

11.12 hrs.

MATTERS UNDER RULE 377—CONTD.

[English]

(II) Need to relax the Foreigners (Protected Areas) Order, 1958 to promote tourism in Meghalaya

SHRI PETER G. MARBANIANG (Shillong): Meghalaya is endowed with beautiful flora and fauna. The State has a peaceful law and order situation and the people are friendly. The State Government have undertaken many schemes to attract tourists. Tourism will generate self-employment for the educated unemployed youths. However, Meghalaya continues to be a restricted area for foreigners under the Restriction Area Order of the Foreigners (Protected Areas) Order, 1958. This has been a big disincentive for foreign tourists and has deprived the nation of valuable foreign exchange. This Order has also created a fear psychosis to domestic tourists to visit Meghalaya. It is urgently required to relax the said Order to include individual tourists also. All parts of Meghalaya should be opened to them. Permits, if required to be issued, should be available from State Government's offices in New Delhi and Calcutta as well as within the State. Even better would be a relaxation of the rules as prevailed prior to 1979.

(III) Need to allow land Development Banks to Resort to functional improvements as permitted under Banking Regulations Act, 1949

SHRI SUDHIR GIRI (Contai): Land Development Banks have been serving the rural India for a long time by way of providing long term development credit to the people especially to those living at the bottom of the social strata. After the introduction of the multi agency systems in the operation of the banking activities, the Land Development Banks have been facing keen competition. If the Cooperative Banks of the country can

have the rights and responsibilities which Banks enjoy under the Banking Regulation Act 1949, why then the Land Development Banks should be deprived of the same while competing very seriously in the present days.

I would, therefore, urge upon the Government to take necessary action urgently so as to allow the Land Development Banks to resort to the functional improvements as permitted under the Banking Regulations Act, 1949.

(IV) Need to look into cases of harassment to drug manufacturers

SHRI VASANT SATHE (Wardha): It is learnt that the Department of Chemicals have reopened the DPEA cases covering the period from 1979 to 1987. This is causing lot of harassment to a large number of drug manufacturers. The basic idea of DPEA was to encourage local production in the country at a time during which there was very little bulk drug production in the country. The concept of DOPA was evolved to compensate those manufacturers whose cost of production would naturally be higher vis-a-vis imported material. When a manufacturer utilities such material for which different prices were fixed and when such material was used in the formulation, the prices of which were also fixed by the Government on the basis of higher rates of raw material, then the Government should consider appropriate set of rules to compensate the manufacturers for the losses incurred for the purpose of equalization so that the prices of pharmaceutical products are kept steady. I am sure that the Government would do justice to the large number of manufacturers on the merits of their cases.

While it is true that some manufacturers could have made some unintended benefits mainly on account of consumption of lower cost of raw material, at the same time prices of number of bulk drugs and its formulations were not fixed because of the administrative bottleneck. Also, whenever such prices were fixed, in quite a few cases it did not reflect the