

**Title:** Further discussion on the motion of consideration of the Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority Bill, 1999 moved by Shri Yashwant Sinha and amendments thereto moved on the 30th November, 1999. (Continued - Not concluded.)

MR. SPEAKER: The House will now take up Item No.13 - further discussion on the IRDA Bill.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (PANSKURA): Mr. Speaker, Sir, today when we are discussing a Bill to open up the Insurance sector to private companies, about 2 lakh employees of LIC and GIC have gone on strike. I hope everybody knows that the employees belonging to almost all the Parties have gone on strike. The Government, I think, should take the warning that they are in a belligerent mood and rightly so. Why should they not be? I do not see any reason why the Government should not take this into consideration and instead rush through the Bill in the House. Why is the Government rushing through with the Bill?

In the Business Advisory Committee meeting held yesterday, some of the Party representatives wanted that consideration of this Bill be postponed for a few days but the Government declined their request. It is a Bill which has wider ramifications on the future economic development of the country. The Government seems to dispose of such an important Bill in a hasty and improper manner without there being proper parliamentary consideration.

Yesterday, I quoted some figures regarding the LIC and GIC contributions to Government bonds and securities. I would like to throw some more light on this. It is common knowledge that in India the public sector insurance companies, LIC and GIC, have performed extremely well in spite of not only the continuing debilitating situation of the country's economy but also the threat of their privatisation during the last several years. For example, while the world wide premium income increased by only one per cent by 1996, the inflation adjusted growth rate, in real term of LIC premium income, is about 17 per cent, nearly three times the growth rate of the Gross Domestic Product. Be it in respect of insurance cover, settlement of claims, return on investment through dividends, providing support budget through taxes and mobilisation of scarce resources for national development, both LIC and GIC have registered exceptional performances. The growth level, as well as claim settlement percentages are higher than the international experiences.

14.49 hours (Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair)

Therefore, there is no justification to privatise the Insurance sector. As I pointed out yesterday, it is totally harmful to the national interest.

Insurance is not covered by WTO agreement. A number of developed as well as developing countries have opposed the inclusion of Insurance sector in the WTO regime. Therefore, there is no compulsion for the Government to open up the Insurance sector to private companies. The then Secretary of Ministry of Finance while deposing before the Petitions Committee of the other House had admitted that so far as its obligation towards WTO is concerned, there is no compulsion whatsoever to open up the Insurance sector.

According to the reports, despite stagnation in domestic savings, record growth rates in premium mobilization has been achieved. Privatisation of the insurance industry in the name of growth and competition would only weaken and jeopardies the existing potential. The private companies both Indian and foreign will operate only in profitable areas of business. Rural areas and vulnerable segments would be neglected and social orientation in providing insurance cover and investment could be completely neglected. The private companies without any social obligation will operate for profit and nothing else. Looking to the world around, it is clear that far from healthy competition a thriving cut-throat competition, mergers, acquisitions and growth of private monopolies and oligopolies will vitiate the insurance sector. The asset base of the foreign companies is so huge that it may afford to undercut the domestic companies and absorb the loss till LIC and GIC are wiped out. After having acquired the monopolistic position, the foreign corporate are sure to overcharge the customers and reap super profits. Whatever insurance support presently available for the poor people through crop insurance etc. will not be available.

Now-a-days, tendu leaves collectors, bidi workers, fishermen, etc. are enjoying subsidised insurance through low premium. Now it will also be abolished. Therefore, the opening of the insurance sector will not bring any gain to the country as a whole, leave aside the poor people of our country. The Government is claiming that the country will be flooded with additional foreign funds if the private companies are allowed to enter insurance sector. It is nothing but a hope. Therefore, IRDA Bill, 1999, instead of helping the country will harm its interest. Please let us know why the Government is so afraid to allow the Bill to be scrutinized and closely looked into by a Joint Committee. It may be a matter of months a JPC can submit its report. It could submit it in the next Session. Is the Government in a hurry because they have made a commitment to a foreign country? I appeal to the Congress Party to have a second thought and agree to send this Bill to a Joint Committee.

While concluding, I submit that there is no economic consideration for opening up of the insurance sector. That is only a political compulsion arising out of this commitment to trans-national companies that too which was given by the Finance Minister to a foreign country. We ourselves are seeing what is happening in Seattle. Instead of India leading the Third world countries for the interest of Third world countries, India is bowing its head before Mr. Bill Clinton.

