Chapter VI

COST OF PRODUCTION OF JUTE AND ITS COMPETING CROPS PER BIGHA IN THE SELECTED BLOCKS OF COOCH BEHAR DISTRICT

6.1. Introduction

In this chapter the aim is to present a discussion on the quantitative aspect of the cost of production of jute and its competing crops in the selected blocks of Cooch Behar district. From the survey on the sample farms over the selected blocks in this district it is found that apart from aus paddy there is no other dominant competing crop of jute. For this, the discussion in this chapter concerned with the above noted objective reduces to the quantitative aspect of the cost of production of jute and its competing crop, namely, aus paddy. Categorically, the objectives are: (i) whether there remains any difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha, (ii) if there be any difference between these two, then what is the extent of the difference, and (iii) to identify the factor(s) responsible for the disparity between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha.

6.2. Some Conceptual Issues

The discussion furnishing the content of the objectives set in the above paragraph has been carried out on the basis of the cost concepts, namely, cost A1, cost B, cost C and cash expenditure. Cost A, includes value of hired human labour, attached labour, hired bullock labour, owned bullock labour, hired machinery charges, owned machine labour, seed (both farm-produced and purchased), fertilizers, manures (owned and purchased), insecticides and pesticides, irrigation charges (both owned and hired), land revenue, cess and other taxes, depreciation on farm implements and tools, farm buildings, farm machineries and irrigation structure, interest on working capital, miscellaneous expenses (artisans, ropes and repair to small farm implements). Cost B here includes the value of the items constituting cost A1 and imputed rental value of owned land (less land revenue paid thereupon) added with the imputed interest on fixed capital (excluding land). Cost C incorporates here the value of items included in the cost B and imputed value of family labour. Cash expenditure consists of all cash payments relating to hired human labour, attached human labour, hired bullock labour, hired machinery charges, seed (both farm-produced and purchased), fertilizers, manures (owned and purchased), insecticides and pesticides and irrigation charges (both owned and hired).

The other concept of cost B is : cost A_2 plus imputed value of owned land (less fland revenue paid thereupon) added

with imputed interest on fixed capital (excluding land). while $\cot A_2$ is defined as : $\cot A_1$ consisting of the items mentioned above combined with the rent paid for leasedin land. This concept has not been considered here as there has not been found any incident of leasing-in land in cultivating either jute or aus paddy in the selected blocks of Cooch Behar district.

6.3. <u>Magnitudes of Cost of Production of Jute and Aus</u> Paddy per Bigha

Table 6.1 shows the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha on the basis of cost concepts stated above for the three sizes of holding, namely, marginal, small and large over the selected blocks and in the district as a whole. From this table it is observed that cost of production of jute per bigha is higher than the cost of production of aus paddy per bigha over the selected blocks and in the district as a whole in the cases of all sizes of holding and all the cost concepts used.

The extent of the height of the cost of production of jute per bigha in relation to that of aus paddy per bigha is observed from Table 6.2. It is discerned from this table that the cost of production per bigha of jute expressed as the percentage of the cost of production of aus paddy per bigha irrespective of cost basis is higher than 141.65 in the cases of all sizes of holding in all the selected blocks except Dinhata block I and in the district as a whole.

Tables 6.3 and 6.4 may add in this context more specifications about the analysis relating to the first two objectives set in this chapter. From Table 6.3 the absolute difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha respective to cost concepts considered is observed for all sizes of holding over all the selected blocks and in the district as a whole. From this table it is observed that the absolute difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha irrespective of cost basis is higher than N. 200 in the cases of all sizes of holding over all the selected blocks and in the district as a whole except Dinhata block I and Tufanganj block II. Among these two places in Dinhata block I with respect to cost A, and cash expenditure the said difference is less than Rs. 200 in the cases of all sizes of holding and in the block as a whole, while with respect to cost C that is greater than Rs. 200 in the cases of all sizes of holding and in the block as a whole but with respect to cost B the figure is higher than Rs. 200 in cases of small and large sizes of holding. In Tufanganj block II the absolute difference between the cost of production of jute and that of aus paddy per bigha

is higher than R. 200 relating to all cost basis, in cases of all sizes of holding and in the block as a whole except marginal sizes of holding in which case the same figure is less than R. 200 with respect to cost A_1 and cash expenditure.

whatever be the picture of the absolute difference between the cost of production of jute and that of aus paddy per bigha Table 6.4 presenting the difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha as the percentage of the cost of production of aus paddy per bigha shows that the said percentages relating to all cost concepts are higher than 41.65 in all blocks except Dinhata block I and in the district as a whole.

6.4. Factors Explaining the Disparity between the Cost of Production of Jute and Aus Paddy per Bigha

The underlined factors behind the extent of disparity between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha discussed so far in the following manner may be identified in the cases of cost A_1 , cost B, cost C and cash expenditure from Tables 6.5, 6.6, 6.7 and 6.8 respectively.

