

DEMANDS FOR EXCESS GRANTS (RAILWAYS) 1978-79

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (SHRI KEDAR PANDAY) : I beg to present a statement (Hindi and English versions) showing Demands for Excess Grants in respect of the Budget (Railways)—for 1978-79.

14.36 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: DISAPPROVAL OF LIFE INSURANCE CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 1981—Contd. AND

LIFE INSURANCE CORPORATION (AMENDMENT) BILL—Contd.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The House will now take up further consideration of the Statutory Resolution and the Life Insurance Corporation, (Amendment) Bill, for which 4 hours have been allotted. Three hours and fifteen minutes are already over and only 45 minutes remain. We have to complete it within 45 minutes. Mr. Indrajit Gupta.

(Interruptions)

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES (Muzaffarpur) : The Minister is willing to extend the time, if necessary.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is all right. Let the Mover of the Resolution reply. I have called him to reply.

SHRI GEORGE FERNANDES : The timing of his reply will depend upon the allotment of time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER
The time is over.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat) : Sir, do not be rigid about it. After all, the Bill is going to be passed.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU (Diamond Harbour) : With your kind permission, I want to make a submission. I hardly speak.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : You never speak.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : We take this Bill as an attack on the working class. Therefore, we want to oppose this Bill at every stage. So, we would be asking for division on every clause and at every stage. Let us not live in fools' paradise. The Bill will take its own time. So, why unnecessarily get agitated over it ?

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN) : Our only request is that the Bill may be passed today itself. We are prepared to sit after 6 O' Clock.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH) : Sir, you were present in the BAC. Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu was also present. We have allotted four hours for this Bill for the simple reason that at the introductory stage we have already spent at least two or three hours. So, it was felt that four hours would be more than sufficient for this Bill, because it has been discussed in the introduction stage also. I would appeal to Shri Jyotirmoy Bosu, who hardly speaks, that what we have generally agreed to in the BAC should not bethere.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER
Now no more discussion on this.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : In the BAC I would suggest that in future you keep a tape recorder. I had been cautioning in the Committee that this Bill will take a lot more time and that this Bill cannot be passed in four hours.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN :
I will stand dinner for everyone of you.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :
No late sitting.

Yesterday I was just beginning my reply and I had just stated the fact that the hon. Finance Minister built his whole case on the assumption, which is a totally unwarranted assumption and a rather bold assumption, that the hon. Judges of the Supreme Court were incapable of understanding correctly what the Attorney-General had meant when he gave an assurance before that Court. This is what the hon. Finance Minister wants this House to believe, that only the Government is wise enough and sagacious enough to understand it, that the Attorney-General had never said that he was prepared to pay a bonus, the only thing he was prepared to say was that they would abide by the decision of the Court. Well, the hon. Judges in a subsequent clarification have stated, as I read out and quoted here, that what they had understood the Attorney-General to say was, that the Government would implement that part of the decision which related to the payment of bonus, and nothing else.

Any way, this contempt petition is pending in the court, it will be heard on the 17th March and then we will see what happens.

Then, I had, with the kind permission of the House laid on the Table of the House a certified copy of the actual Order which was passed by the court on the 10th of November, 1980, and when I laid this on the Table of the House, the Finance Minister said that this Order was signed by the Court Master, who is a sort of a court Headclerk, and therefore, it was not the valid order of the court. I was really surprised at this kind of argument being brought

forward. So, I have consulted the Supreme Court rules. The Supreme Court rules are very clear on this point. The Supreme Court rules say :

“Subject to any general or special directions given by the Chief Justice the seal of the Court shall not be affixed to any writ, rule order, summons or other process save under the authority in writing of the Registrar or the Deputy Registrar. The seal of the court shall not be affixed to any certified copy issued by the court save under the authority in writing of the Registrar or of a Deputy Registrar or Assistant Registrar”.

Here, in the certified copy which I had laid on the Table of the House, you can see for yourself that the signature of the Assistant Registrar of the Supreme Court, if I am reading it correctly, is of Mr. K.K. Sehgal. His signature and his seal are affixed to this certified copy. So, I do not understand how a Finance Minister of the government of India can take shelter behind this argument that this is not a genuine or the *bona fide* order of the court because it is signed by some Registrar or junior officer of the court. This Order, as I said, is quite categorical. Otherwise what is the purpose of the court writing this, viz.

“An order has been passed by this court dated 22-11-78 where the following direction has been given :

“But in case the petitioner feels in the appeal, the petitioner will pay the amount of bonus together with interest at 12 per cent per annum from the date it becomes due, this will be implemented by the appellants.”

This is the Order. This will be implemented by the appellant since it is binding. This is the certified copy properly certified according to the rules of the Supreme Court. I do not think the Government has a leg to stand on now. But now, unfortunately we cannot decide it here in this House. It will have to be decided somewhere else. But unfortunately, in the meantime they have carried out a sort of, I do not know what to call it a *coup d'etat* or something like that against the court by the surreptitious resort to this Ordinance and he has not answered the point I raised. I would like to hear the Government's view on that. What is your view on the Supreme Courts categorical opinion which I have quoted so many times that the LIC Act which is a general Act cannot subvert or replace or substitute the Industrial Disputes Act which is a specific Act governing the industrial relations between the employer and the employees? What your action amounts to is that the Industrial Disputes Act is of no concern here and the industrial relations or the disputes between the employers and employees in the LIC are to be governed not by the Industrial Disputes Act, but by the LIC Act. This is absolutely wrong in the face of what the Supreme Court has said. I am at pains to point out here that it is not the question of how many rupees are going to be reduced in their bonus or dearness allowance. I will be least concerned about that.

If the Industrial Disputes Act is to be set aside or negated in this round-about fashion, then what will remain of industrial relations, what will remain of the constitutional provision by which a citizen of this country has got the right to organise himself in a trade union or in association for the purpose of collective bargaining? You want to take away that right in this manner. You cannot do it. You are striving up a hornet's nest, I am striving you again.

Also he has not answered my point as to how he can reduce by executive order the salaries and emoluments of Government servants, of people who are in the service of the Union as it is called, without recourse to Article 360 of the Constitution.

