

8. The Manipur and Tripura (Repeal of Laws) Bill, 1958 . . . 30 mts.
9. The Rajghat Samadhi (Amendment) Bill, 1958. . . . . 1 hr.
10. The Delhi Rent Control Bill, 1958 (For reference to a Joint Committee) . . . 2 hrs. 30 mts.
11. The Merchant Shipping Bill, 1958 . . . . . 5 hrs.
12. The Indian Medical Council (Amendment) Bill, 1958. . . . . 1 hr.
13. The Appropriation Bill relating to Supplementary Demands for Grants . . 1 hr. 30 mts.
14. The Supreme Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Bill, 1958. . . . . 1 hr. 30 mts.
15. The Workmen's Compensation (Amendment) Bill, 1958 . . . 2 hrs.
16. The International Finance Corporation (Immunities and Privileges) Bill, 1958 . 2 hrs.

OTHER BUSINESS

1. Discussion on Food Situation . . . . . 6 hrs.
2. Discussion on the Planning Commission's Memorandum on Appraisal and Prospects of the Second Five Year Plan . . . . . 3 hrs. 30 mts.
3. Discussion on the Report of the Committee for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals . . . 1 hr. 30 mts.
4. Discussion on the Ganga Barrage Project . . . 2 hrs.
5. Discussion on the Report of the Textile Enquiry Committee, 1958. . . . . 2 hrs.

The Bills mentioned at items 1 to 3, namely, the Sugar Export Promotion Bill, the Central Sales Tax (Second Amendment) Bill and the Estate Duty (Amendment) Bill will be taken up and completed on the 8th and 9th September, 1958. The Banaras Hindu University (Amendment) Bill will be taken up on the 10th September, 1958.

The discussion on the Food Situation will be held on the 15th and 16th September and discussion on the Planning Commission's Memorandum on Appraisal and Prospects of the Second Five Year Plan will be held on the 24th September, 1958.

If extra time is necessary, the House will sit through the lunch hour and also sit extra if necessary.

DR. R. B. GOUR (Andhra Pradesh): There was a motion by Mr. Bhupesh Gupta on the Life Insurance Corporation's investment policy.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: That is to be taken up in the next session. The Finance Minister is not here. It was agreed to, I was told.

RESOLUTION RE. APPOINTMENT OF A COMMITTEE OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT TO EXAMINE THE CAUSES OF INDUSTRIAL UNREST—  
*continued.*

SHRI ABID ALI: Sir, while referring to the Bombay strike of the 25th July because of interruptions this was left out. I wanted to congratulate the workers of Bombay—large numbers of them—for having behaved sensibly in spite of the provocations from the side of some interested parties.

Then, Sir, the premier strike was also mentioned. This started because of a sit-down strike and because of that sit-down strike some charge-sheets were delivered to the workers. Then the question arose about the recognition of the union and the union leaders thought that simply by abuses and *mara mari* they would be able to secure recognition. Ultimately that led to the general strike of the 25th; that is, Sir, the defeat was celebrated. Some organisations in this country have a funny way of doing things. They strike for such a long time; the strikers wanted to go back but they were not being allowed to go back. So they said, first celebrate the defeat in the whole of Bombay. Let the whole country . . .

**SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA:** Is it proper for the Labour Minister to speak about labour in this manner? You see how he is ridiculing labour.

**SHRI D. A. MIRZA:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I wish to know whether the Communist Party was responsible for such strikes because I find that the Leader of the Opposition is very much upset whenever . . .

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** Order, order.

**SHRI ABID ALI:** So this 25th . . .

**DR. R. B. GOUR:** He is happy at the victory of the employers.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** The time is limited.

**SHRI ABID ALI:** Sir, I have not spoken for more than 15 minutes.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** No, no.

**SHRI ABID ALI:** They have been speaking, not I.

**MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN:** You have taken 23 minutes.

**SHRI ABID ALI:** The time taken—from the time when I began up to this moment—is 23 minutes but the time taken by others should not be included. Anyway, I shall try to finish as early as possible.

