

an>

Title: Introduction of the Insurance Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2015.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now, we are taking up Item No.13. After that, we will resume the discussion.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JAYANT SINHA): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Insurance Act, 1938 and General Insurance Business (Nationalisation) Act, 1972 and to amend the Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority Act, 1999.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Insurance Act, 1938 and General Insurance Business (Nationalisation) Act, 1972 and to amend the Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority Act, 1999. "

...(Interruptions)

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have received notices. I will call each one. Please take your seat. Now, Shri P. Karunakaran.

SHRI P. KARUNAKARAN (KASARGOD): Sir, I rise to strongly oppose the introduction of the Bill under Rule 72(1).

The reason for my objection is that the Bill is pending before the Rajya Sabha now. According to the Rules of Procedure either in the Lok Sabha or in the Rajya Sabha, if a Bill is placed before the Lok Sabha, it has to be passed. Then it goes to the Rajya Sabha. That is true in the case of Rajya Sabha also. So, the Bill is pending before the Rajya Sabha; it is not defeated; it is not deferred and it is also not withdrawn. We have not got any message from the Rajya Sabha. Of course, the Secretary-General has to give the message as to what is its position in the Rajya Sabha. So, this Bill with the same identical character should not be placed in this House. So, there is no legislative competency on the side of the Government to place this Bill.

Again, it is a very serious issue that the Government is going to privatize the Insurance Company in total. They are going to raise the cap to 49 per cent. We have sufficient examples of privatization going wrong in the Western countries. What is the position of big economies like America and other countries? We know that five major banks collapsed in America, and that is true in other cases also.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You do not go into the merit of the Bill. Instead of giving a lengthy speech, you say what your objections are, because anyhow we are going to discuss this Bill afterwards. At that time, you can give your full views.

SHRI P. KARUNAKARAN: I object on the ground that the Government has no right to place this Bill before this House just because this Bill is pending before Rajya Sabha. So, I strongly oppose the Bill.

DR. A. SAMPATH (ATTINGAL): Mr. Deputy Speaker Sir, my objection is regarding two points. One is, such a Bill was introduced in the Upper House. The Upper House, Rajya Sabha, constituted a Select Committee and the Bill was sent to the Select Committee for taking evidence and also for their opinion. While it was pending before the Upper House, during this Session the Executive introduced a Motion. The hon. Minister introduced a Motion in the Upper House, Rajya Sabha to withdraw that Bill. Then, again the Upper House decided to defer that Motion. So, my submission is, first, the Bill is now the property of the Upper House. Second, if that has to be withdrawn, that Motion is kept in abeyance, that is, it is deferred.

Sir, the Article 79 of the Constitution of India says: "There shall be a Parliament for the Union which shall consist of the President and two Houses to be known respectively as the Council of States and the House of the People." So, first the Council of States has been mentioned.

The Bill has been introduced in the Upper House and they have constituted a Select Committee. While it is the property of that House, the Government is trying to introduce it here. I am not alleging any *mala fide* intentions of the Government but somehow they were under the impression that this has to be withdrawn and a Motion was put forth. But that House decided that it should be deferred. Anyway, I put my objections. These are very serious objections. I am not going into the merits and demerits of the Bill, that I will do later. But my humble submission is that this House does not have any propriety, it does not have any property, any right, any power, any privilege over it when such a Bill is pending before that House. So, this should not be introduced in this House at this point of time.

PROF. SAUGATA ROY (DUM DUM): Under Rule 72 (1) of the Rules of Procedure, I oppose the introduction of the Insurance Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2015 to further amend the Insurance Act, 1958 and the General Insurance Business (Nationalisation) Act, 1972 and to amend the IRDA Authority Act, 1999.

My esteemed colleagues have already mentioned some points. The history of the Bill is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of this Bill. First, the Select Committee, which was appointed in August 2014 incorporated amendments to the Insurance Laws along with 99 official amendments. The Cabinet approved the proposal to enable the Bill as reported by Select Committee to be taken up for consideration and passing.