On excluding the results obtained for all the cases relating to Dinhata block I along with the case of marginal

size of holding of Cooch Behar block II, accrued from the aggregation relating to this issue, it is observed from Table 6.5 that largely above 90 per cent of the absolute difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha calculated on the basis of $\cot A_1$ is occupied by the absolute difference between the value of human labour uses in producing both these crops in the cases of all sizes of holding in all the selected blocks except Haldibari block and Tufanganj block II and in the district as a whole. In the Haldibari block the corresponding percentages are observed to lie below 90 but more than 80 in cases of all sizes of holding and in the block as a whole. In Tufanganj block II the said percentages are observed to be extended between 80 and 90 everywhere except marginal size of holding in the case of which the same is above 90.

The rest of the percentage shares in the absolute difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha on the basis of $\cos t A_1$ are occupied by the input items namely, manures, fertilizers, interest on working capital, insecticides and pesticides, depreciation on implements and machineries, bullock labour etc. in a descending order of importance. As these items do not occupy notable shares in the above-mentioned difference, so an elaborate analysis similar to human labour has not been made here. And

the similar practice has been made in the successive analysis relating to cost basis namely, cost B, cost C and cash expenditure.

Table 6.6 exhibits that the absolute value of the difference between the value of human labour uses in the production of jute and aus paddy per bigha occupies more than 70 per cent of the share of the absolute value of the difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha calculated on the basis of cost concept namely, cost B in all sizes of holding relating to Cooch Behar block II, Dinhata block I and in the district as a whole except large size of holding in Cooch Behar block II in the case of which the same is below 70. In the Haldibari block, the corresponding percentages are marginally above 60 relating to the marginal and large sizes of holding and in other cases these are marginally below 60. In Tufanganj block II the corresponding percentages are observed to lie between 60 and 70 in all cases. The absolute value of the difference between the inputs namely, imputed value of owned land, manures, fertilizers, interest on fixed capital, interest on working capital, insecticides and pesticides etc. are observed to occupy the percentage share in the remaining part of the difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha in a descending order of importance.

Table 6.7 furnishes that the percentage share of the absolute value of the difference between uses of human labour in producing jute and aus paddy per bigha in the absolute value of the difference between the cost of production of these two crops per bigha calculated on the basis of the measure, cost C, is higher than 70 but below 80 in cases of all sizes of holding relating to Cooch Behar block II, Tufanganj block II and in the district as a whole except marginal size of holding in Cooch Behar block II and in the district as a whole and also small size of holding relating to Cooch Behar block II. In these cases the corresponding percentages are marginally above 80. In the Haldibari block the corresponding percentages are observed to lie between 60 and 70 in all cases and in fine, the same relating to the Dinhata block I are marginally above 90 in every case except the case of large size of holding where the percentage is slightly above 98. The percentage shares of the difference between the values relating to the factors namely, imputed value of owned land, manures, fertilizers, etc. utilised in the production of jute and aus paddy per bigha in the absolute value of the difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha measured in terms of cost C are observed to be negligible and be existed in a descending order of importance.

In keeping outside the results obtained for Dinhata block I, Cooch Behar block II except small size of holding and the results for the district as a whole except the cases of small and large sizes of holding it is evident from Table 6.8 that 84 per cent to 90 per cent share of the difference between the cash expenditure required for producing jute and aus paddy per bigha goes to the difference between the value of the factor namely, human labour used for producing jute and aus paddy per bigha in all the selected blocks and in the district as a whole in cases of all sizes of holding except small size of holding in Haldibari block and Cooch Behar block II, Tufangan; block II as a whole inclusive of marginal size of holding, combined results respective to small and large sizes of holding for the district as a whole. Almost in all these cases the said share is marginally above 95 per cent except small size of holding in Cooch Behar block II and marginal size of holding in Tufangani block II where the corresponding percentages are 98.51 and 98.15 respectively and the result for the Tufangan | block II as a whole is 92.33.

Besides, the rest of the difference of the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha calculated on the basis of cash expenditure concept goes to the difference of the absolute values relating to the factors, namely,

manures, fertilizers, insecticides and pesticides etc. in a descending order of importance. But from the light of the description relating to the share of human labour it may easily be conceived that the shares in the difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha measured in terms of cash expenditure, of the differences between the absolute value relating to the factors namely, manures, fertilizers, insecticides and pesticides etc. used in the production of jute and aus paddy per bigha are very much negligible. Therefore, a detailed discussion relating to the aspect other than that of human labour has not been made here.

In leaving aside fourteen cases with eratic results originated due to aggregation, it may be perceived from the above discussion and from further investigation over the Tables 6.5 to 6.8 that irrespective of cost basis out of 66 results in the cases of all sizes of holding in the selected blocks and in the district as a whole in 37 events, that is, marginally above 56 per cent of the total events are associated with 80 per cent to 100 per cent share occupied by the difference between the value of human labour utilised in the production of jute and aus paddy per bigha in the difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha.

