary Education Board could not be checked by the Examiner, Local Accounts, as according to him the connected accounts registers were either incomplete or not maintained and in some cases, relevant sanctions were not available to him.

6.7. The Committee at the outset wanted to know what steps Government had taken to remove the defects pointed out by the Examiner of Local Accounts who remarked that the position had further deteriorated. The witness stated that the Examiner of Local Accounts had been asked to furnish details of the Schools and a general instruction to maintain registers in proper manner by all Schools had been issued by the Director. Asked as to whether the Department had ascertained whether the instructions were actually followed by the Schools, the witness stated that they had been waiting for the list of Schools which did not maintain proper accounts from the Examiner and no reply had been received from him. A reminder had also been issued in November, 1966.

### Comments & Recommendations

6.8. In this case, the Committee is surprised to find that in many cases, drawals and disbursement of grants to non-Government Educational Institutions were not recorded in the cash books by the Institutions and no uniform and approved accounting procedure was followed by the Institutions making it difficult for auditors of the Examiner of Local Accounts to exercise effective check on transactions. It transpired from the evidence that upto 1967 (June) the Education Department has not been able to obtain the names of the defaulting Schools from the Examiner of Local Accounts whose office is situated at Gauhati. The Department remained satisfied by issuing a routine reminder to the Examiner. The Committee does not see any reason why the Department could not obtain the information of such a vital matter involving serious irregularities in Government Accounts. The Committee, therefore, recommends that this matter calls for an enquiry in the Departmental level so as to fix responsibility for the lapses on the officer or officers concerned. The Government would surely appreciate that the things revealed in the Report of the Examiner are very serious in nature and in such a state of affairs, quite a few misappropriation cases might have remained undetected and the more the delay in completion of records, the less is the chance of taking effective action on such cases of misappropriation. The Committee, therefore, recommends that an effective programme for check on these matters should be immediately chalked out by the Department so that things are brought in proper line without further delay.

6.9. The Department should also intimate to the Committee what further amount has been recovered after May, 1966 against misappropriation involving a total sum of Rs. 74,945 in 18 Schools together with the final action taken on the person/persons responsible for misappropriation.

6.10. The Department should in future invariably ensure proper utilisation of earlier grants before payment of fresh grants to an institution where misappropriation occurred and any deviation should be dealt with severely by the Department.

### Paragraph 19 at Pages 34-35 of the Audit Report, 1966

6.11. The Audit Paragraph brings out that the Director of Public Instruction drew in March, 1964 an amount of Rs. 40,000 and remitted it (in the form of bank draft) to the Inspector of Schools, Lower Assam Circle, Gauhati, for payment as grants to selected displaced Goldsmith students. The amount was deposited in April, 1964 by the Inspector into the Assam Co-operative Apex Bank Limited, Gauhati. Of this, an amount of Rs. 22,606 was not utilised and was returned to the Director of Public Instruction a year later, in April, 1965; the amount was refunded by the Director into the Treasury in July, 1965.

In March, 1966, the Department intimated to Audit that the amount of Rs. 22,606 was not disbursed as there was no eligible student. The Department also intimated to Audit that the Assam Co-operative Apex Bank Ltd., Gauhati was being requested "to assess the interest of the amount deposited into Bank and after receipt of report, the interest will be deposited into the Treasury".

6.12. The Committee at the outset wanted to know when the Government decided to pay relief to the displaced goldsmith students and whether any rough estimate of the requirement was made at the time of making the provision or it was just an *ad hoc* amount fixed for the purpose. The witness stated in reply that Government decided to pay relief on 16th April, 1964 and at that time no provision could be made. Hence, it was an *ad hoc* provision. Asked as to on what basis the *ad hoc* provision was made, the witness replied that the Inspector of Schools obtained the particulars from the Schools. At that time the Department did not know the category of students which would be eligible for the relief. Subsequently it was decided that the students should be registered with the Deputy Commissioners or Subdivisional Officers. Asked as to whether wide publicity of the scheme was given so as to enable the deserving persons to apply for the assistance, the Departmental witness replied in the affirmative and added that they requested the Goldsmith Association to give publicity.

6.13. Asked as to why the undisbursed amount of Rs. 22,606 was returned by the Inspector in April, 1965, the witness stated that since the applications did not come in time, the Inspectors had to wait till the last date. The witness further added that the undisbursed amount could have been refunded before the expiry of the financial year.

#### Recommendation

6.14. In this case, the scheme was taken up without properly assessing the number of eligible beneficiaries and the provision was based on rough estimate. The Department withdrew funds in advance of requirement in violation of the existing financial rules as there was no eligible student to receive the grants. The Inspector of Schools furnished lists of eligible students schoolwise and subsequently it was found that many of the applicants were not eligible for the grant as the school authorities who supplied the lists were not very careful in furnishing their lists. The undisbursed amount was not returned in time by the Inspector of Schools.

