

the Director General, Supplies and Disposals, on 11th February, 1964, at the request of the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting for a high-power medium wave transmitter. It was only in response to this enquiry that the formal offer was received from M/s. Skoda India Ltd., Bombay (Agents for a Czechoslovakian firm) together with other offers from other countries. They were opened by the Director General, Supplies and Disposals on 24th March, 1964 in the presence of the tenderers. While the offers were being examined, an indication was also received from the USSR, from where there had been no response to the tender enquiry, that they might be able to supply transmitters of the type required. In the meantime, however, some rethinking on the whole question appeared to have become necessary for various reasons—e.g. the need for avoiding infringement of the ITU radio regulations (which the operation of the medium-wave transmitter for external services would have involved), and the necessity for permanently strengthening all our external services generally, including the provision of day and night service to the areas intended to be covered (which would be possible only with high-power short-wave transmitters). A final decision in the matter has yet to be taken.

**CALLING ATTENTION TO A
MATTER OF URGENT PUBLIC
IMPORTANCE**

**REPORTED RESIGNATION OF THE CHAIRMAN
OF THE DANDAKARANYA DEVELOP-
MENT AUTHORITY**

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Bhupesh Gupta.

Shri BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal):
Sir, I call the attention of the Minister of Rehabilitation to the reported resignation of the Chairman of the Dandakaranya Development Authority.

THE MINISTER OF REHABILITATION (SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI):
Normally a question of a change in the incumbency of **a post** would not be a matter of urgent public importance, but because of the fact that the resignation of Shri S. K. Gupta, Chairman of the Dandakaranya Development Authority, has received undue publicity, and since a detailed summary of the main points in his letter of resignation has been published in the Press, I would like to make the following statement.

The Dandakaranya Development Authority was set up in September 1958 by a Resolution of Government for the effective and expeditious execution of the scheme to resettle displaced persons from East Pakistan in Dandakaranya, and for the integrated development of this area, with particular regard to the promotion of the interests of the local tribal people. It is composed of (a) a whole time Chairman, (b) a Chief Administrator, (c) Chief Secretaries of the States of Orissa, West Bengal and Madhya Pradesh or their nominees and (d) representatives of the Union Ministries of Home Affairs, Rehabilitation and Finance.

This Government Resolution creating the Dandakaranya Development Authority, while delegating certain powers to the Authority, specifically provided that the "Authority may delegate to the Chairman or the Chief Administrator such of its powers as it may deem necessary for the expeditious execution of the scheme"; and the Chief Administrator was designated as the "Chief Executive Officer" of the Authority.

Later in 1960, when the D.D.A. was reconstituted with a whole time Chairman, Shri Sukumar Sen, it **was** reiterated that the Chief Administrator would continue to be the Chief Executive Officer of the Authority. Powers were accordingly delegated by the Authority to the Chairman and the Chief Administrator with the approval and consent of its Chairman

[Shri Mahavir Tyagi.] Shri Sukumar Sen. Under this delegation, the Chief Administrator in his capacity as "Head of Department" for purposes of administration and control was assigned (i) powers to sanction schemes up to Rs. 5 lakhs, (ii) powers of purchase ranging from Rs. 1 lakh to Rs. 25 lakhs depending on the mode of purchase, (iii) powers to create 1 Class II, Class III and Class IV posts 1 up to 2 years, and to make appointments to these posts. On the other hand, the Chairman was authorised by the D.D.A. to exercise (a) all the powers of D.D.A. including the power to sanction a scheme up to Rs. 10 lakhs when the Authority was not in session, (b) to create posts in Class I and (c) to incur contingent and miscellaneous expenditure.

After the death of Shri Sukumar Sen, Shri S. K. Gupta who is a retired officer of the West Bengal I.C.S. cadre, was appointed as Chairman on 1st November 1963 in consultation with the Chief Minister of West Bengal.

Almost immediately after taking over, Mr. Gupta discussed with my predecessor Shri Mehr Chand Khanna the question of the powers of the Chairman *vis-a-vis* with those of the Chief Administrator, since he was apparently not satisfied with the powers which had been assigned to his predecessor Shri Sukumar Sen. He was advised by the Minister to put up his proposals before the D.D.A. for its consideration. He, accordingly put up his proposals in their meeting held on March 13, 1964. My predecessor Mr. Mehr Chand Khanna also addressed the meeting and while stressing that the Chairman was responsible to the Ministry as the Head of the Organisation he made it quite clear that it was for the D.D.A. to decide the actual delegation of powers as between the Chairman and the Chief Administrator.