This may be clearly understood from the Table 6.9. However, this may help one to possess the view that almost in all the cases of sizes of holding in the selected blocks and in the district as a whole more than 80 per cent of the difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha measured in terms of whichever cost concepts considered in this study is occupied by the difference between the values of human labour used in producing jute and aus paddy per bigha. This probably means that more than 80 per cent of the difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha originated from the difference between the values of human labour utilised for producing jute and aus paddy per bigha in the selected blocks and in the district as a whole. Therefore, it may not be a serious error to ascribe the sole responsibility on the difference between the value of human labour used in both the crops in causing the difference between the cost of production of these two crops. More specifically, this may be said that remarkably higher use of human labour in the case of jute production per bigha almost solely explains the difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha. The implication of this is that labour intensity along with labour market involvement of the farmers in case of jute production is very much higher than aus paddy production.

6.5. Findings

The discussion so far made relating to the objectives framed in this chapter shows broadly:

The cost of production of jute per bigha measured in terms of whichever cost concept is higher than that of aus paddy per bigha in cases of all sizes of holding in all the selected blocks and in the district as a whole.

The cost of production of jute per bigha is higher than that of aus paddy to the extent of 141.65 per cent in most of the cases in the selected blocks and in the district as a whole.

Irrespective of cost basis the absolute difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha is above Rs. 200 in most of the cases in the selected blocks and in the district as a whole.

The absolute difference expressed as the percentage of cost of production of aus paddy per bigha is higher than 41.65 in most of the cases over the selected blocks and in the district as a whole, irrespective of cost basis. The absolute difference between the cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha measured in terms of whichever cost concept is here solely explained by the difference between the absolute value of human labour utilised in the production of these two crops per bigha implying higher labour intensity of jute relative to aus paddy along with the relatively higher labour market involvement of the farmers in the production of jute.

Tables of Chapter VI

Table 5.1 Cost of Production of Jute and Aus Paddy per Bigha in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

(in Rs.)

-				· ·					
Name of the	Farm			Jute			Aus		
block	size	Cos	t/bigha on	n the basis	of	Cost/b	igha on th	e basis o	f
		Cost A1	Cost B	Cost C	Cash expenditure	Cost A ₁	Cost B	Cost C	Cash expendi- ture
Haldibari	Marginal Small	717.35 842.66	993 .62 1190 .9 2	1295.51 1425.90	609 .59 723 . 69	388.99 507.81	540.26 689.22	737.87 867.36	291.85 412.60
	Large 1 All	1008.92	1353.84	1517.73	867.99	622.21	809 . 59	949 . 67	483.14
	farms	806.24	1130.76	1388.68	688 .89	477.21	648.96	827.10	370.02
Cooch Behar II	Marginal Small Large All	696.78 760.28 918.42	972.57 1028.55 1231.45	1277.11 1306.43 1415.34	581.10 637.77 777.76	433.12 457.91 648.38	633.57 653.84 854.79	841.90 849.18 986.55	329.23 344.10 524.13
	farms	747.86	1033.61	1310.81	623.69	481.60	683.40	873.27	370.88
Dinhata I	Marginal Small Large All farms	682.14 778.32	751.39 945.86 1032.82 864.67	1065.83 1130.30 1138.93 1101.92	439.79 582.93 667.18 524.35	414.10 501.98 585.72 474.27	607.76 713.30 807.05 679.64	806.82 842.00 874.81 831.90	346.16 415.30 475.66 392.42

(•**#**

Contd..

Table 6.1 (Contd..)

Name of the			والمراجعة والتواجي والمراجع والمراجع والمراجع	Jute		Aus					
block	size			ha on the	basis of			the basis	of		
	. .	Cost A ₁	Cost B	Cost C	Cash expenditure	Cost A	Cost B	Cost C	Cash expenditu		
Tufanganj	Marginal	543.52	781.83	1120.71	443.78	360.46	529,33	754.11	267.93		
II	Small Large	721.60 864.43	976.75 1128.67	1252.38 1313.35	596.93 725.92	448.02 525.37	629.38 713.21	818.30 832.69	334.12 403.97		
	Allfarms	627.63	877.14	1182.76	- 515.43	404.82	580.84	784.26	303.16		
•								· .			
Cooch Behar	Marginal	614.69	872.10	1187.97	516.12	397.57	582.36	794.00	309.61		
district	Small	753.26	1038.64	1280.81	637.09	470.14	665.74	836.23	365.73		
	Large	892.46	1188.80	1344.29	760.86	594.54	802.20	905.46	476.16		
	All farms	698.25	976.54	1246.04	588 .08	451.88	645.03	826.79	354.14		

.

Table 6.2 Cost of Production per Bigha of Jute Expressed as the Percentage of the Cost of Production of Aus Paddy per Bigha in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Name of the block	Farm size	cost of p	roduction of	aus paddy	jute as the percentage of the per bigha over the cost concepts
	· · · ·	Cost A1	Cost B	Cost C	Cash expenditure
Haldibari	Marginal	184.41	183.92	175.57	208.87
	Small	165.94	172.79	164.40	175.40
	Large	162.15	167.23	159.82	179.66
	All farms	168.95	174.24	167.90	186,18
Cooch Behar	Marginal	160.87	153.51	151.69	176.50
II .	Small	166.03	157.31	153.85	185.34
	Large	141.65	144.06	143.46	148.39
	All farms	155.29	151.25	150.10	168.16
Dinhata I	Marginal	123.06	123.63	132.10	127.05
	Small	135.89	·132.60	134.24	140.36
	Lar g e	132.88	127.97	130.19	140.26
	All farms	128.89	127.22	132.46	133.62

Contd..