6.15. The Committee feels that the scheme was not taken up for implementation in right earnest for which a large amount could not be disbursed in time. No attempt seems to have been made by the Department to enquire into the causes of failure of the scheme. The Committee does not see reason why the amount of Rs. 40,000 was withdrawn by the Department in utter violation of Subsidiary Rule 50 of Assam Treasury Rules when the amount was not required for immediate disbursements. The Inspector of Schools should have been asked by the Government to explain his inability to refund the amount in time. It is also not known whether the interest accrued on deposit of the amount in the Apex Bank was assessed and deposited to the Treasury.

6.16. The Committee, therefore, recommends that in future the Department should not embark upon a scheme without ascertaining and finalising the requisites for successful implementation of the scheme. The cases of violation of existing rules should be enquired into for fixation of responsibility and Departmental Officers should be cautioned against such recurrence. The Committee would like to know whether the interest has been deposited to the Treasury in the meantime.

**Paragraph 20 at Page 35 of the Audit Report, 1966**

6-17. The Audit paragraph indicates that the Headmaster of Government High School, Jorhat drew Rs. 38,000 in March, 1964 for purchase of books and equipment. The amount was deposited in the Assam Co-operative Apex Bank Ltd, in the same month. A sum of Rs. 32,999 was spent over a period of 15 months (upto June, 1965).

The Committee wanted to know as to why the existing financial rules were not observed and how could the Headmaster keep the money for 15 months with him. The witness stated that although the amount was provided in the budget, the Department took some time to finalise matters. The Headmaster was required to call quotations for certain instruments. In such cases, the rule requires that the money should be refunded; but the Headmaster utilised the entire money in two years. The Department had now stopped such practice. Asked as to why comments on draft para were not furnished to the Accountant General within the scheduled period, the witness stated that there was lapse on the part of Directorate in this regard.

**Comments and Recommendation**

6-18. The Committee is surprised to find another instance of withdrawal of funds in advance of requirement. In this case also, the provision of fund was made in the budget with marking pre-budget scrutiny of the scheme which is not a healthy financial practice. The Department should in future make provision of fund after making proper scrutiny of the scheme and after finalising the requisite preliminaries so that as soon as the budget is passed, the Department can spend the money in right time. The Committee desires that instructions should be issued in this regard. The Headmaster concerned should be asked to be careful in future. It should also be reported to the Committee whether the Bank has paid the amount of interest to the Government. The Committee would like to know whether the unutilised amount of Rs.500 has since been utilised or refunded by the Headmaster into the Treasury.

The action taken on the recommendation should be reported to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

**Paragraph 34 at page 41 of the Audit Report, 1966**

6-19 The Audit Paragraph indicates retention of heavy cash balance in the Office of the Director of Public Instruction, Shillong. During the period from July, 1962 to June, 1964, the balance in the cash chest of the Director varied from Rs. 0.13 lakh to Rs. 44.62 lakhs.

The Committee wanted to know as to why the Directorate itself kept in hand a huge amount of money which was certainly fraught with risk. The witness stated that such practice had now been discontinued.

6-20 Asked as to why no security had been obtained from the officials responsible for handling cash, the witness replied that a security was obtained in April, 1966. Asked as to what special precaution was being taken for safeguarding Government money, the witness stated that the Department was now keeping bank drafts instead of cash. On a query, the witness stated that the difficulty had been overcome by giving the Director of Public Instruction authority to issue subsidiary sanction and from time to time he used to issue sanctions.

6-20. The Committee observes that drawal of money in advance of requirement and its retention either in the shape of cash or bank draft is not only fraught with risk of loss due to theft, etc., but this also unnecessarily locks up Government money outside the cash balance of Government. Government intimated to Audit that the amount represented grant sanctioned to the Institutions towards the end of financial years and that after drawal, the Director had to ensure that all formalities had been observed to get the grants. The Committee cannot appreciate the practice of sanctioning of grants at the fag end of the financial year and also before examining the requisite formalities. Such practice should be immediately discontinued to avoid serious breach of financial rules. The Committee could not understand why the Director of Public Instruction retained such heavy balances when it was found that the entire amount was not required for immediate disbursement. Such kind of blocking up of Government money outside the cash balance of Government leads to a misleading picture of ways and means position.

6-21. The Committee came to know from the past Audit reports that for the last few years in every year the Government have had to obtain overdrafts from the Reserve Bank of India on payment of interest charges. Such instances are the causes of loss of interest.

6-22. The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Department should issue instructions in the line suggested above to all its officers not to issue sanctions at the fag end of the year and any violation of such practice should meet with disciplinary action. In future, retention of heavy cash balance either in the shape of cash or bank draft should be dealt with severely by the Department. Action taken on the recommendation should be reported to the Committee.