So far as this automobile strike is concerned, there was no police near about it. It was withdrawn. The employers wanted to work with the help of non-strikers and the police did not help them. They said if the workers had gone on strike and if the employers did not want to accept their demands, they must settle the dispute between themselves. So this charge that the police always comes in to break up a strike is wrong. Mention was made about Katihar mills. If the employers have closed down the mill what can be done? We are not dictators; we follow democratic principles. Sometimes the workers go wrong and sometimes the employers also go wrong. Action has to be taken accord-

ing to law. An Act has been passed in Bombay for action when such a situation arises, when mills close down, when factories are closed down. Even that is opposed by hon. Members which is very much surprising. Mention was made about the strike in the Andhra Electrical Installation and reference was made to Burnpur also. Even about Kerala we get so many suggestions from unions which are not to the liking of hon. Members opposite. What can we do? This is a matter which is within the State's sphere. It has to be settled at that level; not that here we can act as dictators. Mention was also made about the oil workers and it was said that we had made certain promises. All this is wrong. Something has appeared in the newspapers as well. We have not made any promises. When the leaders of the Oil Workers Federation met us we told them that this was within the States' sphere. Tell us what you want to be communicated to them and after ascertaining the views of the State Governments and after telling the employers that these are your demands, we will consider in the light of what the State Governments advise us. So this claim that we have given an assurance about national tribunal is not correct.

About manganese ore, complaints were made that the mines are closing down but the hon. Member who made this reference knows that this is an article for export. If there is no demand from the countries where it is used, the mine has to be closed. What else can be done? Formerly, there was no retrenchment or lay-off compensation. Now, fortunately Parliament has passed an amendment to the Industrial Disputes Act and they are compensated according to law. Jute is also an export industry and the requirements of world competition have to be borne in mind while dealing with such industries.

Then, Sir, it was said that more man-days were lost but I do not know from where these figures have been obtained. So far as 1956 and

1957 are concerned, the number of man-days lost in 1956 was 69,92,040 while in 1957 it was 49,82,229. So there was a decrease and not an increase. Of course, in 1958 there is a likelihood of some increase because of the strike forced on the workers, as I said earlier, in Jamshedpur, ports and docks and the like.

Reference was also made to the enrolment in employment exchanges. Their number is going up not because there is more unemployment but also because the employment exchanges are getting more popular. It is not that those who are registered at the employment exchanges are all unemployed. Many employed people also get themselves registered and many who are unemployed are not registered. Of course, during the Second Plan period about 65 lakhs more employment opportunities are likely to be created in industries like construction, mines, small scale industries, transport and communications, trade, commerce and other social services. Now, my good friend from Madhya Pradesh, Shri Malviya, has made some complaint about . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: We are your bad friends, is it?

SHRI ABID ALI: Let us proceed. Now, regarding Shri Malviyaji's complaint about Birla and the Kerala Government's agreement, perhaps it would be better that I should not make any reference to it at this stage. Of course, he belongs to I.N.T.U.C. and has got the backing of a very powerful organisation which has the support of a very large number of industrial workers in the country and it should be taken care of at that level.

About Gorakhpur labour there is much room for improvement. I quite appreciate it and the Advisory Committee concerning this organisation will be meeting very soon and I hope that it will be possible to get some favourable decision reached there.

Now, about the wage policy, I may submit, as hon. Members are aware,

that article 43 of the Indian Constitution lays down as one of the Directive Principles that the State shall endeavour to secure to all workers a living wage and conditions of work ensuring a decent standard of life. The acceptance of the socialist pattern of society as the objective of State policy and the Second Five Year Plan have given a further fillip to the principle by promoting the cause of fair wages. Whereas Government is very anxious to give effect to the objectives, other considerations also have to be borne in mind. Paying capacity, wage differentials, the need to give consistent direction to the determination of fair wages, the promotion of full employment and growing possibilities with increasing industrial production and productivity are some of the points that call for attention. A wage policy to facilitate the growth of a socialist society on these lines, it may be seen, has both economic and social implications. From the economic point of view, inflationary pressures or pressures on balance of payments have to be avoided. It has also to be seen that productivity is promoted and thus the growth of savings and capital formation encouraged. On the social side, the need is for a reduction of inequalities in income and wealth and more even distribution of national production. The wage policy has to be directed towards lessening of gaps between the top wage and the lowest wage. Now, Sir . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: Only the Secretariat brief seems to be the reasonable portion of his speech.