Article 360 of the Constitution provides for the promulgation of financial emergency which the President can do if he so considers necessary. Minister when he replies finally will kindly.....

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN:
 I will do that.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :
 You kindly clarify to the House what is the meaning and purpose of this Article 360 if you can do the something by an Executive Order. Is this all that the founding fathers who drafted and prepared this Constitution had in their mind? Has Article 360 not been put here with a specific purpose?—viz., only under the provisions of financial emergency? It read:

360 (4) (b): "it shall be competent for the President during the period any proclamation issued under this article is in operation to issue directions for the reduction of salaries and allowances of all or any class of persons serving in connection with the affairs of the Union including the Judges of the Supreme Court and the High Courts."

Naturally employees of LIC are also covered under this. What is the whole purpose of this Article? This is the Article inscribed in the Constitution. If you say now that you can do the something simply by passing an Executive Order, this is my submission, this cannot be done unless you have recourse to Article 360 which means the promulgation of financial emergency. Only in terms of financial emergency you can order emoluments and salaries to be reduced. What is his reply to this? He has not said a single word. This is a matter which can also be tested in a court whether

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

you are violating Article 360 or not. Naturally nobody here is satisfied with the kind of reply we heard yesterday. We are waiting to hear what they have thought of, after having slept over it and having come here to-day. Whether contempt of court has been committed or not, this is for the court to decide and when the contempt petition is heard we will know.

He has made certain observations about the financial working of the LIC and has implied that only by reducing the bonus and dearness allowances of the LIC employees, the financial health of the LIC can be restored. I presume that is what he meant to say.

I want to point out two things. Yesterday, Mr. Venkataraman has said, I am quoting from his speech—

“I will make a comparative statement of the wages. A persons in LIC at the entry level will get Rs. 1567/-”

What does the House understand—press or public or anybody? That the person when he is first recruited—entry level in English means when he first enters into service—entry level in the LIC according to Shri Venkataraman, a Class III employee of the LIC.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN :
I was dealing with the total expenditure. I was dealing and saying that the Class III people are getting more. I was saying Class I people are getting more. This refers to Class I ..

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :
This refers to Class I. That is totally irrelevant.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN :
It is all right. It may be relevant or not, but do not misquote me.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :
You have clarified it now. This is what you said. I have read it out. How does one understand from it as to what you mean—

“A person in LIC at the entry level will get Rs. 1567/-.”

Now you say you are referring to the officers.. (Interruptions)

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN :
It is a comparison ..(interruptions)

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : ...
(Interruptions) employees—Class III people and not Class I Officers.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN :
If you look and compare them, I said IAS Officers. Is IAS Officer at the Class IH level .

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA (Calcutta North East): You wanted to say that IAS officer was getting less than Class III. This is exactly what you said.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :
Do you see what in Air India Shri Naridas drew as his salary and prerequisites in vouchers/ Bills in one years? (Interruptions).

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA :
Anyway, for the purpose of record, it is better to clarify what a person at the entry level of LIC, that is, Class III, when he first joins service gets. We should know that. Direct recruitment is only for Class III Assistants. All other posts of Stenographers, higher Assistants and Superintendents are all promotional posts. Nobody enters these categories at the entry level. They enter as Class III Assistants and, when they enter as Assistants, this is what they get. Basic salary—Rs. 175; Dearness Allowance — Rs. 388.50 p.; House Rent Allowance — Rs. 28 and City Compensatory Allowance, in big cities,—Rs. 20. The total is, Rs. 611.50 p. These are the emoluments at the

entry level of that category of employees who are affected by this Ordinance and this Bill. So, there should be no misunderstanding about it that they are being given a fantastically high salary.

Shri R. VENKATARAMAN:
 How much does it come to ?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : It comes to Rs. 611.50 p. If you are going to say that this is more than what some employees are getting in some other public sector undertakings, that may be.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN : That is all my case. Compared with level to level, Class I level or Class III level, whatever it is, level to level, the LIC employees are getting more than other employees. That is my case.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : So, they must be brought down ? How did they get more ? Did they commit theft or dacoity ? They get what they have got through agreements, negotiated agreements, to which your Government and the LIC were a party. You may say: "We made a mistake." Why should the employees be made to pay for that now ? If you commit a mistake in entering into such type of collective agreements, that was your mistake. Why should you penalise them for it now ?

I do not understand.

Another point which he made was, again, I quote from his speech yesterday :

"In 1959, the cost of administration per policy was Rs. 12.45 p. In 1969-70, it went up to Rs. 23.57p. and in 1978-79, the cost of administration per policy became Rs. 42.30 p. Now, you could easily see how the administration cost has gone up. I say it again, it is the administration cost which has gone up."

This is what he said yesterday. The language which he has used is no very precise because the cost of administration means the total cost of administration. It does not mean, on account of emoluments of employees. The total cost of administration includes so many things.

However, I bothered to find out a more accurate and precise way of making an assessment and that is to take a certain unit, Rs. 1000 sum assured, and find out what is the cost of servicing that policy. You will find, in relation to salary of all classes of LIC employees, what is the cost of servicing Rs. 1000 sum assured and compare it over a period of time. What do we find ? In 1957, the salary expenses of all classes of employees was Rs. 12.12 crores. and, in force, the total business was Rs. 1375 crores. This works out that the cost per thousand rupees sum assured, in 1957, was Rs. 8.58 p. and, similarly, I have calculated that, in 1974-75, it has come down to Rs. 7.93 p. and, in 1979-80, it has come down to Rs. 6.24 p. This is the cost of servicing per thousand rupees sum assured in relation to the salary of all classes to LIC employees.

How can you make out a case that because of the high salaries that they are getting, the cost of servicing is going up ? It is not going up. It has come down and instead of giving them some credit for that, a case is sought to be made out here for cutting down their emoluments unilaterally by a method and by a means which I have already described as most horrifying and obnoxious.

I think Mr. Venkataraman knows this journal "Yoga Kshema" brought out by the LIC. In this Journal, I find that they have said something which I must quote :

"Not all our critics mercifully."