Table 6.2 (Contd..)

Name of the block	Farm size		Cost of production per bigha of jute as the percentage of the . cost of production of aus paddy per bigha over the cost concepts						
		Cost A ₁	Cost B	Cost C	Cash expenditure				
		·····		······································					
Tufanganj	Marginal	150.79	147.70	148.61	165.63				
	Small	161.06	155.19	153.05	178,66				
	Large	164.54	158.25	157.72	179.70				
	Allfarms	155.04	151.01	150.81	170.02				
Cooch Behar	Marginal	1,54.61	149.75	149.62	166.70				
aistrict	Small	160.22	156.01	153.16	174.20				
	Large	150.11	1,48.19	148.46	159.79				
	All farms	154.52	151.39	150.71	166.06				

· 153

Table 6.3	Difference between (Cost of Production of Jute	and Aus Paddy per Bigha in the
	Selected Blocks of (Cooch Behar District and ir	n the District as a whole for
	the Year 1992-93		A

.

					(in Rs.)			
Name of the block	Farm size	Difference between cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha over the cost concepts						
<u> </u>		Cost A ₁	Cost B	Cost C	Cash expenditure			
Halĉibari	Marginal Small Larg e All farm s	328.36 334.85 386.71 329.03	453.36 501.70 544.25 481.80	557.64 558.54 568.06 561.58	317.74 311.09 384.85 318.87			
Cooch Behar II	Marginal Small Larg e All farms	263.66 302.37 270.04 266.26	339.00 374.71 376.66 350.21	435.21 457.25 428.79 437.54	251.87 293.67 253.63 252.81			
Dinhata I	Marginal Small Larg e All farm s	95.49 180.16 192.60 137.01	143.63 232.56 225.77 185.03	259.01 288.30 264.12 270.02	93.63 167.63 191.52 131.93			

Contd..

.

Table 6.3 (Contd..)

Name of the block	Farm size		Difference between cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha over the cost concepts					
		Cost A1	Cost B	Cost C	Cash expenditure			
······································								
Tufanganj II	Marginal	183.06	252.50	366.60	175.85			
	Small	273.58	347.37	434.08	262.81			
	Large	339.06	415.46	480.66	321.95			
	All farms	222.81	296.30	398.50	212.27			
Cooch Behar	Marginal	217.12	289.74	393.97	206.51			
district	Small	283.12	372.90	444.58	271.36			
	Large	297.92	386.60	438.83	284.70			
	All farms	246.37	331.51	419.25 .	233.94			

Table 6.4 The Absolute Difference between cost of Production of Jute and Aus Paddy per Bigha Expressed as the Percentage of Cost of Production of Aus Paddy per Bigha Measured in Terms of Cost Basis, Cost A₁, Cost B, Cost C and Cash Expenditure in

> the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Name of the block	Farm size	Difference between cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha as the percentage of cost of production of aus paddy per bigha over the cost concepts							
		Cost A ₁	Cost B	Cost C	Cash expenditure				
Haldibari	Marginal	84.41	83.92	75.57	108.87				
	Small	65.94	72.79	64.40	75.40				
	Large	62.15	67.23	59.82	79.66				
	All farms	68.95	74.24	67.90	86.18				
Cooch Behar II	Marginal	60.87	53.51	51.69	76.50				
	Small	66.03	57.31	53.85	85.34				
	Large	41.65	44.06	43.46	48.39				
	All farms	55.29	51.25	50.10	68.16				
Dinhata I	Marginal	23.06	23.63	32.10	27.05				
	Small	35.69	32.60	34.24	40.36				
	Large	32.88	27.97	30.19	40.26				
	All farms	28.89	27.22	32.46	33.62				

Contd..

Table 6.4 (Contd..)

Name of the block	Farm size	Difference between cost of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha as the percentage of cost of production of aus paddy per bigha over the cost concepts						
		Cost A ₁	Cost B	Cost C	Cash expenditure			
Tufanganj II	Marginal Small Large All farms	50.79 61.06 64.54 55.04	47.70 55.19 58.25 51.01	48.61 53.05 57.72 50.81	65.63 78.66 79.70 70.02			
Cooch Behar district	Marginal Small Large	54.61 60.22 50.11	49.75 56.01 48.19	49.62 53.16 48.46	66.70 74.20 59.79			
	All farms	54.52	51.39	50.71	66.06			

Table 6.5 Percentage Share of the Difference between the Value of Each Input to the Total Absolute Value of the Difference between the Cost of Production of Jute and Aus Paddy per Bigha Calculated on the Basis of Cost A1 over the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District

