

## LOK SABHA DEBATES

LOK SABHA

Wednesday, March 12, 1975/Phalguna  
21, 1896 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the  
Clock

[MR SPEAKER in the Chair]

ORAL ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

**चलचित्र वित्त निगम द्वारा नये निर्माताओं  
को ऋण दिया जाना**

\* 302. श्री मूल चन्द्र डागा : क्या सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि

(क) क्या उनके मंत्रालय ने समय-समय पर दस आशय की जाच करवाई है कि चलचित्र वित्त निगम उन निर्माताओं को ही ऋण देता है जो लोकोपयोगी फिल्मों का निर्माण करने हैं और उन्हें ऋण के रूप में

दा गई धनराशि ता नहीं उपयो। होता है, और

(ख) क्या चलचित्र वित्त निगम ने ऐसे निर्माताओं को ऋण दिये हैं, जिनकी फिल्में आज तक पर्दे पर नहीं आई हैं यदि हा तो उन फिल्मों के और निर्माताओं के नाम क्या हैं और उनमें से प्रत्येक का कितनी धनराशि दी गई थी ?

**सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय में उपमंत्री (श्री धर्मवीर सिंह) :** (क) जी, नहीं। तथापि, सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्रालय के सचिव की अध्यक्षता में चलचित्र वित्त निगम की कार्य निष्पादन पुनरीक्षण समिति निगम का आवश्यक मार्गदर्शन करती है।

(ख) 31 जनवरी, 1975 के दिन की रिपोर्ट के अनुसार उन फिल्मों का एक विवरण मदन की मेज पर रख दिया गया है जो फिल्म वित्त निगम द्वारा प्रदत्त ऋणों से मुक्कम्मल की गई किन्तु रिलीज नहीं हुई है।

### विवरण

क्रम संख्या	फिल्म का नाम	निर्माता का नाम	दिया गया ऋण रुपा
1	उम्मीद	श्री आर०एस० राजन, बम्बई	5,99,462
2	उमकी गंटी	श्री रोचक पंडित, बम्बई	2,63,941
3	दुविधा	श्री मणि बाल, बम्बई	71,200
4	माया दर्पण	श्री कुमार शाहनी, बम्बई	2,88,954
			(इस बीच रिलीज हो चुकी है।)
5	ग्रहण	श्री अरविंद कुमार सिन्हा, बम्बई	2,53,462
6	त्रिमन्धरा	श्री राज मारब्रोस बम्बई	2,15,500
7	27-डाउन	श्री अचतार कृष्ण कौल, बम्बई	3,06,591
8	जुवनी तबको आरगव्यो	श्री रीतो प्रोडक्शंस, कलकत्ता	2,51,906
9	डाक बगना	श्री गिरीश रंजन, बम्बई	3,20,000
10	परिणय	श्री समान्तर चित्र लि०, बम्बई	1,55,000

श्री मूल चन्द डागा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपका ध्यान एम्टीमेंट्स कमिटी (1973-74) की 58वीं रिपोर्ट को और दिनांक चाहता हूँ, जिस में कहा गया है :

"The Committee are concerned to note that a large number of producers who were given loans by the Finance Corporation have failed to repay their loans. More than 50 per cent of its outstanding loans i.e. an amount of Rs. 59,26,057 are considered doubtful, while a sum of Rs. 12 lakhs has already been written off as bad debts."

मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वे सज्जन कौन हैं, जो 12 लाख रुपये की रकम पचा गये हैं, और वे कौन लोग हैं, जिनके द्वारा 60 लाख देने के बारे में शक है। उनके नाम क्या हैं और उन्हें यह कपड़ा कर्म रीकवर किया जायगा ?

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI I. K. GUJRAL): The hon. Member has asked why so many films financed by the Film Corporation have not come on the screen. I would only like to draw his attention to the fact that the Film Finance Corporation has been primarily set up, not so much as to raise money or get back the money but for promoting certain types of films.

Everywhere in the world wherever such institutions have been set up, the consideration of monetary gains is secondary to improvement of standards. The Film Finance Corporation should not be judged from the money that might not have come back which has also come back—but primarily from the point whether they have been able to influence the cinema scene as a whole or not. It has to be looked at from that point.

So far as the bad debts are concerned, I do not think my hon. friend should be so much worried because

the outstanding loans as on 31st December 1974 were Rs. 89 lakhs but the possibility of bad debts amongst them is approximately Rs. 32 lakhs.

So, in an operation of more than 10 years and an operation involving 126 films, if we find that Rs. 32 lakhs including interest are in a doubtful position, I think, that is not an area which should worry my friend very much.