This is what the LIC is writing, not the employee.

"Not all our critics mercifully have been unfair."

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

For instance, to quote from the "Economic Scene." I think you know Economic Scene. Economic Scene is a publication of the Tatas, the House of Tatas who are, Tata consultancy people and who are by no means well-disposed towards the public sector at all. Day in and day out, they carry on a campaign against the public sector. Even that Tatas journal called The Economic Scene has written thus as :

"In fairness to the LIC, it should also be mentioned that the ratio of its expenses of management to total outgo has fallen from 48% in 1973-74 to 39% in 1977-78. In fact, even in absolute terms its total expenses excluding as payments to policy-holders have increased by just 31% over these years. Consequently, its not annual contribution to the Life Insurance fund has gained spectacularly year after year and shows a rise of as much as 60% over the last five years from Rs. 345.74 crores in 1973-74 to Rs. 547.82 crores in 1977-78. Not a mean achievement by any standard. Unfortunately, the critics of the LIC management and employee efficiency seem to have ignored this significant development altogether. After all, Rome was not built in a day."

This is the observation of a Journal brought out by one of the top monopoly houses which is well-known for its antipathy to the public sector. Even they are having to make this admission !

I do not want to take more time. I think it is better for the time being to avoid this sort of pseudo-economic and financial arguments because by they are not going to prove anything. And then we have to go into all the other public sector undertaking and the Government departments themselves to find out whether anywhere you have applied the same measure,

to and out whether because the cost of administration in your Government departments has gone up in such an unconscionable way, you have decided to reduce the emoluments of your officers of your employees unilaterally by an executive order ? Have you done it anywhere in the name of bringing down the administrative cost of your Government departments ? Can you do it ? I say that you cannot do it unless you take that extreme measure of recourse to Article 360 and declare a financial emergency in this country. You are trying to carry out the measure of financial emergency without declaring the emergency openly. That is what you are doing. So many other things are being done in the case of other emergency provisions also.

15.00 hrs.

Therefore, I feel that the House cannot at all be satisfied with the explanation given for what the Government has done. You can pass anything. That is a different matter. That is all right. Why not dispense with this House altogether if you want to save the trouble of listening to us talking also !

Therefore, I appeal once again to the Government. I am appealing only from one angle. Please do not stir up a horn's nest. If you want to take this category of employees out of the Industrial Disputes Act, come forward with an amending Bill to the Industrial Disputes Act and say there specifically, that this Act, the provisions of this Act, will not apply to the LIC employees. (Interruptions).

AN HON. MEMBER : That is what the Court meant by legislation.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA : Of course, that is what the Court meant by legislations. Do it. Why don't you have the courage to do it ? Why are you resorting to this subterfuge ? Then, gradually you can have a

Schedule ; as other Acts have Schedules, You can have a Schedule to the Industrial Disputes Act and go on adding, putting, more and more categories of employees, into that Schedule every year or several times in a year saying that they have to be taken out of the Industrial Disputes Act. Do it by all means and you will be responsible for wrecking the whole edifice of industrial relations which is sought to be built up in this country with the help of the Industrial Disputes Act.

Therefore, please don't do it. Retrace your steps while there is still time. That shall I want to say. Of course, as far as this Ordinance and the Bill go, we will oppose them lock, stock and barrel.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I shall now put the Statutory Resolution to the vote of the House. The question is :

"This House disapproves of the Life Insurance Corporation (Amendment) Ordinance, 1981 (Ordinance No. 3 of 1981) promulgated by the President on the 31st January, 1981."

The Lok Sabha divided.

Division No. 3] [15.07 hrs.

AYES

Acharia, Shri Basudeb
Agarwal, Shri Satish
Balanandan, Shri E.
Barman, Shri Palas
Basu, Shri Chitta
Biswas, Shri Ajoy
Bosu, Shri Jyotirmoy
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib
Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
Das, Shri R. P.
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Hannan Mollah, Shri

Jatiya, Shri Satyanarayan
Madhukar, Shri Kamla Mishra
Maitra, Shri Sunil
Mandal, Shri Dhanik Lal
Masudal Hosain, Shri Syed
Mhalgi, Shri R. K.
Mukherjee, Shrimati Geeta,
Pandit, Dr. Vasant Kumar
Pathak, Shri Ananda
Rajan, Shri K. A.
Roy Pradhan, Shri Amar
Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
Verma, Shri R. L. P.
Yadav, Shri Vijay Kumar
Zainal Abedin, Shri

NOES

Ahmad, Shri Mohammad Asrar
Alluri, Shri Subhash Chandra Bose
Anand Singh, Shri
Ankineedu Prasad Rao, Shri P.
Arakal, Shri Xavier
Bagun Sumbhui, Shri
Bansi Lal, Shri
Barot, Shri Maganbhai
Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram
Bhatia, Shri R.L.
Bhole, Shri R. R.
Chakradhari Singh, Shri
Chandrakar, Shri Chandu Lal
Chavan, Shri S. B.
Chingwang Konyak, Shri
Dennis, Shri N.
Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan
Dhandapani, Shri C. T
Doongar Singh, Shri
Era Anbarasu, Shri
Gehlot, Shri Ashok
Jaffer Sharief, Shri C.K.
Jain, Shri Bhiku Ram
Jain, Shri Viridhi Chander
Jamilur Rahman, Shri

Kalanidih, Dr. A.
 Kaul, Shrimati Shiela
 Kusuma Krishna Murthy, Shri
 *Mandal, Shri Sanat Kumar
 Mishra, Shri Nityananda
 Murugian, Shri S.
 Muttemwar, Shri Vilas
 Nagaratnam, Shri T.
 Nair, Shri B.K.
 Namgyal, Shri P.
 Nandi Yellaih, Shri
 Netam, Shri Arvind
 Nihal Singh, Shri
 Odedra, Shri Maldevji M.
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Panday, Shri Kedar
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Pardhi, Shri Keshao Rao
 Patel, Shri Mohanbhai
 Patel, Shri Shantubhai
 Patil, Shri A.T.
 Patil, Shri Balasaheb Vikhe
 Patil, Shri Chandrabhan Athare
 Patil, Shri Veerendra
 Phulwariya, Shri Virda Ram
 Quadri, Shri S. T.
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.
 Rao, Shri Jagannath
 Rao, Shri M. Nageswara
 Rathod, Shri Uttam
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Ravani, Shri Navin
 Rawat, Shri Harisha Chandra Singh
 Reddy, Shri G. Narsimha
 Reddy, Shri K. Brahmananda
 Reddy, Shri K. Vijaya Bhaskara
 Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
 Reddy, Shri P. Venkata