Accordingly, the Finance Minister, who is not here and had gone to the States, gave a notice of a Motion in the Rajya Sabha that the Bill as reported by the Select Committee be taken into consideration and passed. However, the Bill could not be taken up for consideration in the Rajya Sabha during the Winter Session of 2014. Then again, the Government for some reason felt that there was some urgency in the matter. So, the Cabinet approved on the 24<sup>th</sup> December promulgation of the Insurance Laws (Amendment) Ordinance 2014 and it was issued on 26<sup>th</sup> December, 2014. After the Ordinance was promulgated in the current Session, the Government moved a motion in the Rajya Sabha to withdraw the Insurance Laws (Amendment) Bill. However, the Government's Motion for withdrawal could not be passed. So, the fact remains that the Insurance Laws (Amendment) Bill, as per the report of the Select Committee appointed by the Rajya Sabha, remains in the Rajya Sabha and is the property of the Rajya Sabha.

You show me one instance in the last 65 years of the operation of the Constitution of India that a Bill while it is still pending in one House will be presented in another House. This whole Constitution as was pointed out by Dr. Sampath talks of a bicameral system. The Rajya Sabha has no powers as far as financial matters are concerned. But as far as legislative matters are concerned, Rajya Sabha has equal powers like the Lok Sabha. So, while the Bill remains in the Rajya Sabha, we have objection to the Bill. We do not agree with this 49 per cent FDI in Insurance but that is the substance of the Bill and I would not go into it.

Sir, I am talking of the procedural point that while the Bill remains the property of another House of Parliament, can Lok Sabha overlook that and bring, first, an Ordinance and then introduce a Bill? Are we subjected to an Ordinance *raj*? Are we subjected to a system where there is constitutional imbroglio? These questions have to be answered and clarified, once and for all, not only for this Bill but also for the posterity whether a Bill remaining pending in one House and not allowed to be withdrawn by that House, can be introduced in the other House. The same Bill is going from one House to another House, then to another House and then an Ordinance is coming in-between. This is not the way the Government should function.

With all the force at my command, I oppose the introduction of the Insurance Laws (Amendment) Bill. We shall ask for a Division on this motion opposing the introduction of the Insurance Laws (Amendment) Bill.

SHRI M.B. RAJESH (PALAKKAD): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the introduction of this Bill. Many of my colleagues have already raised issues for opposing the introduction of this Bill. I want to oppose this Bill mainly on the question of legislative competence of this House because as other hon. Members have pointed out, this Bill is still pending before the other House and the Government has failed to get passed a resolution to withdraw the Bill which is pending in the other House. So, when the Bill is still pending in the other House, the Government has no authority and no right to introduce this Bill in this House.

Sir, the Government is taking a short-cut. The Government is violating the constitutional provisions. The Government is also bending Rules of Procedure according to its own convenience. This cannot be allowed. This has never happened in the 65-year history. The Government is creating a new precedent. This will affect our democracy and the functioning of our Parliament. So, this should not be allowed to happen. Since this Bill is pending in the other House, I oppose the introduction of this Bill in this House.

SHRIMATI P.K. SHREEMATHI TEACHER (KANNUR): Sir, I strongly oppose the introduction of this Bill. My learned and senior colleagues have already spoken here. Actually, the Government is creating a bad precedent. It is proved through their speeches. So, we do not want to create a bad precedent. Actually, the Bill is anti-people and anti-nation. So, I strongly object to the introduction of this Bill. I urge upon the Government not to introduce this Bill.

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN (KOLLAM): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I would like to oppose the introduction of the Bill under Rule 72 and also clause 6 of the Parliamentary Procedure Abstract Series 7 regarding Government Legislative Process of Lok Sabha on the following grounds. Firstly, the very purpose of the legislation is defeated as the same Bill is pending in the other House. That has already been cited by my hon. friends on this side. In this case, I am on a different point. I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the fact that on 24.12.14, the very next day the House adjourned *sine die*, the Ordinance was promulgated. You may kindly see what the Bill is. The Bill is having 99 amendments. Out of them, 88 amendments are on the basis of the recommendations of the Standing Committee on Finance which was constituted in the year 2008 and chaired by Shri Yashwant Sinha. Mr. Yashwant Sinha, as the Chairman of the Standing Committee, submitted the Report in the year 2011, and 88 recommendations have been accepted and incorporated in the Bill as Amendments.

Secondly, subsequent to that, the Bill was returned as the Insurance Laws (Amendment) Bill of 2014, and again it has been sent to the Select Committee and 11 recommendations have been accepted. These also were incorporated in the Bill. This means that 99 Amendments are there.