The Finance Department should also note the observations made by the Committee and take action accordingly.

## EDUCATION (TECHNICAL) DEPARTMENT

### Paragraph 33 (a) at page 41 of the Audit Report, 1966

7.1. The Audit paragraph brings out purchase of equipment in excess of requirement. The Paragraph indicates that tools and equipment valued at Rs. 4.86 lakhs purchased during the period of 1955-56 to 1960-61 were lying unused in three Engineering Institutions and that in April, 1964, the Department decided to transfer the equipment to some other Institutions where it might be used.

7.2. Further, in regard to these purchases, Government observed in September, 1963 that the Director and Principals of Engineering Colleges and Diploma Institutes placed orders for tools and equipment separately through misunderstanding and lack of co-ordination thereby causing double or unnecessary purchase of tools and equipment and observed that the purchases had been haphazard.

7.3. The Committee wanted to know how the principals could make purchases beyond their powers. The witness stated that the Principal had power to purchase upto Rs. 1,000 at a time.

3. Asked as to why the equipments were purchased when they were not actually required, the witness stated that they would not think that the equipment were not required since it was a matter of opinion. The witness assured that he would further examine the matter and send a report.

7.4. The Committee then wanted to know about the present practice of purchase of equipment. The witness stated that a Purchase Board consisting of the representatives of Administrative Department, Finance and Directorate had been constituted which controlled the purchase made by the Department. Asked as to whether there was any departmental investigation to ascertain the actual reasons for such heavy and haphazard purchases, the witness stated that there was a question of fixation of responsibility.

### Recommendation

7.5. The Committee finds that in this case it was due to misunderstanding and lack of co-ordination that the same type of equipment was purchased by the Director on the one hand and the Principals on the other hand. Another explanation given by the Joint Director, Technical Education to Audit in November, 1963 was that in order to avoid lapses of funds certain purchases were made. No delegation was given to the Principals by the Authority to purchase equipment in excess of his limit.

Therefore, the Committee recommends that the matter of fixation of responsibility on the person concerned for such heavy and haphazard purchases should be finalised immediately and action taken should be intimated to the Committee.

The Department should make periodical verification of stores and equipment at proper intervals to ascertain whether any excess purchase has been made.

## SERICULTURE AND WEAVING DEPARTMENT

8.1. The Audit paragraph indicates that the Eri Seed Grainage Farm at Kokrajhar was established in October, 1954 with a view to producing disease-free eri seeds for supply to rearers. The paragraph brings out that although the total expenditure on the farm upto March, 1965 amounted to Rs.2 lakhs (recurring Rs.1.17 lakh and non-recurring Rs.0.83 lakh), the receipts by way of sale proceeds of seeds upto March, 1965 amounted to Rs.8,200 only. The Audit paragraph also indicates that upto 1959-60, no target for production of seeds was fixed. Since 1960-61, the annual target was fixed at 80,000 lays, but this was not achieved (1964-65). Government stated that the achievement fell short of target as the rearing of silk worm was dependent on "metereological variations".

Government also intimated to Audit in November, 1965 that "The farms and Grainages are not intended to earn revenue but are in fact, developmental projects through which the welfare of the rural economy is contemplated. Seeds are distributed at nominal rates just to provide incentives to the people for taking up the industry".



8.2. The Committee at the outset wanted to know (1) the reasons for the low receipts from the sale of seeds as against total expenditure of Rs.2 lakhs upto March, 1965, (2) the failure to achieve the targets and (3) the amount spent for buildings, etc., and on other items.

The witness stated that the grainage was established in the year 1954-55 but during the first year all the required buildings could not be constructed. In order to achieve targets, the third seed cutting house which was completed in 1964-65, was needed. The main reasons for short-fall in achievements were (i) non-completion of the required technical buildings and (ii) the seed Cocoon rearsers did not part with seed Cocoons as the Boro people use papae as subsidiary food and lastly due to meteorological variations. Then the witness informed that under buildings and equipments an amount of Rs.0 95 lakhs was spent.

8.3. Asked as to whether at the time of preparation of the scheme, any target was fixed, the witness stated that at the time of preparation of the scheme no target was fixed and it was fixed at a later stage at 80,000 lays provided buildings and equipment were all there. On a query the Director explained that the target was achieved to the extent of 40 to 60 thousand. Thereafter there was a fall owing to heavy flood, heavy rainfall, etc.

#### **Recommendation**

The Committee would like the Department to take special steps to minimise the loss sustained by the farm.

