

The House reassembled after lunch at half past two of the clock. The Vice-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM SAHAI) in the Chair.

RE APPOINTMENT OF A MEMBER OF THE RAJYA SABHA TO THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSES ON THE COMMISSIONS OF ENQUIRY (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1969—contd.

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY: Sir, to the Motion I moved earlier regarding appointment of a Member of this House to the Joint Committee of the Houses on the Commissions of Inquiry (Amendment) Bill, 1969, Mr. Bhupesh Gupta objected. I want to explain the position further, Sir. In the Committee as it was originally constituted, Mr. Chavan and Mr. Shukla were members thereof. Since their portfolios have been changed, they have resigned their membership of this Committee. Now Mr. Mirdha, the present Minister of State in the Ministry of Home Affairs, is in charge of this subject and so he is sought to be included in this Committee. By his coming to this Committee, Sir, the composition of the Committee is not changed in any way with regard to the official or the non-official members thereof. So, Sir, the motion I have made may please be adopted.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: I want an assurance that, in future, when you make replacements, you would take care that Private Members are not replaced by Government Members. A Private Member should be replaced by a Private Member.

SHRI K. S. RAMASWAMY: This has been an extraordinary case, Sir.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: You will do that. Then I do not press my objection.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI RAM SAHAI): The question is:

"That this House concurs in the recommendation of the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha do appoint a member to the Joint Committee of the House on the Bill to amend the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952, in the vacancy caused by the resignation of Shri Sheel Bhadra Yajee and resolves that Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha be appointed to the said Joint Committee to fill the vacancy."

The motion was adopted.

REFERENCE TO THE REPORTED DEATH OF SHRI SAMIR BHATTACHARJEE IN POLICE LOCK-UP AT CALCUTTA—contd.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Before the House adjourned for lunch, Sir, I brought to the notice of the House the news of the

death of Shri Samir Bhattacharjee as a result of torture in the lock-up. Has it been communicated to the Prime Minister who is also the Home Minister? I would like to know the reactions of the Government to such an incident, which has shocked the people of Bengal in general and the people of Calcutta in particular. And the Home Minister here, he should kindly tell us something about it because I am also tabling a Calling Attention Notice on that, and I hope it will be admitted. Now this matter must be discussed in this House and Parliament should know. As I pointed out, this is no party issue. The Congress itself has condemned the kind of manner in which he was killed. Therefore I have been raising this question. But no reaction we get from the Government. We insist on having the reaction of the Government. In fact, our purpose is to agitate this issue to see that the Government acts in the proper manner, and naturally we insist on what exactly they are doing. Not even information we have got. In the old days, I must point out that on similar occasions we brought it to the notice of Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru—at least one instance I still recall. In the morning we raised it. He got in touch with the Hyderabad Government at that time and in the afternoon he gave the information to the House. I should like to have the same process followed here. Now, what I have said, am I wrong? Are the Bengal papers wrong? Now the Government should say. It is directly under them. Mr. Om Mehta is here. Will you kindly tell him, Sir, the motion I have made may please be go and meet the Prime Minister who is also the Home Minister and convey . . .

SHRI ARJUN ARORA (Uttar Pradesh): There may be no quorum if Mr. Om Mehta leaves the House now.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Somebody else may also do it; still he should go out and communicate it, but I am not asking him to go out just now. Anyway, somebody should go and tell the Prime Minister who is in charge of the Home Portfolio that Parliament, when seized of such matters, should be taken into confidence and told of such matters.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: The Home Ministry is represented here by Mr. K. S. Ramaswamy.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Now you have done your job; can you kindly go there? The trouble, Sir, is they do not enter the Prime Minister's room. They are afraid of entering, they are afraid of knocking at the door of the Prime Minister.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, on this particular point I have got something to say.

SHRI ARJUN ARORA: We must hear the other side also.

SHRIMATI PURABI MUKHOPADHYAY: What is the other side?

Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, it is very unfortunate that a young boy has been beaten to death in the police lock-up. Whatever the offence may be, nobody has given any police officer the authority to beat anybody in the police lock-up. We are not living in the eighteenth century; we are not living under the feudal system. He was beaten so much so that he died in the police lock-up. From this side also we protest against this brutal handling by the police and we demand that the concerned police officer, whoever he may be, should be appropriately dealt with. Appropriate punishment should be meted out to that police officer. Sir, I demand an enquiry into the matter.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Sir, Mr Bhupesh Gupta was in the morning drawing the attention of the Government, particularly of the Home Ministry, to the murder. I would say, of a young man by the police official while he was in police custody. I think it is in the fitness of things that the Government should make a statement and give their reaction. It cannot go on in this way. When he was referring to this matter the Leader of the House was also there but he was simply trying to go out of the House.

उपसभाध्यक्ष (श्री राम सहाय): मैं आपकी तबज़ह़ दिवाज़या में स्टैंड अरॉम में हना पना लगाने गये हैं। प्रोसीडिंग चलेने देना चाहिए।

श्री चिन बपसु: आप इनको अर्ज कीजिए डाइरेक्ट कीजिए कोई स्टेटमेंट देने के लिये।

THE CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1970

(To Amend Articles 75 and 164)

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI PRANAB KUMAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, I introduce the Bill.
[MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair]

THE INDUSTRIES (DEVELOPMENT AND REGULATION) AMENDMENT BILL, 1966—contd.

(To amend Section 15)

SHRI KRISHNAN KANT (Haryana): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, last time when I spoke for some time on this Bill I referred to the malpractices of the growing house of Goenkas and at that time Mr. Arjun Arora had asked the Leader of the House to find out more things about the allegations and tell this House whether there is any substance or the Government should come forward and refute those allegations. I am sorry even after fifteen days, even after Mr. Arjun Arora had pointedly asked three times the Leader of the House that he should enquire into those things and tell whether the Government is in any way implicated or is succumbing to the pressures of Mr. Goenka or not, it has not been done. May I, Mr. Deputy Chairman, through you appeal to the Government and to the Leader of the House, who is not present as usual, to find out and then tell this House as to what the present position is about Mr. Goenka's pressures on the Government. I am standing here to support the very valuable Bill introduced by Shri Arjun Arora, viz., the Industries (Development and Regulation) Bill. This Bill is very necessary in view of the fact that for the last two or three years we, in the Congress, have been trying to remould the administration, the industrial policy and the social structure of this country towards an equalitarian society, a socialistic pattern of society. This Bill does not go far in that direction, but here is a Bill which warns the country and the Houses to know what type of malpractices are going on in the various industrial houses. Now, the myth has been created in this House that the public sector is all inefficient, that there is corruption in the public sector, that the public sector cannot in any way achieve the social objectives, that it is only through the private sector, the profit motive and the way these industries are functioning, the country can prosper. We know there is the committee on Public Undertakings. It looks into the functioning of the public sector undertakings and then presents its report to both Houses of Parliament. Whatever is going on in the public sector, at the cost of the exchequer, is known to both Houses of Parliament as well as to the public. We do not want any expenditure done at the cost of the public not to be known to them as to how it is being spent. So, the public can have control and Parliament can have control over it. They can modify, rectify and improve the functioning of the public sector. In the case of the private sector, nobody knows what is going on there. This Act has been in force for the last 19 years. May I ask the Deputy Minister of Industrial Development, who is sitting here, in how many cases has he made