

**COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC
UNDERTAKINGS
(1972-73)**

TWENTY-SECOND REPORT

(FIFTH LOK SABHA)

On Paragraph 1.17 of the Sixty-third Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings (1969-70)—Fourth Lok Sabha, on National Industrial Development Corporation Limited containing the observation “The Committee are of the opinion that they have been misled by the statement of the Managing Director (National Industrial Development Corporation Limited).”



सत्यमेव जयते

**LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI**

May, 1972/Jyaistha, 1894 (S)

Price : Fifty Paise

**LIST OF AUTHORISED AGENTS FOR THE SALE OF
LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS**

Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.	Sl. No.	Name of Agent	Agency No.
ANDHRA PRADESH					
1.	Andhra University General Cooperative Stores Ltd., Waltair (Visakhapatnam)	8	12.	Charles Lambert & Company, 102, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Opposite Clock Tower, Fort. Bombay.	30
2.	G. R. Lakshminath Chetty and Sons, General Merchants and News Agents, Newpet, Chandragiri, Chittoor District.	94	13.	The Current Book House, Maruti Lane, Raghunath Dalali Street, Bombay-1.	60
			14.	Deccan Book Stall, Ferguson College Road, Poona-4	65
ASSAM					
3.	Western Book Depot, Pan Bazar, Gauhati.	9	14.	M/s. Usha Book Depot, 585/A, Chira Bazar, Khan House, Girgaum Road, Bombay-2 B.R.	5
BIHAR					
4.	Amar Kitab Ghar, Post Box 78, Diagonal Road, Jamshedpur.	37	MYSORE		
			16.	M/s. Peoples Book House, Opp. Jaganmohan Palace, Mysore-1.	16
GUJARAT					
5.	Vijay Stores, Station Road, Anand.	35	RAJASTHAN		
6.	The New Order Book Company, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad-6.	63	17.	Information Centre, Government of Rajasthan, Tripolia, Jaipur City.	38
HARYANA					
7.	M/s. Prabhu Book Service, Nai Subalmandi, Gurgaon, (Haryana).	14	UTTAR PRADESH		
MADHYA PRADESH					
8.	Modern Book House, Shiv Vilas Palace, Indore City	13	18.	Swastik Industrial Works, 49, Holi Street, Meerut City.	2
			19.	Law Book Company, Sardar Patel Marg, Allahabad-1.	48
MAHARASHTRA					
9.	M/s. Sunderdas Gianchani, 601, Girgaum Road, Near Princess Street, Bombay-2.	6	WEST BENGAL		
10.	The International Book House (Private) Limited, 9, Ash Lane, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Bombay-1	22	20.	Grantharoka, 5/1, Ambica Mookherjee Road, Beisharua, 24 Parganas.	10
			21.	W. Newman & Company Ltd., 3, Old Court House Street, Calcutta.	44
11.	The International Book Service Deccan Gymkhana, Poona-4	26	22.	Firma K. L. Mukhopadhyay, 6/1A, Bencharam Area, Lane, Calcutta-12.	82
			23.	M/s. Mukherji Book House, 8-B, Buff Lane Calcutta-6	4

CONTENTS

	PAGE
COMPOSITION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS	(iii)
INTRODUCTION	(v)
REPORT	I
APPENDICES	
I. Letter dated 19-4-1972 from Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu M.P. addressed to the Speaker, Lok Sabha	9
II. Relevant extracts from the proceedings of the Lok Sabha dated 26-5-1972 (Uncorrected)	11

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS

(1972-73)

CHAIRMAN

Shrimati Subhadra Joshi

MEMBERS

2. Shri Dinen Bhattacharya
3. Shri G. Bhuvarahan
4. Dr. Kailas
5. Shri Murasoli Maran
6. Dr. Mahipatray Mehta
7. Shri S. N. Misra
8. Shri Amrit Nahata
9. Shri P. Parthasarathy
10. Shri Ranen Sen
11. Shri Lal K. Advani
12. Shri M. Kamalanathan
13. Shri U. N. Mahida
14. Chaudhary A. Mohammad
15. Shri D. P. Singh

SECRETARIAT

Shri Avtar Singh Rikhy—*Joint Secretary*

Shri M. A. Soundararajan—*Deputy Secretary*

Shri M. N. Kaul—*Under Secretary.*

INTRODUCTION

I, the Chairman Committee on Public Undertakings having been authorised by the Committee to present on their behalf, present this Twenty-Second Report on paragraph 1.17 of the Sixty-Third Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings (1969-70)—Fourth Lok Sabha, on National Industrial Development Corporation Limited containing the observations, "The Committee are of the opinion that they have been misled by the statement of the Managing Director (National Industrial Development Corporation Limited)."