SHRI ABID ALI: Now, Sir, the hon. Mover of the Resolution made a mention that the wages have gone down. It is not so. The real wages have been going up continuously from 1950 onwards. The index of real wage had gone up from 90 in 1950 to 102 in 1954 and 116 in 1955. Proper comparison can be made from 1951 onwards. In this period the share of wages in factories has been fluctuating between 43 and 45. There is another point which requires to be taken into account in

[Shri Abid Ali.]  
judging this share. It is not as if the balance has all gone in the hands of the employers. There can be at least three distinct claimants for the balance: (a) the employer; (b) the capital invested; and (c) the exchequer. The share of the last named has been on the increase with the operation of the planned system in our country. Compared to 1948 when the share was only 7 per cent, the 1955 figure shows that it stood at 9.3 per cent. So far as the employers' share is concerned, on the basis of 29 industries analysed in the Census of Manufactures, it has gone down from 46.8 per cent in 1948 to 42.09 per cent in 1955. In any case, there are a number of limitations on this kind of analysis and these limitations have been brought out clearly in our publication "Some Papers on Wage Policy."

Now, Sir, reference was made to *lathis* and bullets and use of the army and it was said that whenever workers go on strike, the military is called to suppress them. It should be known, everybody knows it, and they also believe it, that military is not called to suppress a strike. They are only called when some people want to destroy property. As I have mentioned earlier if sufficient protection had not been given to the Jamshedpur steel works, the whole thing would have been blown off. What would be the fate of the country and what would have happened to the Five Year Plan? Certainly, the military and all that is possible should be called to help protect these works of ours, to stop mischief, to check mischief. About that no complaint should be made. I have made known to this House only a fraction of what has happened, purposely because for all those horrible things which took place there, much more was planned. If those things had happened then Jamshedpur would not have existed today . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

SHRI ABID ALI: Including the Communists there.

Now, Sir, in conclusion, I beg to submit that so far as we are concerned, we do not want any worker to be victimised for trade union activities—not one single individual. And there are union leaders who do things which are not proper and there are employers also who are not behaving. Always we request trade unionists...

DR. R. B. GOUR: And there are Deputy Ministers like you.

SHRI ABID ALI: Also they admit at the various conferences about which I made mention in the morning. The attempt is to have happier industrial relations and to have a genuine, strong, decent, useful, representative, trade union organisation of the workers. This cannot be done by strikes, lock-outs, and violence. For that much work has to be done. To show that I can call workers to strike, does not show the strength of the trade union movement. The strength lies in sitting across the table and getting something for the good of the worker, for the good of the industry, so that the industry . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: But the employers refuse to sit across the table. What are we to do? That is what Tatas did—your patrons.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI ABID ALI: And the best way of doing all these things—I would request the friends opposite—is to follow what the Labour Minister of Kerala and the Chief Minister of Kerala have been advising the people.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Give the advice to Tatas. They refuse to talk to us.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order.

SHRI ABID ALI: Now, I have been telling them to follow what their Labour Minister and Chief Minister say. Why should they be annoyed?

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time. Order, order.

SHRI ABID ALI: Please stop these interruptions.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: He has to finish his speech.

SHRI ABID ALI: It should be possible . . .

DR. R. B. GOUR: Give him more time.

SHRI ABID ALI: About the demand for committees, there have been demands that we should have made an enquiry into the Kerala affairs.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Do it.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This cannot go on at this rate, Dr. Gour.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Let this Committee do it, if you like.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Order, order. Go on, Mr. Abid Ali.

SHRI ABID ALI: Simply because some people say that there is a case for enquiry, it does not mean that there is a real case. As I submitted earlier, there are so many committees and conferences and there is also the Informal Committee of the Members of Parliament, consisting of about 60 or 70 Members. All these bodies take care of the requirements and, therefore, there is not the slightest justification for the appointment of any Committee. We want the country to flourish and the share of the prosperity should be equitably distributed, and everyone should get his due. About that, of course, hon. Members also have no quarrel. Industrial relations can become happier and better not by law, not by these committees, but by creating an atmosphere and that is what we are doing through the industrial courts and through the tripartite conferences. For that, of course, hon. Members when they sit in the conference agree and we always hope that they will honour these agreements.