At the meeting, the consensus of opinion was that all supervisory and directive powers should be vested in the Chairman, leaving the executive

powers to the Chief Administrator under the supervision and control of the Chairman. The members further felt that it would not be desirable to by-pass the Chief Administrator in any part of the work and that the Chairman should use his supervisory and directive powers to control and branch of the administration, which he felt required his detailed attention. At the same time, the Authority decided to delegate certain additional powers specifically to the Chairman and correspondingly to reduce the powers already delegated to the Chief Administrator.

When I took over the Ministry in April this year, I discovered that even after the D.D.A. had expressed its considered opinion, the Chairman was not satisfied. He still resented the powers which had been assigned to the Chief Administrator, and this led to serious differences of opinion between these two officers.

In the month of June 1964, because of the massive influx of migrants from East Pakistan, when I was in urgent need of a senior officer to fill the post of Director General of Relief, I withdrew Shri L. J. Johnson, the then Chief Administrator from the D.D.A. and in his place appointed Shri S. C Roy, whose name was sponsored by Shri S. K. Gupta himself. However, even after Mr. Johnson had left the Project, I received disturbing reports of lack of cohesion and team work in the ranks of the project staff. The senior officers of the Project were particularly restive.

In July, 1964, Shri Gupta again made a reference to Government about the allocation of powers and wanted a clarification from the Government about their views in this regard. With a view to putting an end to this controversy once for all in the interest of the smooth working of the Project, I took the opportunity at the very first meeting of the D.D.A. on August 13, 1964 after I took office, to clarify the issue. On this occasion

I said that I was in general agreement with the consensus of opinion of the members of the Authority regarding the relative roles of the Chairman and the Chief Administrator. It was the intention of the Ministry that the main functions of the Chairman, who was selected for his maturity and experience, should be to guide and control the organisation through the Chief Administrator and to plan and direct its activities. The Chairman has to exercise, on behalf of the D.D.A. general supervision of the whole organisation and to ensure that the Chief Administrator and the field organisation function efficiently and in accordance with the policies laid down by the D.D.A. On the other hand, it was the duty of the Chief Administrator to exercise immediate control upon the field officers to ensure implementation of the schemes in the field and to coordinate all the many-sided activities of the Project with a view to assist the Chairman. I made it clear that such delegation would not detract from the power and duty of the Chairman to exercise overall supervision and control of all officers working under him.

Not satisfied by the above clarification of powers given by me, Shri Gupta, left the meeting of the D.D.A. and rushed to my office to say that he was not happy with my definition of powers and he would like to resign. I tried to convince him that it was not the intention of the Government to weaken his position as Chairman and that my explanation had in fact emphasized that he was required to supervise the whole organisation and also to ensure that the Chief Administrator and all other field organisations functioned effectively; but he insisted on resigning and a few days later he submitted his resignation which has been accepted by the Government with effect from September 15, 1964.

I must express my feelings of disappointment that a senior officer of Shri Gupta's standing should have chosen, at the time of his resignation, to introduce an element of controversy

by making the details of his letter of resignation available to the Press. Shri Gupta has made pointed references to several aspects of work in the D.D.A. alleging that in regard to these aspects there were grave shortcomings. He appears to have laid all these shortcomings at the door of the Chief Administrator. I shall certainly look into the allegations made by Shri Gupta. As is obvious from the nature of his comments, most of the alleged shortcomings relate to matters of policy, the responsibility for which would lie with the D.D.A. itself. Shri Gupta had been in office for about 10 months before he tendered his resignation. It is a matter of regret that during his tenure of office, he did not bring any of these particular matters either to the notice of the D.D.A. at the three meetings held in his time, or to the notice of the Government.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, I should like to seek a clarification from the hon. Minister point by point. First of all, is it not a fact that the controversy between the Chairman of the Dandakaranya Development Authority and the Chief Administrative Officer has been there for 4 years and that even his predecessor, namely, the late Shri Sukumar Sen, had to get out of it making certain serious charges against the Chief Administrative Officer? And further is it not a fact, Sir, that these charges included the charges that the Chief Administrative Officer did not cooperate with Mr. Sen, discouraged the officers from meeting him and took decisions without consulting him? And it does appear from what we know of those cases now that all this interference and encroachment of authority by the Chief Administrative Officer have aggravated the situation which has resulted in a situation which has compelled an able officer of the Government . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you seeking clarification or giving clarification?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Well, both.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I am sorry you are not entitled to both. You can only seek.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I charge the Government of concealing facts. Let them deny these facts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You can ask for clarifications.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right, Sir, you take it whichever way you like. I say the statement has been suppressing certain material facts before the House, and am I not entitled to bring them to the notice of the House? He said that in view of the fact that things have been given in the press, the Minister has given a summary of them, a gist of it. I say, Sir, I charge the Government of suppressing certain facts and distorting others. Anyway, Sir, let him explain. Therefore, all I say is that he has not gone into this question of dispute or conflict being there.