2. It would be recalled that the subject had figured in the House on 26th May, 1972.

3. The Committee considered the matter on the 27th May, 1972 and the draft Report at their sitting held on the 30th May, 1972 and adopted the report.

NEW DELHI;
May 30, 1972.
Jyāishthā 9, 1894 (S).

SUBHADRA JOSHI,
Chairman
Committee on Public Undertakings.

CONSIDERATION OF PARA 1.17 OF THE 63RD REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC UNDERTAKINGS (1969-70) (FOURTH LOK SABHA) ON NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED CONTAINING THE OBSERVATION "THE COMMITTEE ARE OF THE OPINION THAT THEY HAVE BEEN MISLED BY THE STATEMENT OF THE MANAGING DIRECTOR (NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION LIMITED)"

The Committee on Public Undertakings examined the working of the National Industrial Development Corporation Ltd., during 1969-70 and presented their 63rd Report to Parliament on the 13th April, 1970.

2. This report contained a recommendation in Para 1.17 which reads as follows:—

"1.17. From the information supplied by the Corporation it would appear that apart from Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Ltd., the Corporation did not make any appreciable contribution either in the setting up or in the execution of these Projects. The Committee are of the opinion that they have been misled by the statement of the Managing Director during the course of evidence held on 28th July, 1969. The Committee are convinced that the NIDC did not play any appreciable role either in the conception or the execution of the five projects in the public sector and two projects in the private sector except to some extent in the case of the Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Ltd."

This recommendation is based on the narration indicated in paragraph 1.16 of the Report which is reproduced below:—

"1.16. During the course of evidence the Committee pointed out that the role of the NIDC was to fill the gaps in the industrial structure by starting new industries and to build up a technical expertise and to grant loans with that end in view. The Committee wanted to know how far the establishment of the Corporation had been justified by its setting up of new projects themselves or helping others to put up. The Managing Director, NIDC stated that NIDC executed five projects in public sector

viz. Heavy Engineering Corporation; Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Ltd.; Hindustan Photo Films; Hindustan Organic Chemicals Ltd.; and Bharat Heavy Electricals and two projects in the private sector *viz.* Synthetic Rubber and Tungsten Carbide. The Committee wanted to know the specific work NIDC performed either in the conception or in the execution of these projects. The NIDC in a written reply have stated as follows:

A. Public Sector Projects

A.1. Heavy Engineering Corporation

(i) Foundry and Forge Plant

Preliminary investigations by the NIDC in 1955 revealed that while substantial capacities existed in the country for manufacture of lighter weight castings and forgings, the capacity with regard to heavier castings and forgings was negligible in the country. As a sequel to this, discussions were held with several firms in the world who specialised in the manufacture of forgings and castings and Project Reports were prepared by several important firms from United Kingdom, Germany, Czechoslovakia and Japan. These Project Reports were examined and as a result of this, terms offered by Czechoslovakia were found favourable and the Government of India decided to go ahead with this Project on the basis of Czechoslovakian proposals. The Foundry Forge Project is now in operation.

(ii) Heavy Machine Building Plant

NIDC assisted the Government in initial investigations regarding the heavy equipment required for steel mills and other industries. It was found that practically all types of heavy equipment were being imported. In this case also proposals for a Heavy Machine Building Plant were submitted by USSR, United Kingdom and Czechoslovakia and these were examined. As a result of this, the Government decided to ask the Soviet authorities to assist in the development of this Project. The Plant is now in operation.

