

**COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS  
(2003-2006)  
HUNDRED AND SEVENTH REPORT**

**ELEVENTH ASSEMBLY**



सत्यमेव जयते

**Report of the Committee on Public Accounts  
on the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor  
General of India (Civil) for the year 1994-95  
relating to Panchayat & Rural Development  
Department, Government of Assam**

Presented before the House on 8th February, 2006

Assam legislative Assembly Secretariat  
Dispur : Guwahati-6.

## CONTENTS

	Page/Pages
1. Composition of the Committee . . . . .	i
2. Prefatory Remarks . . . . .	ii
3. Report . . . . .	1-22
4. Annexure-I . . . . .	

(i)

**COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE**  
(2003-2006)

**Chairperson :**

1. Smti. Pramila Rani Brahma

**Members :**

2. Shri Dilip Kumar Saikia
3. Dr. Zoi Nath Sarma
4. Shri Gautam Bora
5. Shri Ajit Singh
6. Shri Bidya Singh Engleng
7. Shri Dilder Rezza
8. Shri Gopi Nath Das
9. Shri Dharamsing Teron
10. Shri Biswajit Daimary
11. Shri Bimolangshu Roy
12. Shri Chandan Sarkar
13. Shri Sarat Saikia

**Secretariat :**

1. Shri G. P. Das, Secretary
2. Shri S. Deka, Joint Secretary
3. Shri B. Basumatary, Deputy Secretary
4. Shri Khalilur Rahman, Committee Officer.

(ii)

## **PREFATORY REMARKS**

I, Smti. Pramila Rani Brahma, Chairperson of the Committee on Public Accounts having been authorised to submit the Report on their behalf, present this Hundred and Seventh Report of the Committee on Public Accounts on the Audit paras contained in the Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (Civil) for the year 1994-95 pertaining to the Panchayat & Rural Development Department, Government of Assam.

2. The Report of the Comptroller and Auditor General of India (Civil) for the year 1994-95 was laid to the House on 15.6.96.

3. The Report as mentioned above relating to the Panchayat & Rural Development Department was considered by the Sub-Committee 'B' of the Committee on Public Accounts under the Convenorship of Shri Dilip Kumar Saikia, MLA (as at Annexure-I) in their sitting held on 14th November, 2005. The Sub-Committee also adopted the draft Report in their meeting held on 3rd January, 2006 for the consideration and approval by the main Committee.

4. The Committee has considered the Draft Report and finalised in their sitting held on 6th January, 2006.

5. The Committee places on records their appreciations to the Sub-Committee 'B' for their strenuous works for obtaining various records, information and clarification pertaining to the Audit Para relating to the Panchayat & Rural Development Department. The Committee also wishes thanks to the Departmental witness for their co-operation. The Committee also appreciates the Principal A. G. (Audit), Assam and his Junior Officers for their valuable assistance. The Committee also pleased to offer thanks to the Secretary, Assam Legislative Assembly with his officers and staff of the Committee on Public Accounts Branch for their valuable services rendered to the Committee.

6. The Committee earnestly hopes that the Government would implement the recommendations made in the Report.

**SMTI. PRAMILA RANI BRAHMA,**

Chairperson,

Committee on Public Accounts.

Dispur :

The 6th January, 2006

**Panchayat & Rural Development Department**  
**G.I.C. sheets issued on loan not returned**  
(Audit para 3.33/CAG(Civil)/1994-95)

1.1 The Audit has pointed out that a test-check (March 1994) of the stock register of building materials maintained by the Block Development Officers (BDO), Kakopathar and Margherita Development Blocks revealed that (a) out of 651 (10 feet long) galvanised corrugated iron (GCI) sheets issued (April 1992) by the B.D.O. Kakopathar Development Block to a private organisation on temporary loan basis for use in flood relief camps, only 290 sheets were returned leaving a balance of 361 sheets (March 1994). (b) Similarly, 500 GCI sheets of some specification issued (April 1992) by the BDO. Margherita Development Block to a Government aided School at Chabua on loan basis without indicating its purpose also were not returned (March 1994) by him. In both the cases no conditions were stipulated at the time of issue or when security deposit was obtained. The total value of 861 (14.25 tonne) GCI sheets not returned in both the cases worked out to Rs.3.38 lakhs. No action had been taken by the block for over two years.

1.2 The department by their written reply has stated that Tinsukia :  
(a) G.C.I. sheets received : 651 pec of 10' long.  
Issued to relief camp : 651 pec of 10' long.

