## CHAPTER II

## FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT AND BUDGETARY CONTROL

The Comptroller and Auditor General of India performs the audit of appropriations to ascertain whether the expenditure actually incurred under various grants underlying the budget are within authorisations given under the Appropriation Act for the year, that expenditure required to be charged under the provisions of the Constitution is so charged, and whether, expenditure is incurred is in conformity with the law, relevant rules and regulations and instructions.

### 2.1 Summary of Appropriation Accounts

The summarized position of actual expenditure during 2016-17 against 72 grants/appropriations is given in Table 2.1.
Table 2.1: Summarized position of actual expenditure vis-à-vis total budget provisions

|  | Nature of Expenditure | Total Grant/ Appropriation | Actual Expenditure | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Saving (-)/ } \\ & \text { Excess (+) } \end{aligned}$ | Amount surrendered | Amount surrendered on 31 March | Percentage of savings surrendered by 31 March |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { ت} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | I Revenue | 59,008.79 | 45,401.78 | -13,607.01 | 9,742.39 | 9,721.09 | 71.60 |
|  | II Capital | 15,097.74 | 10,261.34 | -4,836.40 | 4,957.92 | 4,957.92 | 102.51 |
|  | III Loans and Advances | 752.26 | 333.15 | -419.11 | 395.05 | 395.05 | 94.26 |
| Total Voted |  | 74,858.79 | 55,996.27 | -18,862.52 | 15,095.36 | 15,074.06 | 80.03 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 己 } \\ & \text { oun } \\ & \text { تِ } \\ & \text { تِ } \end{aligned}$ | IV Revenue | 3,370.47 | 3,300.88 | -69.59 | 21.18 | 21.18 | 30.44 |
|  | V Capital | 26.73 | 21.04 | -5.69 | 5.71 | 5.71 | 100.35 |
|  | VI Public debt | 1,946.33 | 1,152.63 | -793.70 | 793.70 | 793.70 | 100.00 |
| Total Charged |  | 5,343.53 | 4,474.55 | -868.98 | 820.59 | 820.59 | 94.43 |
| Grand Total |  | 80,202.32 | 60,470.82 | -19,731.50 | 15,915.95 | 15,894.65 | 80.66 |

Note: Figures of actual expenditure includes recoveries adjusted as reduction of expenditure under voted revenue expenditure
(Source: Appropriation Accounts 2016-17)
The total savings amounted to $₹ 19,743.88$ crore $^{1}$ ( 24.62 per cent of total grants/ appropriation), Budget Controlling Officers allowed ₹ $3,827.93$ crore (19.39 per cent of total saving) to lapse at the end of the financial year. Out of the balance savings ₹ $15,915.95$ crore, $₹ 15,894.65$ crore was surrendered on 31 March 2017, leaving no scope for utilisation of these funds for other developmental purposes. This is a serious cause of concern and indicates the failure of the Finance Department to ensure effective budgetary control.
Recommendation: All anticipated savings should be surrendered on time so that the funds can be utilised for developmental purposes.

[^0]
### 2.2 Financial Accountability and Budgetary Management

### 2.2.1 Excess over provisions relating to previous years (2000-01 to 2016-17) requiring regularization

Under Article 205 of the Constitution of India, it is mandatory for a State Government to get the excess over a grant/ appropriation regularised by the State Legislature.

Excess expenditure of ₹ $3,245.17$ crore over provisions for the years 2000-01 to 2015-16 was yet to be regularised (October 2017) as detailed in Appendix 2.1.

In addition, the following excess as given in Table 2.2 below, pertaining to 2016-17 is also to be regularised.

Table 2.2: Excess over provisions requiring regularisation during 2016-17
(₹in crore)

| SI. <br> no. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grant } \\ \text { no. } \end{gathered}$ | Name of Grant | Total Grant/ Appropriation | Actual expenditure | Excess expenditure requiring regularization |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Revenue Voted |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | 50 | Departments implementing 20-Point Programme | 1.87 | 2.45 | 0.58 |
| Revenue Charged |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | CH-1 | Interest Payments and Servicing of Debt | 2,876.56 | 2,886.83 | 10.27 |
| 3 | 6 | Finance Department | 0.50 | 1.67 | 1.17 |
| 4 | 55 | Women and Child Development | 0.00* | 0.02 | 0.02 |
| Capital Voted |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5 | 6 | Finance Department | 60.10 | 60.44 | 0.34 |
|  |  | Total | 2,939.03 | 2,951.41 | 12.38 |

* Initially a token amount of ₹ 10,000 was provisioned.
(Source: Appropriation Accounts 2016-17)
Recommendation: The State Government is required to get all the existing cases of excess expenditure regularised at the earliest and in future such expenditure may be completely stopped, except in case(s) of dire and extreme emergency, where the expenditure should only be met from the Contingency Fund.