(iii) Heavy Machine Tools Plant

While the Hindustan Machine Tools Ltd. were making considerable progress in the manufacture of light and medium

variety of machine tools, investigations by NIDC revealed the necessity for a production plant for heavy machine tools. Project proposals in this connection were received from West Germany, Czechoslovakia, United Kingdom and other countries. After a detailed scrutiny of various proposals, the Government entered into a contract with Czechoslovakia for establishment of the factory for the manufacture of heavy machine tools. This plant is now in operation at Ranchi.

(iv) Coal Mining Machinery

A preliminary Project Report was prepared by visiting team of Soviet Experts on the manufacture of coal mining machinery in the country, which was hitherto being imported. This Preliminary Report was examined by a team of Indian experts and the items to be manufactured in the Coal Mining Machinery Plant were specified after discussions with the Soviet Experts. The Plant was envisaged to manufacture coal mining machinery and its spare parts including cutters, loaders, conveyors, ball mills etc. The Heavy Engineering Corporation (HEC) was entrusted in the initial stages for execution of the Plant but later it was transferred to the Mining and Allied Machinery Corporation which was entrusted with the execution and operation of the Plant. The Plant has been set up in Durgapur and is now in production.

A.2. Indian Drugs & Pharmaceuticals Limited

In 1959 the Government of USSR offered technical and financial assistance for setting up a number of factories for the manufacture of drugs and other medical supplies. The scheme was accepted by the Government and the contracts were signed in 1960 for the preparation of Detailed Project Reports for the four units *viz.*

- (i) Antibiotics plants
- (ii) Synthetic Drugs Plant
- (iii) Surgical Instruments Plant
- (iv) Phyto Chemicals Plant

The Government decided to locate these plants in U.P., Andhra Pradesh, Madras and Kerala respectively.

Indian Drugs & Pharmaceuticals Ltd. was formed in 1961 to execute, commission and operate these plants.

All the preliminary processing work relating to these plants was done by NIDC.

After the formation of IDPL, NIDC was entrusted to do portions of the detailed engineering work relating to three of the four projects. The detailed engineering work included preparation of detailed technical specifications and design drawings for mechanical and electricals equipment procured indigenously, detailed designs of Administration Block, construction workshops, etc.

The fourth project *viz.* Phyto Chemicals Plant was deferred by the Government.

A.3. Hindustan Photo Films

Until the year 1960-61 all the requirements for cinematographic films, X-ray films, photographic papers etc. were being met through imports. The NIDC initiated talks with East Germany and a firm in France for supply of technical know-how for the manufacture of these films. The proposals submitted by them were examined and a contract was signed by Government with the French firm for setting up this Project. For implementation and operation of the Project, a separate Company was formed under the name of Hindustan Photo Films Manufacturing Company Limited.

A.4. Hindustan Organic Chemicals Limited

Primary and intermediate organic chemicals provide base materials for the dye-stuffs and other chemical industries. The importance of this industry was noticed in the year 1955 and at that time all these primary and intermediate chemicals which formed an important base for the chemical industries were being imported. Proposals were received from various parties from Italy, West Germany, U.K. and U.S.S.R. Based on these Reports, negotiations were held with the West Germany Consortium and the Italian firm M/s. KONA Milan. Finally negotiations were successfully concluded with the West German firm with whom a contract for collaboration was entered into by the Government. The work on the implementation of this Project was entrusted to M/s. Hindustan

Organic Chemicals Limited, Panvel. The NIDC coordinated the functions as delineated above and after formation of HOCL, NIDC has been assisting it in the form of consultancy services in detailed engineering and establishment of various sections.

A.5. Bharat Heavy Electricals

In view of demands for the heavy electrical equipment, Government felt the necessity of supplementing the manufacturing facilities provided at Bhopal by way of putting new plants. The Corporation carried out the preliminary studies for Heavy Electrical Projects (II & III), one for the manufacture of Hydro-electric machinery and the other for the manufacture of large thermal generating plants. These plants are now in operation under Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited.

B. Private Sector Projects

B.1. Synthetic Rubber

Natural latex being scarcely available in India, it was noticed in 1960-61 that it could better be replaced by synthetic rubber. A team from a consortium of well-known American Companies was invited by NIDC to report on the possibility of manufacture of synthetic rubber using Indian raw materials mainly alcohol from sugar factories. The Plant has come up in the private sector at Bareilly.