Sir, with these words, I oppose the Resolution. If the hon. Member does not like to withdraw it, it should be defeated. I would request the House to reject it.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE (Bombay): How many minutes will I get, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You will get fifteen minutes.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: I thought it would be thirty minutes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Thirty minutes in the beginning and fifteen minutes at the end.

DR. R. B. GOUR: He took more than half-an-hour. At least that much should be given to him.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Your Leader has taken more time.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Cut out four minutes that Bhupesh took but the Minister took something more than half-an-hour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have disturbed him for at least five minutes.

DR. R. B. GOUR: Five Minutes also on account of disturbance may be cut. You cut five minutes of Mr. Gupta's speech and five or ten minutes of this disturbance and then give the extra.

SHRI D. A. MIRZA: If they behave like good boys, everything will be all right.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It applies to all.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: How many minutes for him, Sir?

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: I do not want to go into statistics about the time. I shall try to finish as early as possible and keep within the schedule. There were a number of speeches and they have raised a number of points. It would probably embarrass me to cover them all in the little space of time given to me and I would crave your indulgence a little in case the need arises.

[Shri Lalji Pendse.]

I must confess to a feeling of disappointment with the trend of the discussion. It took little notice of the merits or the demerits of the Resolution and suffered more from a fear complex and prejudice. Speaker after speaker referred to or attacked Communism or the doings or mis-doings of the Communists in this country. I suppose that was very irrelevant so far as the terms of the Resolution are concerned but from tenor of the speeches, I felt that the spectre of Communism was haunting the hon. Members no less than it is haunting the whole capitalist world. If we understand our country to be a truly democratic country with the people as sovereign, I do not see why this House should suffer from that haunt unless, of course the sovereignty was put under parenthesis or a question-mark, out from studying anything new or out of the way suggested and, slowly degenerate us into stagnation. Even the hon. Prof. Wadia was not free from this complex. Remarking on my Resolution, he confessed that, on the face of it, the Resolution had nothing objectionable about it but, nonetheless, he said, it aroused suspicion especially since it came from Communist quarters. Now, I do not know the hard logic behind this. Anyway, he has done well in stating it so bluntly that the Communists would know better where they stand in their responsibility to create confidence in different strata of society if they desire to be a national party. Sir, suspicion begets suspicion and in turn breeds antagonism. For a philosopher, it is not enough to record the existence of antagonism. The dynamics of philosophy requires that the antagonism is sublimated into a harmonious synthesis, and if there was antagonism or unrest, one had to go to the roots of the cause and try to scotch them. But, Sir, the feeling uppermost in my mind, as I heard Prof. Wadia, was that he was merely speaking from his lips and not from his heart. Maybe he had to speak and he spoke but his admission that the Resolution was unobjec-

tionable was good so far as this debate is concerned.

Shri Malviya doubted the efficacy of a committee of enquiry that I had suggested but lent his powerful support to the contention of the Resolution. Fact after fact he cited to show that there were causes, grave causes, promoting unrest holding employers and even at times Government responsible. I was happy that in the other case—I think it was Mrs. Parmanand, I do not know her name—another hon. Member also told us the same thing. She also disputed the advisability of setting up committees because her interpretation was novel and I would profit by it. She said that during the tenure of the committees, greater troubles arise. It all depends upon how the committees proceed, upon how the employers behave or maybe, how the workers are insinuated. I do not know. But then she also complained about sabotage and depression on the part of the employers. Shri Malviya cited facts in support of the contention of my Resolution but did not suggest a remedy nor accept mine. Now, that was something very irksome. A motion without an operative part leads us only to wilderness and that is not my attempt after having spent usefully so many hours on this debate. I hope Shri Malviya sees this point and supports the Resolution that I have put before this House.

The next was an elder here, Shri Saksena. I have not quite understood him but he made out one point.

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: I never spoke anything at all on the Resolution.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: That is an additional privilege of old age, I suppose. Sir, he was the third speaker and he has spoken what I will just repeat. He said . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: When did it happen? Last year?