श्री मूल चन्द डागा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, फिल्म फिनांस कॉर्पोरेशन इस लिए रूपया देती है कि अच्छी फिल्में पदों पर आयें। मेरा प्रश्न यह था कि कुछ लोग फिल्म फिनांस कॉर्पोरेशन की 12 लाख रुपये की रकम खा गये, लेकिन उन्होंने कोई फिल्म प्रोड्यूस नहीं की, इसके लिए कौन लोग दोषी और जिम्मेदार हैं, और सरकार ने उनके खिलाफ क्या कार्यवाही की है ?

SHRI I. K. GUPJRAL: Let me correct the impression my friend over there has got. It is not correct to say that films were not made. Films have been made. My friend will kindly see the list. Out of 10 films, two have been released and 8 remain unreleased. They number of films from which money is outstanding, including the interest is 12, that is, films which are considered to be in doubtful area, and except one, other films were already made. Most of them were not successful in the box office and some of them could not find a cinema house to release them. Therefore, this was primarily the reason why the money did not come back and it would not be fair to say that people took money and just swallowed it and did not make films. That is not correct. If you want the names, I can read the names or lay it on the Table of the House.

I can lay it on the Table of the House.

श्री भूल चन्द डागा : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं दूसरा प्रश्न पूछना चाहता हूँ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह तरीका गलत है।

SHRI M. C. DAGA: I put only one question. He has replied to my first question. I am putting one more supplementary question.

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं बड़ा हैरान हूँ।

यह जॉ. तरीका अभी चालू हुआ है मैं उस को ज्यादा आगे नहीं बढ़ने देना चाहता हूँ।

श्री भूल चन्द डागा : प्रश्न क उत्तर में लिस्ट दी गई है कि श्री आर० एम० राजन को 5 लाख रुपये दिये गये हैं, और कुछ दूसरे नामों का भिन्न भिन्न रकम दी गई है। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वे रकम किस किस तारीख को दी गई थी, उनको फिल्म कब प्रोड्यूस करनी थी, आज उनको कितना अर्सा हो गया है और वे फिल्म कब पर्दे पर आ जायेंगी।

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: My non-friend has not read the statement carefully. The statement gives only the details of those films which have not been released so far. They are not a bad debt films. The list of bad debt or doubtful debt films is different. So far as the dates on which loans were given, I shall give the statement.

SHRI MOHANRAJ KALINGARAYAR: The policy of the Film Finance Corporation is mainly to encourage feature films and to help the youngsters and to encourage new ideas. Many people approached the Film Finance Corporation for financial help, but due to the complicated and long process involved in obtaining loans, many of them—talented people—have withdrawn their applications. Is it a fact?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: Yes, at is a fact.

The difficulty is mainly not so much procedural but of paucity of funds. We get very little money which we can advance. In the last fifteen years or so since the Film Finance Corporation has come into being, we have been given in the proximity of a total of Rs. 2 crores. This is very meagre amount as compared to the total money needed. Last year, for instance, we had Rs. 10 lakhs. That caused a great deal of difficulty. I am really anxious that we should find more funds for this purpose.

श्री शंकर बदायन सिंह : चमत्चित वित्त निगम ने जो कुछ भी सहायता दी है, उसकी सहायता करनी चाहिए, क्योंकि इस प्रकार बहुत अच्छी फिल्में भी प्रदर्शित हुई हैं। मैं यह जानना चाहता हूँ कि वित्त दो वर्षों में चमत्चित वित्त निगम द्वारा फाइनेंस की हुई कितनी फिल्में प्रदर्शित हुई हैं और उनमें से कितनी फिल्मों को वेग गॉर्न विदेश में पुरस्कृत किया गया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : वही आप ने प्रश्न का यन्त्री तरह पढ़ा है ?

SHRI I. K. GUJRAL: So far as the number of films which have been appreciated in India and abroad is concerned, the list is fairly long and my hon friend must have got the same.

Urmeed, Uski, Roti, Devida, Maya Dapaa, Grahana, Trisanchya, 27-Down, Jukti, Takko Aar Gappo, Dak Bangla, Parinay, are the films to which amount as shown in the statement has been advanced.

The total number of films made up till now is 126. The total number of films which have received appreciation in India would be in the proximity of 20.

श्री नरसिंह नारायण पांडे : मंत्री महोदय ने एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में कहा है कि 89 लाख रुपये आउटस्टैंडिंग हैं और 12 लाख रुपये के बैंड डेटम हैं। क्या यह सही है कि

फिल्म फिनांस कॉर्पोरेशन जिन फिल्मों को तैयार करने के लिए पैसा देती है, उन फिल्मों के लिए कोई रूपरेखा बनाई गई है, अर्थात् वे इस प्रकार की फिल्में हों, जो बल्कर न हों, और जो जनता का अच्छा मार्गदर्शन कर सकें?

**SHRI I. K. GUJRAL:** This is a fact that Film Finance Corporation gives films which help in the development of taste and which have a great deal of cultural value. That is why you must have seen that the films which have come before the eye of the public are value-setters. This is one of the major contributions which the FFC has made. In this situation if we find that Rs. 32 lakhs are doubtful debts, this should not be considered such a major thing.

**SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER:** The Minister said that about Rs. 5 crores are advanced to the film producers by FFC. I would like to know how much amount was given to the producers who produced films in regional languages like Malayalam, Tamil, Kannada, Bengali and other regional languages and how much amount is realised from producers upto now?

**SHRI I. K. GUJRAL:** The main point is this. My hon. friend might have in mind the fact that regional films in Malayalam, Kannada, Bengali etc. have made a great deal of contribution in the making of good films and that is why FFC is encouraging them. During the last year, 1974-75, this is the figure I have got upto September 30: 2 Hindi films, 2 Bengali films, 2 Gujarati films, 1 Kannada and 1 Malayalam film were financed. I have figures of loans granted language-wise and the total amount of money loaned is about Rs. 11 lakhs. Language-wise in Bengali, two Bengali films were given loans totalling Rs. 2.75 lakhs.

**SHRI B. V. NAIK:** While this country can boast of great makers of films like Mr. Satyajit Ray and Mr. Girish Karnad who comes from my district, is it a fact, while we have no quarrel with FFC for financing new emerging talent, certain Indian films of the new wave go a-begging for want of funds even though they have proved themselves equal to the world-best like Ingemar Bergman, those good directors are finding paucity of funds, and so their talents are going unused today?

**SHRI I. K. GUJRAL:** Unfortunately, this is a fact

**SHRI DINESH CHANDRA GOSWAMI:** He said that the main emphasis is the elevation of taste and cultural value. Out of 120 films or so, except one, or may be a couple of films, the rest could not reach the audience because the distributors are not keen on showing these films. How is this going to be shown to the audience at large and how is this objective going to be realised and what steps are the Government taking to see that they reach the audience so that elevation of taste and cultural value takes place?

**SHRI I. K. GUJRAL:** We have paucity of exhibition theatres. We have 8000 theatres for the population of 55 or 56 crores. The Soviet Union, with one-fourth of population, has 1,40,000 cinemas. So, the problem is there of exhibition of films. And, we are one of the biggest producers of films, about 430 or 440 are produced every year. And it is a fact that distributors go in for money spinners rather than taste. Government has written to State Governments drawing their attention that much more involvement of public funds takes place. For example in Punjab this has taken place. Public resistance against bad films have to be there as well.

I hope the other State Governments will follow suit. So far as FFC is

concerned, we have got some plans to acquire some theatres. In addition to this, we intend encouraging the idea of university theatres. We are hoping that in the course of this year to get started thirty-two universities theatres.

**SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT:** I would like to know from the hon. Minister one thing. Just now he said that the F.F.C.'s primary aim is to help in improving the quality of the films. I would like to know from him as to what precisely our national policy on films is. I would like him to state it precisely in what precise manner has the F.F.C. improved the quality of films so far and whether he is satisfied that the impression in the minds of the people that it continues to encourage the gangsterism is removed? Any how what is precisely the national policy on films and in what precise manner he is seeking to improve the quality of the films now?

**SHRI I. K. GUJRAL:** You will agree that the policy cannot be precisely stated in the question hour particularly I am saying from time to time what our policy is. But, I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friend to the fact that the film policy at the moment is both a statement of wishes and facts. That is because we are unable to invest money in the films. The policy is to get good films; the policy is to invest more in films. So far as "gangsterism" in films is concerned, this hon. House has just passed the new Films Censor Act and that act is now being implemented to see that something is done on the negative side. On the positive side, I have often repeated that unless we are able to make better films, the film scene will not change.

### **Rebate got by Hindustan Lever Research and Development Section from Government**

\*305 **SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA**  
Will the Minister of **PLANNING** be pleased to state:

(a) how much was obtained by Hindustan Lever Research and Development Section as rebate from Government during the years 1971, 1972 and 1973, and

(b) how much was saved by them in the form of foreign exchange during 1961 to 1971?

**THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PLANNING (SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA):** (a) and (b). A statement is laid on the table of the House.

#### **Statement**

(a) The Central Board of Direct Taxes have so far accepted for purpose of assessment of corporate tax of M/s. Hindustan Lever Limited, the amounts for the period specified as under towards research and development:

Assessment Year 1972-73 (Calendar Year 1971)	
(i) Development Rebate	1,97,000
(ii) Capital Expenditure	12,64,500
(iii) Revenue Expenditure on R & D	72,00,000

2 For the calendar years 1971, 1972 and 1973, the amounts claimed by the company, as development rebate and for write off of capital and revenue expenditure incurred on its research centres were laid on the table of the House in answer to Unstarred Question No. 1285 on 20th November, 1974. Amounts mentioned above for calendar year 1971 (Assessment year 1972-73) have so far been actually accepted by CBDT