B.2. Tungsten Carbide

NIDC examined the proposals for the manufacture of tungsten carbide from Indian raw material received from Swedish, United Kingdom and Japanese firms. This scheme was taken up by private parties who were interested in its implementation.

3. The Committee on Public Undertakings (1969-70) were of the opinion that before recording their views in the Report, the Chairman, CPU might call the Managing Director of the National Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. to explain the discrepancy in his statement. However, as the Managing Director was understood to be on tour abroad, the Report of the Committee was presented to the House, on 13th April, 1970. Thereafter Shri R. K. Sethi, Managing Director, National Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. was summoned to see the Chairman on 23rd April, 1970. The

note recorded by the then Chairman (Shri M. B. Rana) on 23rd April, 1970 about this meeting is reproduced below:—

“Shri R. K. Sethi, Managing Director, N.I.D.C. was summoned to see me at 11 A.M. on 23rd April, 1970. He was asked to explain why he misled the Committee by his statement as Managing Director during the course of evidence held on 28-7-1969. From the information supplied by the Corporation it would appear that apart from Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Ltd. the Corporation did not make any appreciable contribution either in the setting up or in the execution of these projects.

2. Shri Sethi said that there was no intention on his part to mislead such an august Committee. It was for the first time he had appeared before the Committee and he was a bit nervous in giving evidence. He said that he was a Railway Engineer and had served there for 27 years with a good record of service. If by any chance the Committee was misled by his statement, he is extremely sorry and tenders unconditional apology for it and requests that the matter may be closed.
3. I feel that the Committee should accept this apology and pardon him for his mistake. The matter may be closed.

Sd/- M. B. RANA,
23-4-1970.”

4. On the same day (23-4-1970), the Chairman reported the above to the Committee on Public Undertakings. An extract from the verbatim proceedings of the aforesaid sitting of the Committee is reproduced below:

“**Mr. Chairman:** Shri R. K. Sethi, Managing Director, NIDC was summoned to see me at 11.00 A.M. today. He was asked to explain why he misled the Committee by his statement as Managing Director during the course of evidence held on 28th July, 1969. From the information supplied by the Corporation, it would appear that apart from Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals Ltd. the Corporation did not make any appreciable contribution either in the setting up or in the execution of these projects.

Shri Sethi said that there was no intention on his part to mislead such an august Committee. It was for the first time he had appeared before the Committee and he was a bit nervous in giving evidence. He said that he was a Railway engineer and had served there for 27 years with a good record of service. If by any chance the Committee was misled by his statement, he is extremely sorry and tenders unconditional apology for it and requests that the matter may be closed.

I feel that the Committee should accept this apology and pardon him for his mistake. The matter may be closed.

Shri Sinha: When he has tendered unconditional apology, let us close this.

Other Members: Yes."

5. On 19th April, 1972 Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu addressed a letter to the Speaker, Lok Sabha, raising a question of breach of privilege of the House and the Committee on Public Undertakings against the Managing Director of the National Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. (Appendix I). The matter was placed before the then Chairman, Committee on Public Undertakings, who recorded a note dated 26th April, 1972 which reads as follows:

"I have discussed the question of motion of privilege with Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu. He has agreed not to raise this question till new Committee is formed; as the matter is important it should be brought to the notice of the new Committee as soon as it is formed".

7. The new Committee for the year (1972-73) was constituted with the appointment of Chairman on the 26th May, 1972.

8. On the same day, this matter was raised by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, M.P., in the Lok Sabha. Relevant extracts from the proceedings of the Lok Sabha (uncorrected) are reproduced in Appendix II.

9. At their sitting held on 27th May, 1972, the new Committee on Public Undertakings (1972-73) considered this matter in detail. The Committee decided that in view of the fact that the Committee on

Public Undertakings (1969-70) which had occasion to express the opinion that "they have been misled by the statement of the Managing Director during the course of evidence held on 28th July, 1969" had themselves accepted the unconditional apology tendered by the Managing Director, National Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. and closed the matter, the fact may be accordingly reported to the House.

NEW DELHI;

May 30, 1972.

Jyaishta 9, 1894 (S).

SUBHADRA JOSHI,

Chairman,

Committee on Public Undertakings.