This is the position and the same position is being seen in the insurance sector. We are very sorry to say that this is absolutely against the interests of our country and we refuse to become an accomplice to this crime that is being committed today. I again appeal to the Congress Party to understand that the parliamentary system is being taken for a ride. I appeal to them that they may not allow the present Government to commit this crime. For all these reasons, I want that this Bill be circulated for eliciting public opinion.

">

">श्री राजेश पायलट (दौसा) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यहां एक बहुत महत्वपूर्ण बिल पर बहस हो रही है। देश का इतिहास रहा है कि जब-जब रिफार्मस की बात हुई है तो देश में मतभेद रहे हैं, यह कोई नई बात नहीं है। आजादी के बाद हमारी पार्टियाँ सत्ता में ज्यादा रही हैं इसलिए हमारी पार्टियाँ को इन बातों का ज्यादा ज्ञान है कि मतभेद कहां और कैसे हुए। जब-जब कांग्रेस ने रिफार्मस की बात की और रिफार्मस लागू करने की कोशिश की तो हम लोगों में डिफरेंसेस रहे। सच्चाई यह है कि मतभेद ही हमारी ताकत है। इन मतभेदों से अच्छी चीज बाहर निकल कर आती है, जो देश के भले में होती है और वह लागू की जाती है।

">

"महोदय, सत्ता में जो भी पार्टी रहे, मैं यह अवश्य मानता हूँ कि देश का हित सर्वोपरि है। यह हम सब के मन में है। लिब्रलाइजेशन की बात हमारी पार्टी ने शुरू की। मैं जब राजीव गांधी जी की कैबिनेट में ट्रांसपोर्ट मिनिस्टर था तब यह बात चली थी। हालाँकि बहुत से ऐसे निर्णय हमारे थे जो हमारी पार्टी ने सरकार में रहते हुए किए थे और जब हमने वे निर्णय किए थे तो देश में बहुत विरोध हुआ था। तब बैंकों का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ था तो कांग्रेस को कोसा गया और उसे एक गलत रास्ता बताया गया लेकिन एक दिन वह भी आया कि कांग्रेस ने अपने ही राज में उनको उल्टा भी किया। जब देश को जिस चीज की जरूरत हो तो उसे देश के लिए लाना, सरकार में सत्ता में जो पार्टी बैठी है उसका फर्ज है कि देश पीछे न रह जाए, इस बात का ध्यान रखें। हम अपनी मर्यादाओं और परम्पराओं को न बदलें। लेकिन सारी दुनिया एक दिशा में चल रही है और उस दिशा में हम थोड़ा पीछे रह जाएं तो उससे भी देश का नुकसान है। इसी सिद्धान्त को लेकर १९९१ में जब हमारी सरकार बनी तो हम लोगों ने लिब्रलाइजेशन की बात चालू की। उस समय देश में इसका विरोध हुआ। आज जिस विषय पर हम बात कर रहे हैं इसमें भी विरोध है। लेकिन सच्चाई यह है कि जो इस बिल को लेकर आ रहे हैं उनकी मनबूरी है। हमारे भाई जो बीच में बैठे हैं वे दिल से चाहते हैं कि यह पास हो जाए लेकिन जो अगोस्ट वोट है वे हमारे साथ जुड़े रहें। हमने दिल से लिब्रलाइजेशन की शुरुआत की थी। यह सच्ची बात है कि जब लिब्रलाइजेशन हुआ तो उसमें कुछ खामियां भी रहीं। मैं यह नहीं कहता कि हमारे कदम सही उठे और हमें उसमें सफलता मिली। हमारे कुछ कदमों में खामियां रहीं और जब कोई नया कदम उठाया जाता है तो ये खामियां आहिस्ते-आहिस्ते पता लगती हैं। जब लिब्रलाइजेशन की बात चली थी तो देश के लिए एक नया कदम था। हमारी सरकार ने कौशिश की और उसमें जो भी कदम उठाए वह हमने अपनी समझ से ठीक उठाए लेकिन उसमें खामियां रहीं होंगी, उन खामियों को आहिस्ते-आहिस्ते दूर किया जाए और देश के हित में जो जरूरी कदम है वह उठाया जाए। हमारी पार्टी में भी मतभेद हैं, इस विषय पर भी हमारी पार्टी में बहस होती रही। आज अगर मैं इसके सपोर्ट में बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ तो कंडीशनल सपोर्ट में खड़ा हुआ हूँ। हमने अपनी पार्टी की तरफ से अमेडमेंट मूव किए हैं कि ये चीजें इसमें जोड़ी जाएं। १९९७ में जब मुलायम सिंह जी की सरकार थी तब चिदम्बरम जी इस बिल को लेकर आए थे। तब भी हमने ये बातें कहीं थीं। हमारी पार्टी सपोर्ट कर रही थी लेकिन सपोर्ट के साथ-साथ हमने ये मुद्दे उस दिन भी उठाए थे और पार्टी में अंदर यह बातचीत हुई थी।

">

">15.00 hrs.