Reddy, Shri T. Damodar
 Sahu, Shri Shiv Prasad
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shaktawat, Prof. Nirmala Kumari
 Shakyawar, Shri Nathuram
 Shankaranad, Shri B.)
 Sharma, Shri, Chiranjali Lal
 Sharma, Shri Kali Charan
 Shastri, Shri Dharam Dass
 *Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
 Shiv Shankar, Shri P.
 Singaravadivel, Shri S
 Singh, Shri C. P. N.
 Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
 Sukhadia, Shri Mohan Lal
 Sultanpuri, Shri Krishan Datt
 Suryawanshi, Shri Narsing
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri
 Tewary, Prof. K. K.
 Thorat, Shri Bhausahab
 Tiwari, Shri Narayan Datt
 Venkataraman, Shri R.
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Verma, Shrimati Usha
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Wagh, Dr. Pratap
 Yadav, Shri Ram Singh
 Yazdani, Dr. Golam

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Subject to correction, the result** of the Division is :

Ayes—27; Noes —91.

The motion was negatived.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Before I put the motion for consideration of the Bill to vote, there are some amendments which have to be

*Wrongly Voted for Noes.

**The following Members also recorded their votes.

AYES: Sarvashree Mohammed Ismail, A.K. Balan, Subodh Sen, Sanat Kumar Mandal and Ramavatar Shastri:

NOES: Sarvashree Bahunlal Solanki, Munder Sharma, Chittari Subha Rao Choudary, H.N. Nanje Gowda, Udaysinghrao Gaekwad, Haninatha Misra, Tariq Anwar and N. Selvaraju.

disposed of. One is by Shri Somnath Chatterjee—he is not here.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna): I want to speak.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is only the consideration motion and members have already spoken.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: I want to put forward my arguments why it should be circulated for eliciting public opinion. Please give me at least 5 minutes.....(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is only consideration motion..... Mr. Bosu, please tell him.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU: Yes, Sir.....I have made him to agree for 4 minutes!

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, the question is :

“That the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon by the 30th June, 1981.”(1)

The Lok Sabha divided.

Division No. 4] [15-11 hrs.

AYES

Acharia, Shri Basudeb
 Agarwal, Shri Satish
 Balanandan, Shri E.
 Biswas, Shri Ajoy
 Bosu, Shri Jyotirmoy
 Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
 Das, Shri R.P.
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit
 Hannan Mollah, Shri
 Jatiya, Shri Satyanarayan
 Madhukar, Shri Kamla Mishra
 Mitra, Shri Sunil
 Mandal, Shri Sanat Kumar

Masudal Hossain, Shri Syed
 Mhalgi, Shri R.K.
 Mohammed Ismail, Shri
 Mukherjee, Shrimati Geeta
 Pandit, Dr. Vasant Kumar
 Pathak, Shri Ananda
 Rajan, Shri K.A.
 Roy Pradhan, Shri Amar
 Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
 Verma, Shri R.L.P.
 Yadav, Shri Vijay Kumar
 Zainal Abedian, Shri

NOES

Ahmad, Shri Mohammad Asrar
 Alluri, Shri Subhash Chandra Bose
 Anand Singh, Shri
 Ankineedu Prasad Rao, Shri P.
 Arakal, Shri Xavier
 Bagun Sumbhui, Shri
 Bansi Lal, Shri
 Barot, Shri Maganbhai
 Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram
 Bhatia, Shri R.L.
 Bhole, Shri R.R.
 Chakradhari Singh, Shri
 Chandrakar, Shri Chandu Lal
 Chavan, Shri S. B.
 Chingwang Konyak, Shri
 Dennis, Shri N.
 Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan
 Dhandapani, Shri C.T.
 Doongar Singh, Shri
 Era Anbarasu, Shri
 Gaikwad, Shri Udaysingrao
 Gehlot, Shri Ashok
 Gowda, Shri H. N. Nanje
 Jaffer Sharief, Shri C.K.
 Jain, Shri Bhiku Ram
 Jain, Shri Virdhi Chander
 Jamilur Rahman, Shri
 Kalanidhi, Dr. A.
 Kaul, Shrimati Sheila

Kusuma Krishna Murthy, Shri
 Misra, Shri Harinatha
 Misra, Shri Nityananda
 Murugian, Shri S.
 Muttemwar, Shri Vilas
 Nagaratnam, Shri
 Nair, Shri B.K.
 Namgyal, Shri P.
 Nandi Yellaiah, Shri
 Netam, Shri Arvind
 Nihal Singh, Shri
 Odedra, Shri Maldevji M.
 Oraon, Shri Kartik
 Panday, Shri Kedar
 Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Pardhi, Shri Keshao Rao
 Patel, Shri Mohanbhai
 Patel, Shri Shantubhai
 Patil, Shri A.T.
 Patil, Shri Balasaheb Vikhe
 Patil, Shri Chandrabhan Athare
 Patil, Shri Veerendra
 Phulwariya, Shri Virda Ram
 Quadri, Shri S.T.
 Ranga, Prof. N.G.
 Rao, Shri Jagannath
 Rao, Shri M. Nageswara
 Rathod, Shri Uttam
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Ravani, Shri Navin
 Rawat, Shri Harish Chandra Singh
 Reddy, Shri G. Narsimha
 Reddy, Shri K. Brahmananda
 Reddy, Shri K. Vijaya Bhaskara
 Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
 Reddy, Shri P. Venkata
 Reddy, Shri T. Damodar

