Remittances of dividends by M/s. Glaxo to principals

2644. SHRI K. V. E. S. BALA SUBBA RAO: Will the Minister of PETROLEUM, CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that M/s. Glaxo have profitered and remitted large dividends to their principals through arranging undesirable imports in contravention of the conditions of the Industrial Licences granted to them;

(b) whether M/s. Glaxo is licensed to produce all the varieties of Vita-min-A or Vitamin-A Palmitate only; and

(c) whether there is any proposal to ensure the implementation of all the Industrial Licences granted to Glaxo before considering the question approving any new bulk drug in their favour; if not, the reasons therefor?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM, CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI DALBIR SINGH): (a) The question whether some of the imports made by M/s. Glaxo are unauthorised is being examined.

The details of the dividends remitted by the company during last 2 years for which information is available is as under:

(in Rs. lakhs)

Year	Amount of dividend
1978-79	1,20,82,500
1979-80	65,02,501

(b) The company is licensed for the manufacture of Vitamin 'A'. No mention is made in the licence of any varieties of Vitamin A or of Vitamin A Palmitate.

(c) As part of the monitoring of the implementation of Industrial Licences issued to companies for the manufacture of bulk drugs action has been initiated for the revocation of licences which remain unimplemented. Applications for the manufacture of bulk drugs are considered on the basis of their need in the country, availability of technology, the parameters of Drug Policy etc.

2645 [Transferred *to the* 24th December, 1981]

Application for registration with DGTD

2646. SHRI K. V. R. S. BALA SUBBA RAO: Will the Minister of PETROLEUM, CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to refer to the answer to Unstarred Question No. 113 given in the Rajya Sabha on the 23rd November, 1981 and state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Mit Laboratories had applied for expansion of capacity under registration with DGTD from 100 kgs to l,000kgs. for manufacture of Terbutaline and in their application for expansion, neither any additional capital equipment was proposed nor offered reduction of capacity of any of bulk drugs permitted to manufacture;

(b) whether the above position is not identical to the case of CIPLA for expansion of capacity from 100 kgs. to l,000kgs for manufacture of Salbutamol as stated by DGTD, the complete basis and reasons of their conclusion;

(c) whether it is a fact that Mit Laboratories have been granted expansion of capacity as applied for, whereas in case of CIPLA, it has been reduced, what are the basis and reasons thereof; and

(d) whether it is not a case of discrimination; if so, what steps are being taken to rectify and see it should not be repeated?