### 2.2.2 Persistent excess expenditure

Persistent excess expenditure over provision was observed in 11 sub heads under six grants/appropriations during the last three years. Excess expenditure incurred each year under these sub heads/schemes are shown in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3: Persistent excess expenditure

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \mathbf{S .} \\ & \mathbf{N} . \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Grant } \\ \hline \text { No. } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Name of the Sub Head | 2014-15 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | CH-2 | 6004-02-101-3052-Block Loans | 6.54 | 7.91 | 9.63 |
| 2 | 6 | 2071-01-102-3080-Payment of Commuted value of pension in India | 3.22 | 3.88 | 2.83 |
| 3 |  | 2235-60-200-7000-Recoupment of Pension Welfare Fund | 4.23 | 3.36 | 3.39 |
| 4 |  | 7810-122-5675-Inter State Adjustment between Madhya Pradesh and Chhattisgarh | 1.12 | 0.39 | 0.34 |
| 5 | 7 | 2030-01-101-4612-Cost of Stamps | 2.50 | 4.11 | 3.64 |
| 6 | 19 | 2071-01-800-5499- Medical facilities for retired employees | 2.25 | 2.11 | 3.21 |
| 7 |  | 2210-03-198-0101-620-Sub-Health Centres | 0.68 | 4.75 | 22.95 |
| 8 | 32 | 2210-80-800-3956-Advertising, Sales and Publicity expenses | 0.50 | 0.24 | 1.56 |
| 9 | 41 | 2210-03-796-197-0102-5998-Community <br> Health Centre | 7.48 | 8.8 | 5.63 |
| 10 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2210-03-796-198-0102-2777-Primary } \\ & \text { Health Centre (Basic Services) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 9.66 | 1.77 | 3.08 |
| 11 |  | 2210-03-796-198-0102 -620-Sub-Health Centres | 6.54 | 6.19 | 20.00 |
|  |  | Total | 44.72 | 43.51 | 76.26 |

(Source: Appropriation Accounts from 2014-15 to 2016-17)
Recommendation: The Finance Department should ensure that no Budget Controlling Officers resort to excess expenditure over the regular allocations approved by the State Legislature and departmental action may be initiated for those who are responsible for the same.

### 2.2.3 Excess expenditure under schemes

In 33 cases, expenditure aggregating ₹ $1,347.11$ crore under various sub heads exceeded the approved provision by $₹ 10$ crore or more in each case as detailed in Appendix 2.2.

### 2.2.4 Savings

The outcome of the appropriation audit revealed that in 67 cases relating to 44 grants and three appropriations, the savings amounting to ₹ $16,292.43$ crore exceeded more than ₹ 10 crore in each case and were also more than 20 per cent of the total provisions as detailed in Appendix 2.3.

Further, against the total savings of ₹ $19,743.88$ crore, significant savings of ₹ 100 crore or more and also more than 10 per cent of the total provision occurred in 37 cases under 29 grants and one appropriation aggregating $₹ 17,337.73$ crore ( 87.81 per cent of total savings) as detailed in Appendix 2.4.

Besides, significant savings exceeding ₹ 20 crore and above in each case were noticed in 25 sub-heads/schemes under 13 grants. Details of final savings are given in Appendix 2.5.

Recommendation: The State Government should prepare budget as per actual need and ensure its optimum utilisation.

### 2.2.5 Persistent savings

In 52 cases under 41 grants and one appropriation during the period 2012-13 to 2016-17, there were persistent savings of more than ₹ 10 crore in each case as shown in Appendix 2.6. The savings ranged between one and 100 per cent of the total budget of the respective grants which indicate that the budgeting was not realistic. In eight cases there were persistent savings of more than 30 per cent each of the provision.
This had been pointed out in earlier State Finance Reports, but the problem still persists.

Recommendation: The Finance Department should review monthly expenditure more effectively so that all anticipated savings are surrendered on time.

### 2.2.6 Entire budget provisions not utilised under sub heads

In 51 cases, under 24 grants the entire provision of ten crore or more made for various sub heads aggregating to ₹ $1,859.53$ crore remained unutilised. Details are given in Appendix 2.7.

### 2.2.7 Supplementary provisions under Grants/Appropriations

a) Unnecessary supplementary provisions

In 36 grants and one appropriation, supplementary provision of $₹$ one crore or more in each case aggregating ₹ $3,181.50$ crore obtained during the year proved entirely unnecessary as the actual expenditure was less than the original provision. Details are shown in Appendix 2.8.
b) Excessive supplementary provisions

In 10 grants against the additional requirement of $₹ 276.78$ crore, supplementary provision of ₹ $2,832.44$ crore proved excessive. The resultant savings exceeding ₹ one crore or more in each case, aggregating ₹ $2,556.10$ crore are shown in Appendix 2.9.

Recommendation: The State Government should prepare supplementary budget as per actual need so that supplementary provisions are more realistic.