"आज भी हमारी पार्टी में लगातार दो दिन से बात चल रही है। हम महसूस करते हैं कि रास्ता ठीक है लेकिन इसमें कुछ सुधार देशहित में लाने जरूरी हैं। इसलिए हमने पार्टी में सलाह करके कुछ अमेडमेंट्स मूव किये हैं और हमें उम्मीद है कि सरकार उन अमेडमेंट्स को मानेगी।

">

"श्री गिरधारी लाल भार्गव (जयपुर) : अगर नहीं मानेगी तो क्या करेंगे?

">

"श्री राजेश पायलट : अगर नहीं मानेगी तो हमारे पास भी रास्ते हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

">

"श्री गिरधारी लाल भार्गव : उस समय आपको याद कर लेंगे।

... (व्यवधान)

">

"श्री राजेश पायलट : उपाध्यक्ष जी, तिरुपति में हमारी पार्टी का अधिवेशन हुआ था और उसमें बहुत सारी बातें सामने आई थीं। बहुत सारे साथी इसके खिलाफ थे और बहुत सारे साथ भी थे। इस बारे में पार्टी में खुलकर बहस हुई और फैसला हुआ था कि लिब्रलाइजेशन बहुत जरूरी है और पार्टी ने उस दिशा में कदम उठाये। कांग्रेस पार्टी में बहुत खुलकर बात होती है, दूसरी पार्टियों में कम होती है।

">

"श्री गिरधारी लाल भार्गव : अच्छा जी।

">

"श्री राजेश पायलट : भार्गव जी, आप मुझसे मत कहलवाओ। एक छोटा सा वाक्य मदन लाल खुराना जी ने बोल दिया था, उनका क्या हाल हो गया। कल्याण सिंह जी ने क्या कह दिया था। सरदार पटेल पंडित नेहरू जी के सामने लड़ते रहते थे लेकिन कांग्रेस में जन्मे रहते थे।

">

"श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव (संभल) : वह जमाना चला गया।

">

"श्री राजेश पायलट : कल्याण सिंह जी ने छोटा सा लफ्ज प्रधान मंत्री जी के खिलाफ कह दिया तो उन्हें पद से ही हटा दिया। यह डेमोक्रेसी के खिलाफ है।

">

"श्री राजीव प्रताप रूडी (छपरा) उपाध्यक्ष जी, यह विषयांतर हो रहा है।

">

"श्री राजेश पायलट : महोदय, इसलिए विषयांतर हो रहा है कि जब इस बिल को लेकर आये थे

... (व्यवधान)

">

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Rajesh Pilot, you are inviting trouble.

">श्री खारबेल स्वाई (नालासोर) : शरद पवार जी ने क्या कसूर किया था, शरद पवार जी को कांग्रेस क्यों छोड़नी पड़ी।

... (व्यवधान)