The aforesaid GCI sheets were issued to flood relief camp as per authority conveyed by Project Director, DRDA, Dibrugarh vide w. t. No. nil dated 21st April '02 out of the total 651 GCI sheets 290 pieces were recovered on 4th May'92 and received and entered in to Stock Book vide page No. 153. The balance 361 pieces of GCI sheets were recovered and utilized on the dates shown below :

<b>Date of recovery</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Stock Book page No.</b>
18.12.93	50	155
01.10.94	32	157
19.01.95	45	161
28.04.95	42	163
18.08.98	192	199
<b>Total</b>	<b>361 Pieces</b>	

Details of utilization of 361 pieces of GCI sheets as follows :

1. Block H. Q. Latrine	:	9 pieces
2. No. 2 Topobon L. P. School	:	51 pieces
3. Moran Kola Kristy Bikash Kendra	:	50 pieces
4. Koilashpur G. P. Hall	:	30 pieces
5. Kakopathar Market shed	:	29 pieces
6. 8 Nos. IAY beneficiary	:	192 pieces
Total		361 pieces

(b) The then project Director, DRDA, Dibrugarh Shri Nogen Hazarika, ACS authorised the then Sr. BDO, Margherita Dev. Block to transfer the GCI sheets to Panitola Dev. Block vide letter No.DRDA/DBR/MS/91-92/P/3557 dated 3rd April'92 as per requisition submitted by the then Sr. BDO. Panitola Dev. Block vide letter No.PDB/RD/JRY/34/91-92/1399 dated 12th March'92 and another No. nil dated 23rd March'98. Accordingly the materials were received by the then Sr.BDO, Panitola Development Block Shri Deben Baruah and utilized the same under the following scheme.

Date	Name of scheme	Quantity
29.04.92	Const. of Pulunga Rajabari Community Hall JRY, 1990-91	3 pieces
15.05.92	Const. of Community Hall-cum-Library at Rajabari	2 pieces
15.05.92	Const. of Tiyajulia L. P. School	60 pieces
3.06.92	Const. of Chetia Pathar L. P. School	63 pieces
23.06.92	Const. of pavellion at Jorai Chokoli Boria gaon.	26 pieces
28.06.92	Const. of Community Hall at Dinjoy	26 pieces
11.12.92	Const. of Panchayat Ghar/1991-92	58 pieces
13.01.93	Const. of Chunchuk L.P. School	54 pieces
23.04.93	Const. of Panchayat Ghar at Rongehangi	01 pieces
5.5.93	Const. of kajikhowa Market shed	120 pieces
17.07.93	Const. of Chungichuk L. P. School	25 pieces
4.03.94	Const. of G.P. Building at Longrai	26 pieces
18.03.94	Const. of Bindhakata G.P. Building	26 pieces
13.05.94	Const. of Ratiakhwa I. B. School	10 pieces
Total		500 piece.

## OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.3 The Committee recommends that the department should reconcile the matter with the A.G. (Audit), Assam and submit a report to the Committee within 30 days from the date of presentation of this report before the House.

### **Locking up of funds**

(Audit para 3.34/CAG(Civil)/1994-95)

1.4 The audit has pointed out that the Rural Development Department, Government of Assam, placed (between June 1992 and November 1992) orders on a Guwahati firm for supply of 14 sets of survey equipments for supply to the Project Director (PD), District Rural Development Authority, Hailakandi although there had been no demand from the PD. The sets were delivered between September 1992 and March 1993. The payment of Rs.3.92 lakhs was made between September 1992 and March 1993. Twelve sets were procured for distribution to five blocks of the District and 2 sets were for the use of PD, DRDA, Hailakandi. As of April 1995, all the sets of survey equipments were lying in stock with the PD. The expenditure of Rs. 3.92 lakhs thus proved unnecessary. In reply, the PD stated (April 1995) that the equipment was required for preparation of plan and estimates. These could not be distributed to the blocks so far, for want of proper storage facilities. Thus the procurement of survey instruments resulted in locking up of funds.

1.5 The department by their written reply has stated that Hailakandi : The survey materials were delivered to the DRDA by the supplier under order of the Government. These materials are kept in the DRDA Godown as block godown was not in good shape. These materials are generally utilized for preparation of correct Plan and Estimate, as there is a technical Cell, in the DRDA. As such, it is stated that the expenditure of Rs. 3.92 lakhs was fruitful.

## OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.6 After discussion, the Committee recommends that the department should reconcile the matter with A.G. (Audit), Assam and submit a report to the Committee within 30 days from the date of presentation of this report before the House.

### Financial performance

(Audit sub-para 6.5.5/CAG(Civil)/1994-95)

1.7 The audit has pointed out that the programme is fully financed by the GOI, A months allocated and released by the GOI, amounts sanctioned by the State Government and the expenditure thereagainst during the period from 1990-91 to 1994-95 were as under :-

Year	Allocation by GOI	Amount released by GOI to State	Amount released by State Govt.	Total Expenditure amount available*	Saving (-) Excese (+)
(In lakhs)					
1990	31.01	15.50	15.50	19.72*	27.52 (+) 7.80
1991-92	32.81	45.49	45.49	45.49	37.88 (-) 7.61
1992-93	29.76	22.14	22.14	29.75*	25.69 (-) 4.06
1993-94	34.65	34.19	34.19	38.25	36.14 (-) 2.11
1994-95	34.65	10.20	5.77	7.88	15.72 (+) 7.84
	162.88	127.52	123.09	141.09	142.95

The savings in 1991-92 was due to non receipt of sanction in time from the State Government. Thus against the grant of Rs. 123.09 lakhs received from Government of India the expenditure incurred by the State Government was Rs. 142.95 lakhs. The expenditure incurred in excess was yet to be got reimbursed from the Government of India.