PART II

## SUMMARY OF COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS, ETC.

**Health Department**

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
1	Paragraph 18 at page 34 of the Audit Report, 1966.	The Committee views with concern that in spite of its recommendations in the past, such a case of irregular drawal of money has occurred in the Health Department. The Department has not yet taken any action against the officers for violation of financial rules.  The Committee would like the Department to take necessary steps as would ensure that the financial rules are not contravened. Action taken against the concerned officer should be intimated to the Committee within one month from the date of presentation of this Report to the House. In future, sanction for drawal of funds should be issued well ahead of March so that funds can be utilised in proper time.  The Finance Department should also note and make provisions for appropriate disciplinary action in such cases of violation of established financial rules.
2	Paragraph 42 at pages 45-46 of the Audit Report, 1966.	In this case, the evidence brought by the Department before the Committee indicates that Firms' business practices have certainly not been beyond reproach. They have employed various doubtful means to obtain extra payment from the Government.  In spite of such serious irregularities, the Government resumed its business dealings with the firm on the plea that the firm had changed its local management and had accepted the liability to refund the excess payment to the firm and the firm had given an assurance to the effect that such irregularities would not recur. In the opinion of the Committee, these are not very convincing grounds. As has been revealed in its past dealings also, the firm proved itself to be unreliable.

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

The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Government should carefully investigate whether resumption of business with the firm was justified or whether the firm ought to be blacklisted for such serious irregular deals with the Government. The Committee should be apprised of the result of the investigation.

The action taken against the Civil Surgeons should be intimated to the Committee within six months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

The Committee would like the Department to examine the system of purchase/supplies to various Districts and Subdivisional Institutions, the mode of payments to the suppliers in order to ascertain as to whether there is any loop-hole in the system itself so as to avoid further loss.

A report on the aforesaid points should reach the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

3 Paragraph 68 at Pages 60-61 of the Audit Report, 1966.

This paragraph shows that Medical and Surgical equipment worth Rs.4.02 lakhs remained unutilised for about 2—3 years in the Medical College, Gauhati because of the bottle-neck created by non-installation of three phase electrical line which was entrusted to the Public Works Department.

The Committee recommends that the Department should issue instructions that all impediments (like absence of various installations and fittings to the hospital buildings) should be removed expeditiously so that medical and surgical equipments can be put to use soon after their purchase.

4 Paragraph 61 at page 55 of the Audit Report, 1966.

The Committee desires that the Department should take immediate steps to settle the outstanding items without delay and report to the Committee about the settlement within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

5 Paragraph 65 at page 59 of the Audit Report, 1966.

The Committee has been given to understand by the Departmental witness that they have proposed to regularise the objections raised by Audit by raising the limit of Gauhati Division No.1 and fixing a stock limit for Aijal Division. A report in this regard should be sent to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
6 Paragraph 69 at page 61 of the Audit Report, 1966.	This case reveals that the Sterilizer machine purchased in May, 1956 at a cost of Rs. 0.46 lakh remained unutilised even after 9 years of its purchase. It transpired from the evidence tendered that the Department was even not aware of the necessity of a boiler to run the sterilizer plant. No accommodation was made for installing the plant; a temporary shed was constructed to keep the sterilizer at a cost of Rs. 0.02 lakh. So the sterilizer could not be put into commission for want of a boiler and accommodation. The machine could not be utilized for the Emigration Hospital for which it was purchased.	The Committee feels that the matter was not dealt with earnestly by the Departmental Officers to avoid unnecessary locking up of capital. The unspent balance of Rs. 0.15 lakh was also not refunded to the Treasury but it was placed under Revenue Deposit.
7 Paragraph 3 at pages 112-113 of the Audit Report, 1966.	In this case, there was no Departmental investigation to ascertain the cause of fire and no watch and ward arrangement was made by the Department for security of the houses which should have been made in the normal way. Though the site was selected by a Civil Surgeon, it was declared unfit for human habitation subsequently and no alternative site has been selected as yet. The Committee could not understand as to why no Departmental investigation was made to ascertain the cause of fire; this is a lapse on the part of the Department. The entire matter seems to be dealt in the Department without proper care and caution and this calls for enquiry to ascertain whether there was any laxity at any stage in fixing the responsibility. A report on action taken on the recommendation should be sent to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.	The Committee, therefore, feels that the whole matter calls for an enquiry for fixation of responsibility on the officer or officers concerned for not taking adequate care and caution in purchasing the machine and for its utilization in time. The result of the enquiry should be intimated to the Committee within three months from the date of placing of this Report to the House.
8 Grant No. 18 pages 38-39 of the Appropriation Accounts 1964-65.	The Committee recommends that the Department should scrupulously avoid such type of bad budgeting and loose control over the expenditure which seems to have become a habit with the Department.	

