

Bank officials and Government officials is concerned, the investigation disclosed no involvement of Reserve Bank officials and also the Government officials. At the same time, I want to make it very clear that if there is any involvement, we are not going to suppress the fact from the House and from the nation also. We would give the details. But so far, there is no such involvement. That should be made clear and I want to repeat it also.

So far as publicity is concerned, more publicity is going to be counter-productive also. If we give more publicity on TV or radio or newspapers also, then it will create panic in the minds of the people that more counterfeit money is in circulation. But it is not like that. We cannot give exact number of counterfeit notes in circulation. But at the same time, we can say from the seizures made and the cases reported that the number of counterfeit notes in circulation is not big and it is not in good number also. That is why I can say that about the publicity, it is better not to keep on harping on that and too much publicity would go into counter-production also.

So far as the National Security Act is concerned, we are examining it. But at the same time, I can tell the Hon. Members that here only in this House at the time of passing the National Security Bill, the Opposition came stating that we should not apply. Any way, in these cases and in the criminal cases, we are considering and examining it. So far as the number of cases reported is concerned, I have already given the number and also stated the number of seizures that have been made in the course of investigation, in the particular case and also in the earlier case.

So far as the number of cases that ended in conviction is concerned, I can say that as far as the Government side is concerned, we are taking a lot of interest.

We are seriously concerned with the development of the case in the court also and we have to keep in mind the fact that the cases are being registered in the States also. That is State subject. In such cases, I appeal to all the State Governments also

to take interest in the prosecution and also to take interest in the investigation.

So far as the CBI is concerned, it is manned by people of integrity and efficiency. They are competent people and they are looking after that. We are proceeding with seriousness so far as the investigation and prosecution is concerned.

So far as the conviction is concerned, we are securing the conviction. After that, you know, in a criminal case, if some body creates doubt in the mind, a reasonable doubt, that is sufficient to acquite the cases. So, it is left to the discretion of the court and it is for the court to look into that.

I do not think that other points are left. I have covered many of the questions raised here.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now we take up legislative business.

12.26 hrs.

#### LIFE INSURANCE CORPORATIONS BILL\*

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill to provide, with a view to the more effective realisation of the objectives of nationalisation of life insurance business, for the dissolution of the Life Insurance Corporation of India and for the establishment of a number of corporations for the more efficient carrying on of the said business and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Motion moved.

"That leave be granted to introduce Bill to provide, with a view to the more effective realisations of the objectives of nationalisation of Life Insurance business, for the dissolutions of the Life Insurance Corporation of India and for the establishment of a number of

Corporations for the more efficient carrying us of the said business and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereon."

Shri Sunil Maitra.

**SHRI SUNIL MAITRA** (Calcutta North East) : Sir, I rise to oppose the introduction of the Bill.

My first ground of objection is that it is beyond the legislative competence of this House to go in for having enactment of this piece of legislation.

Clause 64A of the Bill states that :

"An employee of the Corporation shall not be a member of or be otherwise associated with any political party or any organisation which takes part in politics nor shall he take part in, subscribe in aid of, or assist in any manner, any political movement or activity."

Then, in the Explanation part, it has been stated :—

"The display by such person, on his person, vehicle or residence, of any electoral symbol shall amount to using his influence in connection with an election within the meaning of this Section."

I think that the Hon. Minister is not aware of the fact that previously the staff regulation of the Life Insurance Corporation of India used to have a particular regulation which was meant to prohibit the employees from becoming members of political parties or indulging in political activities, or indulging in electioneering or in election campaign. Subsequently, there was the case which went up to the Supreme Court of India. The case was between Shamlal and All India Insurance Employees Association V. Union of India wherein the Supreme Court of India had given the judgment that Life Insurance Corporation employees were the employees of the statutory corporation and were fully entitled to be members of the political party and to take part in electioneering.

This particular provision in the Bill which is being sought to be introduced today unequivocally and unashamedly flouts the judgment and the decision of the Supreme Court. This House cannot arrogate to itself the right to subvert or flout the judgment of the Supreme Court of India.

Therefore, this House does not have the competence to go in for the enactment of this particular piece of legislation.

My second ground of objection is that in this Bill it is said that Life Insurance Corporation of India has become too big and it is not manageable. Therefore, they want to split or break up the Life Insurance Corporation into five independent corporations so that they can manage.