1.8 The department by their written reply has stated that the C & AG audited the accounts of NPIC for the period from 1990-91 to 1994-95 in



the year 1995-96. As per Audit Report, an amount of Rs. 19.86 lakhs was shown as excess amount spent from the State Government, which did not tally with our records. However, it is mentioned that during the time of audit, sanctions from the Government of India for the amount 17.19 lakhs vide letter No.405/294-IC, dated 16th March'95 was received during the year 1996-97. Due to the late receipt of the sanction from the Central Government the above amount of Rs. 17.19 lakhs could not be taken into account during the year 1994-95 and as such the amount of Rs. 19.86 lakhs as shown by the audit was an apparent excess expenditure. Eventually, there jaws no excess expenditure up to the period 1994-95. However, detailed accounts of fund received from the Government of India and the expenditure made by the State Government upto the period of 1995-96 were submitted to the Government of India, MNES and the accounts were stated to be settled vide letter No.405/2/95/IC, dated 26th August'97. In reference to this letter, an excess amount of Rs. 8,57,502/- was carried forward to the year 1996-97. From the above statement, it is clear that no excess expenditure was made from the State Government till 1995-96.

#### OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.9 The Committee satisfied with the replies of the departmental witnesses, hence pleased to drop the para.

**Physical performance**

(Audit sub-para 6.5.6/CAG(Civil)/1994-95)

1.10 The audit has pointed out that target and achievement of the programme showing percentage of shortfall and number of blocks covered for the period between 1990-91 and 1994-95 are as under :

Year	Number of chulha proposed to be installed			Total	Number of chulha actually installed			Short fall	Percentage of shortfall
	Fixed	por-** table	Comm- unity		Fixed	por-** table	Comm- unity		
90-91	40,000	10,000		50,000	30,000	10,000		10,000	20
91-92	30,000	20,000		50,000	12,127	24,259		13,614	27
92-93	16,000	24,000		40,000	6,487	26,769		6,744	17
93-94	24,000	36,000		60,000	20,117	28,700		11,183	19
94-95	24,000	36,000		60,000	18,118	11,660		30,222	50
				2,60,000				1,88,237	

It would appear from above that the shortfall varied between 17 (1992-93 to 50 per cent (1994-95). It was noticed that out of 214 Blocks in the State only 167 Blocks had been covered by 1994-95. Reasons for shortfall in achievement, were attributed to the following : (i) Non supply of Chulha according to the need and size of family ; (ii) Inability of the State Government to pay TA/DA to the field functionaries and absence of provision to meet the transportation cost from Block Hqrs. to house holds. (iii) Portable chulhas supplied were not considered as smoke free by the beneficiaries.

1.11 The department by their written reply has stated that apart from the reasons explained in the concerned para as above, the nonavailability of the facilities like TA/DA, convenience etc. among the field staff who are engaged with the programme is also main factor for the shortfall of achievement. Moreover, the concerning officers like BDOs/Sr. BDOs and Project Directors cannot afford time to look after the NPIC scheme due to other heavy works of Rural Dev. Schemes. Further more, the Government has created no departmental posts under the scheme of NPIC, scheme is

running with the officers/officials appointed for other rural Dev. Programmes. This is also one of the reasons of shortfall of the achievement of the target.

### OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.12 The Committee observes that the shortfall was varied between 17 to 50 per cent during 1991-92 to 1994-95. The shortfall in achievement was mainly attributed by the department for non supply of chulha according to the need and size of the family, portable chulha is not considered as smoke free by the beneficiaries. Therefore the department needs to pay more importance to fulfill the achievement as per target. With this observation the Committee decided to drop the para.

#### **Engagement of Self Employed Workers (SEW)**

(Audit Sub-para 6.5.7/CAG(Civil)/1994-95)

1.13 The audit has pointed out that though voluntary organisation/agencies, women agencies engaged for welfare of Women Autonomous Bodies, KVIC (Khadi and Village Industries Commission) were to be involved in the implementation of the programme as envisaged in the Scheme, no such organisation/agencies were engaged for the purpose. The improved Chulhas were to be installed by women Self Employed Worker (SEW) in the Block who should be skilled artisans/potters. In view of the important role of SEW, the scheme envisaged active supervision of district level officials to ensure selection of skilled artisans in the blocks. It was noticed that in Gosaigaon and Kachugaon Development Blocks in Kokrajhar District. Borbhag and Madhupur Development Block in Nalbari District and Moirabari Development Block in Morigaon District there were no SEWS. There were instances of engagement of 13 untrained SEWS in paschim Nalbari Development Block under Nalbari District. The department stated that all the women SEWS deployed under the programme were trained and were provided with necessary tools and mould but no records were produced in support of this statement. The Department also failed to constitute a committee for selection of skilled SEWS in Blocks and to

identify models after demonstration as envisaged in the scheme. The scheme further provided for 500 chulhas to be allocated per SEW who were to be paid Rs. 10 per chulha up to 1992-93 and Rs. 20 per chulha thereafter. However each SEW was entrusted with a target of installation of 200 chulhas (40 percent) owing to the area being of highly terrain and inaccessible. Progress report submitted to the Government of India for the year 1993-94 and 1994-95 revealed that 19,943 chulhas were installed by 672 SEWs during 1993-94 and 18,118 by 826 SEWs in 1994-95. This worked out to an average of 25 chulhas per SEW which was far below even the reduced target. The performance was only 12 per cent (which is very negligible).