APPENDIX I

(Vide para 5 of the Report)

JYOTIRMOY BOSU
Member of Parliament
Whip, Communist Party of India
(Marxist)
Principal Opposition, Lok Sabha.

2, Dr. Bishambardas Marg,
New Delhi-1.
19-4-1972.

The Speaker,
Lok Sabha,
New Delhi.

Dear Sir,

Under Rule 222, I wish to raise a question involving breach of privilege of the House and that of a Public Undertaking Committee.

The P.U.C. in its 63rd report has mentioned the following:—

(see page 73 appendix iii)

“The Committee are of the opinion that they have been misled by the statement of the Managing Director (meaning of the National Industrial Development Corporation Ltd.) during the course of evidence held on 28th July, 1969.”

This, you will agree is a very serious matter and in spite of the fact that this was brought to the notice of the Government through the report as well as by Shri Ananda Nambiar, the then Member of Parliament and also member of the P.U.C. no action has been taken against the offender. Under the circumstances there is no alternative to my mind, but to hand it over to the Privilege Committee for necessary action.

I trust you will allow me to raise the issue at your earliest opportunity.

Yours faithfully,
Sd/-
(JYOTIRMOY BOSU)

Copy to:—

- (1) P.S. to H.S. with a request that he may please bring this to the notice of H.S. immediately.
- (2) Secretary.
- (3) J.S. (B).
- (4) Committee Branch with 2 copies along with the original.

APPENDIX II

(Vide para 8 of the Report)

RE: QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu (Diamond Harbour): Sir, I shall read out an extract from the 63rd Report of the Committee on Public Undertakings—April, 1970. This report is on the National Industrial Development Corporation Ltd. Apart from other things, the Committee says that the “Committee are of the opinion that they have been misled by the statement of the Managing Director during the course of evidence held on 28th July, 1969”. It also says that the Managing Director of NIDC stated that the NIDC executed five projects in the public sector, that is, the Heavy Engineering Corporation, Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals, Hindustan Photo Films, Hindustan Organic Chemicals, Ltd., the Bharat Heavy Electricals—all projects in the public sector, and two projects in the private sector, namely, Synthetic Rubber and Tungsten Carbide. The Committee wanted to know the specific work the NIDC performed either in the completion or in the execution of these projects. The NIDC in its written reply have stated certain things which were wholly misleading.

An Hon. Member: What is his name?

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: A man called Sethi. “The Committee are of the opinion that they have been misled by the statement of the Managing Director during the course of the evidence held on the 28th July, 1969. The Committee are convinced that the NIDC did not play any appreciable role either in the completion or the execution of the five projects in the public sector and two projects in the private sector except to some extent in the case of Indian Drugs and Pharmaceuticals.”

It is a very serious matter that responsible persons like the Managing Director of a public sector corporation has the courage to misled a Parliamentary Committee which is supreme in this country in the interests of the people of this country.

The report was published in 1970. Two years have now passed; we are now in May, 1972. After the report, I had given notice of a privilege motion. I was asked to wait. I have waited. Today, you were kind enough to allow me to raise this matter before the House. I also wrote to the Minister, in the meantime, asking him to tell us

what he had done to the managing director. But I was most distressed to learn from other sources that instead of taking action against the managing director, he has been in fact upgraded and financially given some benefit, etc., etc. They are making a mockery of the whole thing.

We remember that a couple of years ago, one Deputy Controller of Iron and Steel, Mr. Mukerjee, who had similarly misled a Parliamentary Committee was brought to the Bar of the House and was made to apologise, or whatever it is. He was reprimanded. May I request you, under the appropriate rules, to refer the matter to the Privileges Committee? Let the Privileges Committee do the fact-finding and do what is fair and right.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Bosu, the Committee was seized of this problem, but in the meanwhile, the term of the Committee expired, and a new Committee has been elected. I saw a note from the Chairman of the old Committee, Shri M. B. Rana. That note is dated 26th April, 1972. He has put this note after the Committee prepared the action-taken report and everything else. In the meanwhile, the term of the Committee had expired and a new Committee has been elected. He says that "I have discussed the question of this privilege motion by Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu. He has agreed to raise this question....."