You are aware that the Life Insurance Corporation of India today has only 940 branch offices whereas the State Bank of India today is having 6,047 branch offices. If with 6,047 branch offices the State Bank of India can be deemed to be a manageable unit or a manageable institution, why on earth does the present Government think that with merely 940 branch offices the Life Insurance Corporation of India is not a manageable unit? Therefore, the excuse that has been doled out is a lame excuse. I think, the Life Insurance Corporation of India is being managed very efficiently and it has not become unmanageable. Therefore, there is absolutely no need to split up the Life Insurance Corporation of India. Therefore, on this ground also I oppose the introduction of this Bill.

Thirdly, in the Bill it has been stated...

**SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA** (Pali) : He has only to question the legislative competence under rule 72...

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER** : He started with that. You were not here.

**SHRI SUNIL MAITRA** : Thirdly, it has been stated in the Bill that splitting up the Life Insurance Corporation into five independent units will enable each Corporation to intensify the rural business. So far as L.I.C. is concerned, when it was

formed in the year 1957, the amount of rural business of the Life Insurance Corporation was less than five per cent and as per the 1981-82 Report of the L.I.C., rural business has gone up to 32 per cent, and when the 1983-84 Report comes, I am sure it will be round about 38 per cent. Therefore, this excuse is also a lame excuse and I object to the introduction of the Bill on this ground also.

My fourth point is, they say that some element of competition will be injected if instead of one Corporation it is split up into five Corporations. There are umpteen number of institutions in this country, including government departments against whom the Life Insurance Corporation has to compete in order to get one single life insurance policy. It is the policy of this Government to invest about 90 per cent, 89.4 per cent to be precise if we take the 1981-82 Report and accounts of the Corporation and 89.4 per cent of the total investible funds of the Life Insurance Corporation has been invested in the public sector or in the cooperative sector whose return is...

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA : Sir, Rule 72 does not permit him to say all this. I am on a point of order, Sir. What does rule 72 say ? He is making a speech...

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : I am making a brief statement of points.

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA : Rule 72 reads :

"If a motion for leave to introduce a Bill is opposed, the Speaker, after permitting, if he thinks fit, brief statements from the Member who opposes the motion..."

Provided that where a motion is opposed on the ground that the Bill initiates legislation outside the legislative competence of the House, the Speaker may permit..."

Only this point can be raised. Why is he making a speech ?

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : What is pinching you ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You read the proviso fully :

"Provided that where a motion is opposed on the ground that the Bill initiates the legislation outside the legislative competence of the House, the Speaker may permit a full discussion thereon."

I have not permitted a discussion. First, he started with legislative competence...

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA : He has taken more than seven minutes.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I will ask him to be as brief as possible.

(Interruptions)

SHRI MOOL CHAND DAGA : He will have the chance of making long speeches.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : Don't doubt my capacity. I can make a long speech and I will if and when it comes up. I am only touching the points now.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You must know that Mr. Sunil Maitra was an employee of the LIC. Therefore, his views have got to be respected. I want to hear his speech also. He was a worker in the Life Insurance Corporation. Therefore, special preference has to be given to him.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : Out of the total investible funds of the Life Insurance Corporation of India, as per the 1982-83 account of the L.I.C. 89.4% was invested in the public and cooperative sectors. Out of the 82% of the earnings, for the year 1981-82, the interest earned was 8.55% whereas in the banking sector, it was more than 15%. It is because of the Government's policy. So, if the Government wants to give better amenities to the policyholders, then, their investment policy should be changed. But Sir, I am one with the Government and the Governmental policy that the L.I.C.

investments are for a social purpose. For drinking water, sewerage and so on, they are doing that. Therefore in terms of investment, the policyholders are getting less bonus. Therefore, the policy of the L.I.C. is not to reduce the premium. The amount on the L.I.C. return to the policyholders is less. Therefore, that the L.I.C. should be split into five zones to give more amenities to the policyholders is bogus. On this ground, also, I oppose the introduction of the Bill.