1.14 The department by their written reply has stated that it is a fact that no voluntary women agency was involved in Implementation of NPIC programme, despite the specific instruction to the BDOs. However, efforts are on for involvement of such agency in the scheme. In Assam, skill artisans are not available in the rural areas. Hence only alternative is to select SEW from amongst the general people with proper training as prescribed by the MNES. In Gossaigaon and kachugaon in Kokrajhar District no SEW could be selected as the scope of conducting the training was not encouraging due to on-going disturbances. In Barbhag and Madhupur Block in Nalbari District and Moirabari in Morigaon District (all are newly created blocks) SEW have already been selected and training is imparted. Pachim Nalbari Dev. Block did not depute any SEW to attend the training organized by DRDA. However, SEWs of the above block have been imparted training subsequently, Necessary tools and moulds were supplied to the BDOs or use the SEW for installation of the fixed chulha. These tools and moulds were received by the BDOs with due receipts.

#### OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.15 The Committee satisfied with the reply of the departmental representatives and decided to drop the para.

**Idle stock**

(Audit Sub-para 6.5.8/CAG(Civil)/1994-95)

1.16 The audit has pointed out that (a) a test check of records of the blocks under 3 selected DRDAs revealed that materials (AC cowls, pipes etc.) for fixed chulhas with all the accessories which were supplied between 1987-88 and 1992-93 to the blocks by the Department for distribution to the beneficiaries were lying in stock without being issued for the purpose as detailed below :

Materials for fixed chulhas were lying in stock without being distributed to the beneficiaries

Name of District	Name of blocks	Year of receipt	Number of Chulhas for which materials were lying
------------------	----------------	-----------------	--

Morigaon	1. Lahorighat	1992-93	105
	2. Bhurbandha	1991-92	103
	3. Mayong	1989-90	86
Nalbari	1. Pub-Nalbari	1987-88	97
		1988-89	97
		1989-90	300
		1992-93	200
Kokrajhar	1. Dotoma	1991-92	<u>104</u>
			1092

Similarly there was very poor sale of portable chulhas on four blocks as shown below :

Name of District	Name of Blocks	Year of receipt	Number received	Balance sold	
Nalbari	1. Borbhag	1994-95	200	4	196
	2. Madhupur	1993-94	200	-	200
Morigaon	Moirabari	1993-94	200	41	159
Kokrajhar	kachugaon	1994-95	<u>200</u>	-	<u>200</u>
			800		755

It was stated that as the size of the Chulha as designed by the Government of India was not in conformity with the requirement of the beneficiaries there was no demand for these materials.

(b) a test chekx revealed that 2840 AC pipes and 1561 AC cowls valued at Rs. 1.25 lakhs procured in 1988-89 remained unutilised (May 1995) at different places (Tihu-Barama, Pub-Nalbari and Lohorighat). The Department stated (July 1995) that the items could not be utilised due to change of model.

1.17 The department by their written reply has stated that fixed chulah materials remained unused due to the reason of switching over to a new type of chimneyless model of fixed chulah. However, during the current year, MNES has directed to adopt fixed chulah with chimney. Accordingly, the BDOs are instructed to use the old stocks of the chulha materials, remained with them, for installation of the fixed chuihas during year 1998-99.

#### OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.18 Having heard the deposition of the departmental witnesses, the Committee has been pleased to drop the para.

#### **Support activities**

(Audit Sub-para 6.5.9/CAG(Civil)/1994-95)

1.19 The audit has pointed out that (a) Training : According to the scheme the SEWs and users are to be trained. The target for training of SEWs and users of chulha, was not fixed. In all 3933 SEWs (1989-90 : 400 ; 1990-91 : 530 ; 1991-92 : 687 ; 1992-93 : 702 ; 1993-94 : 788 and 1994-95 : 826) and 336 users (1990-91 : Nil ; 1991-92 : 114 ; 1992-93 : 62 ; 1993-94 : Nil and 1994-95 : 160) were trained. Information regarding number of SEWs and users to be trained was not furnished by the Department. (b) Publicity and Awareness : the scheme envisaged that the State Implementing Agency was to draw up a publicity campaign, demonstration programme etc. through the local Doordarshan kendra. All India radio and Press. No publicity measures were however organised.

1.20 The department by their written reply has stated that (a) Training : training are normally organised in the field level officers by the Project Director, DRDA and the Principal of the training Centres of Rural Dev. Department. The training is imparted to the SEWs by the trainers of the technical backup unit of NPIC. After completion of the training, respective organizers submit the statement of the trainees of that year. The number of trainees is found out on the basis of the reports submitted by the organizers. As stated in the audit Report, the figure of SEWs indifferent years was the cumulative total number of SEWs up to that year. So the Number of 826 SEWs as shown in the year 1994-95 was the cumulative total of SEWs for the period 1989-90 to 1994-95. The figure shown, as 3933 seems to be calculated, considering the sum of cumulative of each year from 1989 to 1994-95 which is not correct. In fact the total/number of SEWs trained during the period from 1989 to 90 to 1994-95 was 826 only instead of 3933. (b) Publicity and awareness : Although the efforts were made for publicity through the Doordarsan/All India Radio, it could not be materialized. Government sanctions Rs. 2.00 per chulha, per year under the head of publicity and awareness, which is too meager for the publicity. However, wide publicity by publishing and distributing leaflets and posters etc. has been made.

### OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.21 The Committee satisfied with the reply of the departmental witnesses and decided to drop the para.

#### Other topics of interest

(Audit Sub para 6.5.10/CAG(Civil)/1994-95

1.22 The audit has pointed out that (a) Installation of chulhas : The Project Director revealed that as per information collected from 4 blocks of Nalbari District (Tihu-barama, Paschim Nalbari, Pub Nalbari and barkhetri) and 2 blocks of Kokrajhar District (Dotoma and Kokrajhar), 457 and 336 fixed chulhas (value Rs. 0.92 lakh) respectively were dismantled. Besides 180

fixed chulhas (100 in Nalbari District and 80 in Kokrajhar District) remained unused due to defective installation. The Department stated (May 1995) that reports would be called for from concerned blocks. Thus the expenditure of Rs. 0.92 lakh proved infructuous. Between 1989-90 and 1993-94 a total amount of Rs. 16.19 lakhs had been disbursed to SEWs for installation of chulhas but the completion and performance certificates in support of installation of the chulhas by SEWs were not produced to audit. The Department stated (May 1995) that list of beneficiaries received from Blocks was considered as proof of installation. The reply is not tenable as the list cannot be considered reflecting actual installation and performance. It was also seen that out of 27,668 beneficiaries to whom chulhas were distributed in 1992-93 beneficiary list of 5,589 (20 per cent) only was available. In the absence of beneficiary list it was not clear how the Department verified the installation of chulhas in the remaining cases.

1.23 The department by their written reply has stated that (a) Installation of chulhas : It is envisaged in the guidelines of the NPIC that the SEW should be selected from the Block area by the district level officials and accordingly, the SEW, from different blocks were selected by the respective blocks and district level officers for imparting training. It is stated that as there was no instruction regarding constituting the District Level Committee for selection of SEW, no action was taken in that regard. In the present guidelines also there is no instruction for constituting the District Level Committee for selection of the SEW. (b) The report regarding dismantling of fixed chulha with chimney is as below : The fixed chulhas were installed by the trained SEW as per specification. These were not found to be defective. Most of the house in rural areas of Assam have thatched roof and need repairing almost every year. During the time of repairing of the roof house, the chimney of the chulhas gets dismantled. Further more, it is seen that the chimney of the fixed chulhas needs cleaning of soots almost every fourth night. Due to recurring cleaning of the pipes from above the roof, the thatched roof gets damaged. As a result the chulhas are dismantled to get rid of the roof damage. Hence, refund of dismantled chulhas valued Rs. 92,000.00 may not arise. Keeping in view the above reason, Government introduced only fixed chulhas without chimney and no case dismantling this chimneyless chulhas has been reported so far. However, Government



has again introduced the fixed chulha with chimney during the year 1998-99. The completion of performance certificate as suggested by Audit was not introduced earlier. During the year 1998-99, the BDOs have already been instructed to introduce the system of obtaining completion certificate.

### OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.24 The Committee satisfied that the department have already been instructed to introduce the system of obtaining completion certificate as suggested by the Audit and hence decided to drop the para.

### Monitoring and Evaluation

(Audit Sub para 6.5.11/CAG(Civil)/1994-95)

1.25 The audit has pointed out that (a) a test check of the records of the Directorate revealed that one Scientific Officer of the Ministry of Non Conventional Energy (MNES) visited a few blocks in May, 1994, August 1994 and December 1994 and suggested a review for propagation of the fixed chulhas without chimneys for wider acceptability by keeping in view food habits of the people, space and water heating requirements. It was also suggested that the smoke problem could also be solved if in place of a pipe a permanent chimney hood structure was provided. The Department could not state whether the above suggestion was accepted or not. (b) The programme envisaged a three tier monitoring and evaluation procedure by the State Implementing Agency/Technical Back up Unit, by Ministry of Non-conventional Energy Sources (MNES) and National Council for Applied Economic Evaluation Survey of national Programme for the years 1988-89 to 1990-91. The preliminary study of the evaluation report of NCAER was sent by MNES to the State Implementing Agency for taking remedial action/improvement of the national Programme. No action was taken by the Department in this respect. The Monitoring Cell of the State Implementing Agency maintained only periodic progress reports but had not produced any record about the impact to show the improvement made on the basis of suggestion given by NCAER. As per the scheme, when a village is fully provided with smokeless chulhas, such village is taken as smokeless village. The Annual report of TBU for 1992-93 and 1993-94

revealed that 4 (four villages, (3 in 1992-93 and 1 in 1993-94) were adopted by the TBU for conversion into smokeless village but no report about whether those villages actually became smokeless was produced to audit. The State officials of the Implementing Agency as well as Block Officers were required to ensure regular monitoring and supervision by paying field visits, No records in support of their visits were produced to audit. The State Government also did not prescribe any norm and schedule of visit for the purpose. The overall performance of the programme, has also not been evaluated.