Sir, my question is that subsequent to this, when it has gone to the scrutiny of the Standing Committee; it was scrutinised by the Select Committee; and after that the Bill is re-named and it is introduced in the House. So, it is the property of the House, which has already been stated. Subsequently, they have moved a motion for withdrawal of the Bill. It is being deferred. What is the meaning of it? It means that the Bill and the legislative process are still there in the Upper House. This is a very important issue. The history of Parliament has never seen such a situation. So, definitely we want a ruling from the Chair also.

My point is that suppose the Rajya Sabha or the Upper House passes the Bill tomorrow or day-after-tomorrow ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SHIVKUMAR UDASI (HAVERI): It is a hypothetical question.

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN : No, it is not hypothetical. This Bill is ...(*Interruptions*) No, let the Government answer to my question. ...(*Interruptions*)

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do not interfere. Let him say what he wants to say.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN : Sir, I am only on my legal points. Suppose we pass the Bill. What would be the next course of action? The next course of action is that it is to be transmitted to the Rajya Sabha. What will happen if it goes to the Rajya Sabha? In the Rajya Sabha, an identical Bill is there. How can it be legislated in the Rajya Sabha? So, my point is that the legislative competence of this House is barred as there is an identical Bill in which the legislative process has already been completed and 99 Amendments have been incorporated. So, we have to respect that House.

Sir, the second point is different in respect of the legislative exercise. This is against all customs, conventions, and legislative procedure that we are doing all these things.

Sir, another objection is that factual error is there in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. If you go through paragraph 2 of the Statement of Objects and Reasons, it states that : "The Bill is made on the basis of the recommendations of K. P. Narasimhan Committee and the Law Commission recommendations". My point is that the K. P. Narasimhan Committee or the Law Commission has never recommended that the cap of 29 per cent has to be increased to 49 per cent, which is absolutely an error on the ...(*Interruptions*)

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are going into the merit of it.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN : No, it is not the merit of the case. There is a factual error in the Statement of Objects and Reasons.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can raise this issue during the discussion on this Bill.

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN: Sir, I have another point under Rule 67.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Firstly, you quote the Rule, and then I will say about it.

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN: Under Rule 67 also, as I was saying about identical Bills, and in this House also there is a specific Rule, that is, Rule 67, which states that :

"When a Bill is pending before the House, notice of an identical Bill, whether received before or after the introduction of the pending Bill, shall be removed from, or not entered in, the list of pending notices, as the case may be, unless the Speaker otherwise directs."

This means that an identical Bill, which is pending in the other House cannot be taken into the List of Business and cannot even be put in the Agenda. So, we are creating a new precedence. My humble submission is that please do not introduce the Bill because we will be creating a new precedent against all principles of legislative practice and against the principles of Parliamentary democracy. So, I strongly oppose the introduction of this Bill.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the hon. Parliamentary Affairs Minister want to say something on this?

PROF. SAUGATA ROY: Sir, the hon. Finance Minister has to reply to this.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, the Minister will give the reply, but he wants to intervene and say something on this.

THE MINISTER OF URBAN DEVELOPMENT, MINISTER OF HOUSING AND URBAN POVERTY ALLEVIATION AND MINISTER OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU): I am not replying on the Bill. I am speaking on a procedural issue being a Parliamentary Affairs Minister. I feel that Rule 72 or Rule 67, whichever he has quoted, he is questioning the legislative competence of the Indian Parliament and the Lok Sabha, which is elected by the people of India.

Sir, this House has the jurisdiction. In this connection, Rules 112 and 67 can also be referred. Rule 67 says that if the Speaker allows it, then it can be introduced. The Speaker has given the permission and that is why it is being introduced. Thirdly, the moment an Ordinance is issued, that is the law. We are now trying to...(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAUGATA ROY: For the time being only, that is, up to six weeks.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Up to six weeks, actions taken during the lifetime of the Ordinance are valid is known to all of us. So, this Ordinance is valid up to 5<sup>th</sup> or 6<sup>th</sup> of April.

