[Shri B. N. Datar.]

will consider all the aspects of the case and send back the Bill with such improvements as they consider necessary.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do join in the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Bill to provide for the imposition of a ceiling on land holdings in the Union territory of Delhi and for matters connected therewith, and resolves that the following members of the Rajya Sabha be nominated to serve on the said Joint Committee, namely:—

1. Shri Onkar Nath
2. Shri R. M. Deshmukh
3. Shrimati Anis Kidwai
4. Shri N. Ramakrishna Iyer
5. Shri Kishori Ram
6. Shri S. Panigrahi
7. Shri Abdur Rezzak Khan
8. Mirza Ahmed Ali
9. Shri Niranjan Singh
10. Shri Govind Ballabh Pant."

The motion was adopted

HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSION *RE* DEATH OF A MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT FOLLOWING INJECTION OF PENICILLIN

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Two Members have given notice. Only one can speak, and the other Member can put questions. I find Dr. Gilder has also given notice and he may also put questions. Now who will speak? Yes, Mr. Dhage.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, it is very regrettable that the hon. Minister when he gave answers to the questions raised by Diwan Chaman Lall made a categorical statement regarding the working of the Pimpri Penicillin Factory being satisfactory.

DR. W. S. BARLINGAY (Bombay): Will the hon. Member kindly move to the mike?

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: But, Sir, according to the information that we have, we find that all is not well with the working of the Penicillin factory, particularly its Quality Control Section.

Now, Sir, in the reply that was given by the hon. Minister, he stated categorically that four tests were not carried out. That is not correct. There is in my hand a document which has been circulated by the Ministry concerned, and it is stated in this document that four tests were carried out. Not only that that has been the case, but I also find from this document that growth was found in the first three tests. Sir, according to the law of the Drugs Act it is stated that if growth is found in more than one test, it should be rejected. Accordingly it so happened that Dr. Kulkarni, who is the Chief Scientific Officer there to pass this item, on the 28th of August, 1959, rejected this, because in the first three tests he found contamination, and the statement in my hand also says that in the first test on 10-8-1959, out of 15 tubes, 2 tubes were found with fungus growth. In the second test on 20-8-1959, out of 30 tubes, 2 were found with bacterial growth. And the test was repeated, for the third time, on 28-8-1959 and out of 15 tubes, 1 showed bacterial growth and 2 fungus growth.

According to the section of the Drugs Act this should be rejected and accordingly Dr. Kulkarni rejected it. But I do not know what happened later. It was perhaps thought that this should be passed and so a fourth test was carried out on 22-9-1959 only with 10 tubes, and Dr. Kulkarani passed it on 25-9-1959.

Sir, there is an infringement of the law so far as the testing of this is concerned. The first consideration is that if 15 tubes or vials are taken in the first test and if they are found to be contaminated, twice that number must be taken in the second test, and if they are found to be contaminated, they must be rejected. But what happened? There was a third test and in that third test they should have taken 60 vials. Instead of that they took only 15 tubes and even in that they found that it was contaminated. Accordingly Dr. Kulkarni rejected it. But then they took another 10 vials in the fourth test on 22-9-1959 and Dr. Kulkarni passed it on 25-9-1959, because only 10 vials were taken and no one was found to be contaminated.

Sir, the Drug Controler, Mr. S. K. Borkar, has submitted a statement and in that he has tried to rely on the U.S.A. Drug Administration Rules, but in doing so he has forgotten that that is also governed by another rider, which says that if the same contamination is found in two tests, it must be rejected. That portion of the rules was not taken into account and Dr. Kulkarni was asked to pass this. That is my contention. Anyway, while these tests were going on, the departmental junior scientists themselves felt that this was not proper, and I find . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL (Punjab): Are you talking about this particular batch?

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: I am only concerned to point out that there are infringements of the regulations laid down by the Drugs Act and the working of the Quality Control Section is in a particular manner, which is not satisfactory.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Quite true, but what I was saying was this: The hon. Member referred to four tests having been made and I was asking whether these four tests of penicillin belonged to the same batch which was used on the late Mr. Tripathi. Is that not correct?