1.26 The department by their written reply has stated that (a) In the Inspection Report of Sr. Scientific Officer (MNES), regional office submitted to the Directorate, it was suggested to provide a permanent chimney hood structure in place of A.C. pipe, to check the smoke. In reply to this letter, a clarification was sought for from the Sr. S. O. (NER) vide this Directorate letter No.PDD(CP)4/93/23 dated 1st June'94, regarding the cost, efficiency, construction material, construction specification and approval from the MNES. In our letter, it was proposed in place of A.C. pipes, may be more expensive in comparison to A.C. pipes, which may in turn in-crease the burden on the poor villagers. Due to this reason as well as for non-receipt of clarification and approval from MNES, the proposed chimney hood structure was not considered for implementation. It is also stated that as per guidelines of the MNES, only the approved models of chulhas can be taken up for propagation under scheme. In view of the above facts, in anticipation of getting approval and clarification from MNES, no action was initiated in the matter, However, a reminder addressed to the MNES has again been issued vide this Directorate letter No.PDDP(CP)4/93/63 dated 8th October'98. The implementation of the above structure of chulha could only be considered after receipt of approval from MNES. Hence para may be dropped. (b) The evaluation study was not made due to confusion regarding fund allotment. However, in consideration to the suggestion of Audit, the evaluation study will be taken up, subject to provision of fund made by the Government.

#### OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.27 The Committee heard the explanation from the departmental representatives and decided to drop the para.

### Summing up

(Audit Sub para 6.5.12/CAG(Civil)/1994-95)

1.28 The audit has pointed out that though the grants received from Government of India have been fully utilised there was shortfall in the installation of chulhas. The Department is yet to cover many blocks even though the scheme was being implemented since 1985. The performance of SEWS who are to install the chulhas was very poor as it was only 25 per SEW on an average against 200 targetted by the Department and 500 prescribed under the scheme. The Department could not produce records relating to verification of actual installation and performance of chulhas.

1.29 The department by their written reply has stated that the shortfall of achievement of target is mainly due to the late receipt of fund from the Government. Generally the fund is made available during the fag end of the financial year and due to that reason the target cannot be achieved fully. NPIC scheme has been covered in all the Blocks excluding the IREP Block where similar chulha programme is adopted. Further, the new blocks where concerning Staff was not appoint, where not included in the schemes. In case of bifurcation of a new block from the existing block the name of new blocks were not included in the list although the scheme was implemented in whole of the areas of the undivided blocks. However, from the year 1997-98, all the Dev. Blocks have been covered in the NPIC programme. The implementing Agency has been authorised to fix the target to each SEW and to train required number of trainees within the limit of allocated fund for the purpose. Due to topographical heterogeneity, the more number of SEWs are required in Assam for poor communication. That is why, the number of chulhas installed/distributed per SEW is less than the target fixed as per norms. Moreover, in some years, the numbers of portable chulhas distributed were more than the number of fixed chulhas installed. For the portable chulhas, the SEWs are not required. Hence, the number of chulhas per SEW are less than the allotted figure. Actually, the records for installation of chulhas are maintained by the BDOs/Project Directors. Some of such records were shown to the Audit team.

## OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.30 The Committee satisfied with the reply of the departmental witnesses and decided to dispose of the para.

### **Irregular disbursment of subsidy**

(Audit para 6.6/CAG(Civil)/1994-95)

1.31 The audit has pointed out that after scrutiny by Audit (March 1995) revealed that the project Director (PD) District Rural Development Agency (DRDA), Hailakandi purchased and distributed horticulture seedlings, manure and pesticides worth Rs.6.95 lakhs to 151 selected families of South hailakandi Development Block between September 1992 and April 1993 as subsidy for planting these material in their respective agricultural land. Apart from subsidy in kind, financial assistance of Rs. 0.60 lakh was also provided to those families in order to enable them to cover their respective plantation areas with bamboo fencing. However, the subsidy to the families was released without linkage with institutional finance. The PD in his reply stated (April 1995) that due to non-availability of requisite number of bank branches in the concerned localities the programme was implemented with the approval of the Chairman of the Governing Body, DRDA. The grant of subsidy under IRD programme without credit linkage was irregular and main objective of the programme i.e. upliftment of IRD families above the poverty line was not fully achieved. The departments on plea of non-availability of bank branches in the area was also not tenable in view of alternate arrangements prescribed by the Government of India

1.31 The department by their written reply has stated that Hailakandi : In South hailakandi Development Block 151 Tribal families were given IRDP assistance under delinking procedure. These are as follows :

Name of the village	No. of Tribal beneficiaries	Date of distributions	Amount
Balcherra	100	23,09.92	Rs.4,99,892.00
Balcherra	20	12,04.98	Rs. 99,854.00
Balcherra	31	12,04.93	Rs.1,54,966.00
Total	151		Rs.7,54,712.00

