51

Policy are contained in the Statement on New Drugs Policy laid on the Table of the Lok Sabha on March 29, 1978.

- (b) Yes, Sir. Memorandum have been received from various Associations of drug manufacturers as well as a few individual manufacturers stating that the New Pricing Policy would adversely affect them.
- (c) The Department of Chemicals and Fertilizers have had discussions with the drug industry representatives who have been asked to work out, in specific terms, the impact of the New Pricing Policy. While some of the manufacturers have sent some giving their projections, in brief terms of the impact of the New Drug Policy on their profitability, a large number of companies have not yet furnished the required data in detail. Any assessment as to the adverse effects, if any, of the New Pricing Policy would be possible only after complete data are available from the manufacturers and such data have been scrutinised in consultation with NIGP.

Excess production of Protinex by M/s. Pfizer

1186. SHRI RAMDEO SINGH: Will the Minister of PETROLEUM, CHEMI-CALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state:

- (a) whether Protinex of Pfizer is a new article under Industrial Development and Regulation Act, 1951 in accordance with the opinion given by Ministry of Law; if so, who are the vested interests who are shielding this company, full facts may please be given;
- (b) what is the excess production in the case of Protinex, and raw materials utilised for its production during the last three years; sources from which such raw materials have been procured in violation of Government policy; and

(c) what is the quantity of Oxytetracycline released to M/s. Pfizer in 1977-78 and 1978-79 by IDPL; details of letters issued by the Ministry to IDPL in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM, CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA): (a) It has already been stated in reply to Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 2352 answered on 1-8-78 that M/s. Pfizer have been found producing Protinex without a specific Industrial Licence, the company's contention being that they are entitled to do so under the Industrial Licence granted to them for the manufacture of Protein Hydrolysate. A final view on this is yet to be taken by the Government.

(b) The annual licensed capacity of Protein Hydrolysat in favour of M/s Pfizer is 110 Tonnes. Their production of Protein Hydrolysate and Protinex during 1975 to 1977 had been as below:

(In Tennes)

Ycar		Protein Protinex Hydrolysate			
1975			193.79	345.029	
1976			239.70	402:551	
1977 .	•		N.A.	397-603	

The question of excess production of Protinex and other related issues would depend upon the final decision as referred to in para (a) above that may be taken by the Government.

(c) The requisite information has already been furnished in reply to Lok Sabha Unstarred Question No. 4760 answered on 29-8-1978.