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Yes, that is the thing; all belonged to the batch F1573-D, but I have not been able to understand what your contention is.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I am saying that the batch that the hon. Member is referring to is the batch which was used on the late Mr. Tripathi and which was not tested according to the rules.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Yes, that is there. What I am also trying to emphasize is that the Quality Control Section is not working according to the law laid down by the Drugs Act. Not merely in the case of F1573-D, which was injected into the body of an hon. Member of Parliament, but also in general, in the matter of the testing of penicillin, the law has not been followed. The law has not been followed; departmentally the scientists themselves have taken objection to this and yet it was said "Well, you may pass it."

Sir, I have got various photostat copies here, and I find that the law has been infringed in more than one way. I am not reading the laws, because you have not given me more time, but if the hon. Minister disputes what I say in this regard, I may be allowed to quote the law. For want of time I am merely stating the facts in as brief a manner as possible. Now I find from the photostat copies that I have that the law requires 10 vials to be taken if there are more than 1,000 vials in any batch. But we find that not 10 vials are taken but only 2 vials are taken for the purpose of testing, and this has happened in a number of antibiotics, not only in the case of this penicillin but also in the case of streptomycin, dihydrostreptomycin and so on—I am not able to give you all the names—but this is the case.

[Shri V. K. Dhage.]

Now another requirement of the law, rule 118 (3) of the Drugs Rules, is that this should be kept at a particular temperature for five days under observation whereas here we find that this has been passed without its having been so kept under observation. Now this is a matter which is very serious. If the Quality Control Section is to work in this way, I am sorry, Sir, it will be very difficult for us to have any kind of reliance on the product that comes out of this factory, and I feel that this is a very valid case for the purpose of having a judicial enquiry in the matter to see whether the law that is prescribed in the Drugs Act is followed properly or not and whether there has been any infringement in this regard.

Another thing that is coming out of the report that has been made by the junior scientists is that when you have to test incubation etc., you have to add a certain element, a certain medium called L-cysten, and these junior officers have said that this medium is not employed at all. And yet the thing is being passed.

How many minutes more?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Seven minutes more.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: The hon. Minister also stated in his reply that the expert committe that was appointed was not to go into the examination and the suitability of methods adopted and the degree of success, etc. achieved. I have referred to the letter of appointment of this expert committee and I find that they were specifically appointed for this purpose. I hope the hon. Minister will refer to the letter of appointment. Their purpose was:—

> "To examine the technical side of the penicillin project from the production as well as research aspect..... and to give independent advice....."

The words "independent advice" require emphasis.

> "....to give independent advice to the Government of India on the suitability of the methods adopted and the degree of success achieved by the Board of Directors of the Company."

I do not know how the hon. Minister gave the reply in answer to a question that this Committee was not competent to go into it. The desire of the House was that even before you had received any report from Washington or London, the matter ought to have been entrusted to this expert Committee to see as to what was happening in the Pimpri Quality Control Department. But this was not done.

Sir, I have something else to say. Even the bottling of the vials of penicillin does not seem to be properly done. Sir, when questions were put in the House during the course of the discussion, a medical practitioner happened to come and listen to the discussion. He had had correspondence with the Hindustan Antibiotics Ltd. in this regard. That was some time in the month of October, 1958. He wrote to them to say that when he bought a bottle of penicillin, he found glass pieces in that bottle. Here is that bottle containing glass pieces. You will see in this bottle glass pieces of a considerable size. These penicillin bottles have been sold in the market for injection purposes. I do not know what sort of vigilance the department is exercising that we have glass pieces inside the bottle.

THE MINISTER OF HEALTH (SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR): May I see the bottle please?

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: If you like, I will pass it on to you so that you may examine it.

[*The bottle was passed on to Shri D. P. Karmarkar.*]

Sir, after having seen through the correspondence, the notes and the photostat copies that I have, I feel that the penicillin factory at Pimpri is not being conducted properly. I am not going into the reasons, but there has been a contravention of the provisions of the Act. The provisions under the Act require that for a contravention of the provisions prosecution should be launched against such persons. It may be that it is a Government factory, but if it is not a Government factory, the law requires that in case of an infringement of the law, the State should take notice of it. But in a case like this nothing has been done. I would, therefore, ask the hon. Minister to have a judicial enquiry into the matter, so that people may have confidence in the working of this institution.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I am grateful to you for permitting me to ask a few questions of the hon. Minister. I believe he is aware of the fact that there was in the House of Commons a case known as the Crichell Down case in which the Minister, as a result of the information given to him by his staff, inadvertently misled the House and the hon. Minister resigned. In this particular case I do not want my hon. friend to resign—I am very fond of him—but he has misled the House and misled the House in a most grievous manner, misled the House by misleading himself, by being misled by the Managing Director of this concern who happens to be a B. A., B. L., and not a technical man. Now, Sir, I ask, I repeat this question. Is it a fact that three tests were made of this particular batch, No. F1573-D, which was used on the hon. Member of Parliament, who died as a result of this injection? Is it a fact that each one of these tests was a positive test for toxic result and, therefore, rejected? Mr. Karmarkar, in reply to this question, said:

> "No, Sir, that is not my information. I will try to check it up."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only question, please.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I quote the questions put and the answers given by him on the last occasion:—

> "DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Will my hon. friend take this information from me that there were three tests originally?
>
> SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I will not take this information from the hon. Member unless he gives some positive proof.
>
> DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I will do that. Is it a fact that these tests were made as prescribed under section 119 (2) of the Drug Rules of 1945, but after this batch was found to be toxic, the Managing Director ordered a fourth test?
>
> SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Sir, I heard such vague rumours round about the lobbies of this House and the other House. Therefore, I made pointed enquiries from the Managing Director myself and he told me that it is absolutely untrue."

Now, I ask my hon. friend:

Is it a fact that a test was made on the 10th August with 15 vials, a test was made on the 19th August with 30 vials, as prescribed by the law, and a test was made on the 28th of August with not 60 vials, but with only 15 vials, all of which were found to be contaminated and, therefore, were rejected? After rejection, another test is made, not with 120 vials, as the law prescribes, but only with 10 vials. It was a test made by the same individual who rejected the first test. Now, Sir, is this a fact or not a fact? Has the hon. Minister not been misled by the Managing Director of this firm and in turn misled this House by giving an incorrect reply? What action is the Government to take in respect of this matter against the Managing Director, not only for having misled the hon. Minister, misled the House, but for

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]

having contravened the rules which prescribe a sentence of three years' imprisonment, apart from the action that might be taken against him for having been responsible for the loss of the life of an hon. Member of Parliament?

DR. M. D. D. GILDER (Bombay): Sir, I would ask one or two questions. Granted that this sample of penicillin was contaminated with bacteria and fungi. Does the hon. Minister believe that the lamented death of the Member of Parliament was due to this contamination?

Secondly, Sir, there was a Consultative Committee formerly. Now, I believe there is a managing committee of experts. Will the hon. Minister kindly tell us the difference in their functions and their personnel?

Thirdly, Sir, photostat copies have been shown to the hon. Minister.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Only one question is allowed according to the Rules.

DR. M. D. D. GILDER: Just one question, Sir. The photostat copies have been shown to us. Is the hon. Minister aware that in the Aarey Milk Colony, managed by the Bombay Government, a mouse was found in a half-consumed bottle of milk, and on enquiry it was found that it was dropped by a disloyal and discontented servant?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are not concerned with the last part of the question. Who will reply to it?

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Perhaps the last question about the penicillin bottle has no relevance. I will not take any notice of it because . . .

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: I did not put a question.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: The medical practitioner has sent a bottle which has come to our knowledge today, full three weeks after this question had arisen, and it has been placed here for the benefit of Parliament. I thought when a case like that—a bottle containing glass pieces—occurred, the first duty of any responsible medical practitioner in any part of India was to put it at the top, if this was a scandal. And in view of the fact that it comes so late, I am not prepared to join the contest because it has no concern with Mr. Tripathi's deaht. Now, Sir, with your indulgence and the indulgence of the House I shall deal with . . .

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: I did not read the correspondence for want of time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It has nothing to do with this.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I shall deal with the exact points with which I and my statements are concerned and since other things have been . . .

SHRI P. N. SAPRU (Uttar Pradesh): Not to take notice of something which . . .

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: His Lordship was not used to interrupting just at the commencement of an advocate's arguments. So, coming back to this point, there were two statements which were indirectly made by Mr. Dhage to which, thanks to my esteemed friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, my attention has been drawn. He has asked about the infringement of the rules. It was a fact that these had come to my ears. It was a fact that I put a question to the Director at that time directly —maybe what I had heard and the question that I had put were not adequate questions. I asked him: "Is it a fact that the rules provide for so many tests and if two tests failed, then you have to discard the whole medicine?" It was just in the terms in which I heard it. I have not the text with me which he has read.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: May I interrupt my hon. friend?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no time.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: My hon. friend asked me:

> "Is my hon. friend aware of the allegation that I have made, namely, that the drug rules were not complied with in this particular instance? Is he prepared to give us a categorical answer that they were complied with?"