Sahu, Shri Shiv Prasad
 Sethi, Shri P.C.
 Shaktawat, Prof. Nirmala Kumari
 Shakyawar, Shri Nathuram
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri Chiranji Lal
 Sharma, Shri Kali Charan
 Sharma, Shri Mundar
 Shastri, Shri Dharam Dass
 Shiv Shankar, Shri P.
 Singaravadivel, Shri S.
 Singh, Shri C.P.N.
 Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
 Solanki, Shri Babu Lal
 Sultanpuri, Shri Krishan Dutt
 Suryawanshi, Shri Narsing
 Swaminathan, Shri R.V.
 Tariq Anwar, Shri
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri
 Tewary, Prof. K.K.
 Thorat, Shri Bhausahab
 Tiwari, Shri Narayan Datt
 Venkataraman, Shri R.
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Verma, Shrimati Usha
 Virbhadr Singh, Shri
 Wagh, Dr. Pratap
 Yadav, Shri Ram Singh
 Yazdani, Dr. Golam

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Subject to correction, the result* of the Division is:

Ayes: 26

Noes: 95

The motion was negatived.

*The following Members also recorded their votes:

AYES: Sarvashree Tridib Chaudhuri, A. K. Balan and Subodh Sen.

NOES: Sarvashree Chitturi Subba Rao Chaudary, Mohan Lal Sukhadia and N. Selvaraju.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now
the question is:

"That the Bill be circulated
for the purpose of eliciting public
opinion thereon by the 13th
July, 1981." (10)

The Lok Sabha divided.

Division No. 4] [15.11 hrs.

AYES

Acharia, Shri Basudeb
Agarwal, Shri Satish
Balanandan, Shri E.
Biswa, Shri Ajoy
Bosu, Shri Jyotirmoy
Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
Das, Shri R. P.
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Hannan Mollah, Shri
Jatiya, Shri Satyanarayan
Madhukar, Shri Kamla Mishra
Maitra, Shri Sunil
Mandal, Shri Sanat Kumar
Masudal Hossain, Shri Syed
Mhalgi, Shri R. K.
Mohammed Ismail, Shri
Mukherjee Shrimati Geeta
Pandit, Dr. Vasant Kumar
Pathak, Shri Ananda
Rajan, Shri K. A.
Roy Pradhan, Shri Amar
Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
Verma, Shri R. L. P.
Yadav, Shri Vijay Kumar
Zaitaj Abedian, Shri

NOES

Ahmad, Shri Mohammad Asrar
Alluri, Shri Subhash Chandra Bose
Anand Singh, Shri
Ankineedu Prasad Rao, Shri P.
Arakal, Shri Xavier
Bagun Sumbui, Shri
Bansi Lal, Shri
Barot, Shri Maganbhai
Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram
Bhatia, Shri R. L.
Bhole, Shri R. R.
Chakradhari Singh, Shri
Chandrakar, Shri Chandu Lal
Chavan, Shri S. B.
Chingwang Konyak, Shri
Dennis, Shri N.
Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan
Dhandapani, Shri C. T.
Doongar Singh, Shri
Era Anbarasu, Shri
Gaikwad, Shri Udaysingrao
Gehlot, Shri Ashok
Gowda, Shri H. N. Nanje
Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.
Jain, Shri Bhiku Ram
Jain, Shri Nihal Singh
Jain, Shri Virdhi Chander
Jamilur Rahman, Shri
Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
Kusuma Krishna Murthy, Shri
Misra, Shri Harinatha
Misra, Shri Nityananda
Murugian, Shri S.
Muttamwar, Shri Vilas
Nagaratnam, Shri T.
Nair, Shri B. K.
Namgyal, Shri P.
Nandi Yellaiah, Shri
Netam, Shri Arvind
Odedra, Shri Maldevji M.
Oraon, Shri Kartik
Panday, Shri Kedar
Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani

Pardhi, Shri Kesharao
 Patel, Shri Mohanbhai
 Patel, Shri Shantubhai
 Patil, Shri A. T.
 Patil, Shri Balasaheb Vikhe
 Patil, Shri Chandrabhan Athare
 Patil, Shri Veerendra
 Phulwariya, Shri Virda Ram
 Quadri, Shri S. T.
 Ranga, Prof. N. G.
 Rao, Shri Jagannath
 Rao, Shri M. Nageswara
 Rathod, Shri Uttam
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Ravani, Shri Navin
 Rawat, Shri Harish Chandra Singh
 Reddy, Shri G. Narsimha
 Reddy, Shri K. Brahmananda
 Reddy, Shri K. Vijaya Bhaskara
 Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
 Reddy, Shri P. Venkata
 Reddy, Shri T. Damodar
 Sahu, Shri Shiv Prasad
 Sethi, Shri P. C.
 Shaktawat, Prof. Nirmala Kumari
 Shakyawar, Shri Nathuram
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri Chiranjil Lal
 Sharma, Shri Kali Charan
 Sharma, Shri Mundar
 Shastri, Shri Dharam Dass
 Shiv Shankar, Shri P.
 Singaravadiel, Shri S.
 Singh, Shri C. P. N.
 Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
 Solanki, Shri Babu Lal
 Sukhadia, Shri Mohan Lal
 Sultanpuri, Shri Krishan Dutt
 Suryawanshi, Shri Narsing

Swaminathan, Shri R. V.
 Tariq Anwar, Shri
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri
 Tewary, Prof. K.K.
 Thorat, Shri Bhausahab
 Tiwari, Shri Narayan Datt
 Venkataraman, Shri R.
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Verma, Shrimati Usha
 Virbhadra Singh, Shri
 Wagh, Dr. Pratap
 Yadav, Shri Ram Singh
 Yazdani, Dr. Golam

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Subject to correction, the result of the division is:

Ayes: 26

Noes: 95

The motion was negatived.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU:
 Sir, I am on a point of order. Since the machine is out of order, the consideration of the Bill may be postponed.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I rule your point of order as out of order.

Now I shall put the motion for consideration to the vote of the House.

The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956, be taken into consideration."

The Lok Sabha divided.

Division No. 6] [15.17 hrs.