Name of the	Farm size				•		Items of	Cost A1	• •	• •
block	•	Value of hired human labour	Value of attached labour		Hired bullock	Owned bullock	Total	Mach inery charg es	Seed	Manure
Haldibari	Marginal Small Larg e All farms	77.87 89.99 61.97 79.55	5.19 -1.66 22.96 6.13	83.06 88.33 84.93 85.68		-1.26 2.59 3.22 0.52	2.47 1.63 4.34 2.70	- 3.36 0.66	-5.76 -3.83 -4.11 -5.11	5.31 4.68 0.39 4.14
Cooch Behar II	Marginal Small Larg e All farms	100.75 91.16 82.98 97.57	- 4.52 12.53 0.53	100.75 95.68 95.51 98.10	1.75 0.73 0.07 1.24	0.07 0.55 -0.61	1.82 1.28 -0.54 1.24	1.38 2.33 -4.17 0.55	-9.17 -7.49 -9.22 - 9. 95	2.04 3.67 5.31 3.08
Dinha ta I.	Marginal Small Larg e All farms	131.49 90.92 80.29 103.32	4.42 23.36 34.84 18.86	135.91 114.28 115.13 122.18	-1.19 -0.40	-1.23 4.33 -2.43 0.29	5.10 3.14 -2.83 2.14	– , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	-22.92 -11.37 -12.70 -16.00	9.25 4.97 -8.97 2.77

and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

158

158 A

		•				
Fertilisers	Insecticides and pesticides	Irrigation charges	Land revenue, cess and other taxes	Depreciation on implements and machineries	Interest on working capital	Total
7.43	3.00		0.13	1.46	2.90	100.00
6.38	-1.70	-	0.24	1 . 48	2,79	100.00
11.86	-0.62	2.59	-0.06	-5.67	2.99	100.00
8.23	0.62	0.51	0.17	-0, 51	2.91	100.00
2.87	0.66	-4.74	0.04	1.49	2.86	100.00
2.54	0.47	-0.80	0.01	-0.60	2.91	100.00
8.25	-0.19	- 1.64	0.02	3.85	2.82	100.00
3.61	0.34	-3.02	0.06	2.14	2.85	100.00
10.85	-0.77	-40.60	0.03	0.21	2.94	100.00
-0.49	3.95	-17.11	-0.06	-0.10	2.79	100.00
4.53	6.66	-4.81			2.99	100.00
4.73	3.01	-22.25	0.17	0.36	2.89	100.00

Contd..

Table 6.5 (Contd..)

. .--

• •

Name of the	Farm size						Items of	Cost A ₁		
block		Value of hired human labour	Value of attached labour	Total	Hired . bullock	Owned bullock	Total	Machiner charges	y Seed M	lanures
Tufanganj II	Marginal Small Large All farms	91.34 77.62 70.86 83.79	2.94 3.46 10.77 4.17	94.28 81.08 81.63 87.96	0.63 -0.74	0.84 1.06 2.16 1.03	2.84 1.69 1.42 2.33	- - -	-12.27 -8.13 -6.39 -10.06	7.29 13.97 9.14 9.96
Cooch Behar āistrict	Marginal Small Large All farms	96.79 86.26 74.46 89.84	2.65 6.10 16.73 5.55	99.44 92.36 91.19 95.39	0.57 -0.03	0.36 0.78 0.46 0.46	2.00 1.35 0.43 1.51	0.42 0.60 -0.41 0.29	-10.68 -7.75 -7.78 -9.26	5.52 7.42 1.90 5.50

Fertilisers Insecticides Irrigation Land revenue, Depreciation Interest on Total and on implements working charges cess and other pesticides and machineries capital taxes 3.14 1.62 0.01 0.21 2.88 100.00 8.83 2.26 -2.58 2.88 100.00 ----9.10 2.21 2.89 100.00 _ 5.11 1.93 -0.93 0.16 0.68 2.86 100.00 4.87 1.31 -7.40 0.09 1.58 2.85 100.00 5.24 2.40 -5.00 0.07 0.43 2.88 100.00 8.35 3.27 -0.93 0.08 2.88 100.00 1.02 5.36 2.04 -5.41 0.19 1.54 2.85 100.00

159A

Table 6.6 Percentage Share of the Difference between the Value of Each Input to the Total Absolute Value of the Difference between the Cost of Production of Jute and Aus Paddy per Bigha Calculated on the Basis of Cost B over the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Name of the	Farm size			It	ems of co	ost B			
block		Value of híred huma n labour	Value of attached labour	Total	Hired bullock	Owned bullock	Total	Machinery charges	Seed
Haldibari	Marginal Small Larg e All farms	56.40 60.06 44.03 54.33	3.76 -1.11 16.32 4.18	60.16 58.95 60.35 58.51		-0.91 1.73 2.29 0.35	1.79 1.09 3.09 1.84	- 2.39 0.45	-4.16 -2.56 -2.92 -3.49
Cooch Behar II	Marginal Small Larg e All farms	78.36 73.56 59.49 74.18	3.65 8.98 0.40	78.36 77.21 68.47 74.58	1.36 0.59 0.05 0.95	0.05 0.44 -0.44	1.41 1.03 -0.39 0.95	1.07 1.88 -2.99 0.42	-7.14 -6.04 -6.61 -6.81
Dinhata I	Marginal Small Large All farms	87.42 70.44 68.50 76.51	2.94 18.09 29.72 13.97	90.36 88.53 98.22 90.48	-0.92 -0.35	-0.82 3.35 -2.07 0.22	3.39 2.43 -2.42 1.59	- - -	-15.24 -8.80 -10.83 -11.84