### Animal Husbandry and Veterinary Department

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
9	Paragraph 26 at page 38 of the Audit Report, 1966.	The Committee is constrained to observe that the matter calls for a thorough enquiry at the departmental level [for fixing responsibility for lapse on the part of officers or officer concerned for which Government had to incur large amount of loss. The Department should also immediately examine and outline a detailed procedure for such purchase, management of the Farm, and on other ancillary matters so as to safeguard the financial interest of the Government.
10	Paragraph 27 at pages 38-39 of the Audit Report, 1966.	<p>According to the Report of the disease Investigation Officer who reported in 1963, the environmental condition of the farm was not congenial for rearing goats in large number. The Officer advised that the goats should be removed immediately to a better place. The report of the Officer was accepted by the then Director of Animal Husbandry and Veterinary. The Departmental witness contended that the Investigation Officer was an expert in cattle diseases and not an expert in goat diseases and that an epidemic broke out in the farm due to which such mortality resulted. The Committee cannot accept the present views of the Department since they in their earlier report to the Accountant General did not state the above facts, nor did the Department inform the Audit subsequently that their earlier report was not based on proper assessment and that the report was not correct. The following are the informations obtained by the Committee from records:—</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. On 21st of February, 1964—30 goats were sold in auction at Rs. 300.</li> <li>2. On 30th March, 1964 another lot numbering 34 was sold at a price of Rs. 304 and the total receipt was Rs. 979.</li> <li>3. On the first auction there were only five bidders.</li> <li>4. On the second sale, the same number of bidders were there.</li> <li>5. The book value of the last lot was Rs. 1,575.</li> <li>6. The senior officers of the Department were reported to have conducted the sale.</li> <li>7. The site of auction was 23 miles from Silchar town.</li> </ol> <p>The Committee recommends that the whole matter should be probed into by an independent agency to ascertain whether there was any laxity in (1) choosing the site, (2) the cause of death of goats, (3) the manner of auction conducted and (4) whether the project was properly investigated before executing the scheme. Report of the enquiry together with a report on the action taken by Government thereon should be sent to the Committee within 3 months from the date of submission of this report to the House.</p>

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
11	Paragraph 87 at page 71 of the Audit Report, 1966.	<p>In this case, it transpired from the evidence as well as from the records at the disposal of Audit that the Department embarked on an immature scheme without finalising the preliminary requisites for successful implementation of the scheme. Funds were withdrawn for disbursement to loanees without finalising the necessary rules for disbursement. The loans were advanced to individuals only a few of whom were stated to be political sufferers though the Scheme provided for disbursement of loans to political sufferers for live-stock industry. The Scheme did not provide for any loan to any individual who was not a political sufferer. The Scheme also provided that the live-stock farm established by the loanees should be inspected periodically by the Department which was not apparently done by the Department. The Departmental witness could not say whether the loanees fulfilled conditions imposed on them by the terms of the loan. It was also not properly checked by the Department whether half-yearly returns were submitted by the loanees. A large sum of money was withdrawn on 30th March by the Department in utter violation of existing financial rules in order to avoid lapse of grant. The Committee recommends that such breach of rules by the Department which resulted in blocking of money should be severely dealt with and action should be taken against the defaulting Officer or officers. The records available with Audit indicate that the Department could not furnish even in April, 1965 any record showing the securities obtained from the loanees. This is a serious matter and requires to be enquired into. According to the terms and conditions, a loan is required to be secured adequately and is not to exceed 50 per cent of the value of the property offered as security. It was also not known whether personal security was obtained by the Deputy Commissioner before disbursement of the loan.</p>

Therefore, the Committee finds that there has been laxity of proper supervision, at all stages, in realisation of loans in time, in finalising matters in time which resulted in slow disbursement of the loans and unsuccessful implementation of the Scheme.

The Government should enquire into the matter thoroughly so as to ascertain the (I) causes of improper realisation of the loans, (II) the actual utilisation of the loan, (III) causes of non-finalisation of necessary rules in time, (IV) whether there was any deviation from the original scheme in

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
		<p>selecting the class of loanees, etc., and other ancillary matters and to fix responsibility on the officer or officers for whose fault the scheme utterly failed. A report in this regard should reach the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.</p> <p>The Committee recommends that in all such schemes care should be taken to see that preparation for the follow-up programme is made in order to ensure that the purpose of the scheme is successfully carried out.</p> <p>A statement showing the up-to-date position of realisation of loans should be submitted immediately to the Committee through the Accountant General, Assam.</p>

#### **Veterinary (Fishery) Department**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 12 Paragraph 36 at page 43 of the Audit Report, 1966. | <p>The Committee recommends that the proforma accounts should be prepared regularly and submitted to the Committee through the Accountant General within a period of six months from the date of placing the Report to the House. The Department should take suitable steps to improve the working of the farm so that the farm can at least be run at no profit no loss basis if not on profit. The action taken should be reported to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.</p> <p>The Committee recommends that Government should consider whether it would not be worthwhile to convert this farm into a nursery farm instead of commercial farm as at present.</p>  |
| 13 Paragraph 37 at page 43 of the Audit Report, 1966. | <p>It transpired from the evidence that these Fishery Projects were taken up by Government in a hurry without proper examination. The Committee regrets to note that the economic aspect of these projects were not taken into consideration at the initial stage. It seems that these schemes were taken up in the first Five Year Plan because funds were available with the Department which had to be spent so that they did not lapse, as a result of which an amount of Rs. 84,565 on capital expenditure apart from recurring expenditure proved to be almost infructuous. The Committee has also come to know that this matter was gone through by the Estimates Committee which made some valuable recommendations. The action taken by the Department on the recommendations of the Estimates Committee may be intimated to this Committee for their appraisal.</p> |



Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
14 Paragraph 78 at pages 65-66 of the Audit Report, 1966.	The Committee is surprised to know that the surety of the lessee is still in possession of his land which was put to auction and then purchased by the Government at Re.1 as there was no bidder. No effective steps have been taken to evict the unlawful occupier of the Government land by the Department which calls for an enquiry for fixation of responsibility. The Bakijai cases started against the lessee for realisation of the balance amount of Rs.17,351 had to be struck off as no property was found for attachment but according to rules it is to be ascertained before settlement that the lessee is financially sound.	The Committee also finds no justification for grant of remission of the entire revenue of Rs.16,000 as the report of the S. D. C. indicates that the lessee earned a revenue of Rs.1,500 during 1957-58. As against Rs.1,500, he deposited only Rs.799.50 P. The settlement on resale was also made to a bidder who has been disqualified for any settlement under the rules.
	In view of the above, the Committee recommends that the entire case calls for a Departmental enquiry so as to fix responsibility for the lapses committed by the Officers dealing with the tenders as well as for not operating the existing law in time in order to safe guard the financial interest of the Government. Action taken on the recommendation should be reported to the Committee within a course of three months from the date of presentation of this report to the House.	
<b>Revenue Department</b>		
15 Paragraph 5(c) at page 10 of the Audit Report, 1966.	The Committee does not see any reason why the Department could not realise the outstanding loans amounting to Rs.1.84 lakhs (without interest). The Committee recommends that the Department should take energetic steps to realise the loans and in future the Department should not issue loans to defaulters unless and until the arrear is fully realised. The action taken should be reported to the Committee in due course.	
16 Paragraph 5(d) at page 11 of the Audit Report, 1966.	The Committee feels that Government should impress upon the Commissioner that he should be very vigorous in the inspection of Deputy Commissioners' establishments and also in the co-ordination of works such as collections of arrears of revenue, loans, verification of balances, etc. The action taken and progress made in this direction should be reported to the Committee from time to time.	

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
17. Paragraph 51 at page 50 of the Audit Report, 1966.		The Committee desires that the arrear amount of Rs.15,000 should be realised from the allottees as early as possible. In future the Revenue Department should be careful in examining the area of the land to be acquired so as to ascertain the actual condition of the land before payment of compensation so that financial interest of the Government is safeguarded adequately by the Departmental Officers who are meant for it.
18. Paragraph 77 at page 65 of the Audit Report, 1966.		The Committee feels that in this case Government showed unimaginable leniency to the defaulters who misappropriated a huge amount of Government money. The properties of these Mouzadars are still in their possession and no prompt action was taken to evict them. The Committee therefore recommends that the whole matter calls for an enquiry by an independent agency so as to ascertain (i) grounds on which undue leniency was shown to the Mouzadars, (ii) causes of delay in evicting them from the lands purchased by Government, (iii) if there was any lapse in the inspection of the Mouzas timely, (iv) steps taken to follow up the criminal case referred to police against the second Mouzadar. A report of the enquiring agency should be submitted together with a report relating to the action taken by Government thereon within six months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

### Home (Police) Department

19. Paragraph 39(a) at page 44 of the Audit Report, 1966.		The Committee would like to draw the attention of the Department to its recommendation contained at page 2 of its Report on Audit Report, 1964, etc., relating to replies to draft paras sent by Audit and urge upon the Department to strictly adhere to the directions of the Committee referred to above.
20. Paragraph 39(b) at page 44 of the Audit Report, 1966.		In this case, the Committee feels that the Department should have asked the Contractor to supply he-goats in place of ram at the same rate. In future, if a Contractor fails to supply meat of a particular variety and instead supplies lower quality meat, he should be paid at the lower rate. Suitable provision for this should be made in the contract deed after obtaining legal opinion. Finance Department also should take note of this recommendation.
21. Paragraph 40 at pages 44-45 of the Audit Report, 1966.		The Committee would like to know about the result of the departmental proceedings as soon as they are finalised. Progress in the matter should be intimated to the Committee from time to time.

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

### Home ( Jails) Department

22. Paragraph 41 at page 45 of the Audit Report, 1966. The Committee would like to be appraised of the final result of the proceedings against the officers at fault and this should be intimated to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.