Now, Sir, the Government of India had invested Rs. 5 crores when the L.I.C. was born. Out of this investment of Rs. 5 crores, Government of India has already received Rs. 97.14 crores by way of valuation surpluses and in the biennial valuation ending on 31-12-1983, Government of India is going to receive not less than Rs. 35 crores. That means on an investment of Rs. 5 crores, in the month of January, 1984, Government of India will be receiving round about Rs. 130 crores on an investment of only Rs. 5 crores. If today the Life Insurance Corporation of India is to be split up into five zones then, invariably, this valuations surplus would go down. If this goes down, each Corporation will be having separate bonus rates for the policyholders say, the bonus will be Rs. 25 for an endowment policy in the Eastern Zone Corporation Rs. 35 in the western zone corporation and Rs. 38 in the Southern zone corporation. That means, ultimately, the Government will come to the conclusion that because zone (a) and (b) of the Corporations out of five zones of the Corporation are not as much profitable as zones (c), (d) and (e) Corporations, zone (a) and (b) of the Corporation should be dismantled as a nationalised institution. Sir, I have a lurking suspicion in my mind that this Bill has been introduced to ultimately destabilised and denationalise the L.I.C. if not wholly, at least, in part. If out of the five corporation of the LIC formed after the split, two or three are in the red or they do not show as much profits as the other corporations, then a cry will be raised from the private sector that because these two Corporations are not as profitable as the rest of them, these may be handed over to the private sector. Again this cry will be raised let there be a competition between the

private and public sectors. This is the first step towards dismantling the nationalised institution.

Therefore, Sir, I oppose the introduction of this Bill and I shall go on opposing it till the last ounce of my strength and the strength of my party as also the strength of the working class and on the basis of the strength of the L.I.C. employees.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Prof. Dandavate—not present. Shri Ramavatar Shastri. I think you can sit and speak. You are still not well. Though I am not a doctor, I can understand that. You can sit and speak. I know you will be very short in your speech.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna) : Sir, this will be my very short speech.

मैं जीवन बीमा निगम विधेयक के पुरः स्थापित करने का जोरदार विरोध करता हूँ क्योंकि पांच हिस्सों में विभाजित करने से, इस उद्योग को भारी क्षति होगी। यह विधेयक अनावश्यक, अदूरदर्शी, अविवेकपूर्ण, जनतांत्रिक परम्पराओं पर चोट करने वाला, देश में क्षेत्रीयता की भावना को उभारने वाला, किसान विरोधी, बीमा कराने वालों के हितों पर प्रहार करने वाला, कानूनी दृष्टि से कमजोर आर्थिक बोझ बढ़ाने वाला तथा राष्ट्रीयकरण की नीति को कमजोर करने वाला है। इनमें जिन उद्देश्यों की चर्चा की गई है उनमें एक की भी पूर्ति नहीं होगी बल्कि उससे इस उद्योग में अशांति का वातावरण फैल जायेगा और सरकार को लेने के देने पड़ जायेंगे। कार्यक्षमता घट जायेगी और धन के बंटवारे में वर्षों लग जायेंगे। एरा सेमिनर कमेटी की सिफारिशों का सहारा लेकर सरकार ऐसा करना चाहती है। परन्तु विधेयक ठीक उनके विपरीत है। उक्त कमेटी ने कहीं भी ऐसा नहीं कहा है कि जीवन बीमा निगम को पूर्णतः समाप्त कर

दिया जाये। इस विधेयक का मुख्य उद्देश्य इस उद्योग में काम करने वाले 45 हजार कर्मचारियों पर चोट करना है। इसके द्वारा उनसे सामूहिक सौदेबाजी के अधिकार को छीनकर उन्हें गुलामों की स्थिति में लाकर रखना है। अपने हितों के लिए वे किसी से बात तक नहीं कर सकते।

जीवन बीमा निगम को पांच भागों में बांटने का विरोध सन् 1961 में एस्टीमेट कमेटी, 1968 में प्रशासनिक सुधार समिति का कार्यकारी दल और 1969 में कमेटी आफ इन्क्वायरी इन टू दी एक्स्पेसेज आफ एल० आई० सी० कर चुकी है। इतना ही नहीं, पहले के कई वित्त मंत्रियों और प्रधान मंत्री पण्डित जवाहर लाल नेहरू भी इस प्रकार के पागलपन के सुझावों को संसद में रद्द कर चुके थे। सन् 1979 तक किसी भी कमेटी ने इस बदर बाट का समर्थन नहीं किया था।

The Era Sezhiyan Committee has opposed the formation of five independent Corporations competing with one another through out the country which would add to the cost.