">

">श्री राजेश पायलट : मैं यह नहीं कहता कि हमारी पार्टी में खामियां नहीं हैं। मैं कह रहा था कि हमारी पार्टी में इस पर बातचीत चली और हमने लिब्रलाइजेशन के लिए फैसला किया तथा हमने अपने पार्टी के मैनीफेस्टो में कहा है कि इस देश में इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर के सेक्टर में इन्वेस्टमेंट की जरूरत है और यह ऐसा सेक्टर है जिसमें पैसा बहुत कम आ रहा है। सन १९९१ से आज तक अगर इस क्षेत्र में पूरा पैसा लग जाता तो लिब्रलाइजेशन के फायदे और आगे पहुंच जाते। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जब तक इसके फायदे आम आदमी तक नहीं पहुंच जाते और गांव के लोग इसके बारे में पूरी तरह से समझ नहीं जाते तब तक इसका पूरा फायदा नहीं हो सकता है। मैं संचार मंत्री था तो मैंने पार्टी और सरकार में उदाहरण देकर इसके बारे में कहा था। सेल्यूलर फोन में जमाने में शुरू हुए थे। मैंने कहा था कि सेल्यूलर फोन इन कंपनीज को दे दें, उनसे पैसा या लाइसेंस फीस न लें। उनसे कहें कि महाराष्ट्र में जो सेल्यूलर फोन लगाए वह महाराष्ट्र के गांवों में पांच साल में टेलीफोन लगा दे, जिससे हम गांव में जाकर कह सकें कि बम्बई में तो लोग बिना तार के टेलीफोन कर सकते हैं, लेकिन उसी पैसे का फायदा उठाकर गांव में टेलीफोन लग गये हैं। यह लिब्रलाइजेशन की नीति है। जब आम आदमी को यह बात समझ में आयेगी कि क्या फायदा लिब्रलाइजेशन का हमारे देश में हो रहा है। अब बेरोजगारी की बात है। जहां-जहां लिब्रलाइजेशन के कारण सेक्टर खुले हैं वहां हम लोगों को फायदा पहुंचा सके हैं। लिब्रलाइजेशन के साथ कॉटेज-इंडस्ट्री को जोड़ने की हमारी नीति थी लेकिन वह हम फौलो नहीं कर पाये। हमारी यह भी नीति थी कि इसके कारण बैकवर्ड एरियाज नैगलेक्ट न हों। नहीं तो गांव और शहर के बीच खाई बढ़ती जायेगी। लेकिन आज रूरल और अर्बन एरियाज की खाई बढ़ती जा रही है। जब तक यह खाई कम नहीं होगी तब तक कोई भी पॉलिसी आप लेकर आये, उसका आम आदमी पर सही असर नहीं पड़ेगा। इसलिए लिब्रलाइजेशन में बदलाव की जरूरत है। लिब्रलाइजेशन के सब लोग फेवर में हैं। सब चाहते हैं कि वह आगे बढ़े और गांव में सुविधाएं पहुंचें। आम आदमी तक उसकी सुविधा पहुंचे यह हम कहते रहे हैं।

">

">उपाध्यक्ष जी, आज के बिल के बारे में जैसा मैंने कहा कि हमारी कुछ रिजर्वेशन हैं। इसमें हमने कुछ अमेंडमेंट्स मूव किये हैं। जहां तक पोर्टेन्शियलिटी की बात है तो यह अच्छी बात है। अगर फेयर कंप्टीशन होता है और जो २४ प्रतिशत और ७६ प्रतिशत की रेशो आ रही है उससे मैं महसूस करता हूँ कि पोर्टेन्शियलिटी है। जो मुझे आंकड़े मिले हैं और जो लाइव इंश्योरेस प्रीमियम की जी.डी.पी. की परसेंटेज है वह भारत की १.३ है, अमरीका की ५.२ है, यू.के. की ६.५ है और साउथ कोरिया की ८ है।

">

">There is an availability of potential.

">उन्होंने यह भी बताया है कि आज की २२ से २३ प्रतिशत पॉपुलेशन सिर्फ इंश्योरेस पॉलिसीज पर है।

">

">करीब एक लाख टोटल पालसीज हैं, पोर्टेन्शियलिटी है। यदि इसमें आगे काम किया जाए, फेयर कम्पीटिशन में काम किया जाए तो अच्छा होगा। जिस नीयत से बिल लाया जा रहा है, जिस नीयत से नीति बनाई जा रही है, उसमें फर्क नहीं आए। मैं हमेशा अपने भाषण में कहता रहा हूँ कि नीति और नीयत का फर्क इस देश को पीछे कर रहा है। अगर अच्छी नीयत के साथ नीति बनती है, वह जब लागू हो तो वही नीयत रहे तो नीति सही नतीजे देती है लेकिन नीति बनाते समय नीयत दूसरी रहती है और जब नीति लागू होती है तो नीयत बदलती रहती है। इसलिए देश पीछे जा रहा है। इस पोर्टेन्शियलिटी को देखते हुए इस बिल में जो चीजें लाई गई हैं, वह अच्छे रूप में लाई गई हैं।