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: I agreed to wait for ten days.

Mr. Speaker: He has written: "It should be put before the new Committee." So the Committee is already seized of the matter and so I advise you to wait still further so that the Committee may come up with their findings because they are the proper authority to take action on it.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: May I make a statement in the context of what you have said. The original report was published in April, 1970. Two years and one month have passed and nothing has happened. I also wrote to the Minister, nothing happened. Mr. Rana had asked me, when I pointed this out, to wait for about ten days, that is till the 14th of May. Today it is 25th and you have been kind enough to allow it today. I would certainly accept what you say, but they should finalise the whole thing before the end of this session.

Mr. Speaker: The end of the session is only next week. By the beginning of next session, would be better.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: There was a similar case in which Mr. Wanchoo and Mr. Mukerjee were involved. It was raised by Mr. Madhu Limaye and a decision was taken in the House to refer the entire question to the Privileges Committee. If I remember aright, in that case Mr. Mukerjee was not given an opportunity for defending himself, he wanted to defend the case but he was reprimanded.

An Hon. Member: He was given an opportunity.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: In this particular case, why should the new Public Undertaking Corporation take it up? It should be referred to the Privileges Committee.

Mr. Speaker: The Committee were considering this question and in the meanwhile they were dissolved; it was not within their powers to extend their term. I do not know how far it will be proper to take up this matter and bring it to the House. I do wish that they send me some report. I do not close the matter; it is pending; let us see what comes out of that.

Shri Piloo Mody: May I make a submission? If you send this matter back to the new committee, it is wholly irregular. That Committee is not constituted for that particular purpose. The previous committee had a certain incident in which some evidence was given which they did not think was fair. Therefore, they have published it in a report; the report has been laid on the Table of the House. It is now public property; the Committee should no longer have anything to do with it.

Mr. Speaker: Action-taken report is still pending; they are seized of it.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: Action-taken report must have come six months after that.

Mr. Speaker: It has not yet come.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: This man in the meantime is allowed to go around the capital trying to pressurise; it is a dangerous thing you are doing... (*Interruptions*). The name is Mr. Sethi.

An Hon. Member: It is somebody else.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: He has been allowed to start a new public sector project called the Bharat Compressors.... (*Interruptions*.)

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: Are we not cooking our own goose?

Mr. Speaker: I am not used to this kind of question. After all, we have to go by certain procedures.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: Two years have been spent; the man has been upgraded. He is moving around and the hon. Minister does not do anything. The Committee does not do anything. This Government is most reluctant to touch any bureaucrat.... (*Interruptions.*)

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah: In the Action-Taken Report, normally they confine themselves to certain recommendations made for implementation. With regard to certain remarks passed by the committee, unless there is a specific direction from the Chair, they may not go into this.

Mr. Speaker: The remarks of the Chairman are that they are already considering this matter.

Shri P. Venkatasubbaiah: That is the remark of the outgoing Chairman. The Chair should give a direction that this matter be gone into and a separate report submitted.

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Rana is not here. I appointed the Chairman only this morning. I agree with Mr. Mody that this is a matter which needs careful consideration. We will be laying certain precedents which I do not want to lay off hand without examining the matter. The Committee is not functioning. The elections were held only recently and the Chairman was appointed only this morning. I just wanted to know whether the committee is seized of the matter and whether the Action-taken Report is pending. The Chairman says, they are already seized of this matter and considering it.

Shri Piloo Mody: Considering what they are not supposed to be considering.

Mr. Speaker: I will have to take everything into account. (*Interruptions.*) I cannot allow a debate on this. Anything that comes into your hands, you try to raise a debate over it.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: Are we not unduly kind to this man?

Shri Piloo Mody: Think it over, Sir. You can bring it up again on Monday.

Mr. Speaker: I quite agree that more the time, more the latitude given to these people, because in the past also, we have been silent over certain matters and the result is, things went too far.

Shri H. N. Mukerjee: Why is the Government mum? Do they want to hide under the cloak of formal legalism when all this kind of thing goes out to the country? Allegations are made and substantiated but nobody from Government gets up to say anything about it.