AYES

Ahmad, Shri Mohammad Asrar
 Alluri, Shri Subhash Chandra Bose
 Anand Singh, Shri
 Ankincedu Prasad Rao, Shri P.
 Arakal, Shri Xavier
 Bagun Sumbrui, Shri
 Bansi Lal, Shri
 Barot, Shri Maganbhai
 Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram
 Bhatia, Shri R.L.
 Bhole, Shri R.R.
 Chakradhri Singh, Shri
 Chandrakar, Shri Chandu Lal
 Chavan, Shri S.B.
 Chingwang Konyak, Shri
 Dennis, Shri N.
 Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan
 Dhandapani, Shri C.T.
 Doongar Singh, Shri
 Era Anbarasu, Shri
 Gaikwad, Shri Udaysingrao
 Gehlot Shri Ashok
 Gowda, Shri H.N. Nanje
 Jaffer Sharief, Shri C.K.
 Jain, Shri Bhiku Ram
 Jain, Shri Nihal Singh
 Jain, Shri Virdhi Chander
 Jamilur Rahman, Shri
 Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
 Kusuma Krishna Murthy, Shri
 Misra, Shri Harinatha
 Misra, Shri Nityananda
 Muttemwar, Shri Vilas
 Nagaratna, Shri T.
 Nair, Shri B.K.
 Namgyal, Shri P.
 Nandi Yellaiah, Shri
 Netam, Shri Arvind
 Odedra, Shri Maldevji M.
 Orson, Shri Kartik
 Panday, Shri Kedar

Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
 Pardhi, Shri Kesharao
 Patel, Shri Mohanbhai
 Patel, Shri Shantubhai
 Patil, Shri A.T.
 Patil, Shri Balasaheb Vikhe
 Patil, Shri Chandrabhan Athare
 Patil, Shri Veerendra
 Phulwariya Shri Virda Ram
 Quadri, Shri S.T.
 Ranga, Prof. N.G.
 Rao, Shri Jagannath
 Rao, Shri M. Nageswara
 Rathod, Shri Uttam
 Raut, Shri Bhola
 Ravani, Shri Navin
 Rawat, Shri Harish Chandra Singha
 Reddy, Shri G. Narsima
 Reddy, Shri K. Brahmanda
 Reddy, Shri K. Vijaya Bhaskara
 Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
 Reddy, Shri P. Venkata
 Reddy, Shri T. Damodar
 Sahu, Shri Shiv Prasad
 Sethi, Shri P.C.
 Shaktawat, Prof. Nirmala Kumari
 Shakyawar, Shri Nathuram
 Shankaranand, Shri B.
 Sharma, Shri Chiranji Lal
 Sharma, Shri Kali Charan
 Sharma, Shri Mundar
 Shastri, Shri Dharam Dass
 Shiv Shankar, Shri P.
 Singaravadi, Shri S.
 Singh, Shri C.P.N.
 Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
 Solanki, Shri Babu Lal
 Sukhadia, Shri Mohan Lal
 Sultanpuri, Shri Krishan Dutt
 Suryawanshi, Shri Narsing
 Swaminathan, Shri R.V.
 Tariq Anwar, Shri
 Tayyab Hussain, Shri

Tewary, Prof K.K.
 Thorat, Shri Bhausahab
 Tiwari, Shri Narayan Dutt
 Venkataraman, Shri R.
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.
 Verma, Shrimati Usha
 Vibhadra Singh, Shri
 Wagh, Dr. Pratap
 Yadav, Shri Ram Singh
 Yazdani, Dr. Godam

NOES

Acharia, Shri Basudeb
 Agarwal, Shri Satish
 Balan, Shri A. K.
 Balanandan, Shri E.
 Basu, Shri Chitta
 Biswas, Shri Ajoy
 Bosu, Shri Jyotirmoy
 Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib
 Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
 Das, Shri R. P.
 Gupta, Shri Indrajit
 Hannan Mollah, Shri
 Jatiya, Shri Satyanarayan
 Kalanidhi, Dr. A.
 Maitra, Shri Sunil
 Mandal, Shri Dhanik Lal
 Masudal Hossain, Shri Syed
 Mhalgi, Shri R. K.
 Mohammed Ismail, Shri
 Mukherjee, Shrimati Geeta
 *Murugian, Shri S.
 Pandit, Dr. Vasant Kumar
 Pathak, Shri Ananda
 Rajan, Shri K. A.

Roy Pradhan, Shri Amar
 Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
 Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
 Verma, Shri R. L. P.
 Yadav, Shri Vijay Kumar
 Zainal Abedin, Shri

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :
 Subject to correction, the result † of
 the division is :

Ayes : 94

Noes : 30

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 48

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :
 Now we shall take up clause by
 clause Consideration. There are
 amendments.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee. He is
 not here.

Shri Rajan.

SHRI K. A. RAJAN (Trichur) :
 I beg to move :

Page 2,—

after line 2, insert—

“Provided that such terms
 and conditions shall not be un-
 favourable to the employees and
 agents as compared to the terms
 and conditions existing prior to
 January 31, 1981.”-(8)

Page 2,—

for lines 5 to 30, substitute—

“(2A) All rules made under this
 section shall be subject to any

*Wrongly voted for NOES.

†The following Members also recorded their Votes :

AYES : Sarvashree Chitturi Subba Rao Chaudhary, N. Sel-
 varaju and S. Murugian.

NOES : Savashree Sanat Kumar Mandal, Kamla Mishra Madhukar and
 Palas Barman.

judgement, decree or order of any court, tribunal or other authority and subject to the provision of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, or any other law or any other agreement, settlement, award or other instruments for the time being in force" (9).