DR. R. B. GOUR: Fifteen days back

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: On the 22nd of last month. Now, I am with you quite all right. If you cannot remember things fifteen days old, it is doubtful how you were competent to say about Lokamanya Tilak. He said that the Resolution was not properly worded and, in citing that opinion, he invoked the spirits of the late Lokamanya Tilak. That was quite in the manner of the Hindu ritual when they employ a cocoanut or a betel nut as a vehicle to invoke the deity to secure benedictions. I doubt if he has secured ar because his attempt was to ridicule me. He said, "I am surprised that the person coming from that part of the country from where the great Lokamanya came should have moved this Resolution criticising the Congress and employers." If he wants to carry

3 P.M. consolation that he knew Lokamanya Tilak much more than I profess to know, his age gives him the advantage but we know the, hard fact that—the Congress, whatever it was then—Lokamanya had to spend the whole of his life in fighting that Congress. We cannot afford to ignore the Surat Congress of 1907. There we are with that invocation. But he suggested that the Resolution was one-sided in that it did not mention about the employees. That was also the complaint of my revered elder Dr. Kane. I understood it. But I expected them to understand the spirit of my Resolution. The Resolution is based on certain accomplished facts of conventions or decisions arrived at between the 15th and 16th Labour Conferences and those, I have alleged, have been broken by the employers. If that is my contention, how can. I accuse myself at the same time that I am an accuser? I might remind Dr. Kane of the case of another advocate of Bombay—Advocate Harkare. He ended his life with accusing himself for spreading sedition and in securing conviction for life. I don't want to perform that feat. Therefore I have omitted the mention of labour, not because of forgetfulness but for the reason of definite understanding of the problem. Then Shri Thomas

55 RSD--3.

appeared to me equally frightful about the Communists. He can have his quarrels with them. I don't want to intervene. But then, I have not quite understood the propriety of drawing in USSR or other friendly Communist countries. He wanted probably to show that there was also earth and mud and not heaven in those countries. My sole concern is Bharat and I look at the world or the exterior phenomena strictly from the point of view of the interests of my country but then that is different from considering India in isolation. That is why I am not afraid of studying the experiments which other countries are making, notably China on the agricultural front to which so many of my friends referred, and I would not fight shy of borrowing from them anything that is useful for solving the problem of this country. After all we go about borrowing money at extravagant rates of interest and we are not ashamed of it but Mr. Thomas brought in the poverty of India which is proverbial not because it was bad or shameful but only to justify the reduction of wages or to deny the due increases. Yes, we are all agreed that this country is poor, that 80 per cent. of the people as they said—my figures are 73 per cent.—live on agriculture. This we have been hearing decade after decade and yet we are not ashamed of quoting it. What is it that keeps such a large population on an outmoded form of economy as our agriculture is? Unless we are able to lift up half the number of agriculturists and put them on some useful creative vocation, the burden on land will not be lessened. Then there is the present land tenure system which requires to be completely refashioned. Until we have done that, merely crying sentiments over the poverty of agriculturists will not lead us anywhere. Then he referred to some places where workers earn Rs. 15 or Rs. 20 per day. I was happy that it commensurated with the rate of daily allowance here. Three other gentlemen coming from my State made fulminating speeches. I concede them the right to fulminate in that we of the Samy-

[Shri Lalji Pendse.]  
ukta Maharashtra Samiti have flooded them four-square in the last elections and ruined their chances probably, Mr. Deokinandan Narayan's . . .

SHRI SHEEL BHADRA YAJEE: On the basis of linguism, not socialism.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: Yes, division.

(Interruptions)

I will not fight shy of that world division'. Yes. If you have divided the whole country, I have the right to demand that . . .

SHRI H. P. SAKSENA: He says 'linguism'.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: Yes. I am proud of all languages recorded in the Constitution and I do not want any slight being made of any of the languages or injustice meted out to it. He hurled me some challenges. It is not worth while to spend time here. The better place would be his home town to meet him even in front of his house and reply to his challenge.

SHRI DEOKINANDAN NARAYAN: I accept it gladly.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: The other speaker was the hon. Mr. Rajbhoj. There is one thing about the hon. Member. I have always admired his power of oration. He has a fine knack of weaving words into meaningless sentences. If it was not for that, he should have been a real Raja Bhoj, but because of the omission of one *matra*, he has just become a Rajbhoj, a meaningless term again. (Interruption) It will not pay him to provoke me, Sir.