">

">हमारे बहुत से साथी एल.आई.सी. और जी.आई.सी. की बात कर रहे हैं। बिल साफ कह रहा है कि उनका कोई प्राइवेटाइजेशन नहीं हो रहा है। इसे फेयर कम्पीटिशन में लाया जा रहा है। इसमें कोई बुराई नहीं है। अगर इंश्योरेस कम्पनियां इतनी कम्पीटिटिव हैं तो इन्हें दुख किस बात का है? जब मुझे डर नहीं है कि मेरे भाई आचार्य जी आगे निकल जाएंगे तो मैं हमेशा दौड़ने के लिए तैयार रहूंगा। जब मुझे लगेगा कि मैं इन से पीछे रहूंगा तो मैं बहाने बनाऊंगा कि आपने सीटी पहले बजा दी, वरना मैं आगे पहुंच जाता। अगर फेयर कम्पीटिशन वाली बात सही है

">... (व्यवधान)

">इंक्विटी सब के लिए बराबर रखी है। उसी रूप में कम्पनियां आएगी। एक डर यह लग रहा है कि वह एकदम आकर टेक ओवर कर लेगी। मुझे उसके कुछ उदाहरण मिले हैं। चाइना में १० साल से प्राइवेटाइजेशन होने के बाद आज २० परसेंट शेयर प्राइवेट कम्पनियां ले पाई हैं। इसी तरीके से ताइवान में हुआ। यह छोटा देश है। मैं इससे कम्पेयर नहीं करना चाहता लेकिन चाइना से जरूर कम्पेयर कर सकता हूँ। इसमें चिन्ता नहीं करनी चाहिए कि वह एकदम सभी को टेक ओवर कर लेगे।">

">आज के हिसाब से रैगुलेशन ठीक है। इसमें नकली और टेम्पररी लोग नहीं आ पाएंगे। १०० करोड़ मीनिमम इंक्विटी रखी है और २०० करोड़ की इंश्योरेस कम्पनियां की रखी है। यह अच्छा कदम है। इसमें ऐसे गलत लोग नहीं आ पाएंगे जिन्हें दूसरे रूप में पैसे कमाने का इंटेरेस्ट होगा। यह भी अच्छा कदम है कि पैसा बाहर नहीं जाएगा। ... (व्यवधान) बिल में लिखा है कि इन्होंने सारे सेफ गार्ड्स लिए गए हैं। इसमें जो फायदा होगा, वह बाहर नहीं जाएगा। सरकार पर विश्वास करना पड़ता है। आचार्य जी आप बुरा मत मानना। १९९७ में आप सरकार को सपोर्ट कर रहे थे।

... (व्यवधान)

">

श्री बसुदेव आचार्य (बांक्रुरा) : हमने उस समय सरकार को समर्थन दिया था लेकिन इस बिल को अपोज किया था।

... (व्यवधान)

SHRI RAJESH PILOT : Sir, Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee will bear me out that Shri Indrajit Gupta was the Home Minister in the United Front Government and it was that Government which had brought this Bill. (Interruptions)

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE : In spite of that, we opposed the Bill and that is why it was withdrawn. (Interruptions)

श्री राजेश पायलट : मैंने आपको बात बता दी।

... (व्यवधान)

मैं गुस्से में अंग्रेजी नहीं बोल रहा हूँ। सच बात यह कह रहा हूँ कि यह बिल उस समय आया था जब १९९७ में चिदम्बरम जी फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर थे।

... (व्यवधान)

SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, China has accepted this proposal. Our friends from the Left parties always say: 'Mao Tse-tung Zindabad'. So, why should they oppose this proposal?

चाइना वाले ऐक्सेप्ट कर रहे हैं तो इन्हें क्या एतराज है।

... (व्यवधान)

मास्को ने किया या नहीं मुझे नहीं मालूम लेकिन चाइना ने तो ऐक्सेप्ट किया।

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Sir, it was introduced during the tenure of the United Front Government. But the fundamental difference, at that time, was that there was no proposal to amend the LIC and GIC Nationalisation Act.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI BALASAHEB VIKHE PATIL): Sir, even now there is no proposal to amend the LIC and GIC Act. (Interruptions)

SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : No; there is a proposal to amend the LIC and GIC Nationalisation Act. (Interruptions)

SHRI BALASAHEB VIKHE PATIL: It is specifically mentioned in the Bill that there is no such proposal and LIC and GIC will be intact. (Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Rajesh Pilot, are you yielding to him?

SHRI RAJESH PILOT : I am not yielding.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record.

(Interruptions) ... (Not recorded)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Basu Deb Acharia, nothing is going on record. What is the use of your speaking now?