Now, as far as we know, from the newspapers and otherwise, a conference of the late Dr. B. C. Roy, Chief Minister of West Bengal, the Prime Minister, the Rehabilitation Minister, Mr. P. C. Sen, and Mr. Asoke Sen, Law Minister, took place. They gave complete assurance to the Chairman that they will have full autonomy and full powers. In fact, the word used—if I remember aright—was that the supreme authority would be the Chairman. Now I ask: Is it not a fact that the present incumbent of the office, Mr. S. K. Gupta, has made serious allegations about encroachment on his authority making the post of chairmanship a non-entity? Why does he not mention whether this is a fact? Why does he not mention whether in the letter of resignation the present Chairman drew attention to the following facts? Agriculture in Dandakaranya is in a poor way. Irrigation is conspicuous by its absence. Urban and semi-urban rehabilitation is nil. Small budget is allotted to education. However, vastly expanded establishment exists

showing Rs. 110 crores overhead expenditure, but not excluding certain expenditure which have been shifted elsewhere to which the hon. Minister took exception. Doubtful schemes are being pushed across at heavy cost to the Government.

Then in agriculture he pointed out that 40 per cent, of the people did not have even 10 acres of land. These allegations have been made. May I know further whether it is not a fact that Mana Camp has been separated without consultation with the present Chairman of the Dandakaranya Authority and that the Chief Administrator has been raised to the level of Additional Secretary and actually made a virtual head of the whole thing whereas the present incumbent of the office of the Chairman has been reduced to a non-entity?

Sir, I demand that the whole matter of the Chairman should be placed on the Table of the House. Let the House consider the allegations. Similar allegations came from Mr. Sukumar Sen for whose integrity and administrative ability we had all very great respect. Now his successor is also making more or less identical charges against Mr. Johnson, the Chief Administrative Officer, as well as the Dandakaranya Development Authority. He has accused the Government that the hon. Minister held the meeting even without consulting him and he took certain steps. A reference has been made to the meeting on the 13th March, is it not a fact that the Chairman of the D. D. A. pointed out that the meeting was a result of lobbying and that nothing was done there except to devise ways and means to get him pushed out from the Authority in Dandakaranya? Sir, therefore, I would suggest that this matter should be considered and the Prime Minister should institute a separate independent enquiry into the serious allegations that have been made. Sir, the lives of thousands of

refugees are involved in it, and I can tell you, according to the accounts in the West Bengal newspapers, they are frustrated.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, I do not think you need bring in all these things.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: All right, if you allow a discussion, I will not bring in all these things. But just one point more that needs clarification. I have made a serious charge with all sense of responsibility that he has suppressed truth in this House. This is what I say. And if the letter of the Chairman of the Dandakaranya Authority was placed before the House, what I say will be intelligible to all and will be acceptable to all.

Here I should like to say that when he went to the meeting and addressed that meeting, the agenda did not include the subject-matter which the hon. Minister dealt with. Further, may I know whether it is not a fact that the Chairman of the Dandakaranya Development Authority took serious exception to his speech and said in his letter of resignation that it was the last straw. The complaint is that he could not function as the Chairman under this dispensation, that Mr. Johnson all the time encroached upon him, and may I know whether it is not a fact—another serious thing that he pointed out—that the local Madhya Pradesh and Orissa people in administrative matters have no place at all? The whole thing is a cesspool of corruption, money-grabbing and all kinds of manipulations. I wish the Prime Minister was here. He was here just now. Last time the Prime Minister took it up on his own and a conference was held. Dr. B. C. Roy took it up. Today nothing will satisfy us unless the Prime Minister institutes a thorough enquiry into the allegations that have been made now and before, by the late Shri Sukumar Sen, and* the Dandakaranya Development Authority is cleared up of this cor-

ruption and maladministration and restored its full autonomy. We demand an enquiry, a proper enquiry under the aegis of the Prime Minister. Let Members of Parliament be associated with it.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA (West Bengal): Sir, I am also one of the movers of the Motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Please sit down. Mr. Vajpayee.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: I wonder if I am required to answer what he has asked.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE (Uttar Pradesh) : In his opening remark the hon. Minister stated that the resignation of a particular officer should not be a matter of urgent public importance. Sir, I submit that this constitutes a reflection on the Chair. You were good enough to admit this Motion as a matter of urgent public importance. The hon. Minister has no business to say that this matter does not constitute one of urgent public importance. Sir, I think the hon. Minister should . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: No, no. I am satisfied that I am not involved. Moreover, he has said that normally a question of a change in the incumbency of a post would not be a matter of urgent public importance but because the resignation has received undue publicity he would like to make a statement.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: I am sorry if my friend could not follow. What I said was that normally it was not so but because hon. Members have given notice . . .