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI : I beg to move :

Page 2,—

for lines 5 to 30, substitute—

"(2A). All rules made under this section shall be subject to any judgement, decree or order of any court, tribunal or other authority and subject to Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 or any agreement, settlement, award or other instrument for the time being in force." (13)

Page 2,—

after line 30, insert—

'(C) for sub-section (3), the following shall be substituted, namely—

"(3) All rules made under this section shall be laid before each House of Parliament within a maximum period of ten days while it is in session or within the said period from the commencement of the next session of the House and shall lapse and cease to be of any effect if the same are not approved in each House by a majority of the total membership of that House and by a majority of not less than three-fourths of the members of the House present and voting." (14)

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : I beg to move :

Page 2,—

after line 2, insert—

"Provided that such terms and conditions shall not affect the

existing rights and/or benefits of the employees and agents, available to them prior to January, 31, 1981." (16)

Page 2,—

for lines 5 to 30, substitute—

"(2A) All rules made under this section shall be in conformity with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act and shall not be in disregard to any judgement; decree or order of any court or any other law or any agreement, settlement, award or other instrument for the time being in force." (17)

SHRI R. L. P. VERMA : I beg to move :

Page 2,—

for lines 5 to 30, substitute—

"(2A) All rules and sub-rules made under this section shall not be contrary to the judgements of Courts, awards of tribunals and the agreements and settlements reached under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947." (19)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Would you agree if I put all the amendments to the Clause together ?

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU : No, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : I am only suggesting.

Mr. Rajan.

SHRI K. A. RAJAN : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, my amendment No. 8 reads as follows :—

"Provided that such terms and conditions shall not be unfavourable to the employees and agents as compared to the terms and conditions existing prior to January 31, 1981."

[Shri K A. Rajan]

Regarding this particular amendment to the Act, at the introductory stage as well the second stage, various points have been raised from the constitutional as well as from the legal points of view on this particular Bill.

Sir, this Bill has been brought in such a condition that this scuttles the root of the industrial relations. There is an anxiety as to what will happen to the Life Insurance Corporation employees. A large number of workers are covered by the Industrial Disputes Act and by various agreements that have been entered into by the L. I. C. for the protection of the service conditions of the employees. Now the Ordinance had been promulgated and this Bill has now been brought forward before the House. Prior to that there is a long history of the agreements entered into by the Life Insurance Corporation employees and the management from 1974 onwards. The agreements were entered into after crossing so many hurdles. The workers fought inch by inch in the courts as well as outside and by bargaining with the management arrived at an agreement with them. This is just to protect their service conditions and so that position should not be disturbed even with this enactment. That is the crux of my amendment which I have moved.

My other amendment reads as follows :—

“(2A) All rules made under this section shall be subject to any judgement, decree or order of any court, tribunal or other authority and subject to the provision of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, or any other law or other instruments for the time being in force”.

Sir, this amendment has been brought forward in the light of the various orders and judgements that

have been referred to by the Member of the Statutory Resolution, Mr. Indrajit Gupta. The whole industrial relations are governed by major Acts like the Industrial Disputes Act. This Act prevails over any other Acts or any other legislations. That provision has been made. The whole industrial relations are going to be affected by this amendment which you are bringing in. The entire working class of the country is aware of the way in which the settlement of 1974 was scuttled. They have to come through various courts and they have to fight so many battles. Sir, how can workers have any faith hereafter in any settlement arrived at with the Government or any other public sector undertaking, if this is going to be the situation hereafter? Sir, Government will have to act as the model employes in respect of all industrial relations. But if they overthrow all cannons of industrial relations what is going to happen? It is going to cause havoc to all industrial relations of the country, if you take away all these things from the purview of the Industrial Disputes Act. Sir, the working class of the country have got some protection of their status and other working conditions. These are protected under the Industrial Disputes Act. You should not take away those rights. This is a very dangerous signal. This is going to cause havoc for the whole working-class movement of the country. I have moved my amendments so that the legitimate rights of the workers are protected. I request the hon. Minister to accept these amendments. Thank you.

श्री रामाक्षर झाखी (पटना) :

उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं सब से पहले धारा नं० 1 पर बोलता हूँ क्योंकि यही अभी विचाराधीन है, बाकी पर मैं बाद में बोलूंगा। मेरा कहना यह है कि मैंने जो संशोधन धारा 1 में किया है उसका संशोधन नं० 11 है— मैं उस पर बोलता हूँ और मेरा संशोधन इस प्रकार है.....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I is under Clause 1. Now we are on Clause 2.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: What about Clause 1 ?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It will come in the end. That is the Title. You are forgetting everything.

श्री रामावतार शास्त्री : ठीक है, मैं क्लॉज 2 के अपने संशोधनों में बोलता हूँ । इस में मेरे तीन संशोधन हैं । आप संशोधन नं० 13 को देखिये इस धारा के अधीन बनाये गये सभी नियम किसी न्यायालय अधिकरण या अन्य प्राधिकरण के किसी निर्णय डिग्री या आदेश के अधीन और औद्योगिक विवाद अधिनियम, 1947 के या उस समय लागू किसी करार, पंचाट या अन्य लिखित समझौते के अधीन होंगे ।

इस का किसी भी तरह से उलंघन नहीं होगा चाहिये - न औद्योगिक विवादों के कानूनों का और न पहले से मजदूरों के बीच में और सरकार के बीच में जो समझौते हुए हैं, उन का उलंघन होना चाहिये अगर किसी न्यायालय ने किसी कर्मचारी के पक्ष में कोई फैसला किया है, उस का भी उलंघन नहीं होना चाहिये - मेरे इस संशोधन का मतलब यही है । लेकिन सरकार खुद उस का उलंघन करना चाहती है । यहाँ पर न्याय या अन्याय की डिबेट नहीं है, बल्कि हाई कोर्ट ने जो फैसला किया है वे उस के उलट जा रहे हैं । औद्योगिक कानून, 1947 को काट रहे हैं, जिस को किसी भी तरह से काटने का हम को अधिकार नहीं है, जब तक कि प्रलय से उस में संशोधन न करें । इस तारीके से बीमा कर्मचारियों पर हमला कर के ये जन तन्त्र पर हमला कर रहे हैं । ट्रेड यूनियन के अधिकार पर हमला कर रहे हैं और

उपाध्यक्ष जी, ट्रेड यूनियन का अधिकार जन तन्त्र का अधिकार हम लोगों ने बहुत मेहनत और कुर्बानी के बाद हासिल किया है मजदूर वर्ग ने हासिल किया है । हम को मजदूरों की बड़ी-बड़ी लड़ाइयाँ लड़नी पड़ी हैं, आप स्वयं भी उन में से बहुत सी लड़ाइयों में रहे होंगे ।