... (Interruptions)

श्री राजीव प्रताप रूडी उपाध्यक्ष जी, ये इतना बढ़िया भाषण कर रहे थे कि बीच में बाधा उत्पन्न कर दी।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप तो बाधा पैदा मत करिये।

श्री राजेश पायलट : उपाध्यक्ष जी, मैं प्रार्थना कर रहा था कि इसमें डरने की कोई बात नहीं है। जैसाकि मैंने शुरू में कहा था कि यह बिल लाने की इनकी मनबूरी है। ये दिल से पास करवाना चाहते हैं लेकिन दिखाना चाहते हैं कि हमने विरोध किया जिससे खिलाफ वोट इनके साथ जुड़ जायें। हम लोग दिल से देश का भला चाहते हैं। तो इनमें और हम में इतना फर्क है और इसलिये मैं इस बात को कह रहा हूँ कि इनकी मनबूरी है।

कल हमारे भाई श्री आचार्य जी ने पढ़कर सुनाया कि जब श्री वाजपेयी जी विपक्ष में थे तो उन्होंने क्या भाषण दिया था तो इनके दिल की बात नहीं है, दिल की बात तो कांग्रेसियों की रही है जब लिबरलाइजेशन इस देश में आया। कांग्रेस ने उस रूप में कई कदम भी उठाये थे। आज मैं इसलिये कह रहा हूँ कि यह बिल सही है। सबसे बड़ी बात तो यह है कि हमारे वित्त राज्य मंत्री बैठे हुये हैं जो किसान वर्ग के हैं। आज २ से ३ हजार करोड़ रुपया सोशल सैक्टर के लिये अवेलेबल है और वह रुपया गरीबी रखा से नीचे रहने वालों की शिक्षा, स्वास्थ्य और ग्रामीण विकास के लिये है। यह ऐसा फंड है जिसमें लागू टर्म प्रोग्राम लिये जाते हैं। अगर एक या दो साल के लिये कोई कार्यक्रम लिया जाना होता है तो दूसरे सैक्टर से पैसा लिया जा सकता है लेकिन लागू टर्म के लिये इस फंड में काफी पैसा है। आप कह तो रहे हैं कि उनका ख्याल रखा जायेगा, लेकिन मुझे शक है क्योंकि इसमें कहीं गवर्नमेंट सिक्यूरिटीज लिखा है और कहीं अंडर गवर्नमेंट लिखा है। आपकी वॉर्डिंग से तो यह ब्यूरोक्रेसी के हाथ में चली जायेगी। मैं विधिवत रूप से यह चाहता हूँ कि आप देश को गारंटी दें कि सोशल सैक्टर इस बिल से इफैक्टिव नहीं होने दिया जायेगा तो हमें तसल्ली रहेगी अर्थात् सोशल सैक्टर पर इसका कोई असर नहीं पड़ेगा। लिबरलाइजेशन से जो फायदा वास्तव में होना चाहिये, वह गरीब आदमी तक पहुँच जायेगा। इस कारण हमारी पार्टी ने सैक्शन-२७ में अमेंडमेंट मूव किया है कि अगर सोशल सैक्टर इफैक्टिव न हो तो एक क्लॉज ले करके सेफ गार्ड करे जिससे हमें तसल्ली रहे। उपाध्यक्ष जी, हमें उम्मीद है कि हमारे मंत्री जी इस बात के लिये लड़ते रहेंगे। वे हमारी पार्टी में रहे हैं और २०-२२ साल का हमारा साथ रहा है, हमारे बजुर्ग हैं, बड़े भाई हैं, महाराष्ट्र में कोआपरेटिव किसानों के मूवमेंट में आगे चले हैं। इनके होते हुये हमें थोड़ी बहुत उम्मीद है और इस सरकार से पूर्ण आशा है क्योंकि हमारी तरफ से गये हुये कुछ लोग उधर बैठे हैं जो हमारी विचारधारा रखते हैं। इसलिये हमने यह अमेंडमेंट मूव किया है।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा अंतिम पाइंट यह है कि जैसे

TRAI

बना था। आपको याद होगा कि सरकार ने यहाँ भाषण दिया था कि हम डीरेगुलराइज करेंगे, डीसेट्टेलाइज करेंगे और इसलिये

TRAI

बना था। लेकिन आज उसकी क्या हालत हो गई है? वे कोर्ट में बैठे हैं और सरकार बीच में फंसी पड़ी है। ऐसा ही