PROF. SAUGATA ROY: It is valid till the first week of April.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: I am more specific by saying that it is valid till the 5<sup>th</sup> of April. The Parliament, in its wisdom, is trying to legislate by converting the Ordinance into a law. The House is at liberty to discuss, debate and then decide. The Speaker has given permission to this. Let us move ahead. All the points which they are saying like 'it is anti-people', and 'it is against this committee and all', can be discussed during the debate. ...(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SAUGATA ROY: You were a Member of Rajya Sabha. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: Shri Premachandran, you should have some patience, when I have been patience. ...(*Interruptions*)

HON. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The Minister is on his legs and let him complete what he is saying.

SHRI M. VENKAIAH NAIDU: While I am replying, leave it to me. My point is that the hon. Member has quoted certain rules. I am quoting clearly from clause (2) of Rule 112 which clarifies the position regarding the two Bills, which are substantially identical. There is a well-established practice and the Government is at liberty to introduce the Bill in whichever House it chooses. This Government has chosen to introduce this Bill seeking to convert the Ordinance into a law in Lok Sabha. So, there is no problem on that account. Let us discuss the merits once the Bill is taken up for consideration. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MOHAMMAD SALIM (RAIGANJ): Parliament comprises of two Houses. ...(*Interruptions*)

HON. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have raised certain points and the Minister is going to give the reply now. Please listen to him first. Mr. Minister:

...(*Interruptions*)

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I asked the Minister to give the reply and not others.

SHRI JAYANT SINHA: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I would request the hon. Members who have taken advantage of our willingness to follow parliamentary protocol to follow it in turn.

HON. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please address the Chair.

SHRI JAYANT SINHA: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the Parliamentary Affairs Minister has been very clear in laying out the parliamentary protocol. We are well within our rights to introduce the Bill and put it to a vote. If you grant us the leave, I think we are well within our rights to do so. Secondly, I will also say that it is a constitutional responsibility that when an Ordinance exists, within six weeks, we should present it to Parliament. The very same hon. Members who are getting so agitated or in a frenzy about us introducing this, if we had not done it, they would have accused us of not meeting our constitutional responsibility for not introducing the Bill. So, they cannot have it both ways. In any case, I submit the Bill for a vote.

HON. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Insurance Act, 1938 and General Insurance Business (Nationalization) Act, 1972 and to amend the Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority Act, 1999."

Those in favour will please say 'Aye'.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

HON. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Those against will please say "No".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'No'.

HON. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I think, the 'Ayes' have it. The 'Ayes' have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The 'Noes' have it. We want a Division. ...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN: Sir, we want a Division.

PROF. SAUGATA ROY : Sir, we want a Division.

SHRI P. KARUNAKARAN : Sir, we want a Division. ...(*Interruptions*)

HON. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let the Lobbies be clearedâ€”

#### **ANNOUNCEMENT RE: AUTOMATIC VOTE**

#### **RECORDING SYSTEM**

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I request all the Members to take their seats. Secretary-General to read about the operation of Automatic Vote Recording

System.

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Kind attention of the hon. Members is invited to the following points in the operation of the Automatic Vote Recording System:-

1. Before a division starts, every hon. Member should occupy his or her own seat and operate the system from that seat only;
2. When the hon. Speaker says "Now Division", the Secretary-General will activate the voting button whereupon "red bulbs" above the Display Boards on both side of the hon. Speaker's Chair will glow and a gong sound will be heard simultaneously.
3. For voting, hon. Members may please press the following two buttons simultaneously only after the sound of the gong and I repeat only after the sound of the gong.
4. The two buttons which have to be pressed is one the "red vote" button which is in front of the every hon. Member on the head phone plate and the second button to be pressed is any one of the following buttons fixed on the top of the desk of the seat:
  1. Ayes - Green colour
  2. Noes - Red colour
  3. Abstain - Yellow colour
5. It is also essential that both the buttons are kept pressed till another gong is heard and the Red Bulbs above the plasma display are "off".
6. Hon. Members may please note that their votes will not be registered:
  - If the buttons are kept pressed before the first gong.
  - If both buttons are not kept simultaneously pressed till the second gong.
7. Hon. Members can actually "see" their vote on the Display Boards installed on the either side of the hon. Speaker's Chair.
8. In case, the vote is not registered, they may call for voting through slips.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Now, the Lobbies have been cleared.