ठीक इसी प्रकार की समस्या भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के सम्मुख उपस्थित हुई थी जिसका निराकरण उसने सन् 1973 में स्टेट बैंक आफ इण्डिया एक्ट, 1955 में संशोधन करके कर लिया। सरकार जीवन बीमा कानून 1956 में भी ऐसा संशोधन करके उद्देश्यों की प्राप्ति कर सकती है। अतः इन शब्दों के साथ वित्त मंत्री से मेरा अनुरोध होगा कि वह इस जन-विरोधी विधेयक को वापस कर ले और आगे कोई भी कार्यवाही करने के पहले इस विधेयक पर जनमत प्राप्त करने के लिए इसे प्रसारित कर दें।

SHRI ANANDA PATHAK (Darjeeling) :  
Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I oppose

this Bill tooth and nail. The reason for that has already been stated by Mr. Sunil Maitra. This Bill is against the interests of our country, the interests of the employees and also the policy holders. Therefore, I oppose this Bill tooth and nail.

SHRI P.K. KODIYAN (Adoor) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I oppose the introduction of this Bill because this Bill will not achieve the aim for which it has been introduced. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons it has been stated that the insurance coverage should be spread to the rural areas in a larger measure but the splitting of the Corporation into five separate corporations will lead to intensive competition among the units. Those units will go on concentrating more and more in the urban areas because there is more scope for attracting more such business in the urban areas. Naturally this sort of intense competition among the units will be only at the cost of insurance work in the rural area. Insurance in the rural area entails heavy expenditure. Naturally therefore this competition between these five units will result in utter neglect of this insurance work in the rural area. There is also another danger. There will be competition between the various units not only in canvassing the Life Insurance Policies in their respective areas. For various reasons, each zone will have the right to canvass policy not only within the jurisdiction of the zone but they can canvass in all part of the country. Even the Era Sezhiyan committee has not recommended such a thing. It has opposed any kind of competition among units, if such units are set up as a result of its recommendation. So, it goes against the spirit of the recommendation of that committee. Their recommendations are actually being distorted. Also Section 68 of the Bill overrides previous agreements, awards and settlements on industrial disputes between the management and employees. The Central Government is being given this power. This overrides all previous Acts, awards, settlements etc. This entirely eliminates the process of negotiation between management and employees under industrial disputes enactment, the facilities which are available to all the other employees of the public sector undertakings. Therefore, it discrimi-

nates against these employees. It takes away the right of collective bargaining, collective benefit to the employees. So, in that respect, it is an anti-labour measure. It will only lead to more and more of industrial tension. This will not help in the smooth functioning of the corporation. This will not help in discharging its main responsibility, that is, canvassing more life insurance business.

Therefore, this Bill goes against the very aim of increasing the life insurance business, which the Hon. Minister wants us to believe.

Therefore, I oppose the introduction of this Bill.

**SHRI KRISHNA CHANDRA HALDER** (Durgapur): May I say something? I wish to make a submission.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Not now. You may speak when your turn comes to speak on the Bill. You may speak when your party likes you to speak.

Now, the Hon. Minister.

**THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY)**: Sir, at this juncture we have only to see whether Parliament is competent to undertake this legislation or not. Now, if you kindly look into the subject-matter of this Bill, you will see that the subject-matter of this Bill is relatable to Entries 43, 44 and 47 of LWI of the Seventh Schedule of the Constitution.

I do not think, it is necessary to refer to the Constitution.

**SHRI SUNIL MAITRA**: What about the Supreme Court, judgement?

(Interruptions)

**SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY**: We can definitely say that Parliament is competent to enact this legislation; there is no doubt about it.

A number of points have been raised by

the Hon. Members about the splitting up of the Corporation and whether this legislation is beyond the scope of this Parliament. Further, it was also stated that the decision of the Supreme Court has been flouted, and the contention that things are unmanageable, as it is, is not correct. A reference was also made to the State Bank of India, and it was stated that the rights of the workers have been taken away and that it is against the interests of the workers.

At the out set, I may state that the present legislation is in the interest of the employees of the Life Insurance Corporation as also the policyholders. I do not know, why the Hon. Members who have been advocating decentralisation, are advocating centralisation today.

(Interruptions)

Before nationalisation of the Banks, there were 8262 branches in the country. After nationalisation, the number has gone up to 43,000. The branches have been opened in the rural areas and consequently, more employees have been employed; promotion avenues have naturally increased. It is obviously in the interest of the employees; of course, it is not in the interest of the union leaders. That is what I can say...

(Interruptions)

Till 1980, there were 90 districts which have not been touched by the Life Insurance Corporation, now the position is that only 57 such districts remain. We have not reached the district of the Hon. Member so far. We have not reached so many districts; there are so many talukas where the life insurance message has not reached, forget the villages. The intention of the Government is that the message of life insurance should reach the villages and the rural areas. If there is expansion of the activities of the Corporation, and a number of branches are opened, naturally it will be in the interest of the employees.