Earlier he had referred to two tests . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Three tests.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Three tests of whatever it is. I said—and I gave out the source of my information also—when it came to my ears that this was a serious question and I asked Director himself and he said 'no'. Now what has transpired in this enquiry after that is that my hon. friends are relying upon Rule 119. It seems that it requires a formal amendment but there is also a provision under Rule 114 at page 55 of the Drugs Control Rules, 1958 edition . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: This is not fair to the House and what is not fair to the House, my hon. friend must admit. The question was: "Were there four tests made?" And the categorical reply of the Managing Director was 'no'. No four tests were made. It is not a question of the rules . . .

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Let me inform the House of the present position. Now Rule 114, after having laid down the methods of testing, says in the second proviso:

> "If a manufacturer satisfies the licensing authority that he has already in use tests for the presence of living aerobic or anaerobic bacteria in any of the abovenamed substances, and that these tests, as applied by him, will detect the presence of such bacteria in the substance as ready for issue with a certainty at least equal to that afforded by the application of the tests prescribed by this Part, the licensing authority may approve the use of such tests in the place of the prescribed tests, but in such a case the authority may at any time withdraw such approval and require the manufacturer to carry out the prescribed tests".

I understand from the Drug Control authority in Bombay that he did permit this factory to adopt the U.S.A. test instead of the B.P. test. I see what is now necessary. By an error, on the bottles it is written according to B.P. It requires a change but I have satisfied myself and I could tell the House confidently that nothing has been done either with a view to or which has resulted in a breach of any rule. In his discretion, the Drug Controller at Bombay did permit the Hindustan Antibiotics to adopt the U.S.A. standard, which, taken up as a whole, is more rigid than the B.P. . I am satisfied, on the advice of experts having known about it, that there has been no contravention of any rule under the Drugs Rules or any other rules relevant for the purpose of our Drug Control. That is item one.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Sir, I beg to interrupt him, because once this House has been misled and I do not want my hon. friend to mislead the House a second time. It may be that he is doing it quite inadvertently, but the fact remains that there is a record on the register of which we have got a record here, where the doctor says that the tests are not being done according to the procedure, and it is not being done according to the provisions . . .

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I would like some indulgence from the House. In order to have a fair discussion it is no use, like we do sometimes in

[Shri D. P. Karmarkar.]

the courts, mixing up one thing with the other. I am limiting myself strictly to the examination of the drug that was used in the case of Mr. Tripathi and nothing else. I do not think that under this Half-an-hour discussion the Hindustan Antibiotics is on its trial. I do not accept that position nor was that position present before me when I answered the question. If hon. Members wish to have a discussion about the whole Hindustan Antibiotics establishment, they are free to have that and you are in a position to permit that discussion. Today I am strictly on the point of the medicine that was served to Mr. Tripathi after the administration of which, unhappily, the patient died. So about that I am speaking. I am satisfied that no rule has been infringed because under Rule 114, I understand that the Bombay Drug Control Authority has permitted the Hindustan Antibiotics to adopt the U.S.A. procedure which has been set down in very great details.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: That is why I said that the hon. Minister is misleading the House because he has himself not understood probably the position. The U.S.A. procedure states categorically that where contamination has entered into the test tubes during the process of testing, there a second test is allowed. If there is the same contamination present again in the test, then that thing has to be rejected. That is the U.S. procedure.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I understand the point perfectly well. With regard to the tests carried out in the factory, I may request my colleagues to reply because he is much more familiar with that.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no time for two replies. We have only 2 or 3 minutes.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: We do not mind it but that is a very important subject and the House . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LAL: You must permit me also to make a speech if another Minister is going to speak.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: Coming to the second point, I am afraid that hon. Members are confusing sterility with non-toxicity. Toxicity is something that poisons the system. Sterility is the absence of any other foreign matter. I am in a position to say, in reply to the question asked by my friend and colleague Dr. Gilder from Bombay, that so far as we are able to say, there was no question of Mr. Tripathi having suffered from any toxicity. That is the present position.

