

found one km away from the Bank, but it is burning. So, the police went there and again made enquiries. If a car is burning, they have to find out what has happened to the occupants of the car. After some investigation, one gentleman came forward and said "there was another car waiting on the spot, when this car was burning, they got into the other car and sped away". By the time the police received this information, that car would have gone beyond their reach, because they were travelling in a car and not in a bullock cart or on foot. So, by the time the police came to know that they have abandoned the car and sped away in another car there was a gap of one hour. Still, within the time available the police did their best. I may tell you that I have mentioned last year's case also. The investigation is on, the investigation is in progress. So, it is not in public interest or in the interest of apprehending the culprits that the details are placed before the House. It is for a thorough, efficient investigation so that the culprits may not take any clue and go beyond the arms of law or justice. So, for that purpose we said that no efforts are spared in getting the matter completely investigated.

(Interruptions)

So far as the investigation goes, there does not seem to be any lag. I am speaking about police. About the other part of the investigation it is yet to be worked out and investigations have to be made, then only we can say whether there is collusion, connivance or complacency, indifference or whatever it is. It is not proper at this stage to reveal all those things. Investigation is proceeding on. I may assure hon. Mr. Banatwalla about this. He has taken exception to "vigorous" steps. If I say "strong" steps, then? I have to find an appropriate word to say about the intensity and sincerity of the Government. If I used only the word "step", he would have asked "Why not vigorous? Why not strong?"

So, in order to guard myself from Mr. Banatwalla, I said that vigorous steps are being taken, investigation is on and we will spare no efforts to see that the culprits are booked.

SHRI A. NEELALOHITHADASAN NADAR (Trivandrum): What about banning his visit to Pune?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please don't disturb. He is not yielding.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH: I said, he has been placed in his respective place. I have already told this in the House.

13.27 hrs.

BUSINESS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
TWENTY-FIFTH REPORT

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): Sir, I beg to move.

"That this House do agree with the Twenty-fifth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 23rd February, 1982."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Twenty-fifth Report of the Business Advisory Committee presented to the House on the 23rd February, 1982."

The motion was adopted.

13.28 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned for Lunch till thirty minutes past Fourteen of the Clock.