

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH): (a) 37 cases of deferred payment.

(b) Rs. 20 87 crores.

(c) Six cases of the value of Rs. 3 24 crores were rejected by the Committee dealing with proposals for deferred payments.

SHRI M. VALIULLA: May I take it that the deferred payment is for seven years?

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH: It varies from five to seven years and the instalment terms are also slightly different.

SHRI M. VALIULLA: Are there units in India earmarked to repay that money after seven years? Have we got any units which are known to us from which we are going to reimburse that loan on the deferred payment system

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH: Perhaps the question is a little bit vague, if I may say so. The unit is the person who has approved the deferred payment terms and agreed to repay the foreign loan in that manner. And it is only an arrangement by which a foreign firm, through their bankers, agrees to give a credit to this country and to that firm for a period of five years or seven years and to pay it back from year to year.

SHRI M. VALIULLA: Anyway, ultimately the country will have to pay the amount to the foreign country from which the loan is taken. So, there should be some source here from which to pay that amount.

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH: There is no source but internal finance converted into external finance,

SHRI M. VALIULLA: Have any concerns taken any loans from outside the country on the deferred payment system?

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH: Yes, Sir. Three projects have already been

completed by the Government of India—one is the Nangal Generators; the second the Nangal Electrolyzers for Fertilizers and the third is the U. P. Government Co-operative Sugar Factory.

**ACTION TAKEN AGAINST THE OFFICER RESPONSIBLE FOR LOSS IN THE FILMS DIVISION**

\*219. SHRI M. VALIULLA: Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to refer to para 32 of the Estimates Committee's Eleventh Report regarding the misappropriation of a sum of Rs. 10,000 by an officer of the Films Division and state what action has been taken against the officer concerned?

THE PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY TO THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN) : It would not be correct to say that there has been any misappropriation of Rs. 10,000. The officer concerned was charged with keeping with himself Government money received on Government account and also shortages in certain items of furniture in the Films Division. A departmental enquiry was held and as a result he was ordered to pay to Government Rs. 4,147 in 29 monthly instalments. The officer has been demoted and reverted to the Intelligence Department from where he had been taken.

SHRI M. VALIULLA: May I know how long it has taken for the Government to take action in the matter?

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: It was brought to our notice in the year 1952 and then action was actually taken in 1954 for the recovery of the amount. Even before that, in the beginning of 1954, he was reverted to his original position in the Intelligence Department.

SHRI M. B. JOSHI: Is it not a case of misappropriation?

DR. B. V. KESKAR: This is a question of interpretation. The Enquiry Officer who submitted his report after very careful consideration gave out his opinion that there has been no misappropriation.

SHRIMATI SAVITRY DEVI NIGAM: May I know why was it that the Intelligence Department was thought suitable for such a careless officer to be sent?

SHRI G. RAJAGOPALAN: It was not a question of thought of the Intelligence Department. He was originally taken from the Intelligence Department. He was a stenographer there and he has been reverted to his old post as stenographer. But in the Film Division itself, he was holding an Administrative Officer's post.

SHRI P. N. SAPRU: How is the case distinguishable in law from that of misappropriation?

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is for the lawyer.

DR. B. V. KESKAR: This is an administrative enquiry and the legal question does not arise.

SHRI TAJAMUL HUSAIN: For the sake of information, may we know the name of the officer

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not necessary.

**हुसैनवाला के समीप पाकिस्तानियों का भारतीय सीमा में प्रवेश**

**\*२२०. श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान : क्या प्रधान मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :**

(क) क्या यह सच है कि २३ जून १९५७ के आस पास फिरोजपुर से पांच मील हुसैनवाला सीमा के समीप पाकिस्तानी राष्ट्रियों ने भारतीय सीमा में घुसने की कोशिश की; और

(ख) यदि ऐसा है तो सरकार ने इस सम्बन्ध में क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

**† [PAKISTANI'S ENTRY INTO INDIAN TERRITORY NEAR HUSSAINWALLA**

\*220. SHRI NAWAB SINGH CHAUHAN: Will the PRIME MINISTER be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that near about the 23rd June, 1957 Pakistani National tried to intrude into the Indian territory near Hussainwalla border, five miles from Ferozepore; and

(b) if so, what action Government have taken in the matter?]

**बैदेशिक कार्य ज़रमंत्रि (श्रीमती लक्ष्मी मेनन) : (क) जी नहीं ।**

**(ख) प्रश्न नहीं उठता ।**

■ THE DEPUTY MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON): (a) No, Sir.

(b) Does not arise.]

**श्री नवाब सिंह चौहान : क्या सरकार को इस सम्बन्ध में निकले हुए कुछ समाचारों का पता है जो समाचार पत्रों में प्रकाशित हुए थे ? यदि है तो उनके बारे में क्या कहना है ?**

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: Sir, the only source of information that the Government of India have got is from the Army Authorities and the Punjab Government and both of them have replied that no such attempt was made.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH: Is it not true that in the Jaisalmer District and the Bikaner Division in Rajasthan, every day Pakistanis enter and go back for the purpose of either dacoity or business or for ordinarily seeing their relations?

SHRIMATI LAKSHMI MENON: This is a question relating to Hussainwalla and not to others.

† [ ] English translation.