160**A**

Manures	Fertil izer s	Insecti- cides and pesticides	Irriga- tion charges	Land revenue cess and other taxes	Deprecia- tion on implements and machineries	Interest on work- ing capital	Imputed value of owned land	Interest on fixed capital	Total
3.84	5.38	2.17	-	0.09	1.06	2.10	26.77	0.80	100.0
3.13	4.26	-1.13	-	0.16	0.98	1.86	30.60	2.66	100.0
0.27	8.42	-0.44	1.84	-0.04	-4.03	2,12	26.80	2.15	100.0
2.83	5.62	0.43	0.35	0.12	-0.35	1.98	29.26	2.45	100.0
1.59	2.23	0.51	-3.69	0.04	1.16	2.23	21.73	0.50	100.0
2.96	2.05	0.38	-0.65	.0.01	-0.48	2,35	19.39	-0.09	100.0
3.80	5.92	-0.13	-1.18	0.02	2.76	2.02	22.32	5.99	100 . 0
2.34	2.74	0.26	-2.29	0.05	1.63	2.16	21.86	2.11	100.0
6.15	7.21	-0.52 -	-26.99	0,02	0.14	1.96	32.25	1.27	100.0
3.85	-0.38		-13.26	-0.05	-0.08	2.16	21.77	0.77	100.0
-7.65	3.86	5.68	-4.10	-	-	2,55	14.69	-	100.0
2.05	3.50		16.48	0.12	0.26	2.14	23.42	2.53	100.0

Contd..

Table 6.6 (Contd..)

Name of the	Farm size		• •		Items o	f cost B			
block		Value of hired human labour	Value of attached labour	Total	Hired bullock	Owned bullock	Total	Machinery charges	Seed
Tufanganj II	Marginal Small Large All farms	66.22 61.13 57.83 63.01	2.13 2.72 8.79 3.13	68.35 63.85 66.62 66,14	0.50 -0.60	0.61 0.83 1.76 0.78	2.06 1.33 1.16 1.76	- - -	-8.90 -6.40 -5.22 -7.56
Cooch Behar district	Marginal Small Large All farms	72.53 65.49 57.38 66.76	1.98 4.63 12.89 4.13	74.51 70.12 70.27 70.89	0.44	0.27 0.59 0.35 0.34	1.50 1.03 0.32 1.12	0.31 0.45 -0.31 0.21	-8.00 -5.88 -5.99 -6.88

Manures	Fertilizers	Insecti- Cides and pesticides	Irriga- tion charges	revenue	Deprecia- tion on implements and machineris	Interest on work- ing capital	Imputed value of owned land	Interest on fixed capital	Tota
5.28	2.28	1,18		0.01	0.15	2,09	27.87	-0.37	1000
11.01	6.95	1.78	-2.03		-	2.27	21.24	-	ຸ100 ໋
7.46	7.42	1.81	-		-	2.36	18.39		1000
7.49	3.84	1.45	-0.70	0.12	0.51	2.15	24.40	0.40	1000
4.13	3.65	0.98	-5,55	0 .07	1.19	2.14	23.99	1.08	1001
5.64	3.98	1.82	-3.80	0.05	0.33	2.18	22.59	1.49	100。
1.46	6.43	2,52	-0.71	0.06	0.79	2.22	20.07	2 .87 .	100.0
4.09	3.98	1.52	-4.02	0.14	1.15	2.12	23.26	2.42	100.0
; }									
	· •								
				,				•	

1A

Table 6.7 Percentage Share of the Difference between the Value of Each Input to the Total Absolute Value of the Difference between the Cost of Production of Jute and Aus Paddy per Bigha Calculated on the basis of Cost C over the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Name of the	Farm size	•	· · · · · ·	•	It	ems of c	ost C		
block		Value of hired human labour	Value of attached labour		Total Hired bullock	Owned bullock		Machinery charges	Seed
Hald ibari	Marginal	45.85	3.,05	18.70	67.60 2.20	-0.74	1.46	_	-3.38
	Small	53.95	-1.00	10.18	63.13 -0.57	1.55	0•98	-	-2.30
	Large	42.19	15.63	4.19	62.01 0.78	2.19	2.97	2.29	-2.80
	All farms	46.61	3.59	14.21	64.41 1.28	0.30	1.58	0.39	-3.00
Cooch	Marginal	61.03	_	22.11	83.14 1.06	0.04	1.10	0.83	-5.56
Behar II	Small	60 .28	2.99	18.05	81.32 0.48	0.36	0.84	1.54	-4.95
	Large	52.26	7.89	12.16	72.31 0.04	-0.39	-0.35	-2.62	-5.80
	All farms	59 .38	0.32	19.96	79.66 0.76	-	0.76	0.33	-5.45
Dinhata I	Marginal	48.48	1.63	44.54	94.65 2.34	-0.45	1.89	-	-8.45
	Small	56.82	14.60	19,33	90.75 -0.75	2.71	1.96	-	-7.10
	Large	58,55	25.41	14.52	98.48 -0.29	-1.77			-9.26
	All farms	52,42	9.57	31.47	93.46 0.94	0.15	1.09	-	-8,12

