

Variation in Drug Prices

1368. DR. JOSEPH LEON D'SOUZA: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state:

(a) what are the reasons for large variation in the price of Proxyvon capsules and Sudhinol Compound and what are the approved prices and the sale prices of the two products;

(b) whether it is a fact that Buta Proxyvon and Spasmoproxyvon are also being sold at very high prices and if so, what are the approved prices, sales prices and sales turnover of these products during the last three years, year-wise; and

(c) who are the manufacturers of these products and what are their investments profits and sales during the last three years, year-wise, company wise?

THE MINISTER OF CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI VASANT SATHE): (a) Proxyvon capsules and Sudhinol-N-Compound differ both in composition and pack size. Hence, the prices of the two products are non comparable. There is no approved price for Proxyvon Capsules. The sales price of 6's pack of Proxyvon Capsules is Rs. 4.68 as per Indian Pharmaceutical Guide, 1983. The approved price of 10' pack of Subhinol-N-Compound is Rs. 5.48 exclusive of excise duty. The sale price thereof as per Indian Pharmaceutical Guide is Rs. 6.43 inclusive of excise duty.

(b) M/s. Panama Industries & Laboratories., manufacturers of Buta Proxyvon and Spasmoproxyvon have not applied for price approvals for these products. A Show Cause Notice has been issued to the company along with directions to submit their application for price fixation for their products in accordance with the provisions of Drugs (Prices Control) Order, 1979.

(c) M/s. Ranbaxy are the manufacturers of Sudhinol-N-compound.

Details of M/s. Ranbaxy are given in reply to Rajya Sabha Unstarred Question Dy. No. 1341 for 6-8-1984. The investment in fixed assets of this company during the year 1982 was Rs. 590.94 lakhs. Similar information to the extent available from M/s. Panama Industries & Laboratories who are manufacturing Buta Proxyvon and Spasmoproxyvon is being collected and would be laid on the Table of the House.

Pakistan media coverage of Punjab Events

1369. SHRI B. SATYANARAYAN REDDY:

SHRI HUKMDEO NARAYAN YADAV:

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH:

SHRI SURAJ PRASAD:

Will the Minister of INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING be pleased to refer to the answer to Starred Question 12 given in Rajya Sabha on the 23rd July, 1984 and state:

(a) whether the attention of the Government of Pakistan was drawn to the official media coverage in that country including Television of the events in Punjab and other anti-India and hostile propaganda; and

(b) if so, what was the reaction of the Government of Pakistan and what steps were agreed to be taken to stop hostile propaganda in future?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING AND IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT): (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The Pakistan side claimed that they had covered the matter on the basis of reports from reputed news agencies. This is not however, borne out since what was projected through the selective use of the foot-age from foreign TV agencies, was only a one-sided and distorted picture.

To improve things in future an understanding was arrived that:

(1) there was need to give positive projection through Radio and TV in both the countries. Officials of the two countries could meet every three months and review the coverage.

(2) Radio correspondents of the two countries be exchanged.

(3) Radio and Television Programmes of the two countries be regularly exchanged.

सोनीपत की ई० सी० ई० द्वारा कंपनी अधिनियम का उल्लंघन

1370. श्री हुक्मदेव नारायण यादव : क्या विधि, न्याय और कंपनी कार्य मंत्री यह बताने की कृपा करेंगे कि :

(क) सोनीपत की ई० सी० ई० कंपनी ने पिछले तीन वर्षों में कितनी बार कंपनी अधिनियम के उपबन्धों का उल्लंघन किया है ;

(ख) इस कंपनी के विरुद्ध अभी तक कितने मामले दर्ज किये जा चुके हैं ; और

(ग) इन सभी मामलों में अब तक कौन सी कार्यवाही की गई है ?

विधि, न्याय और कंपनी कार्य मंत्री (श्री जगन्नाथ कौशल) : (क) से से (ग) कंपनी अधिनियम, 1956 के अन्तर्गत ई० सी० ई० या ई० सी० जी० सोनीपत के नाम से कोई कंपनी पंजीकृत नहीं है। सम्भवतः माननीय सदस्य के मन में "इलेक्ट्रिक कंस्ट्रक्शन एण्ड इक्विपमेंट कंपनी लिमिटेड", नाम की कंपनी है, जो कंपनी रजिस्ट्रार दिल्ली एवं हरियाणा के यहाँ पंजीकृत है। इस कंपनी के संबंध में, पिछले तीन सालों के दौरान सरकार की सूचना में कंपनी अधिनियम,

1956 के अन्तर्गत निम्नलिखित दोष आए हैं:—

(1) फार्म संख्या 6, दिनांक 9-3-81 (शेयर पूंजी में वृद्धि) को प्रस्तुत करने में विलम्ब, जिसके सम्बन्ध में कंपनी रजिस्ट्रार द्वारा अधिनियम की धारा 611(2) के अन्तर्गत अतिरिक्त शुल्क लगाया गया था।

(2) फार्म संख्या 23, दिनांक 20-12-82 (विशेष संकल्प) को प्रस्तुत करने में विलम्ब, जिसके संबंध में कंपनी रजिस्ट्रार द्वारा अधिनियम की धारा 611(2) के अन्तर्गत अतिरिक्त शुल्क लगाया गया था।

(3) दिनांक 31-10-1983 तक के, कंपनी के तुलन पत्र से यह प्रतीत होता है कि इसने कंपनी अधिनियम की धारा 370 के उल्लंघन में अन्य निगमित संस्थाओं में निक्षेपों को दिया है तथापि, कंपनी ने स्पष्ट किया है कि निक्षेप, अधिनियम की धारा 370 के अन्तर्गत निर्धारित सीमाओं के अन्दर है। मामला सरकार के विचाराधीन है।

पिछले तीन सालों की अवधि में कंपनी के विरुद्ध कोई भी अभियोग प्रस्तुत नहीं किया गया है।

Making payment of Telephone Bills in instalments

1371. SHRI J. P. GOYAL: Will the Minister of COMMUNICATIONS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that telephones of subscribers who request the telephone department, Delhi to allow them to pay their telephone bills in instalments in case the department