The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Insurance Act, 1938 and General Insurance Business (Nationalisation) Act, 1972 and to amend the Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority Act, 1999."

*The Lok Sabha divided:*

**DIVISION AYES 13.26 hrs.**

Agrawal, Shri Rajendra

Ahlawat, Shrimati Santosh

Ahluwalia, Shri S.S.

Amarappa , Shri Karadi Sanganna

Angadi, Shri Suresh C.

Bais, Shri Ramesh

Bala, Shrimati Anju

Balyan, Dr. Sanjeev  
Bhabhor, Shri Jasvantsinh Sumanbhai  
Bhagat, Shri Sudarshan  
Bhatt, Shrimati Ranjanben  
Birla, Shri Om  
Chakravarty, Shrimati Bijoya  
Chandel, Kunwar Pushpendra Singh  
Chaudhary, Shri C. R.  
Chaudhary, Shri P.P.  
Chaudhary, Shri Ram Tahal  
[@Chauhan, Shri Devusinh](#)  
[@Chautala, Shri Dushyant](#)  
Chavan, Shri Harishchandra  
Choubey, Shri Ashwini Kumar  
Choudhary, Shri Babulal  
Deka, Shri Ramen  
Devi, Shrimati Rama  
Dhotre, Shri Sanjay  
Diwakar, Shri Rajesh Kumar  
Dubey, Shri Nishikant  
Gaddigoudar, Shri P.C.  
Gaikwad, Dr. Sunil Baliram  
Gangwar, Shri Santosh Kumar  
Geetha, Shrimati Kothapalli  
Giluwa, Shri Laxman  
Gupta, Shri Shyama Charan  
Jena, Shri Rabindra Kumar  
[@Jigajinagi, Shri Ramesh](#)  
Joshi, Shri Pralhad  
Jyoti, Sadhvi Nirranjan  
Karandlaje, Kumari Shobha  
Kashyap, Shri Virender  
Kaswan, Shri Rahul  
Kataria, Shri Rattan Lal  
Kateel, Shri Nalin Kumar  
Khanduri AVSM, Maj. Gen. (Retd.) B.C.  
Khanna, Shri Vinod  
Kishore, Shri Kaushal  
Koli, Shri Bahadur Singh  
Kumar, Dr. Virendra

Maadam, Shrimati Poonamben  
Mahato, Dr. Banshilal  
Mahato, Shri Bidyut Baran  
Majhi, Shri Balbhadra  
Malviya, Prof. Chintamani  
Manjhi, Shri Hari  
Maurya, Shri Keshav Prasad  
Meghwal, Shri Arjun Ram  
Mishra, Shri Bhairon Prasad  
[@Modi, Shri Narendra](#)  
Mohan, Shri P.C.  
Mohapatra, Dr. Sidhant  
Munda, Shri Karia  
Munde, Dr. Pritam Gopinath  
Nagar, Shri Rodmal  
Narasimham, Shri Thota  
Nath, Shri Chand  
Ninama, Shri Manshankar  
Nishad, Shri Ajay  
Nishad, Shri Ram Charitra  
Pal, Shri Jagdambika  
Pandey, Shri Hari Om  
Pandey, Shri Rajesh  
Pandey, Shri Ravindra Kumar  
Paraste, Shri Dalpat Singh  
Paswan, Shri Ramvilas  
[@Patasani, Shri Prasanna Kumar](#)  
Patel, Dr. K. C.  
Patel, Shri Devji M.  
Patel, Shri Prahlad Singh  
Patel, Shrimati Anupriya  
Patel, Shrimati Jayshreeben  
Pathak, Shrimati Riti  
\$Patole, Shri Nana  
[@Phule, Sadhvi Savitri Bai](#)  
[@Pradhan, Shri Nagendra Kumar](#)  
Pratap, Shri Krishan  
[@Raj, Shrimati Krishna](#)  
Rajoria, Dr. Manoj  
Ram, Shri Janak