IRDA

के साथ ऐसा न हो जाये कि आज तो वह ठीक लग रहा है और बाद में कुछ करना चाहें तो कर नहीं सके। सरकार को इस बात का ख्याल रखना पड़ेगा कि वह जो सेफ गार्ड्स बिल में ले आये उससे ऐसी हालत न पैदा हो जाये कि जिस मकसद के लिये हम बिल लाये, देश में वह लीगल लूपहोल्ज की वजह से पूरा न हो पाये। इस बिल में आपकी वॉर्डिंग के कारण दो-तीन जगह पर जो दिया गया है, इसलिये हमने यह अमेंडमेंट दिया है। उनसे वेग करने के चासेज हैं कि फायदा उठाकर डाइवर्ट कर दिया जाये। यह बिल हमारी नीतियों के अनुकूल है क्योंकि १९९१ में हमने लिबरलाइजेशन किया था। हम सदा इस पक्ष में रहे कि ज्यादा से ज्यादा सैक्टर खोले जाये ताकि आम आदमी को फायदा पहुंच सके। जैसाकि मैंने अपनी बात में कहा कि सरकार को इस बात का ख्याल रखना चाहिये कि सोशल सैक्टर इफेक्टिव हो। लिबरलाइजेशन का जो प्रोजेक्ट शुरू किया गया है, उससे हजारों करोड़ रुपये मिलेंगे जिससे आम आदमी को फायदा मिल सकेगा। यह पैसा बाहर न जाये, ऐसा शक हमारे कई भाइयों ने ज़ाहिर किया है। बिल में तो आपने कह दिया लेकिन इसमें सेफगार्ड्स और स्ट्रिंग लाये जायें जिससे इन लोगों को यकीन हो जाये। अगर इनको यह यकीन दिला दें तो शायद बिल के साथ होने के लिये तैयार हैं लेकिन जैसा मैंने कहा कि विश्वास आपको लाना पड़ेगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं अपने अमेंडमेंट मूल करते समय सोशल सैक्टर के बारे में कुछ बातें कहूंगा। मैं आपका आभारी हूँ कि आपने मुझे बोलने के लिये वक्त दिया। मैं कंजेशनली इस बिल को सपोर्ट देता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