### 2.2.8 Supplementary provisions under sub heads/schemes

a) Unnecessary supplementary provisions

In 44 cases, under 19 grants, supplementary provision of ₹ one crore or more in each case aggregating ₹ 628.51 crore obtained during the year proved entirely unnecessary as the actual expenditure was less than the original provision. The details are shown in Appendix 2.10.
b) Excessive supplementary provisions

In 52 cases, under 24 grants, against the additional requirement of ₹ $1,978.18$ crore, supplementary provision of ₹ $3,008.58$ crore proved excessive. The resultant savings exceeding ₹ one crore or more in each case, aggregating ₹ $1,030.40$ crore is shown in Appendix 2.11.
c) Inadequate supplementary provisions

In 18 cases, under 11 grants, against the additional requirement of ₹ 883.88 crore, supplementary provision of ₹ 440.86 crore proved inadequate. The resultant deficit exceeding $₹$ one crore or more in each case, aggregating ₹ 443.02 crore is shown in Appendix 2.12.

### 2.2.9 Excessive/unnecessary/insufficient re-appropriation of funds

There were excess/savings of more than ₹ 10 crore and above after reappropriation in 27 sub heads/schemes under 14 grants as detailed in Appendix 2.13. This indicates that the estimates were not properly assessed, as even after the withdrawal/ augmentation of funds through re-appropriation, there were final savings/ excesses in the grants.

### 2.2.10 Surrender in excess of actual savings

In 36 cases, the amounts surrendered ( $₹ 50$ lakh or more in each case) were in excess of the actual savings, indicating inadequate budgetary control in these departments. As against savings of ₹ $6,112.35$ crore, the amount surrendered was ₹ $6,698.42$ crore, resulting in excess surrender of ₹ 586.07 crore. The details are given in Appendix 2.14.
Recommendation: Budget Controlling Officers should assess balances available with them before surrender of funds.

### 2.2.11 Anticipated savings not surrendered

In 9 cases under five grants and three appropriations savings of more than $₹$ one crore in each case had occurred but no part of the same was surrendered by the concerned departments. The total amount involved in these cases was ₹ 609.02 crore which is 3.08 per cent of the total savings of $₹ 19,743.89$ crore as detailed in Appendix 2.15.
Similarly, out of the savings of ₹ $10,736.09$ crore in 37 cases under 27 grants and three appropriations (after surrender, savings of ₹ one crore and above in each case), provisions amounting to ₹ $4,479.11$ crore ( 41.72 per cent of above savings) were not surrendered as detailed in Appendix 2.16.
Recommendation: All anticipated savings should be surrendered on time so that the funds can be utilised for other development purposes.

### 2.2.12 Rush of expenditure

As per Paragraph 92 of Madhya Pradesh Budget Manual (as followed by Government of Chhattisgarh), rush of expenditure particularly in closing months of the financial year should be avoided. Contrary to this, in 39 Major Heads, expenditure of ₹ $5,569.91$ crore was incurred during the last quarter of 2016-17 which was 64 per cent of the total expenditure of ₹ $8,756.54$ crore under these heads as detailed in Appendix 2.17. Of this, ₹ 277.67 crore ( 32 per cent) of total expenditure was incurred in the month of March 2017.
Rush of expenditure in the closing month of the financial year entails risk of misuse of public money and unhealthy practices. Rush of expenditure in the last quarter of the financial year is not prudent financial management and is against the provision in the budget manual.

Recommendation: The Finance Department should control rush of expenditure during the fag end of the financial year.

### 2.3 Advances from the Contingency Fund

As per the Chhattisgarh Contingency Fund Act, 2001 of the State, no advance shall be made out of the Contingency Fund, except for the purposes of meeting unforeseen expenditure. During 2016-17, the state Government drew ₹ 2.29 crore from the Contingency Fund as shown in in Table 2.4.

Table 2.4: Expenditure from Contingency Fund of the State

| Sl. <br> No. | Department | Nature of expenditure for which <br> advances were drawn from the <br> Contingency Fund | Month of <br> Drawal | Amount <br> of <br> Advance |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | Tourism | Supply of drinking water and construction <br> of toilet at Institute of Hotel Management <br> for the implementation of the "Hammar <br> Chhattisgarh Scheme". | June 2016 | 2.09 |
| 2 | Forest | For payment of decree amount | October 2016 | 0.20 |

In the case of tourism department, the expenditure did not meet the criteria for drawal from Contingency Fund as this expenditure was not of an unforeseen or of an emergent character. Thus, the advance drawn from Contingency Fund the purpose was in violation of the Act. However, the total withdrawal from the fund during 2016-17 was recouped through supplementary budget.

Recommendation: The State Government should ensure that no advances are drawn from the Contingency Fund except to meet expenditure of emergent and unforeseen nature.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ There was an overall savings of $₹ 19,743.88$ crore and excess of $₹ 12.38$ crore which resulted in a net saving of ₹ $19,731.50$ crore.