It has been said in the Parliament and there have been a number of editorials also about the standard of service having gone

down extremely. The policyholders are not getting the service as they should. The Era Sezhiyan Committee had considered this question in detail and made certain recommendations. The Committee on Public Undertakings of Parliament has also gone into the matter in detail and made certain recommendations. Both these Committees have recommended that this organisation should be reorganised in the interest of efficiency of the organisation as also in the interest of the policyholders. These are the clear recommendations of the Era Sezhiyan Committee...

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : This Committee has rejected all these ideas.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : It may not be palatable to you, but the country will receive it gladly.

After all it is the duty of the Government also to satisfy the people as well as the employees. It is not the duty of the Union leaders alone. It is the duty of the Government also to clear the doubts of the employees and we are doing it in the interest of the employees. We want to make it very clear.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : Mr. C. D. Deshmukh rejected the idea. Sir, the Hon. Minister is completely ignorant of Life Insurance affairs. That way they are not strengthening Life Insurance.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : When the right time comes you will see whether we are destroying it or strengthening it. Now, let me reply.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You must allow him to reply. Hear him please.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : What is his reply to the Supreme Court Judgement ?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You have

raised many points. He is replying to them one by one.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Let the Minister reply. No interruptions please. Should the Minister not say why he wants to introduce the Bill ? Should he not justify the reasons for introducing the Bill in the House ? You are opposed to the introduction of the Bill. Should he not from the Government side justify as to why he is introducing such a Legislation ? Please listen to him. I don't like any interruption. You have opposed the introduction for 35 minutes. Let him reply. I can't ask him to reply the way you want a reply.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : Sir, I gave an example of the banks. When the spectacular expansion in banks has taken place, there has been an opportunity for the Bank employees to get promotion. Now within six to eight years they are getting promotion. Only in exceptional cases they may not get one, but that opportunity has been made possible because of the expansion that has taken in the banking sector. Similarly, if the Life Insurance Corporation goes to the villages, there will be more branches and opportunities will also be more for its employees to get promotions.

Sir, in the Editorials and Letters to the Editor columns of the newspapers there was a criticism about the Policy Holder Service.

*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Mr. Maitra, the Minister is not yielding, and you are not going to solve any problem. You allow him to reply. You have got every chance.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : Sir, there was a criticism from the Opposition parties and also the Era Sezhiyan Committee stated that the Policy Holders' Service is deteriorating and that there is a need for improving its efficiency. That is the recommendation and it has been clearly stated in the report of the Era Sezhiyan Committee. Shri Era Sezhiyan is not from the Congress Party.



**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** For your information Mr. Era Sezhiyan was an employee of the Life Insurance Corporation of India like Mr. Sunil Maitra.

**SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY :** That is an additional point for us. Not only that, but also a responsible Committee of Parliament—the Public Undertakings Committee—recommended its reorganisation. They also stated that the Government should come forward with a scheme to improve the efficiency in its service. So, we have introduced this Bill. Since it is going to be referred to the Joint Committee of the Parliament, all these points could be raised there also.

Sir, my Hon. Friend has stated about the Supreme Court judgment. In this connection I would say no specific provision was there in the Life Insurance Corporation at that time. That is why the Supreme Court had given a judgment like that. Now, when there is a specific provision introduced in this Bill...

**SHRI SUNIL MAITRA :** There was a specific provision.

**SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY :** We are not flouting the judgment of the Supreme Court,

*(Interruptions)*

आचार्य भगवान देव (अजमेर) : यह कोई सब्जी मार्केट नहीं है। आपने अपनी बात कह दी है, अब आपको मंत्री जी का जवाब भी सुनना पड़ेगा।

*(व्यवधान)*

**SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY :** What has the Supreme Court Stated? The Supreme Court has already stated that the Government would have the power to determine the terms and conditions of the service of the employees. So, we have incorporated it. So, I don't think there is any substance in the arguments or contentions of the Hon. Members. If at all they are

interested in the improvement of the service conditions of the employees and if at all they are interested in the interests of the employees and that of the policy holders, I I don't think there is any material or substance to oppose it.

**MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER :** The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill to provide, with a view to the more effective realisation of the objectives of nationalisation of life insurance business, for the dissolution of the Life Insurance Corporation of India and for the establishment of a number of Corporations for the more efficient carrying on of the said business and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto."