With regard to the U.S.A. test, if you permit, I am content with the statement that I am myself satisfied about it. If the House wishes more information, it can have it. The note that has been circulated to the House contains the full information but if the House is desirous, my friend will again explain the procedure that has been accepted. So far as the particular batch of the medicine that was tested there is concerned, we on this side, after the carefullest scrutiny, are satisfied that it did fulfil the U.S.A. test. It is no use picking up a small point here and a small point there but if my hon. friend wants to raise . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: The small points means the death of an hon. Member of Parliament. It is not a small thing.

SHRI D. P. KARMARKAR: I wish my hon. friend is sufficiently experienced not to make a hasty statement unless he has something in his possession positively that the bottle that was served to Mr. Tripathi was either toxic or in any way deleterious to his health. I am afraid that he is not in a position. There is the penicillin that was administered, there is the death but to have a cause and effect relationship requires something more than emotion and the emphatic making of a statement which has absolutely no foundations whatsoever

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Have you anything to say, Mr. Shah?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: May I be permitted to say something?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: There is no time, Mr. Chaman Lall.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I have as much right as any Member of this House. One Minister has had his say and if the other Minister is going to speak, then you must permit me to have my say.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No other. You just have 3 minutes.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY (SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH): Sir, I am grateful and I can assure at the outset all hon. Members of the House that the Government and all of us share with the same acuteness the sorrow that they have expressed on the death of an hon. Member about which Shri Chaman Lall, Mr. Dhage and other friends have expressed.

Regarding the point that Mr. P. N. Sapru has rightly mentioned, if anything is brought to our notice about this particular vial, where it is said there was glass, I can assure the House that that also will be gone into.

Regarding this particular batch of penicillin, I can only reiterate that this batch was containing 14,000 vials of which 8,000 had already been consumed, without any report anywhere of any detrimental or harmful effect to any person who was administered it. Sir, the remnant of this batch has been tested at Kasauli and found to be completely non-toxic . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Let me in this context point out . . .

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH: Let me have a continuous say. All the points of my hon. friend will be covered.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I only want to ask, whether it is not a fact that under this test when it is done, the batch, under the law, must have been there for five days. The vial was tested on 22nd September and . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has heard all that, Diwan Chamal Lall, let him reply now.

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH: Sir, we are as interested, as anybody else is, to see that the highest standards are maintained in this respect. Let me just develop and I will cover all the points. This question of such importance cannot be settled by such cross questions and answers. Let me state the whole position.

Sir, over and above that, after that the samples were sent to the Haffkine Institute, the Kasauli Institute and the Calcutta Institute and we have fortunately now got the reports from all these three institutes and they have found that the drug was up-to the standard quality and that the highest possible standard has been maintained.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): What is the report from outside, from countries like the U.S.A. and the U.K.?

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH: If questions are asked and answer given then it will not be possible to . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No further disturbance.

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH: Sir, the whole country gets unnecessarily agitated without the basic data before it by questions and answers which do not take us anywhere. Let me give the whole position, the whole review. We will submit all the reports when they come.

Sir, we also sent for our satisfaction, for the satisfaction of the House and of the country, some samples to London and Washington and we are awaiting the reports from these countries also.

[Shri Manubhai Shah.]

Over and above that, we got two eminent persons, one from Lucknow—Dr. Mukherji and Dr. J. C. Ray from Calcutta, to draw samples from this batch and they are at the moment conducting tests. As soon as these test reports are ready, Sir, they also wil be laid on the Table of the House. This is the present position as far as this batch and the various tests are concerned. Again retesting in the Hindustan Antibiotic Factory has also been done, both according to the U.S.A. standard and also the B.P. standard and it has been found to be of the standard quality.

Now as to the question of my hon. friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, whether a fourth test was carried out or not, I may say that the fourth test was carried out and it was carried out after the three tests. In the monsoon season in Poona and elsewhere there is fungus growth due to the moisture and so there is contamination of two types, the bacterial and the fungus types. The fungus type contamination was found and under the U.S.A. Federal Law there is this provision which with your permission I would like to read out, just a short extract of four lines:

> "If at the examination a growth of micre-organism is visible, further samples may be taken and the tests may be repeated on the further samples taken, but no container, the contents of which form part of the batch, shall be issued until such further samples have passed the test. The process of taking samples from the batch for test may be repeated twice:
>
> Provided and if the same organism is visible in more than one test, the batch shall be treated as not sterile and the material content in the batch shall not be issued or used as part of a future batch unless and until it has been re-sterilized and has passed the test."