### Education (General) Department

23. Paragraph 117 at pages 91 of the Audit Report, 1966. Results of the Departmental proceedings, if already drawn up, together with the decision of the court should be intimated to the Committee. The remedial measures proposed to be taken by the Department should also be taken immediately in order to stop recurrence of such cases.
24. Paragraph 118 at page 91- 92 read with serial No.12 of Appendix XI at page 135. The Committee recommends that while sanctioning grants in subsequent years, the Department should take into account earlier performance of the defaulting institutions so that cases of non-submission of utilisation certificates by these institutions are not allowed to continue further.
5. Paragraph 122 at page 93 of the Audit Report, 1966. In this case, the Committee is surprised to find that in many cases, drawals and disbursement of grants to non-Government Educational Institutions were not recorded in the cash books by the Institutions and no uniform and approved accounting procedure was followed by the Institutions making it difficult for auditors of the Examiner of Local Accounts to exercise effective check on transactions. It transpired from the evidence that upto 1967 (June) the Education Department has not been able to obtain the names of the defaulting Schools from the Examiner of Local Accounts whose office is situated at Gauhati. The Department remained satisfied by issuing a routine reminder to the Examiner. The Committee does not see any reason why the Department could not obtain the information on such a vital matter involving serious irregularities in Government accounts. The Committee, therefore, recommends that this matter calls for an enquiry in the Departmental level so as to fix responsibility for the lapses on the officer or officers concerned. The Government would surely appreciate that the things revealed in the Report of the Examiner are very serious in nature and in such a state of affair, quite a few misappropriation cases might have remained undetected and the more the delay in completion of records, the less is the chance of taking effective action on such cases of misappropriation.

Serial  
No.

Reference

Recommendation

The Committee, therefore, recommends that an effective programme for check on these matter should be immediately chalked out by the Department so that things are brought in proper line without further delay.

The Department should also intimate to the Committee what further amount has been recovered after May, 1966, against misappropriation involving a total sum of Rs 74.945 in 18 Schools together with the final action taken on the person/persons responsible for misappropriation.

The Department should in future invariably ensure proper utilisation of earlier grants before payment of fresh grants to an institution where misappropriation occurred and any deviation should be dealt with severely by the Department.

26 Paragraph 19  
at pages 34-35  
of the Audit  
Report, 1966.

In this case, scheme was taken up without properly assessing the number of eligible beneficiaries and the provision was based on rough estimate. The Department withdrew funds in advance of requirement in violation of the existing financial rules as there was no eligible student to receive the grants. The Inspector of Schools furnished list of eligible students school-wise and subsequently it was found that many of the applicants were not eligible for the grant as the school authorities who supplied the lists were not very careful in furnishing their lists. The undisbursed amount was not returned in time by the Inspector of Schools.

The Committee feels that the scheme was not taken up for implementation in right earnest for which a large amount could not be disbursed in time. No attempt seems to have been made by the Department to enquire into the causes of failure of the scheme. The Committee does not see any reason why the amount of Rs.40,000 was withdrawn by the Department in utter violation of Subsidiary Rule 50 of Assam Treasury Rules when the amount was not required for immediate disbursements. The Inspector of Schools should have been asked by the Government to explain his inability to refund the amount in time. It is also not known whether the interest accrued on deposit of the amount in the Apex Bank was assessed and deposited to the Treasury.

Serial No.	Reference	Recommendation
		<p>The Committee, therefore, recommends that in future the Department should not embark upon a scheme without ascertaining and finalising the requisites for successful implementation of the scheme. The cases of violation of existing rules should be enquired into for fixation of responsibility and Departmental Officers should be cautioned against such recurrence. The Committee would like to know whether the interest has been deposited to the Treasury in the meantime.</p>
27	<p>Paragraph 20 at page 35 of the Audit Report, 1966.</p>	<p>The Committee is surprised to find another instance of withdrawal of funds in advance of requirement. In this case also, the provision of fund was made in the budget with marking pre-budget scrutiny of the scheme which is not a healthy financial practice. The Department should in future make provision of fund after making proper scrutiny of the scheme and after finalising the requisite preliminaries so that as soon as the budget is passed, the Department can spend the money in right time. The Committee desires that instructions should be issued in this regard. The Headmaster concerned should be asked to be careful in future. It should also be reported to the Committee whether the Bank has paid the amount of interest to the Government. The Committee would like to know whether the unutilised amount of Rs.500 has since been utilised or refunded by the Headmaster into the Treasury.</p>
		<p>The action taken on the recommendation should be reported to the Committee within three months from the date of presentation of this Report to the House.</p>
28	<p>Paragraph 34 at page 41 of the Audit Report, 1966.</p>	<p>The Committee observes that drawal of money in advance of requirement and its retention either in the shape of cash or bank draft is not only fraught with risk of loss due to theft, etc., but this also unnecessarily locks up Government money outside the cash balance of Government. Government intimated to Audit that the amount represented grants sanctioned to the institutions towards the end of Financial years and that after drawal, the Director had to ensure that all formalities had been observed to get the grants. The Committee cannot appreciate the practice of sanctioning of grants at the fag end of the financial year and also before examining the requisite formalities. Such practice should be immediately discontinued to avoid serious breach of financial rules. The Committee could not understand why the Director of Public Instruction retained such heavy balances</p>

Serial  
No.