Ram, Shri Vishnu Dayal  
Rathore, Col. Rajyavardhan  
Rathore, Shri Hariom Singh  
Rathwa, Shri Ramsinh  
Ray, Shri Ravindra Kumar  
Reddy, Shri Konda Vishweshwar  
Reddy, Shri Mekapati Raja Mohan  
Reddy, Shri P.V. Midhun  
Renuka, Shrimati Butta  
Rudy, Shri Rajiv Pratap  
[@Sahu](#), Shri Lakhani Lal  
Sai, Shri Vishnu Dev  
Sampla, Shri Vijay  
Sanjar, Shri Alok  
Sarmah, Shri Ram Prasad  
Satpathy, Shri Tathagata  
Sawaikar, Adv. Narendra Keshav  
Sharma, Shri Ram Swaroop  
Shetty, Shri Gopal  
Shirole, Shri Anil  
[@Shyal](#), Dr. Bhartiben D.  
Singh, Dr. Nepal  
Singh, Dr. Yashwant  
Singh, Shri Dushyant  
Singh, Shri Ganesh  
Singh, Shri Hukum  
Singh, Shri Kirti Vardhan  
Singh, Shri Lallu  
Singh, Shri Pashupati Nath  
Singh, Shri Rakesh  
Singh, Shri Sunil Kumar  
Singh, Shri Sushil Kumar  
Singh, Shrimati Pratyusha Rajeshwari  
Sinha, Shri Jayant  
Solanki, Dr. Kirit P.  
Somaiya, Dr. Kirit  
Sonkar, Shri Vinod Kumar  
[@Supriyo](#), Shri Babul  
Swain, Shri Ladu Kishore  
Tarai, Shrimati Rita



Tasa, Shri Kamakhya Prasad  
Teli, Shri Rameshwar  
Teni, Shri Ajay Misra  
Thakur, Shri Anurag Singh  
Thakur, Shrimati Savitri  
Tomar, Shri Narendra Singh  
Tripathi, Shri Sharad  
Udasi, Shri Shivkumar  
Utawal, Shri Manohar  
Vasava, Shri Parbhubhai Nagarbhai  
Verma, Shri Bhanu Pratap Singh  
Verma, Shri Parvesh Sahib Singh  
Wanga, Shri Chintaman Navasha  
Yadav, Shri Hukmdeo Narayan  
Yadav, Shri Laxmi Narayan  
Yadav, Shri Ram Kripal  
[@Yediyurappa](#), Shri B.S.

## **NOES**

[@Ahamed](#), Shri E.  
Bakshi, Shri Subrata  
Banerjee, Shri Abhishek  
Banerjee, Shri Kalyan  
Banerjee, Shri Prasun  
Barman, Shri Bijoy Chandra  
Biju, Shri P. K.  
Chaudhury, Shri Jitendra  
Dastidar, Dr. Kakoli Ghosh  
Datta, Shri Sankar Prasad  
De(Nag), Dr. Ratna  
Dev, Kumari Sushmita  
Dhruvanarayana, Shri R.  
Faizal, Mohammed  
George, Adv. Joice  
Ghosh, Shrimati Arpita  
Gogoi, Shri Gaurav  
Gowda, Shri S.P. Muddahanume  
Karunakaran, Shri P.  
Khan, Shri Md. Badaruddoza

Khan, Shri Saumitra  
Kharge, Shri Mallikarjun  
Kumar, Shri Kaushalendra  
Mahato, Dr. Mriganka  
Mandal, Dr. Tapas  
Mani, Shri Jose K.  
Nagesh, Shri Godam  
Noor, Shrimati Mausam  
Poddar, Shrimati Aparupa  
Premachandran, Shri N.K.  
Rajesh, Shri M. B.  
Ramachandran, Shri Mullappally  
Roy, Prof. Saugata  
Roy, Shrimati Sandhya  
Roy, Shrimati Satabdi  
Sahu, Shri Tamradhwaj  
Salim, Shri Mohammad  
Samal, Dr. Kulmani  
Sampath, Dr. A.  
Sanghamita, Dr. Mamta  
Saren, Dr. Uma  
Suresh, Shri D.K.  
Teacher, Shrimati P.K. Shreemathi  
Thomas, Prof. K.V.  
Venugopal, Shri K. C.

**ABSTAIN**

Nil

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Subject to correction\*, the result of the Division is:

Ayes: 131

Noes: 45

*The motion was adopted.*

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister may now introduce the Bill.

SHRI JAYANT SINHA: I introduce the Bill.

HON. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let the Lobbies be opened.

---