162 A

		· · ·		- 					
Manures	Fertili- zers	Insecti- cides and pesticides	Irriga- tion charges	Land revenue cess and other taxes	Deprecia- tion on implements and machi- neries	Interest on work- ing capital	Imputed value of owned land	Interest on fixed capital	Total
3.12	4.37	1.77		0.08	0.86	1.71	21.76	0.65	100.00
2.81	3.83	-1.02	<u> </u>	0.15	0.88	1.67	27.48	2.39	100.00
0.26	8.07	-0.42	1.76	-0.04	-3.86	2.03	25.67	2.06	100.00
2.43	4.82	0.37	0.30	0.10	-0.30	1.70	25.10	2.10	100.00
1.24	1.74	0.40	-2.87	0,03	0.90	1.73	16,93	0.39	100.00
2.42	1.68	0.31	-0.53	0.01	-0.39	1.93	15.89	-0.07	100.00
3.34	5.20	-0.12 -	-1.04	0.02	2.42	1.77	19.61	5.26	100.00
1.88	-2.19	0.21	-1.84	0.04	1.30	1.73	17.50	1.69	100.00
3.41	4.00	-0.28 -	-14.97	0.01	0.08	1.08	17.88		100.00
3.11	-0.31	-	10.69	-0.04	-0.07	1.74	17.56	0.62	100.00
6.54	3.30	4.85	-3.51	-	–	2.18	12.56	-	100.00
1.41	2.40		-11.29	0.08	0.18	.1.47	16.05	1.74	100.00

Contd..

Table 6.7 (Contd..)

hired human labour attached labour family labour bullock bullock family bullock bullock nery charges Tufanganj II Marcinal Small 45.61 1.47 31.12 78.20 1.00 0.42 1.42 - -6.13 Small 48.92 2.18 19.97 71.07 0.40 0.67 1.07 - -5.12 Large 49.99 7.60 13.56 71.15 -0.52 1.52 1.00 - -4.51 All farms 46.85 2.33 25.65 74.83 0.72 0.58 1.30 - -5.62 Cooch Behar aistrict Marginal 53.34 1.46 26.46 81.26 0.91 0.20 1.11 0.23 -5.62 Cooch Behar aistrict Small 54.93 3.89 16.12 74.94 0.36 0.50 0.86 0.38 -4.93 Large 50.55 11.36 11.90 73.81 -0.02 0.31 0.29 -0.28 -5.28	NEMe of the	Farm size			Items c	of cost	С				
Small 48.92 2.18 19.97 71.07 0.40 0.67 1.07 $ -5.12$ Large 49.99 7.60 13.56 71.15 -0.52 1.52 1.00 $ -4.51$ All farms 46.85 2.33 25.65 74.83 0.72 0.58 1.30 $ -5.62$ Cooch BeharMarginal 53.34 1.46 26.46 81.26 0.91 0.20 1.11 0.23 -5.86 Cooch BeharMarginal 54.93 3.89 16.12 74.94 0.36 0.50 0.86 0.38 -4.93 Large 50.55 11.36 11.90 73.81 -0.02 0.31 0.29 -6.28 -5.28	block	·	hired human	attached	family	Total				nery	Seed
Small 48.92 2.18 19.97 71.07 0.40 0.67 1.07 $ -5.12$ Large 49.99 7.60 13.56 71.15 -0.52 1.52 1.00 $ -4.51$ All farms 46.85 2.33 25.65 74.83 0.72 0.58 1.30 $ -5.62$ Cooch BeharMarginal 53.34 1.46 26.46 81.26 0.91 0.20 1.11 0.23 -5.86 Cooch BeharMarginal 54.93 3.89 16.12 74.94 0.36 0.50 0.86 0.38 -4.93 Large 50.55 11.36 11.90 73.81 -0.02 0.31 0.29 -6.28 -5.28						· . ·	•				
aistrictSmall54.933.8916.1274.940.360.500.860.38-4.93Large50.5511.3611.9073.81-0.020.310.29-0.28-5.28	T ufanganj II	Small Large	48 . 92 49.99	2.18 7.60	19.97 13.56	71.07 71.15	0.40 -0.52	0.67 1.52	1.07 1.00	-	-6.13 -5.12 -4.51 -5.62
		Small Lærge	54 .93 . 50 . 55	3.89 11.36	16.12 11.90	74.94 73.81	0.36 -0.02	0.50 0.31	0.86 0.29	0.38 -0.28	-5.88 -4.93 -5.28 -5.44