Reference

Recommendation

when it was found that the entire amount was not required for immediate disbursement. Such kind of blocking up of Government money outside the cash balance of Government leads to a misleading picture of ways and means position.

The Committee come to know from the past Audit reports that for the last few years in every year the Government have had to obtain overdrafts from the Reserve Bank of India on payment of interest charges. Such instances are the causes of loss of interest.

The Committee, therefore, recommends that the Department should issue instructions in the line suggested above to all its officers not to issue sanctions at the fag end of the year and any violation of such practice should meet with disciplinary action. In future, retention of heavy cash balance either in the shape of cash or bank draft should be dealt with severely by the Department. Action taken on the recommendation should be reported to the Committee.

The Finance Department should also note the observations made by the Committee and take action accordingly.

#### **Educational (Technical) Department**

29 Paragraph 33(a)  
at page 41  
of the Audit  
Report, 1966.

The Committee finds that in this case it was due to misunderstanding and lack of Co-ordination that the same type of equipment was purchased by the Director on the one hand and the Principals on the other hand. Another explanation given by the Joint Director, Technical Education to Audit in November, 1963 was that in order to avoid lapses of funds certain purchases were made. No delegation was given to the Principals by the Authority to purchase equipment in excess of his limit.

Therefore, the Committee recommends that the matter of fixation of responsibility on the person concerned for such heavy and haphazard purchases should be finalised immediately and action taken should be intimated to the Committee.

The Department should make periodical verification of stores and equipment at proper intervals to ascertain whether any excess purchase has been made.

#### **Sericulture and Weaving Department**

30 Paragraph 50  
at page 49  
of the Audit  
Report, 1966.

The Committee would like the Department to take special steps to minimise the loss sustained by the farm.

## APPENDIX I

## List of Officers who were examined by the Public Accounts Committee

Serial No.	Designation of Officers	Date of examination
(1)	(2)	(3)
1	Secretary, Health Services ... ..	17th May 1967.
2	Director of Health Services ... ..	Do.
3	Secretary, Animal Husbandry and Veterinary	18th May and 28th July 1967.
4	Director of Animal Husbandry and Veterinary	Do.
5	Director of Fisheries ... ..	Do.
6	Secretary, Agriculture (Fishery) ... ..	Do.
7	Secretary, Industries (Sericulture and Weaving)	25th July 1967.
8	Director of Sericulture and Weaving ... ..	Do.
9	Chief Secretary, Home ... ..	26th July 1967.
10	Deputy Secretary, Home ... ..	Do.
11	Inspector General of Police ... ..	Do.
12	Inspector General of prisons ... ..	Do.
13	Secretary, Revenue ... ..	27th July 1967.
14	Director of Land Records ... ..	Do.
15	Deputy Secretary, Revenue ... ..	Do.
16	Secretary, Education ... ..	28th July 1967.
17	Director of Public Instruction ... ..	Do.
18	Director of Technical Education ... ..	Do.

## Time devoted to each days meeting

Date	Time of meeting	Total time
(1)	(2)	(3)
28th April 1967	From 11-30 a.m. to 1 p.m.	2 hours 30 minutes.
29th April 1967	From 10-30 a.m. to 12-45 p.m.	2 hours 15 minutes.
17th May 1967	From 10-30 a.m. to 1 p.m.	2 hours 30 minutes.
	From 3 p.m. to 5-25 p.m.	2 hours 25 minutes.
18th May 1967	From 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.	3 hours.
	From 2 p.m. to 4-25 p.m.	2 hours 25 minutes.
19th May 1967	From 10 a.m. to 1 p.m.	3 hours.
25th July 1967	From 11 a.m. to 12-35 p.m.	1 hour 35 minutes.
26th July 1967	From 10 a.m. to 12-15 p.m.	2 hours 15 minutes.
27th July 1967	From 10 a.m. to 1-15 p.m.	3 hours 15 minutes.
	From 2-30 p.m. to 4 p.m.	1 hour 30 minutes.
28th July 1967	From 10-30 a.m. to 12-10 p.m.	1 hour 40 minutes.
	From 2 p.m. to 4-15 p.m.	2 hours 15 minutes.
29th July 1967	From 9 a.m. to 12 noon	3 hours.
25th Sept. 1967	From 10-30 a.m. to 11-50 a.m.	1 hour 20 minutes.
Total	35 hours 35 minutes	