*The Lok Sabha divided :*

**AYES**

**Division No. 2**

**13.13 hrs.**

Ahmed, Shri Gulsher  
Ankineedu Prasada Rao, Shri P.  
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha  
Bairwa, Shri Bansari Lal  
Bhagwan Dev, Acharya  
Bhoi, Dr. Krupasindhu  
Bhuyan, Shri Bhubaneswar  
Birender Singh, Rao  
Buta Singh Shri  
Chennupati, Shrimati Vidya  
Daga, Shri Mool Chand  
Dalbir Singh, Shri  
Doongar Singh, Shri  
Gehlot, Shri Ashok  
Gogoi, Shri Tarun  
Jain, Shri Virdhi Chander  
Jamilur Rahman, Shri  
Jena, Shri Chintamani  
Jha, Shri Kamal Nath



Kamla Kumari, Kumari  
 Kuchan, Shri Gangadhar S.  
 Kurien, Prof. P J.  
 Lakkappa, Shri K.  
 Mahendra Prasad, Shri  
 Mallanna, Shri K.  
 Mallick, Shri Lakshman  
 Mallikarjun, Shri  
 Misra, Shri Harinatha  
 Mohanty, Shri Brajamohan  
 Naik, Shri G. Devaraya  
 Narayana, Shri K.S.  
 Nurul Islam, Shri  
 Padayachi, Shri S S. Ramaswamy  
 Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra  
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani  
 Patel, Shri Uttambhai H.  
 Patil, Shri Uttamrao  
 Pattabhi Rama Rao, Shri S.B.P.  
 Phulwariya, Shri Virda Ram  
 Poojary, Shri Janardhana  
 Potdukhe, Shri Shantaram  
 Prasan Kumar, Shri S.N.  
 Quadri, Shri S.T.  
 Raju, Shri P.V.G.  
 Ramamurthy, Shri K.  
 Ramulu, Shri H.G.  
 Ranga, Prof. N.G.  
 Rathod, Shri Uttam  
 Reddy, Shri K. Vijaya Bhaskara  
 Reddy, Shri P. Venkata  
 Sajjan, Kumar Shri  
 Sethe, Shri Vasant  
 Scindia, Shri Madhavrao  
 Shastri, Shri Dharam Dass  
 Shiv Shankar, Shri P.  
 Shivendra Bahadur Singh, Shri  
 Singh, Dr. B.N.  
 Soren, Shri Harihar  
 Sreenivasa Prasad, Shri V.  
 Sultanpuri, Shri Krishan Dutt  
 Suryawanshi, Shri Narsingrao  
 Swaminathan, Shri R.V.  
 Tariq Anwar, Shri  
 Thorat, Shri Bhausaheb  
 Tytler, Shri Jagdish

Vijayaraghavan, Shri V.S.  
 Yadav, Shri Ram Singh  
 Zainul Basher, Shri

#### NOES

Bag, Shri Ajit  
 Balan, Shri A.K.  
 Bhoopathy, Shri G.  
 Datta, Shri Amal  
 Giri, Shri Sudhir  
 Halder, Shri Krishna Chandra  
 Hasda, Shri Matilal  
 Jagpal Singh, Shri  
 Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali  
 Kodiyan, Shri P.K.  
 Maitra, Shri Sunil  
 Misra, Shri Satyagopal  
 Modak, Shri Bijoy  
 Mukherjee, Shri Samar  
 Ngangom Mohendra, Shri  
 Pal, Prof. Rup Chand  
 Pathak, Shri Ananda  
 Rajesh Kumar Singh, Shri  
 Riyan, Shri Bajuban  
 Roy Pradhan, Shri Amar  
 Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar  
 Saha, Shri Gadadhar,  
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar;  
 Shejwalkar, Shri N. K.  
 Singh, Shri B.D.  
 Sinha Shri Nirmal.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Subject to Correction\* the result to the division is as follows ;

AYES : 68

NOES : 26

*The motion was adopted.*

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY  
Introduce \*\*the Bill.

\* The following members also recorded their votes.

Ayes : Sarvashri G.P. Anuragi, Seth Hembiram, K. Kunhambn, Amarsingh Rathawa, Sobeng Tayeng, Bishnu Prasad and Bajubon R. Kharlukhi.

Noes : Shri Kalapnath Sarkar.

\*\* Introduced with the recommendation of the President.