Mr. Speaker: I am asking the new Chairman to look into it and give the exact position. Perhaps the intimation has not yet gone.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: It would not be correct for anyone to say that the ministers sitting here have no knowledge of this matter.

Mr. Speaker: In a matter like this involving the question of privilege any observation by the minister perhaps may complicate the matter still further, till the new committee gives something to us in the shape of a report or direction.

Shri Indrajit Gupta: NIDC comes under the Ministry of Industrial Development. Only a few months ago, I personally brought it to the notice of Mr. Moinul Haque Chowdhury that this same man, Mr. Sethi, against whom strictures were passed by PUC, has been appointed by him as a one-man committee to enquire into the affairs of Ashcock and Aldown, a concern which was being closed down. I wrote to the Minister saying, "At least change the man. Don't appoint this man against whom strictures have been made." Later Mr. Chowdhury met me in the lobby and informed me, "I have gone into your letter. I think that is something else not connected with this. Let him conduct this enquiry." The matter is getting further complicated because no action is being taken. He has started Bharat Compressors in Allahabad in the public sector—the same Mr. Sethi. He is being given all sorts of favours. He is being promoted and upgraded and nothing is done about by the PUC report. We do not want a repetition of the Pipeline Inquiry.

Shri Pilo Mody: Quite apart from what Shri Indrajit Gupta has said, the fact of the matter is that this evidence was taken by the old Public Undertakings Committee. The New Public Undertakings Committee should proceed with its work. As Shri Venkatasubbaiah has said, the Action Taken Report deals only with the recommendations by the Committee on Public Undertakings. It has nothing to do with any strictures or anything of that sort. The new Public Undertakings Committee has henceforth nothing to do with that case. This is a matter which has been seized by the House. This Report has been laid before the House, it has been printed and now it is for the House, and the House alone, to take action. Any attempt

to put it back to the new Public Undertakings Committee would be a very wrong procedure.

Shri Samar Guha: You have said that you want to refer the matter to the Public Undertakings Committee on the basis of the recommendation made by the former Chairman of the PUC. The former Chairman of the PUC, after having approved the draft of the report, after having the Report approved by the whole Committee, has placed it before the House. Now he cannot have any right to make such a recommendation that the whole matter should be reconsidered by the new Committee. It is a moot question. It will create a very bad precedent.

Mr. Speaker: He has not given any finding.

Shri Samar Guha: He has made a passing observation that it should be reconsidered by the New Committee.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: Sir, since you have allowed Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu to raise this on the floor of the House, and he has raised it with your permission, you must have informed the Minister concerned because the usual procedure is that whenever a matter is raised, either you refer it to the Minister....

Mr. Speaker: That is only when I give my consent. Here I have not given my consent.

Shri S. M. Banerjee: I agree that you have not given your consent. But you have allowed him to raise the issue. When, for instance, Shri Indrajit Gupta raised a point earlier, Shri Gokhale was there and he did reply to it. Here some serious charges are made against this gentleman, Shri Sethi, whose face I have not seen. I have nothing against him; let him be promoted; I do not mind it. But he has been given a new assignment, and when the point is raised here, the whole Cabinet is keeping quiet. Why should they behave like the three wise monkeys: "Speak no evil, see no evil and hear no evil"?

Mr. Speaker: It is only when the privilege motion is admitted by the consent of the Speaker that information is sent to the Minister. In this case, I want to convey to you that the Committee on Public Undertakings have not yet submitted the Action-Taken Report. That Action-Taken Report contains what action has been taken on it. After that the position may be entirely different.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: How? (*Interruptions*).

Mr. Speaker: Do not try to side-track the issue. Unless we have this report, it is very difficult to give any consent to this. I am asking the new Chairman to expedite the matter. If there is any difficulty about it later on, I shall inform the House.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: Let the Minister make a statement on this the coming Monday.

Mr. Speaker: This will go to the new Chairman.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: Kindly direct the government to produce the Minister here.

Mr. Speaker: I will not send it to the Minister until I admit it.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: I will raise it on Monday. I give you notice here and now.

Mr. Speaker: Don't be loaded with so many things at one time.

Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu: I am a beast of burden. What can I do?

Mr. Speaker: You are a very wise beast. I hope, all of you will agree.
