

CHIT FUNDS BILL—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The House will now take up further consideration of the Chit Funds Bill.

Shri Dennis.

SHRI M. DENNIS (Nagercoil): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, while welcoming the Bill, I wish to offer a few remarks.

Enacting a comprehensive uniform legislation to cover the entire country to regulate and control chit funds transactions is long overdue and it is a long felt-need. This legislation would protect and safeguard the interests of subscribers from the unscrupulous dealings of the promoter or the foreman and it would also check the various abuses and mal-practices found in chit funds transactions. This would put to an end the practice of diverting chit funds by the foreman or the promoter for profitable and glamorous ventures.

The chit funds transaction is a good source of saving and constitutes a convenient instrument combining savings and borrowings. It is a positive institutional alternative to the money lender, something to compete with him. The positive role played by it in the rural areas cannot be minimised. It is an important source of credit to people of poor and moderate means in the rural areas. Its accessibility and easy availability are the main reasons for its wide popularity. It is a very important financial intermediary for the poor and the middle-class people. The part played by the chit fund institution in the economic life of the poorer sections of the community is well-known. It has grown in a larger proportion in the country. Side by side with the good promoters and foremen, unscrupulous promoters also emerged and, so, several chit's regulatory measures are adopted by States by passing several Acts.

Chit Fund transaction is based on mutual trust and confidence between the subscribers on the one hand and, the foreman, on the other. Therefore,

there should be harmonious cooperation and realisation of mutual benefit should always be those for its smooth running. Both sides are to be protected and the Bill should be made in such a way that it should be acceptable to all sections. This enactment should be aimed at ending the undesirable practice of unscrupulous foremen. It should not be a curb on the spirit of initiative and enterprise developed over years.

Chit Funds provide considerable employment opportunities.

The Select Committee has made some improvements in the Bill by making modifications. Still some more modifications are necessary for the smooth running and harmonious functioning of the chit fund transactions. Smooth running of the transaction alone would benefit both subscribers and foremen.

So, the Bill has to be enacted in such a way that the chit funds transactions run on sound and smooth line.

With this in view, I have suggested some amendments and Amendment Nos. 42 to 47 in the serial number regarding Clauses 4, 7 and 20.

As per the provisions of the new Bill. Previous sanction has to be obtained from the State Government. The previous sanction would be given to the foreman only if he has fulfilled certain conditions. Getting previous sanction is a new provision in this Act. This provision is not provided in other State Acts. This provision is provided in Clause 4 of this Bill. As per the provision, the promoter or the foreman has to be under the tender mercies of the Registrar and enormous powers are given to the Registrar. To soften the position and to make a lenient attitude towards the foreman, I have suggested amendment under Clause 4 (3) (a), after the words.

"had been convicted of any offence under this Act or under any other Act regulating chit business,"

I have suggested that the following be added namely, 'unless a period of one

[Shri M. Dennis]

year has elapsed since his conviction'. The reason for this amendment is this. As I have said before, only as per this legislation, the promoter has to undergo the formality of getting the previous sanction from the State Government. In the State Acts this provision is not there. The promoter of foreman, on previous occasions, even for simple offences, would submit himself to penalty in a casual way thinking that it would not affect his prospects in the matter of conducting chit transaction. This is a new provision, and he would be cautious on future occasions, he would be cautious that he should not be disqualified by an offence. However, a lenient view has to be taken in the matter. A time limit is provided under Clause 4(3) (c) of the Bill which reads:

"(c) had been convicted of any offence involving moral turpitude and sentenced to imprisonment for any such offence unless a period of five years has elapsed since his release."

Here under Clause 4(3) (a), the offence is not a grave offence. So, a time limit of one year is a reasonable suggestion and it may be accepted.

Apart from that, Clause 4(3) (a) includes 'any other Act regulating chit business'. Here it means the State Acts. According to Clause 90(2) of this Bill, other Acts, notwithstanding they are repealed, shall continue to apply to chit funds in operation at the commencement of this legislation. So, at the commencement of this legislation, if there is a chit transaction in operation, though the State Acts are repealed by this Bill, the continuance of that chit transaction would not be affected. That is clearly provided under Clause 90(2) of this Bill. But as per provision in Clause 4(3) (a), even those promoters who are conducting chit fund transactions and not disqualified as per the provisions of State Acts are hereby disqualified. This clause conflicts with Clause 90(2) of this Bill. When protection is given under Clause 90(2) to the promoters of chit fund transactions which were in operation at the commencement of this legislation if

they are not disqualified by those Acts, they should not be disqualified by Clause 4(3) (a) of this legislation. That is the letter and spirit of Clause 90(2). So, if that position is not accepted, at least one year time may be given by accepting the amendment.