These village of South hailakandi Development Block are situated in the border areas of hailakandi and Mizoram State. They are all tribal families and living below poverty line. In South Hailakandi Development Block, the population is 63,127 approximately as per 1991 Census but there are only two Bank branches of Cachar Gramin bank located at Jamira and Manipur. The villages where the beneficiaries are resident are located at a distance of 35/40 Km approximatel from the bank branches name above. As a matter of fact there are no Bank branches in the neighborhood. The people living in border areas are deprived of benefits under IRDP. During the year 1994-95 only 43 IRDP beneficiaries were assisted by these to Bank branches. It is to help these people living below poverty line that the Horticulture Scheme as mooted and approved by the Agriculture Department was taken up. Para 7.18 of IRDP manual provides for authorizing the DRDAs to draw the amounts from the bank on the strength of State Government's guarantee in those Blocks where there are no Bank branches. In the instant case disbursement under delinking procedure was made in border areas of South hailakandi Development Block in the line of State Government's approval for Katigorah Development Block (within Cachar District) vide Government letter No. RDD.272/91/6 dated 27th February'92. on 27th February'92 Hailakandi DRDA was not created, as Hailakandi Sub-Division was part of Cachar District. Subsequently, State Government also approved disbursment under delinking procedure in other areas of cachar District vide Government letter No.RDD.272/91/8 dated 4th July'92. Regarding land holdings of the beneficiaries, it is stated that the beneficiaries do not have any pattas land but in occupation of remote forestland in un-surveyed areas and they can utilize the agricultural inputs in about 10 bighas of land. During the month of September and even October and during April there are rainfall in this district and so helpful to plantation. The Agriculture Departments ideal time is only as average but there are exceptions as in the instant case. All care was taken to inform the beneficiaries through the Gram. Sevaka verbally, about delivery of seedling. The expenditure of Rs. 7.56 lakhs incurred was of help to the beneficiaries and there are more demand from these areas for implementation of such schemes. It may be stated that the State Government is not in a position to authorised the DRDA to draw loan amount from Banks and to stand guarantee to draw such loan.

## OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

133 The Committee discussed the matter thoroughly and satisfied with the replies of departmental witnesses and hence the Committee has been pleased to drop the para.

### Mis-utilisation of fund

(Audit para 6.7/CAG(Civil)/1994-95)

1.34 The audit has pointed out that a test-check (August 1994) of the accounts of the Project Director, District Rural Development Agency (DRDA), North Cachar Hills, Halflong revealed that though there was no provision under JRY scheme for construction of buildings to be used by banks, between 1988-89 and 1990-91 three buildings were constructed under JRY at Laisong, Khepri and Chotodanglai at a total cost of rs. 2.59 lakhs for use by the Banks (State Bank of India and Rural Bank) as branches. There was nothing in the records produced to audit to show that there was any proposal from Bank authorities to open branches at those places. The buildings remained unutilised as of August 1994. In another case construction of buildings for two lower primary schools at Digarkro and Borlongpher was taken up under the YOJANA during 1990-91. After incurring an expenditure of Rs. 1.37 lakhs, the work was abandoned after leaning that school buildings already existed at the above locations. Thus funds to the extent of Rs. 3.96 lakhs was not utilised for the purposes as envisaged in JRY scheme.

1.35 The department by their written reply has stated that N. C. Hills : The Audit objection regarding construction of Bank buildings under JRY between 1988-89 and 1990-91 at Laisong, Khepre and Chato Langlai amounting to Rs. 2,58,579.00 has been noted. The schemes for construction of the buildings were approved and recommended by the Block Level Construction Committee with a view that the same may be given to banks for running Rural Branches in those remoted areas for the welfare of villagers in those rural areas. As people from these areas have to travel a great distance for availing loans etc. Under various schemes from the banks it has hampered

their development to a great extent. The members of the public felt that if buildings were made available in these remote areas then banks can be asked to open branches there and provide good public service and also help in successful implementation of IRDP schemes. In the meanwhile as the construction works of these buildings completed the law and order situation in North Cachar Hills District deteriorated to a large extent. As the activities of the insurgents increased and disturbances took place frequently the initiative for opening of new bank branches died a natural death. However, the buildings so constructed were handed over to the public to be used as Community Halls-cum-Recreation Centres as per felt needs of the people of these areas. The matter was also apprised to the Hon'ble Members of the Public Accounts Committee during 1993-94 and they conducted spot verification of the same and deemed to have been considered. As envisaged in JRY manual, all rural works resulting in creation of durable, productive, community assets can be taken up under the Jojana. As these buildings originally meant for housing banks are utilized for Community purpose the utility of the scheme has been derived by the local community and as such the observations made by the audit may kindly be dropped. Regarding construction of L. P. Schools of Digarkro and Borolongpher under JRY during 1990-91 amounting to Rs. 1.37 lakhs it is reported by the concerned Block Development Officers that N. C. Hills District Council had constructed schools in the above two places but the condition of the existing schools were dilapidated condition and not also adequate to put up all the children in the school. Hence, necessary renovations and construction of new rooms were taken up for the schools as per approval of the Governing Body of the DRDA, N. C. Hills. As the buildings were constructed for sole purpose of using it as L. P. Schools hence there does not appear to be any violation of the norms as laid down in the JRY manual.

#### OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.36. The Committee decided to drop the para with a direction that the department should follow the guideline in implementation of such schemes in future.

## Unauthorised expenditure under Indira Awas Yojana

(Audit oara 6.8/ CAG(Civil)/1994-95)

1.37 The audit has pointed out that a test check (march 1995) of the accounts of the project Director (PD), District Rural Development Agency (DRDA), Hailakandi revealed that out of a target of 100 houses, 82\* houses were constructed under five development blocks (Katlichera, Algapur, Lala, Hailakandi and South Hailakandi). The total cost incurred was Rs. 22.22 lakhs against the maximum permissible limit of Rs. 9.27 lakhs (i.e. Rs. 8,000+ Rs. 3,300 = Rs. 11,300 X 82) as the houses were not constructed in clusters/microhabitat approach. The houses were, however, not provided with sanitary latrines and smokeless chulhas. Failure to restrict the expenditure within the permissible amount resulted in extra expenditure of Rs. 12.95 lakhs. In reply, the Agency stated (March-April 1995) that the excess expenditure was due to change of specification of houses as per demand of the beneficiaries. The Agency further stated that the extra expenditure was met from the interest fund of JRY. The reply of the Agency was not acceptable to audit because they were not authorised to change the specification of the houses as per demand of beneficiaries and the interest earned has to be credited to JRY fund and cannot be utilised to meet any expenditure incurred over and above the norms laid down.

1.38 The department by their written reply has stated that Hailakandi : The IAY houses were constructed as per model estimate prepared in the Directorate. Each unit of IAY house cost Rs. 14,500/- as per 1991 estimate. It has certain specification lying plinth area of 20 sqm., Break wall, and GCI roofing etc., The total houses constructed in the five development Blocks under DRDA., Hailakandi is 82. Therefore, 82 x 14,500.00 - Rs. 11,89,000/- and not Rs. 9.27 as stated by Audit. The amount in excess was expended to make permanent nature of house i.e. R.C.C., Assam Type as the beneficiaries had their existing latrine and smokeless chulhas.

### OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.39 The Committee heard the deposition from the departmental representative and recommends that the matter should be reconciled with A.G. (Audit), Assam and submit a report to the Committee within 30 days from the date of presentation of this report before the House.



### **Improper utilisation of fund**

(Audit para 6.9/CAG(Civil)/1994-95)

1.40 The audit has pointed out that a test-check (March 1995) of the accounts of the DRDA, Hailakandi revealed that (a) the bank draft for Rs. 2.10 lakhs was handed over to the NGO in June 1993 without entering into an agreement specifying the conditions laid down by the Directorate ; (b) As per report of the Assistant Project Officer (Technical) of DRDA, the work was not done as per approved plan and estimate. Besides, the entire amount of 1st instalment was not spent but utilisation certificate for the same was submitted by the NGO. The Chairman also urged that the 2nd instalment be released to the Project Director, DRDA and not to the NGO for taking up the remaining constructional work ; Despite this the 2nd instalment of Rs. 4.06 lakhs was also paid to the NGO (July 1994). The PD was also asked to ensure completion of the construction work by 14 August 1994 and to furnish the utilisation certificate and completion report by 31 August 1994 ; (c) The work remained incomplete as of April 1995. The reason for non-completion of the work by the NGO within the stipulated period or reason for not initiating any action against them had not been indicated by the PD.

1.41 The department by their written reply has stated that Hailakandi : Directorate of Panchayat and Rural Development, Assam sanction Rs. 6.16 lakhs to M/S North Hailakandi Handloom Co-operative Society Ltd., Algapur, Cachar vide sanction No.DRD-8/02/92-93/97 dated 4th May'92. The copy of sanction was given to Project Director, Hailakandi for necessary action. The 1st instalment of Rs. 2.10 lakhs was released to the organization through Project Director, Hailakandi. Since the 1st instalment was released to the organization submitted Utilization Certificate to Deputy Commissioner. It has become necessary to release 2nd instalment to the same organization. (a) It may be mentioned that there is no provision for entering into contract while disbursing fund to NGOs and as such no agreement was made. (b) The 2nd instalment was released directly to the organization as per utilization certificate submitted by the organization to Deputy Commissioner, Hailakandi. (c) The completion Report alongwith utilization certificate of Rs. 6.61 lakhs.

## OBSERVATIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

1.42 The Committee is not satisfied with the replies of the departmental witnesses regarding incurred expenditure of Rs. 6.61 lakh. The Committee, therefore recommends that the department should reconcile the matter with the A.G. (Audit), Assam and submit a report to the Committee within 30 days from the date of presentation of this report before the House.

**ANNEXURE-I**

**The Members of the Sub-Committee 'B' of the Committee on Public Accounts (2003-2006)**

**Convenor :**

1. Shri Dilip Kumar Saikia

**Members :**

2. Shri Gautam Bora
3. Shri Dharamsing Teron
4. Shri Dilder Rezza
5. Dr. Zoi Nath Sarmah
6. Shri Chandan Kumar Sarkar.