

exigencies of service they are required to work on off days they are allowed compensatory leave as well as each compensation; and if required to work on Gazetted Holidays, they are given cash compensation only.

(b) The Ministerial staff as well as the Operational staff is given  $1\frac{1}{2}$  times of the Basic Pay besides normal-wages if called on the work on a Gazetted Holiday. For working on an off day, they are paid double the wages and a compensatory rest (off).

(c) Yes, Sir.

(d) The Operational staff is governed by Motor Transport Workers Act, 1961. According to Section 13 of this Act, they are required to work 8 hours in a day and 48 hours in a week. Their duty is spread evenly for 8 hours a day on all the 6 working days in a week. Thus they are not allowed the facility of Second Saturday off or compensatory allowance in lieu thereof.

(e) Does not arise in view of the position explained against (d) above.

#### Import of Drug by ICI Ltd.

1249. PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA:  
SHRI R. L. P. VERMA:

Will the Minister of HEALTH be pleased to state:

(a) whether it is a fact that Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd. are in collaboration with some foreign firm and if so, the particulars thereof;

(b) whether the drug "Eraldin Practolol" is imported by this company;

(c) whether this drugs has to pass through some tests in some Governmental laboratory and if so, what are they and their recommendations;

(d) whether this drug has adversely affected the patients who consumed it;

(e) whether Government are aware that this company has paid a lot of compensation in U.K. and other countries to the affected persons who took this medicine;

(f) if so, whether Government will get this issue examined by a High Level Committee; and

(g) what action is proposed to be taken against the manufactures of this drug?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH (SHRI NIHAR RANJAN LASKAR): (a) to (g). Practolol is a cardio drug indicated in the management of angina pectoris and cardiac arrhythmias. Enaldin is a brand of Practolol produced by M/s Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd., U. K. The Alkali and Chemical Corporation of India Ltd., Calcutta now shifted to Madras) is a subsidiary of M/s. Imperial Chemical Industries Ltd., U.K. The firm was granted permission by the Drugs Controller (India) to import Practolol under Rule 30-A of the Drugs and Cosmetics Rules in November, 1973. Practolo and its preparations were included in the British Pharmacopoeia, 1973 when this drug was permitted import. Subsequently permission to import and market Practolol preparations were granted to serves all Indian firms. In August 1974 the Alkali and Chemical Corporation of India informed the Drugs Controller (India) of possible side effects of skin or eye lesions on some the request to discontinue treatment with Practolol. The firm had informed leading cardiologists in the country about these side effects with the request to discontinue treatment with Practolol immediately if patients developed skin rashes or showed ocular signs or symptoms. A suitable warning about these side effects was also included in the package leaflet of the product.

Drugs Controller (India) had subsequently asked all manufacturers marketing Practolol preparations to include a statement regarding the side effects observed with the drug. Following reports received from the World Health Organisation that some countries had withdrawn the marketing of Practolol, the Drugs Controller (India) in August, 1975 cancelled permission granted for import or manufacture of Practolol preparations to Alkali and Chemical Corporation of India and to other firms. The firms were also asked to withdraw stocks of the drugs which may have been released in the market by them.

As Practolol was included in the British Pharmacopoeia and standards for this drug were available, the question of conducting any test in Government laboratories did not arise. We have no information as to whether the company has paid compensation in U. K. and other countries to persons who took the medicine and suffered from side effects. No reports have been received of any cases of toxic effects as a result of the administration of this drug in India.

**Encroachment of Railway Land by M/s Oriental Building and Furniture Company Ltd.**

1250. SHRI NAVIN RAVANI: Will the Minister of RAILWAYS be pleased to state:

(a) how much railway land has been encroached upon in New Delhi by M/s Oriental Building and Furniture (P) Limited;

(b) how much encroached portion of this land is occupied there by its sister concern Pure Drinks Limited and since what period;

(c) how much amount of arrears of rent is falling due to this company and for how long;

(d) what steps are being taken by the Railway Administration to get

that land vacated and arrears to be recovered;

(e) when that company went to High Court and why the appeal against High Court order was not preferred in time; and

(f) what is the position at present?

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS (SHRI MALLIKARJUN): (a) 2,743 sq. yards of railway land near Minto Bridge Railway station, were licensed to M/s. Oriental Building and Furnishing Co., Private Limited. The agreement expired on 31-12-1972, but they have not so far vacated the area.

(b) Details in this regard are not known.

(c) The total amount due from this company from 1st January 1968 upto June 1976 on account of arrears of rent and damages and interest etc., for unauthorised occupation is about Rs. 17.75 lakhs, after adjusting the amount already paid by them and security deposit available with the Railway.

(d) Application has been filed in the Court of Estate Officer in July 1975 for eviction and realisation of arrears/damages.

(e) and (f). The Company M/s. Oriental Building and Furnishing Co. Private Limited filed a suit in the High Court of Delhi in 1977 asking for arbitration and also for an interim stay order against eviction. The Railway contested the case but the High Court passed the stay order on 30-8-1977. The main suit for arbitration is still pending before the High Court and is being contested. The next date of hearing is 14th July, 1980.

No appeal was made against the stay order of the High Court as according to legal opinion the Supreme