In the second amendment I have suggested the deletion of clause 4(3)(b) — lines 5 to 8 on page 4. Previous sanction would be refused even in the case of default in payment of fees or the filing of any statement or record, etc. These are minor offences. The matters referred to in clause 4(3)(b) are only technical and procedural lapses. That could be committed even by employees without the knowledge of the foreman. For these offences penalties have been clearly provided in clause 76 (2) of this very same Bill and he can be fined upto Rs. 3000. The refusal of previous sanction as per clause 4(3) by inserting a provision like 4(3) (b) for these minor procedural and technical lapses is too hard for the promoters. This provision has to be deleted and the position rectified.

The next amendment I have given is regarding clause 7(2) (b)—page 6, line 9,—add 'at the end—'unless a period of one year has elapsed since his conviction.' This is also the same as that of the amendment suggested for 4(3) (a) and next amendment is also same as that of the previous amendment suggested for 4(3) (b)—that is clause 7(2) (c) be deleted in toto. These are technical and procedural lapses and I need not repeat what I have stated earlier.

I have given an amendment for Clause 20(1)—page 10, line 7, regarding security deposit by the foreman. That is what is provided in clause 20(1). I have given a suggestion for amending that clause in the following manner. Instead of the existing provision, namely, 'before applying for a previous sanction under section 4', substitute the old provision, namely, 'before filing a declaration under section 9(1)'. The Select Committee has made this modification. The point to be considered, is that foreman can invite the subscribers only after obtaining previous sanction. As per this provision the fore-

man is expected to deposit the entire amount of the security deposit which is required to be deposited in an approved Bank or the concerned authority before getting the previous sanction.

The point to be noted here is that it is only after getting the previous sanction from the State Government, he can invite the subscribers and collect the money from them. Before that, no one would pay money. It is practically impossible for a foreman to deposit the amount before he gets the previous sanction contemplated in Clause 4.

Another point to be noted is that it is possible that his application for the previous sanction may also be rejected on the grounds stated in Clause 4 and in other provisions in this Bill previous sanction may also lapse after twelve months plus six months. In such cases, he has to apply for the return of the amount and he has to face the ordeal of getting back the refund. He has to undergo a lot of troubles or difficulties. Moreover, for the deposited money, he would not get interest also. To protect or safeguard the interest of the subscribers from the unscrupulous foreman, it has been clearly provided in Clause 9 that the Foreman cannot commence the chit transaction before he gets the clearance certificate. So, that safeguard is enough. Before getting the certificate for commencement he can deposit the money. This would safeguard and protect the interests of subscribers. So, this amendment may be accepted.

Another amendment I have Submitted that is for the deletion of clause 77. Deletion of entire clause is not within the rules and so not allowed. As per Clause 77, imprisonment is allowed for the second and subsequent offences. The point to be noted is that even for the simple offences, he has to undergo the ordeal of imprisonment. Even if there is a technical or procedural lapse, if this is his subsequent and second offence, he has to undergo the imprisonment. This is a very harsh provision. At least a distinction must be made between the punishment imposed for the simple

offences and grave offences. Even Such a distinction is not provided here. So, imposing the penalty of imprisonment to second offenders without considering the nature and gravity of offence is too harsh and it is not proper.

PROF. N. G. RANGA (Gunture): Imposing an imprisonment in this omnibus Bill is not possible.

SHRI N. DENNIS: Under Clause 76, discretion is allowed to the judicial officers. Distinction is allowed to them for imposing the punishment according to the nature of the offence. My point here is that Clause 76 of the Bill would meet the needs of justice; the judicial officer can impose a severe punishment according to the gravity or the nature of the offence. If the offence is grave then imprisonment can be awarded but imposing imprisonment on a foreman for procedural lapses and minor offences is not proper.

Sir, this Bill may be passed with these modifications.