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: Let the hon. Minister repeat the whole sentence. He has not given a detailed summary of the main points.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He has suppressed the truth and the continuity of the letter.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: May I submit that nothing should have been said by hon. Minister to constitute a reflection on the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: No.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: May I submit that once a motion had been admitted by the Chair, the Minister has no business to say that normally it should not have been admitted but

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: I did not say so. I can always dispute whether a question is of public importance or not.

SHRI A. B. VAJPAYEE: No.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is for the Chair to decide.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He did not say. Do not interrupt. Nobody interrupted you.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: He can get away by saying anything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I thought you I were very anxious about the dignity of the Chair.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You may be generous, we are not so generous.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: I have to put a question.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will let you know.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: My hon. friend Mr. Gupta has just said that I have suppressed facts. I do not know which facts I have suppressed.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Give the letter.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: Perhaps it is also insulting to the Chair by talking in that manner.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Through you I am asking, Sir.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: My submission therefore to you is that whatever allegations Mr. Gupta has made—not my hon. friend here but the retiring Mr. Gupta of the D. D. A.—the Chairman—in his resignation he has made certain charges no doubt as I have read but may I inform the House that during the 10 months of his tenure as Chairman of the D. D. A., I have already said so, he never pointed out any of these defects.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not a dialogue. You have said all that you have to say.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I have more to say.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At great length you have said.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: May I be allowed to proceed? As Cha'u-man he attended many meetings of the Development Authority but he never pointed out to the hon. members of that Authority that these were the defects that he had come across, nor, did he inform the Ministry whose servant he was as it was his loyal duty to inform the parent authority that such and such were the defects, that there was corruption, that there was extravagant expenditure, etc. Something has been said about expenditure and he has also objected to the expenditure incurred on establishment of Rs. 110 lakhs. Well, the House will be surprised to know that it was Rs. 110 lakhs before he took over, in Mr. SuKumar Sen's time, but when his time came, he suggested an expenditure of Rs. 24 lakhs. It is this Chairman who has

increased this sum of Rs. 110 lakhs. His proposals were for Rs. 124 lakhs. So it is nothing. He has made no reference of any such defects to me or to my predecessor or to the Administration at all. All the correspondence if you see in the Ministry, is about his rights and privileges and about what is the right of the Chairman. I could not go over the decision of D. D. A. The Authority is composed of Chief Secretaries of important States and important representatives of the Ministries here and it is they, who are senior officers, who were authorised to find out what authority should the Chairman have and what authority the Administrative Officer should be vested with. They have decided it and it was for the Chairman to dispute it there but he always went on about his rights and privileges. He never cared to inform the Ministry about this. He did not send up any concrete proposals for development of relief of the migrants there. It is only for that purpose that I took away Mr. Johnson. He is a very senior and efficient officer, having experience of the Rehabilitation Ministry. He was the Chief Administrator there. In the hope that it was a better plan, instead of disturbing the Chairman, I took away Mr. Johnson and made him the Director-General in the Rehabilitation Ministry in the Centre, in the hope that there will be peace. Then in my place I appointed a man who was recommended by Mr. Gupta, the Chairman, himself. I told him: 'My dear friend, under these conditions, I suggest which officer you would like to have?' He suggested one and I persuaded the Government concerned, the State Government, to release him and then I appointed him. Even then the controversy went on about the rights and privileges. That is why, I am sorry to say, work has suffered actually in his time. I hope now that he has resigned it will improve and I have accepted the resignation. But I must give him the credit that he was

honest, I must confess. I have found no other defect in him. He was honest, intelligent and understood things, but this was the position. I have no aspersion to cast on Mr. Gupta, the outgoing Chairman, except that he kept me in the dark altogether.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Therefore he did not like honesty.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: I was one of the joint Movers of this Motion with Mr. Gupta. I would not repeat what he has said but I shall only introduce two or three points for an answer from the Minister. Is it not a fact that one of the grievances of Mr. Gupta made all along since his appointment 10 months before was that the post of the anti-corruption officer which has been abolished on the ground of economy should not have been abolished as rampant corruption was going on in the D.D.A.? The second thing is is it not the

position. that Mr. Gupta from time to time made it perfectly clear to the Rehabilitation Ministry that unless the function of control is given to him who, according to the Rehabilitation Minister also, is an honest and efficient officer, he cannot be effective in helping the resettlement of the refugees? So all the while he was asking for power being given to the Chairman. There is no question of quarrel with the Administrator. The third question is whether it is not a fact that there was no basis for the Minister saying that Mr. Gupta released the letter of resignation to the press and that it was from his office that the correspondence leaked. When he says that it was very unfortunate that Mr. Gupta released his letter of resignation to the press, I think he has no foundation for that. I want to know whether he is prepared to accept my challenge that it was from his office that it was released.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Will he submit before the House the letter? There are two demands. One is he