			•		
					•
	•				
					1
					· · ·
		·			• ·
				*	· .
	· ·		•		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
 والكر فسيعت المستحد فعجر يسداقهم و		ومرجعته ويبد كيرك كالبناء ويداره ويتحد			
					ليجرد المحيرية مستوري المتعادية فالمراجع ويرتبعها

Manures	Fertili- zers	Insecti- cides and pesticides	Irriga- tion charges	Land revenue cess and other taxes	Deprecia- tion on implements and machi- neries	Interest on work- ing capital	Imputed value of owned land	Interest on fixed capital	Total
3.64 8.81 6.45 5.57	1.57 5.56 6.42 2.85	0.81 1.42 1.56 1.08	-1.63 -0.52	0.01 - 0.09	0.10	1.44 1.82 2.04 1.60	19.19 17.00 15.89 18.14	-0.25 - 0.30	100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00
3.04 4.73 1.29 3.23	2.68 3.34 5.67 3.15	0.72 1.53 2.22 1.20	-4.08 -3.18 -0.63 -3.18	0.05 0.04 0.06 0.11	0.87 0.27 0.69 0.91	1.57 1.83 1.95 1.67	17.64 18.94 17.68 18.39	0.79 1.25 2.53 1.92	100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00
					· · ·				•
		······································							•

A

Table 6.8 Percentage Share of the Difference between the Value of Each Input to the Absolute Value of the Difference between the cost of Production of Jute and Aus paddy per Bigha Calculated on the Basis of Measure, Cash Expenditure over the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Name of the	Farm size			Iter	ns of ca	sh expend	iture					Total
block	-	.Value of hired human labour	Value of attached labour		Hired bullock			Manures		Insec- tici- des & pesti- cides	gation chagges	
Haldibar <u>i</u>	Marginal Small Large All farms	80.47 96.87 62.27 82.09	5.36 -1.79 23.08 6.32	85.83 95.08 85.35 88.41	-1.03 1.12		-	5.04 0.39	7.68 6.87 11.91 8.49	3. 10 -1.83 -0.62 0.64	- 2.60 0.52	100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00
Coobh Behar II	Marginal Small Large All farms	105.46 93.86 88.35 102.76	4.65 13.34	105.46 98.51 101.69 103.31	0.75 0.07	1.44 2.40 -4.43 0.58	-7.71 -9.81	2.14 3.78 5.65 3.25	3.00 2.61 8.78 3.80	0.69 0.48 -0.20 0.36	-4.96 -0.82 -1.75 -3.18	100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00
Dinhata I	Marginal Small Large All farms	134.10 97.72 80.75 107.30	25.10 35.04	138.61 122.82 115.79 126.89	-1.28 -0.41		-23.38 -12.22 -12.27 -16.62	5.34 -9.01	11.07 -0.52 4.55 4.91	-0.79 4.25 6.69 3.13	-41.41 -18.39 -4.84 -23.11	100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00

Contd.,

Table 6.8 (Contd..

					·····	£ l_					مرعد مراداة وموجود ومهمه	
Name of the block	Farm size	Value of hired human labour	Value of attached labour			f cash e Hired machi- nery charges			Ferti- lisers p		gation	Total
Tufangaj II	Marginal Small Lafge All farms	95.09 80.80 74.63 87.95	3.06 3.60 11.34 4.38	98.15 84.40 85.97 92.33	0.66 -0.78		-12.77 -8.46 -6.73 -10.56	14.55 9.63	3.27 9.19 9.58 5.36	1.69 2.35 2.33	-2.69 -0.97	100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00
Cooch Behar Bistrict	Marginal Small Large All farms	101.76 89.99 77.91 94.61	6.3 7 17.51	104.54 96.36 95.42 100.46	0.60 -0.04	0.44 0.62 -0.42 0.30	-11.23 -8,08 -8.14 -9.76	7.75 1.99	5.12 5.47 8.74 5.65	1.38 2.50 3.42 2.15	-7.78 -5.22 -0.97 -5.70	100.00 100.00 100.00 100.00
				• •								
										يرت و . بي . بي . بي . بي . بي . وي		
	· · ·			· .	•							
				· · ·	•							

Table 6.9 Number of Cases Falling Within Different Ranges of Percentage Shares Occupied by the Difference in the Value of Human Labour in the Difference of Cost of Production of Jute and Aus Paddy per Bigha Measured in Terms of Cost A, Cost B, Cost C and Cash Expenditure in the Selected Blocks of Cooch Behar District and in the District as a Whole for the Year 1992-93

Ranges of percentage shares occupied by the difference in the value of human labour in the difference of cost	Number of cases falling within specified ranges irrespective of size of holdings etc. over all the areas respective to cost bases:								
of production of jute and aus paddy per bigha	Cost A ₁	Cost B	Cost C	Cash expenditure	Overall costs				
Less than 70%	· -	9	4	-	13				
70% - 80%	. –	7.	9	-	16				
80% - 90%	7 .	. 1	3	5	16				
90% - 100%	8	3	4	6	21				
Overall Total	15	20	20	11	66				