श्री जगपाल सिंह (हरिद्वार) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, कल जब मैंने इस चिट फंड बिल, 1981 को पढ़ना शुरू किया तो मैं इस नतीजे पर पहुँचा कि हमारी सरकार लोगों का खून चूसवाने के लिए लगातार प्रयास कर रही है। इस बिल को लाने का पर्पज भी मुझ को यही लग रहा है। डिप्टी फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर, श्री जर्नादन पुजारी यहाँ पर बैठे हैं, पहले भी ये बेयरर बांड्स बिल यहाँ पर लाए थे, जिसमें श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी ने यह टारगेट रखा था कि इस देश में काला धन कमाने वालों से एक हजार करोड़ रुपया ब्लैकमनी निकाला जाएगा। लेकिन इस बिल का मकसद तो उससे भी ज्यादा भयानक लग रहा है क्योंकि यह एजेंसीज तो पहले से ही गरीब जनता का खून इस देश में चूस रही थीं और यह बिल लाकर तो सरकार ने पूरी मजबूती से काल ठोकने का काम किया है ताकि ये एजेंसीज जब तक चाहें मनमाने ढंग से चिट फंड्स के द्वारा जनता का खून चूसती रहे। हमारे पुजारी जी यहाँ पर बैठे हैं, अगर हम इस बिल की इंटेंशन पर जाएं तो यह बिल हमारी सोसायटी को कहाँ ले जाएगा? मैं समझता हूँ उनमें जरा

[श्री जगपाल सिंह]

सी भी समझदारी और जनता से प्यार होगा तो वे इस बिल को वापिस ले लेंगे ।

मैं डिप्टी फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर से जानना चाहूंगा क्या इस बिल को यहाँ रखने से पहले उन्होंने रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया से इसकी ड्राफ्टिंग करवाई थी या उनसे कोई ओपीनियन ली थी कि इस बिल को लाने के बाद इस देश के ब्लैक-मनी पर क्या असर पड़ेगा और हमारे देश में इस समय जो मनी इन्फ्लेशन है उसपर क्या असर पड़ेगा तथा देश की एकोनोमी की क्या हालत होगी ? मैं समझता हूँ यह बिल लाकर आप ब्लैक-मनी को कन्ट्रोल नहीं करना चाहते हैं बल्कि ब्लैक-मनी कमाने वालों को छूट देना चाहते हैं कि वे अपने ब्लैक-मनी को व्हाइट मनी में कन्वर्ट कर लें ।

इस देश में आपको पास नेशनलाइज्ड बैंक्स हैं और को-आपरेटिव्स का एक सिलसिला है जिसकी दकालत आप हमेशा ही करते रहते हैं फिर आप को-आपरेटिव्स को और ज्यादा मजबूत करने का काम क्यों नहीं करते ? आप नेशनलाइज्ड बैंक्स और को-आपरेटिव्स के द्वारा चिट फंड एक्टिविटीज का संचालन क्यों नहीं करते ? आप राजधानी से लेकर देहातों तक नेशनलाइज्ड बैंक्स और को-आपरेटिव्स के द्वारा इस काम को क्यों नहीं करना चाहते ? आपको मालूम है इस बिल की सेलेक्ट कमेटी के सदस्य केरल, आंध्र, तमिलनाडु - जहाँ पर को-आपरेटिव सिस्टम पूरी तरह से सफल रहा है - वहाँ के लोगों ने इस बिल की आलोचना की थी । हालाँकि कमेटी के सामने अधिकतर उन कम्पनियों की एविडेंसेज ही हुईं जोकि चिट फंड कम्पनियाँ चला रही हैं और काला धंधा करती हैं । उन्हीं के मेमोरेण्डम कमेटी के सामने पेश किए गए लेकिन कुछ थोड़ी सी इंडेपेंडेंट एविडेंसेज भी केरल से आई जिसमें यह कहा गया कि यह बिल इस देश में को-आपरेटिव सिस्टम को तबाह कर देगा, कोआपरेटिव सिस्टम कोलैप्स हो जाएगा और आज देहातों में जो रिलीफ के काम चल रहे हैं उनमें रुकावट पड़ेगी । इसलिए मैं जानना चाहता हूँ

इस सिलसिले में क्या आपने रिजर्व बैंक आफ इंडिया से भी कोई ओपीनियन ली थी ? यदि ली थी तो उसकी क्या ओपीनियन थी और यदि नहीं ली तो क्यों ? क्या आपको पता है कि हमारी सोसायटी पर इस बिल को लाने का क्या रिपरकशन होगा ? क्या आपको मालूम नहीं है कि यह चिट फंड कम्पनियाँ किस तरह से काम करती हैं ?