[Shri Bhupesh Gupta.] should submit the letter before the House so that you can examine whether what I have said is right and what action is to be taken. The Second is the investigation by the Prime Minister.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have said it but why repeat?

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You have to say

MR. CHAIRMAN: I will take my time.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: Because of the resignation of Mr. Gupta 20,000 refugees have deserted the Mana camp and a sense of frustration prevails, A discussion should be allowed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have put your question. I hope you have nothing more. If you have, please say it and be out with it.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: The question is

MR. CHAIRMAN: I do not want questions. I thought you had something else to say.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: I may say . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are not supposed to carry on in this manner.

SHRI D. L. SEN GUPTA: If you allow, I can put five or six more questions.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Utter Pradesh): Unfortunately this is the tradition in this House.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: I have made it clear that excepting clarifying the authority of the Chairman on the one side and the Administrator on the other, I have caused Mr. Gupta no other annoyance. The last may be that when he submitted the resignation, I accepted it. These are the

two actions I have taken, otherwise I have little to do. It is very recently that I took over but about the corruption of officers, I might inform the House that in these ten months tenure of Mr. Gupta, I have asked my Ministry, he had taken no action against any of the officers for corruption although he was the Chairman.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Officers are not allowed to see. Mr. Johnson did not allow them . . .

(Interruptions.)

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: I am not yielding to pressure. I am not like Mr. Gupta that I shall resign and go.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: We are not going to put up with that kind of reply.

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is putting up with you.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: I am doing my duty.

(Interruptions.)

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Sir, . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: You are not playing the game.

Sapi MAHAVIR TYAGI: About the Vigilance Officer . . .

(Interruptions.)

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, please do not interrupt him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Whs-should I let him say it?

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: I stu! repeat, I have given him no cause for annoyance except that, when his resignation came, it was accepted, and I am not going to negotiate with him.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is not a question of resignation.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: I make an announcement here and now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I demand here and now.

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: I am not going to yield the floor.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I demand an enquiry-

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, I would request you, don't interfere.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Why is he saying so?

MR. CHAIRMAN: He is saying what he has to say.

(Interruptions)

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: I am not going to make Government surrender to him. *(Interruptions)* I am not going to negotiate if any officer chooses to resign.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: It is no use, you allow Ministers to corrupt, officers to corrupt and then . . .

SHRI NAFISUL HASAN: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, will Mr. Gupta continue to disobey the Chair?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Gupta, you have to sit down.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Please ask them to sit down.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: I take serious objection to Mr. Gupta's demonstration. I shall not allow Mr. Gupta to put the whole proceedings to ransom.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I cannot stand the conduct of that Minister. I will get out.

(Interruptions)

MR. CHAIRMAN: You may do whatever you like.

(At this stage Shri Bhupesh Gupta left the Chamber)

SHRI MAHAVIR TYAGI: Sir, I want to make it clear once for all that I am not going to make the Government surrender to public servants. If they resign, they can choose their way. It is not that I gave him any annoyance, let me make it clear once more, and when his letter of resignation came, I did not negotiate further; I immediately accepted it-

With regard to the Vigilance Officer I may tell you; there was a demand to reduce expenditure to the extent of Rs. 2J crores and it was resolved about the Vigilance Officer, about whom Mr. Gupta had made reference, that the post of the Vigilance Officer should be abolished and it was done and the States' Vigilance Officers and their various establishments were put in charge. There was no case produced by Mr. Gupta. I still challenge him. If there is any case, I shall make enquiries and see to it that corruption is not tolerated. If there is a case, an enquiry will be made, but during these ten months, I again repeat, Mr. Gupta did not take the trouble of informing either the D.D.A. or the Central Government about any activities of corruption in the department, Sir.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

STATEMENTS SHOWING ACTION TAKEN ON ASSURANCES, PROMISES AND UNDERTAKINGS GIVEN DURING VARIOUS SESSIONS

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI B. BHAGAVATI): Sir, on behalf of "Shri Satyanarayan Sinha I beg to lay on the Table the following statements showing the action taken by Government on the various assur-