जब हम लोगों ने कहा कि इस को जनता की राय जानने के लिये प्रसारित करो तो ये तर्क देते हैं कि जनता हमारे साथ है । यदि आप ऐसा दावा करते हैं कि जनता आप के साथ है तो फिर चबराते क्यों हैं, चलिये जनता के बीच में, फैसला हो जाएगा । अगर जनता यह कह देगी कि वे कथित बीमा कर्मचारी जो 4 हजार रुपये तनख्वाह पाते हैं उन को नीचे लाना चाहिये अन्य कर्मचारियों की तरह भिन्नमग्य बनाना चाहिये तो हम मान लेंगे । लेकिन जब तक जनता ऐसा नहीं कहे और आप जनता की तरफ से बोलें - यह ठीक नहीं है । यह 1980 का समय नहीं है, एक साल से ज्यादा का समय बीत चुका है, जनता के बीच से आप के पांव उखड़ चुके हैं । अगर सचमुच में अपने पांव नहीं उखड़ने देना चाहते हैं तो उस की राय ले लीजिये । लेकिन आप इस का विरोध करते हैं । इस लिये मैं कह रहा हूँ कि मजदूरों ने बड़ी कुर्बानियों के बाद ट्रेड यूनियन के अधिकार पाये हैं । सरकार की जन-विरोधी और मजदूर विरोधी नीतियों के खिलाफ लड़ते हुए जो शहीद हुए हैं उन का खून बेकार जाने वाला नहीं है इसलिये मैं विवेदन करूँगा कि मेरे इस संशोधन को स्वीकार कर के बीमा कर्मचारियों को जो अधिकार प्राप्त हैं उन अधिकारों पर कोई चोट न की जाय । इस कानून को वापस लिया जाय और इसे रही की टोकरी में डाल दिया जाय ।

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA
(Calcutta North East): My
amendments read:

Page 2,—

after line 2, insert—

“Provided that such terms and conditions shall not affect the existing rights and/or benefits of the employees and agents, available to them prior to January 31, 1981.”(16)

Page 2,—

for lines 5 to 30, substitute—

“(2A) All rules made under this section shall be in conformity with the provisions of the Industrial Disputes Act and shall not be in disregard to any judgement; decree or order of any court or any other law or any agreement, settlement, award or other instrument for the time being in force.”(17)

Sir, while moving the amendments I invite the attention of the hon. Finance Minister to the judgement of the Supreme Court. In exercise of the powers vested in the Government, you are seeking to amend the service conditions regarding bonus and the Dearness Allowance of the L.I.C. employees. Now, I will read out the relevant portion of Mr. Justice Krishna Aiyer:

“The anatomy of the 1974 settlements is no more confined to bonus than the physiology of man is limited to bones. It is an integral, holistic and delicately balanced ensemble of clauses, with cute calculations and hard bargaining on many matters. To dissect is to murder, in the art of true poetry as in the craft of settlement in industry; and, therefore, it is impermissible to single out a clause and extinguish it, as the totality is a living entity which does not permit of dismemberment, limb by limb, without doing violence to the wholeness and identity of

the settlement. Here, the 1974 settlements have brought about a conflict-resolution on a variety of items including (a) scales of pay, (b) method of fixation in the new scales (c) dearness allowances; (d) house rent allowance, (e) city compensatory allowance, etc.”

**THE MINISTER OF STATE
IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME
AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF
PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS
(SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH) :**
Sir, now it is 3-30 P.M. According to the List of Business today the Non-Official Business will start today at 3.30 P.M. I would request Mr. Jyotirmoy Bosu to be more helpful and cooperative so that this discussion may be taken up at 6 O'clock.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :
No, no, it is not possible.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH:
We are already in the second reading of the Bill.

(Interruptions)

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :
Since he has mentioned my name, I would like to say this. Firstly, the mover of this resolution is Shri Indrajit Gupta : therefore, it is upto him, to some extent, to say what he wants to say. As far as I am concerned, we would volunteer to cooperate with them, and I suggest that we should do it on Monday because many of our Members who have accepted engagements outside have got tickets and are going out. Therefore, to sit beyond 6 O'clock today is next to impossible.

**SHRI ATAL BEHARI VAJ-
PAYEE (New Delhi) :** We had suggested yesterday when we were discussing the Gujarat situation that the discussion might be taken up today after 6 O'clock after the non-official business was over, but the treasury benches were not prepared to accommodate us. You cannot have one-way traffic.

SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH :
I only reiterated what was decided in the Business Advisory Committee. What we said yesterday was that it was agreed in the Business Advisory Committee that the discussion on Gujarat situation would be over on that particular date. That was made clear also. We are now in the stage of second reading of the Bill. There are only four clauses. It would not take more than one hour. Let us take it up at 6 O'clock and finish today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS :
No, no.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :
It is not acceptable ; we will take up this Bill on Monday.

SHRI BHISHMA NARAIN SINGH : After 6 O'clock.

SHRI JYOTIRMOY BOSU :
We will see on that day.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :
Now, Private Members' Business.

15.32 hrs.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

SIXTEENTH REPORT

SHRI DONGAR SINGH (Hamirpur) : I beg to move :

"That this House do agree with the Sixteenth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 3rd March, 1981."

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER :
The question is :

"That this House do agree with the Sixteenth Report of the Com-

mittee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions presented to the House on the 3rd March, 1981."

The motion was adopted.

15.33 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL*

(AMENDMENT OF ARTICLES 324, 325, ETC.)

SHRI G. NARASIMHA REDDY (Adilabad) : Sir, this Bill has financial involvements. Earlier, our office did not detect it. Now, they have detected and have informed me. I have already applied to the President of India for permission.

I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The question is :

"That leave be granted to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India."

The motion was adopted.

SHRI G. NARASIMHA REDDY : I introduce the Bill.

15.34 hrs.

CONSTITUTION (AMENDMENT) BILL*

(AMENDMENT OF ARTICLE 171)

SHRI ERA ANBARASU (Changalpattu) : I beg to move for leave to introduce a Bill further to amend the Constitution of India.