मैं एक छोटा सा उदाहरण सहारनपुर के बारे में आपको देना चाहता हूँ । मान लीजिए - वहाँ पर दस हजार रुपये की लाटरी का ड्रा हुआ । वहाँ बोली-बोलते हैं, जैसे कि किसी ने आठ हजार रुपये बोली, किसी ने नौ हजार रुपये बोली और किसी ने सात हजार रुपये बोली, सात हजार रुपये उसको उसी वक्त देकर और दस हजार रुपये की वसूली अपने फिक्स पीरियड में करते हैं । जो उस पर खर्चा आता है, कागज स्टैम्प आदि वह राशि भी उस में से अलग काट ली जाती है । देहातों में पुरानी सोसायटीज पारी का काम किया करते थे, यह तो उनसे भी खतरनाक है । यह बिल लाकर और आपने उसमें कील ठाँक दी है । यदि आप में थोड़ी सी भी समझदारी है, तो मैं आपसे अपील करूंगा और यदि सरकार चाहती है कि इस तरह से जनता का शोषण बन्द किया जाए, तो आप नेशनलाइज्ड बैंकों को डायरेक्शन दीजिए कि उन बैंकों के द्वारा या को-आपरेटिव सोसायटीज के द्वारा देहात में ब्लाक-स्तर पर चिट-फंड कंपनियों को ले जाएंगे । यदि आप लोगों की सफटी चाहते हैं, उनके एक्सप्लायेशन को रोकना चाहते हैं तो आपको इस दिशा में कदम उठाना चाहिए, नहीं तो मैं नहीं समझ पा रहा हूँ कि आप इस बिल के द्वारा क्या करना चाहते हैं ।

आपने रजिस्ट्रार ऑफिस की बलाज में कहा है कि रजिस्ट्रार अगर किसी को फॉर्म-शन देने से इन्कार कर दे, तो स्टेट को याबर होगी कि वह उसको दोबारा रिव्यू कर दे । यदि कोई व्यक्ति काला धन्धा करता है, नम्बर-दो का काम करता है और अगर रजिस्ट्रार के पास अपनी ओपीनियन भेज देता है कि यह आदमी गलत है,

काला-धन्धा करने वाला है, तो उस पर पॉलिटिकल प्रेशर डाल कर उसको परमिशन दिलाना चाहते हैं। मैं इस बिल का बनियादी तौर पर विरोध कर रहा हूँ, मैं इसलिए उन बातों पर नहीं जाना चाहता हूँ और मैं आपसे अपील करूँगा कि आप इस बिल को वापिस ले लीजिए और इस संबंध में रिजर्व बैंक की ओपीनियन लीजिए। केरल, तमिलनाडु और आन्ध्र के गावों के लोगों ने जो सिलेक्ट कमिटी के सामने अपना एबीडॉस दिया है, उस पर दोबारा गौर कीजिए और सोच कर तथा समझदारी से इस बिल को वापिस ले लीजिए।

इसलिए मैं सदन का समय ज्यादा न लेते हुए, क्योंकि मुझे क्लाज-टू-क्लाज नहीं जाना है, इसका खास जो मकसद है वह मैंने आपके सामने रख दिया है। मैं डिप्टी फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर से अपील करूँगा कि वे इन सब चीजों को देखते हुए इस बिल को वापिस ले लें। यदि वापिस नहीं लेते हैं, तो मैं कहूँगा कि आपकी सरकार और खास तौर से श्रीमति इन्दिरा गांधी पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था को मजबूत करना चाहती है। मोनोपोली हाउसेस को पैदा करती है और इस मुल्क के खून-पसीने की कमाई को एक्ज्यू-मूलेट करके इस देश के चन्द हाथों में देना चाहते हैं। इससे गरीबों को कोई रिलीफ नहीं मिलेगा। इन चिट फंड फाइनेंस कम्पनियों को क्या मालूम कि देहात के अन्दर किस तरह से प्रोडक्शन रिलेशन्स है, हमारे देहात की क्या कंडीशन है और किस तरीके से देहात के अंदर किन-किन योजनाओं को पहुँचाना चाहिए। मैं आपके माध्यम से कहना चाहता हूँ कि उनको इस देश के प्रोडक्शन से कोई ताल्लुक नहीं है, डबलपमेन्ट से कोई मतलब नहीं है। मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ कि इस प्रकार से एकत्रित पैसा कहाँ जाएगा - यह पैसा जाएगा फाइव स्टार होटलों में, विलासिता पर पैसा खर्च होगा। इस प्रकार की भयानक बीमारी से हमारे देश की जनता को बचाइए। लेकिन आपके पास इस दिशा में कोई गारन्टी नहीं है। एक साल के अन्दर ये चिट-फंड कम्पनियाँ करोड़ों रुपये ले जाती हैं। यह पैसा कहाँ से आता है? यह ब्लैक-मनी