Then Dr. Parmanand referred to—and very rightly—the record of labour laws since the independence of this country. Yes, I am acquainted with some. I concede that they are very progressive but how many of them have been put into operation? The Vedas are fine, enchanting:

सर्वेऽत्र सुखिनः सन्तु ।

सर्वे सन्तु निरामयाः ॥

सर्वे भद्राणि पश्यन्तु ।

मा कश्चित् दुःख माप्नुयात् ॥

But where is the fantasy? Is it in reality existent in this country? So merely having good labour laws on record—of course it is progressive than denying of laws—but it does not help the solution of the problem.

(Time bell rings.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have taken 17 minutes.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: Where do I stand?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You have to wind up.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: Yes, I will drop the others but I must refer to my colleague here Shri Solomon who really did me yeoman service in quoting the Prime Minister, no smaller authority than the Prime Minister. That is also an indictment in a way of the present industrial relations and if you have to improve upon them, I could conceive of no other method, democratic method than the setting up of a committee of enquiry. Now I will turn to two or three points of the hon. Deputy Minister of Labour.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is time.

SHRI LALJI PENDSE: I will finish in two minutes. Sir, I wanted to compliment him in the beginning for the sobriety that he displayed. But then he suddenly flared up into an anti-Communist and anti-Opposition tirade and robbed me of a good chance of complimenting him. At the end again he was sober. He told us many things, but I am now struggling against time and I have none. I will only say that there is another side and a strong side to the contention that he has made.



He referred to the Bombay strike, the recent strike, and he prided that the bus workers reported for work in far greater numbers. May he note that they were permitted to to work, if they wanted? So that is not much of a proof that the strike was a failure. About the philosophy of it, I have to make one point. He said that they at last celebrated a defeat. Now, in the history of our freedom movement, when Himalayan mistakes were made and celebrated, it does not lie in the mouth of the Deputy Minister to say that they celebrated a defeat. I state it was moral courage to have done so.

(Time bell rings.)

Sir, with these words, I place my Resolution in the hands of the House and I hope it will be adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"This House is of opinion that Government should appoint a Committee consisting of not less than 15 members of Parliament representing all political parties and groups to examine the causes of the present industrial unrest as well as the attitude and policies of the employers and Government in the light of the declared objectives of the Second Five Year Plan and to recommend to Government measures which should be taken for improving industrial relations on the basis of the directive principles of the Constitution and in consonance with social justice and democracy."

The House divided:

AYES—13.

Ahmad, Shri Z. A.  
Bose, Dr. A. N.  
Dutta, Shri Trilochan  
Gour, Dr. R. B.  
Gupta, Shri Bhupesh  
Kane, Dr. P. V.  
Khan, Shri Abdur Rezzak

Malviya, Shri Ratanlal Kishorilal  
Nair, Shri Perath Narayanan  
Narasimham, Shri K. L.  
Pendse, Shri Lalji  
Singh, Shri D. P.  
Solomon, Shri P. A.

NOES—30.

Abid Ali, Shri  
Barlingay, Dr. W. S.  
Barooah, Shri Lila Dhar  
Bedavati Buragohain, Shrimati  
Bisht, Shri J. S.  
Deogirikar, Shri T. R.  
Deokinandan Narayan, Shri  
Doogar, Shri R. S.  
Gilder, Dr. M. D. D.  
Kulkarni, Shri G. R.  
Latif, Shri Abdul  
Mahesh Saran, Shri  
Mirza, Shri D. A.  
Misra, Shri S. D.  
Naik, Shri Maheswar  
Pande, Shri T.  
Panigrahi, Shri S.  
Parmanand, Dr. Shrimati Seeta  
Pawar, Shri D. Y.  
Pushpalata Das, Shrimati  
Pustake, Shri T. D.  
Raghubir Sinh, Dr.  
Rajagopalan, Shri G.  
Reddi, Shri B. Gopala  
Sapru, Shri P. N.  
Shah, Shri M. C.  
Singh, Shri Vijay  
Sinha, Shri R. B.  
Valiulla, Shri M.  
Yajee, Shri Sheel Bhadra

The motion was negatived.