

ates under the Gold Control Order, were refused certificates by the authorities;

(b) if so, how many such applications were rejected in 1967 and on what grounds; and

(c) whether Government propose to reconsider those rejected applications for the issue of certificates to them?

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): (a) From September 1963 when Rule 126-HH was introduced in the Defence of India Rule, 1962, upto end of 1967, 28065 goldsmiths in the State of Madras applied for issue of 'certificates' to function as self-employed goldsmiths under the said rule. Out of these, only 2,063 goldsmiths were refused 'certificates'.

(b) During the year 1967, 69 applications for 'certificates' were rejected. The ground of rejection was non-payment of the loans within the period specified under the Rules, which expired on 31-5-1967.

(c) The rules provide for extension of the specified period in hard and deserving cases on sufficient cause being shown.

Prevention officers under Central Excise Department

6765. **SHRI G. KUCHELAR:** Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that the Prevention Officers under the Central Excise Department of various States are not finding cases of smuggling of their own but taking investigations only after the Police find such cases;

(b) if so, how many cases have been found and charged by the Prevention Officer of Central Excise in Kerala, Mysore, and Andhra Pradesh during 1967-68 and how many have

been found by the Police and handed over to Central Excise;

(c) whether it is a fact that the rewards are being drawn by the Prevention Officers for all such cases; and

(d) if so, how much was paid and for how many cases?

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): (a) Although a number of smuggling cases have been detected by the Police officers, particularly in the border areas and on the west coast, the number of cases detected by the officers of the Central Excise Department on their own is quite large. Where the Police officers have not been entrusted with appropriate Customs powers the investigations have necessarily to be undertaken by the Customs and Central Excise Officers.

(b) The information relating to the period from 1st January, 1967 to 15th March, 1968 is given below:

| | Cases detected by Customs and Central Excise officers | Cases detected by Police officers. |
|----------------|---|--|
| Kerala | 538 cases involving goods worth Rs. 4,49,094/- | 6 cases involving goods worth Rs. 1,446/- |
| Andhra Pradesh | 356 cases involving goods worth Rs. 10,85,344/- | Nil |
| Mysore | 219 cases involving goods worth Rs. 25,85,853/- | 7 cases involving goods worth Rs. 36,023/- |
| | In 1967, 13 cases involve goods worth Rs. 23,591/- were detected jointly by the Police and Central Excise Officers in Mysore State. | |

(c) and (d). The grant of reward to officers depends on the part played by each officers in a case. Reward is

not sanctioned as a routine in every case. Only in important cases where there is an element of personal risk or where exceptional courage or initiative has been shown rewards are sanctioned.

In the cases detected by Customs and Central Excise Officers from 1st January, 1967 to 15th March, 1968, rewards amounting to Rs. 828 in only nine cases have been paid to such officers in Kerala, and none in Andhra Pradesh and Mysore, so far. In the cases detected by the Police and handed over to the Central Excise Department during the same period in these three States, no reward has so far been granted to any Customs or Central Excise officer.

**Certificates to Goldsmiths in Madras
Tamilnad**

6766. SHRI P. P. ESTHOSE:
SHRI A. K. GOPALAN:
SHRI K. RAMANI:
SHRI NAMBIAR:

Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that a large number of goldsmiths in Tamilnad after giving back the loan amounts which they obtained from Government applied for certificates to permit them to do their goldsmith work;

(b) if so, how many applications have been received by Government so far and how many of them have been accepted and certificates issued;

(c) whether a good number of such applications have been rejected; and

(d) if so, how many and the reasons therefor?

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): (a) and (b). Only 72 goldsmiths who paid back the loan obtained by them, applied for certificates to work as goldsmiths after the issue of Defence of India (Fourth

Amendment) Rules, 1966. Out of these applications, certificates have been issued to three goldsmiths.

(c) and (d). The remaining 69 applications for 'certificates' were rejected by the Central Excise Officers on the ground of non-payment of the loan within the period specified in Part XIAA of the Defence of India Rules, 1962. The period specified in the Rules, which expired on 31-5-1967, could, in hard and deserving cases and on sufficient cause being shown, be suitably extended.

**Foreign exchange brought by
Mr. Thomas Guest**

6767. SHRI P. GOPALAN:
SHRI NAMBIAR:
SHRI SATYANARAIN
SINGH:
SHRI C. K. CHAKRAPANI:

Will the Minister of FINANCE be pleased to state:

(a) the total amount of foreign exchange brought by Mr. Thomas Guest, alleged fertiliser expert, as published in the 1968 Blitz Republic Day Number; and

(b) if so, the total amount of foreign exchange taken away from India by Mr. Thomas Guest?

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI): (a) and (b). Foreign nationals visiting India for short periods may bring foreign exchange for meeting their requirements and there are no restrictions on such inward receipts. They are also permitted to take out unspent balances. No documentary record of total moneys brought in or taken out by foreign tourists is required to be maintained. It will, therefore, not be possible to indicate how much foreign exchange was either brought in or taken out by Mr. Guest.