का पैसा है जिस को वे व्हाइट-मनी बनाना चाहते हैं। वह गरीबों का पैसा है जिस को वे अपने हाथों में इक्कठा कर लेते हैं। आप ने इन कम्पनियों पर क्या प्रतिबन्ध लगाया है? 20 परसेन्ट, 40 परसेन्ट, 60 परसेन्ट कितने परसेंट पैसा वे नेशनल डबलपमेन्ट में लगाएंगे कितने परसेंट पैसा वे भारतीय नेशनलाइज्ड बैंकों में जमा कराएंगे। इस की कोई गारन्टी नहीं है कि जो पैसा इक्कठा होगा वह इस देश के प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ाने में लगाया जाएगा।

इन सब चीजों को देखते हुए मैं डिप्टी मिनिस्टर (फाइनेंस) श्री जनार्दन पूजारी से अपील करूँगा कि आप इस बिल को वापिस लीजिए, क्योंकि पूरे देश में ये चिट फंड कम्पनियाँ सिवाए एक्सप्लोएटेशन के कुछ नहीं करती हैं।

*SHRI ERA MOHAN (Coimbatore): Hon. Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, on behalf of my party the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam, I would like to express my views on the Chit Funds Bill, 1980, which has been introduced by my hon. friend the Deputy Minister of Finance, Shri Janardhan Poojari. For the past several years there were widespread and wild allegations of malpractices on the part of Chit Funds on the floor of this House, in the Press and on public platforms. There was discontent and dissatisfaction among the people also. In fact, in many places, the Chit Funds had become Cheat Funds and the people become the victims of the deception of Chit Funds. As a consequence of this, this Bill was introduced in this House; it was later referred to the Select Committee of this House. The Bill as amended by the Select Committee is before us today.

The hon. Member who preceded me pointed out that all the black money in the country has emanated from the Chit Funds. I do not know how far this contention is correct. In our country several hundred crores of rupees are reported to be in circulation and all that

[Shri Era Mohan]

money could not have come from the Chit Funds. Some mistakes might have taken place here and there. It does not mean that all the Chit Funds are bad. We should remedy the mistakes and not blame everyone. Just because of a few mistakes here and there, the entire system of Chit Fund operations should not be condemned. In any urban and rural centres, several traders have got the succour of these Chit Funds for their livelihood. By joining the Chit Funds and later bidding in auctions, they have got the money for expanding their business. Many people have derived their sustenance from these Chit Funds. I wholeheartedly welcome this measure from this angle and I would suggest a few things for the approval of this House.

Clause 4(3)(a) (b) and (c) should be deleted for this reason that under this Clause the Registrar has been empowered to refuse previous sanction to commence or conduct chits even for technical and trivial offences such as a day's delay in filing a copy of the minutes of auction proceedings. Even the life-term convicts, who are murderers, are given an opportunity in the prison to mend their ways and they are given an opportunity for rehabilitation after their prison term. Here, due to emotional outburst a person may commit a minor crime and may be imprisoned. For participating in agitation a person may be sent to jail. After his release, he should not be barred from getting permission to run the chit fund for his livelihood. When that should be the intent of this law, it is not proper that for failure to produce a copy of the auction proceedings within the prescribed period one should be debarred from getting permission to commence or conduct chit funds. The promoter cannot be held responsible for a minor lapse on the part of his Manager or his Accountant. The promoter should not be punished for this. That is why I demand the deletion of this clause.