So more than three tests can be carried out.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: If the contamination appears in two batches . . .

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH: Sir, I am as anxious as my hon. friend, Diwan Chaman Lall, to protect the public interest in this country and we are not at all going to hide anything. Let me . . .

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: I have not the slightest doubt about that, but . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The half-an-hour discussion is over. There is a message from the Lok Sabha.

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: But, Sir, the . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The time is over.

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH: Sir, I have to make an important annuoncement. I would like to have a little indulgence of the House for placing some information, because it is not only the whole House that has to judge, but also the thing goes out in the newspapers and the public in India gets agitated. We are the custodians of the public sector project and the whole House is the custodian of it and we have to see that in the matter of drugs nothing is said without proper examination which may cause unnecessary anxiety. The Hindustan Antibiotics is managed by a competent directorate and there are seven eminent scientists, the Surgeon general of Bombay . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: What is the announcement?

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH: I will just mention it in two minutes.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Let him have two minutes.

SHRI MANUBHAI SHAH: The whole thing seems to have got into the technical question of time.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But a half-an-hour discussion is a half-an-hour discussion. It cannot be a three-fourths of an hour discussion.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: But has not House the right to by-pass the rule?

DIWAN CHAMAN LALL: Let him have two more minutes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI MANBUHAI SHAH: This Board of Directors have just appointed a sub-committee of the Board consisting of Dr. B. B. Yodh of Bombay, Dr. Jhala, the Director of the Haffkine Institute, Dr. K. Venkataraman, the Director National Chemical Laboratory, Poona, Dr. Pandit, Director Indian Council of Medical Research and Shri Borkar, Drug Controller, India. The committee will go into the whole procedure. They will examine not only this batch, but we are more interested in putting the factory free from any defect and putting it on the highest possible standard for the future also.

Over and above this, after this committee has examined it, it is the intention of the Government that, if we find that further examination is necessary to satisfy ourselves and the country, we will appoint a committee which will go into and examine the whole procedure that is in force for testing penicillin and other drugs also manufactured in the Hindustan Antibiotics Factory, Pimpri, and to make necessary recommendations.

For the present that is the postion. Only this evening Diwan Chaman Lall and other friends pointed out something about which they showed further anxiety. We have not contacted these friends; but our intention is to appoint a committee, after this sub-committee of the Board has gone into the whole thing, if necessary for further examination. This will consist of Dr. Bhabha, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commisson, Col. R. N. Chopra, Director of the Drug Research Laboratory, Jammu and Kashmir, Dr. J. C. Ray of Calcutta and Dr. C. G. Pandit of the Indan Council of Medical Research. All these four persons will examine the complete procedure at Pimpri and we will not like to see even a single thing that is even in the nature of a technical breach, because we are here concerned with public health, with the health of millions of people. Also we want that the House should be free from anxiety on any score, that anything is being done which is below standard. I can assure the House and as the custodian of the country's drugs project, this House is entitled to know how the tests are made and the House should be free from all anxiety. The Board of Directors which is a very competent body is examining it. It has appointed its own sub-committee of the highest possible persons in the country and they will examine it. Over and above that, Government will also appoint a committee consisting of Dr. Bhabha, Dr. Pandit, Col. Chopra and others who will go into the whole procedure and then make the recommendations that may be necessary.

SHRIMATI SAVITRY DEVI NIGAM (Uttar Pradesh): Sir, I would like to make a submission, that some Members of this House should also be taken on this committee.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Sir, I am sorry . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: Let me finish, Sir. When you have allowed one minute . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No further question. Please read the Message from the Lok Sabha.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: I only want to say that I am glad that the hon. Minister had made this announcement today, in answer to this half-an-hour discussion, and I congratulate him on it.

MESSAGE FROM LOK SABHA

THE MOTOR VEHICLES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1959

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report to the House the following message received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary of the Lok Sabha:—

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 96 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to enclose herewith a copy of the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill, 1959, as passed by Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 22nd December, 1959."

Sir, I lay the Bill on the Table.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House stands adjourned *sine die*.

The House then adjourned *sine die* at fifty-eight minutes past four of the clock.

GMGIPND—RS—144 RSD—1-3-60—550