

|                         | (Rs. in Crores) |
|-------------------------|-----------------|
| Orissa . . . . .        | 5.00            |
| Punjab . . . . .        | 20.00           |
| Rajasthan . . . . .     | 9.00            |
| Tamil Nadu . . . . .    | 40.00           |
| Uttar Pradesh . . . . . | 70.00           |
| West Bengal . . . . .   | 10.00           |

### Mineral Production in Orissa

4857. SHRI CHINTAMANI PANIGRAHI: Will the Minister of PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS AND MINES AND METALS be pleased to state:

(a) the total mineral production during the year 1967-68 and 1968-69 in Orissa;

(b) whether any financial assistance has been given to that State for increasing the production of minerals during the current year; and

(c) if so, the details thereof?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM & CHEMICALS AND MINES & METALS (SHRI JAGANATH RAO): (a): The total mineral production, excluding that of salt, minor minerals and atomic minerals, in Orissa during 1967 and 1968 was 9.99 million tonnes valued at Rs. 155 million and 11.01 million tonnes valued at Rs. 182 millions respectively.

(b) No, Sir.

(c) Does not arise.

**Stay of an Assistant Accounts Officer under the control of Controller of Defence Accounts, Dehradun at one Place**

4858. SHRI HARI KRISHNA: Will

the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether any period for stay at one place has been prescribed for an Assistant Accounts Officer under the control of the Controller of Defence Accounts, Dehra Dun;

(b) if so, what and if not, the reasons therefor;

(c) the number of such Officers who have stayed in Delhi for more than 3-5 years and the reasons for their continued stay; and

(d) the number of cases in which transfer orders were issued and the number out of them in which these orders were cancelled and the reasons for their cancellation?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JAGANNATH PAHADIA): (a): No, Sir.

(b) The answer to the first part of the question is contained in the answer to (a) above. As regards the second part of the question the answer is that this has been considered to be administratively unnecessary. It is always open to the competent authority to order a transfer whenever this is considered necessary.

(c) Three officers have completed three years at Delhi but no officer has completed five years under C.D.A. (A.F.). Two officers under C.D.A. (A.F.) Dehra Dun have, however, completed more than five years continuous stay at Delhi but they were serving under other organisations before being posted under C.D.A. (A.F.) and have served for only two years in Delhi in C.D.A. (A.F.)'s organisation.

(d) Only in one case a transfer order was cancelled. An officer working under C.D.A. (A.F.) in Delhi was posted to Shillong but the transfer was cancelled on account of an accident necessitating treatment at the hospital.