Clause 76 stipulates the punishment of imprisonment of 2 years and/or a fine upto Rs. 5000. For a simple offence a fine upto Rs. 3000 has been imposed

under this clause. Clause 77 does not make any distinction between grave and simple second offence and the punishment is imprisonment upto 2 years. This can be incorporated in Clause 76 itself, if it is necessary. Clause 77 is redundant in this respect. It should be deleted.

Clause 6(3) restricts the amount of discount to 30 per cent of the chit value. For a chit with the duration of 100 months, this discount is very little. This is not right inducement for the bidders. The Chit fund company also will not benefit from this 30 per cent discount. This 30 per cent dividend will not attract those who want to join the Chit Fund. I suggest that this discount should be raised to 50 per cent.

Clause 16(2) stipulates the compulsory presence of 2 subscribers at the time of auctioning. The Foreman can only invite the subscribers to be present at the time of auctioning. If none turns up what can he do. He cannot withhold the auction on this ground. If anyone objects to the auctioning, then re-auction can be conducted. If none objects to the auction, there should be no compulsion that auction should not be held. It should be left to the Foreman to decide and to hold the auction in the presence of not less than two subscribers if possible; otherwise he can do so by himself.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You should have moved all these amendments, Mr. Mohan. I don't think you have done that.

SHRI ERA MOHAN: The hon. Minister is taking down my points. Hereafter I will do that.

Clause 20(1) says that the Foreman should deposit the amount equal to chit amount as security. This will create financial problems for the foreman. This security amount should be reduced to 50 per cent of the chit amount. Instead of cash, if bank guarantee is furnished, it should be enough. The Foreman should be enabled to mortgage his assets also if necessary.

Clause 21(1)(b) fixes the commission at 5 per cent. This is not enough. This

*Steps to promote
secular outlook
in the country*

will tempt the chit funds to resort to unfair means. Hence the Commission should be raised to 7 1/2 per cent.

Clause 22(1) provides that the Foreman should pay the prize amount within seven days after the date of the draw. The subscribers are to furnish authentic documents before the money is disbursed. Supposing there is delay on the part of subscribers in producing documents and more than 7 days is taken in that, the Foreman should not be held responsible for the delay. The time should be extended till the subscribers produce the required documents.

This Bill is a regulatory measure for the promoters of Chit Funds. But what happens to the defaulting subscribers? If a suit is filed in a Court of Law, it takes about 4, 5 years before the case is decided. By that time the Chit Fund may be in the stage of winding up. If four subscribers decide to default, then there is no alternative for the Chit Fund except to close the shop. Even with all relevant and authentic documents, it will take years to have the cases settled in the Courts of Law. There should be a legal provision that the cases against the defaulters should be completed as expeditiously as possible, within a period of three months. Such a legislative protection must be given to the promoters of Chit Funds.

I would in the end refer to the diversion of chit money and the profits by the promoters in Hotels, Races etc. at the cost of subscribers. I would not like to refer to those Chit Funds by their names. There are stringent provisions in the Bill which should be implemented effectively. Before I conclude I would like to have explanation from the hon. Deputy Finance Minister for banning the Banks from conducting Chits. Since this is a public utility measure, I extend my wholehearted support to it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Shri Bhiku Ram Jain.

SHRI BHIKU RAM JAIN: There is only one minute left.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You speak one or two sentences and then continue next time.

SHRI BHIKU RAM JAIN (Chandni Chowk): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to welcome the introduction of this Bill.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now you can continue next time.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FORTY-FOURTH REPORT

श्री चन्द्रबे प्रसाद वर्मा (आरा) : मैं प्रस्ताव करता हूँ कि यह सभा 14 जुलाई, 1982 को सभा में प्रस्तुत किए गए गैर-सरकारी सदस्यों के विधेयकों तथा संकल्पों संबंधी समिति के 44वें प्रतिवेदन से सहमत है।

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is:

"That this House do agree with the Forty-fourth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 14th July, 1982."

The motion was adopted.

RESOLUTION RE: STEPS TO PROMOTE SECULAR OUTLOOK IN THE COUNTRY

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now we shall take up further discussion of the following Resolution moved by Shrimati Vidya Chennupati on 23rd April, 1982:—

"Keeping in view the secular character of our Constitution and the fact that secularism is one of the basic tenets of our State Policy, this House recommends to the Government to take immediate steps to:—

(a) promote a sense of castelessness through inter-caste and inter-religion marriages;