

the finding of the departmental enquiry.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I am certainly in possession of some facts, but whether those facts will stand after further investigation is a doubtful position. Today if I say that some officers are involved and tomorrow if by investigation, I find that they are not involved it will be unfair to the officers. Therefore, I am not proceeding on the basis of the preliminary information that we have got. All these matters have been referred to the S.P.E. and after we receive their report, appropriate action will be taken.

Shri Achar: When these alleged misappropriations take place, is there no way by which the department itself could find it out?

Mr. Speaker: I am really surprised at these questions. The hon. Minister said that there was a departmental enquiry and some tentative conclusions were arrived at. It is a matter where he did not want to stop with the departmental enquiry, but wanted to proceed further and he has referred it to the special police. So, pending the enquiry by the police, it will not be right and proper and it will be embarrassing both to the officers and to Government to disclose the result of the departmental enquiry.

Shri Achar: My question was, when these misappropriations took place, how is it that nothing was done until somebody from outside files an anonymous application?

Shri Jagjivan Ram: The matter relates to certain earth works. There are engineers who have to certify the classification of the work done and there is individual discretion in the classification of the work, whether the earth is soft, hard or rocky. We have to depend at a certain stage on certain officers for the classification. Unless there was some suspicion that some officers were involved, there was no case for reference to the S.P.E.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I want to know what is the amount involved. The Minister stated that there was some overpayment. I want to know whether it is a fact that the contractor did not pay the real wages to the adivasi labourers.

Mr. Speaker: All these were asked in the earlier stage.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: But there was no reply.

Shri M. C. Jain: When was the departmental enquiry held and when was the case handed over to the S.P.E.? I want to know the dates.

Shri Jagjivan Ram: I do not think I have got the dates now, but as soon as it was found that there was some *prima facie* case, it was referred to the S.P.E. If the hon. Member tables another question, I shall give the dates.

Mr. Speaker: I am not going to allow that. How does it improve the situation and the knowledge of the House? Next question.

Supply of Waters from Tungabhadra

*1551. **Shri Rami Reddy:** Will the Minister of Irrigation and Power be pleased to state:

(a) whether the differences between the Andhra Pradesh and Mysore Governments in regard to the supply of waters of Tungabhadra to Gadwal and Alampur have been composed;

(b) the exact nature of the differences;

(c) whether the matter has been referred to the Centre for arbitration; and

(d) the action taken by the Centre in the matter?

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Hathi): (a) Not yet, Sir.

(b) While the Andhra Pradesh Government are of the view that the Gadwal and Alampur Taluks are within the scope of the Tungabhadra

Left Bank Canal scheme, the Government of Mysore hold the view that they are not included in the scheme as sanctioned by the former Hyderabad Government.

(c) No, Sir.

(d) Does not arise.

Shri Rami Reddy: May I know whether Centre will initiate any action in this matter?

Shri Hathi: The two State Governments are discussing this matter. They met in November, 1959 and we have offered our services if they so desire. We have not heard anything from the two Governments as yet.

Shri Rami Reddy: Is it a fact that records pertaining to Gadwal and Alampur and the left bank canal were made over to the Mysore Government at the time of the re-organisation of States and the Andhra Government has requested the Mysore Government to show those records to come to a final conclusion in the matter?

Shri Hathi: Yes; it is a fact and the Central Government did request the Mysore Government to give those records. But those records do not throw much light on the subject.

Shri Rami Reddy: May I know whether the left bank canal has been so designed as to carry additional water for irrigating Alampur and Gadwal area?

Shri Hathi: The whole question is under examination.

Shri Basappa: May I know whether Alampur and Gadwal lie in the tail end of the left bank canal and whether the water taken in this canal has not yet reached even the 60th mile, whereas Alampur and Gadwal lie in the 120th mile or so?

Shri Hathi: At first, it will be 127 miles plus 14 miles to be constructed. After that, these two branches will come up.

Shri Rami Reddy: May I know whether it is not a fact that the former Hyderabad State was allotted 100,000 million cubic feet of water and out of that, the Hyderabad Government had allotted 82,000 million cubic feet for irrigating the former Hyderabad Karnatak area and the remaining 18,000 million cubic feet of water was reserved for irrigating the two taluks of Gadwal and Alampur?

Shri Hathi: That is what the Andhra Government says.

Shri Heda: May I know whether it is a fact that when the Hyderabad Government was considering this project and the allocation of waters, at that time Gadwal and Alampur taluks were part of Raichur district where this project exists and whether under the original scheme the canal went up to the end of not only Gadwal and Alampur taluks but it went into the heart of Nalgonda district?

Shri Hathi: That is the subject of dispute. One party says that it is included in the project and the other party says that it is not included. That has to be determined, because the original records are not forthcoming to show up the truth.

Shri M. S. Murty: May I have whether it is not a fact that this is the only source of irrigation for Gadwal and Alampur taluks?

Shri Hathi: May be.

Theft at Calcutta Docks

*1552. **Shri Raghunath Singh:** Will the Minister of Transport and Communications be pleased to lay a statement showing:

(a) the number of thefts of imported materials in Calcutta Docks during 1959-60;

(b) the number of claims preferred in this connection by the aggrieved parties during 1959-60; and

(c) whether it is a fact that thefts of such imported materials in Calcutta docks are increasing?