>

श्री राजीव प्रताप रूडी (उपरा) उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, १९९६ से इस बिल के ऊपर चर्चा चल रही है। १९९६ में सरकार इस बिल को लाई। उसके बाद अंतिम समय में इस बिल को विद्वं किया गया। पुनः जब हमारी सरकार आई तो इस बिल को पूरे जोर और जोश के साथ सदन में पेश किया गया और आज इसके मूलभूत विषयों पर चर्चा करने के लिए हम यहां खड़े हुए हैं। महोदय, जब १९५६ में जीवन बीमा निगम का राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ, उस समय इसका यह उद्देश्य था कि देश में इन्श्योरेंस सैक्टर में इसके पूर्व काम करने वाली जितनी कंपनियां थीं, वह अपनी मोनोपली एस्टेबलिश करके और उन पर कोई नियंत्रण नहीं था, वे लोगों से पैसा वसूलते थे और अपने उपयोग में लाते थे और लोगों को भरोसा नहीं था कि निजी क्षेत्र में इसका उपयोग ठीक ढंग से किया जा रहा है जिसके कारण सरकार ने इसको १९५६ में नेशनलाइज़ किया और इसी तरह जनरल इन्श्योरेंस को भी १९७३ में नेशनलाइज़ किया गया क्योंकि उसमें बहुत सारी त्रुटियां देखने को मिलती थीं। ऐसा महसूस किया गया कि मात्र शहरों तक इसका लाभ रहा, धन का दुरुपयोग हो रहा है, कंपनियां उसके पूर्व भी लोगों का धन बटोरकर इन्श्योरेंस के नाम पर वसूल कर लेती थीं और उसके बाद गायब हो जाती थीं, औद्योगिक विकास के नाम पर निवेश का काम कम हो रहा था। इन सब मुद्दों को लेकर नेशनलाइजेशन की प्रक्रिया प्रारंभ हुई। यह भी उद्देश्य था कि उस समय जब नेशनलाइज़ किया गया तो उसका लाभ अधिक से अधिक लोगों तक पहुंचे, गांवों तक बीमा की योजना पहुंच जाए और कम धन में भी बीमा की सुरक्षा लोगों को प्राप्त हो सके। उस समय सरकार की जो मंशा थी, जो सोच व्यक्त की गई थी कि जो भी पैसों इस प्रकार से इस कोश में आते हैं, उसका देश के विकास में और खासकर अर्थतंत्र को मजबूत करने के लिए इसकी अहम भूमिका होगी और उसका उपयोग करके हम देश को एक अच्छी औद्योगिक नीति और आर्थिक विकास के ढांचे पर उतार सकते हैं। उस समय भी जब इसका विश्लेषण किया गया तो देखा गया कि जो इन्श्योरेंस प्रीमियम कलेक्ट किये जाते हैं, अधिकांश इसमें बड़े बड़े औद्योगिक घरानों से आते हैं और ५ गाइवेट प्रीमियम की मात्रा कम रहती है, किन इसमें भी एक अच्छे कोर फंड का डेवलपमेंट हो रहा था। लेकिन जिन उद्देश्यों के कारण इन्श्योरेंस कंपनियों को नेशनलाइज़ किया गया था, वह उद्देश्य प्राप्त करने में सरकार और लोगों को बहुत हद तक कठिनाई का सामना करना पड़ रहा था और पूरे देश में माहौल बनता गया कि लोग टर्म इनवेस्टमेंट के लिए और इस देश की आर्थिक संरचना को मजबूत करने के लिए यह आवश्यक था कि बड़ी मात्रा में राशि का उपयोग हो और उसके लिए लोग टर्म इनफ़ास्ट्रक्चर फंडिंग की आवश्यकता थी और इन्श्योरेंस की इसमें भूमिका होनी चाहिए थी। लेकिन दुर्भाग्यवश पिछले तीस वर्षों में जितनी हमारी आशाएं और उम्मीदें इन्श्योरेंस सैक्टर और कॉर्पस फंडिंग की तरफ थीं, उसकी भरपाई नहीं होने के कारण कि आज पूरे देश में आर्थिक तंत्र को मजबूत करने के लिए इन्श्योरेंस के इस बड़े तबके पर विचार करने के लिए सरकार को मजबूर होना पड़ा है। १९९१ में कांग्रेस की सरकार थी। उस समय लिबरलाइजेशन की प्रक्रिया प्रारंभ हुई और एक अच्छी शुरुआत इस देश के लिए हुई। राजेश जी ने मैं समझता हूँ कि पूरी चर्चा में जितना कुछ भी कहा, वह इस सरकार की तरफ से कहा और जो उन्होंने अमेंडमेंट पेश किया है, मैं समझता हूँ कि प्रतिपक्ष की भूमिका निभाने के लिए वह लाना आवश्यक है, इसलिए उन्होंने अमेंडमेंट्स की चर्चा की है। उनकी बातों से प्रतीत होता है कि इस बिल के प्रति उनकी पूरी की पूरी सहमति है और इसकी उपयोगिता और प्रगति को देखते हुए ये चाहते हैं कि आई.आर.डी.ए. बिल पास हो और निश्चित रूप से इस देश में एक नया माहौल स्थापित करके एक नये कोश की स्थापना हो और नये तरीके से इनवेस्टमेंट इस क्षेत्र में हो।

>

"महोदय, जब भी औद्योगिक विकास की चर्चा होती है, इन्श्योरेंस एक ऐसा सैक्टर है और खासकर भारत में जब इन्श्योरेंस की बात होती है तो ४०० बिलियन रुपये से भी अधिक के पोर्टेन्शियल की बात होती है और इसमें इतना बड़ा निवेश होने की संभावना है जिससे इनफ़ास्ट्रक्चरल ग्रोथ में फायदा होता है। इन्श्योरेंस सैक्टर का जो पैसा होता है, इसका बड़ी लंबी अवधि के लिए निवेश में उपयोग किया जाता है। विश्व के किसी भी कोने में देखें तो पेंशन फंडिंग और इन्श्योरेंस फंडिंग की आवश्यकता देश की मूलभूत संरचनाओं को मजबूत करने के लिए होती है। कई तरह की चर्चाएं हुईं और हमारे लोफ्ट के साथियों ने बताया कि इसमें बहुत सारी समस्याएं ऐसी हैं जिसके कारण लोगों में इस बात का प्रचार भी कराया गया कि इन्श्योरेंस के आने से, पंजी निवेशकों के आने से, निजी कंपनियों के आने से बाहरी स्रोतों के आने से इसमें कहीं न कहीं स्थानीय स्तर पर लोगों को नुकसान होगा। जी.आई.सी. और एल.आई.सी. जैसे सैक्टर की कंपनियों को नुकसान की संभावना है।

>

"उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस तरफ मैं आपका ध्यान विशेष रूप से आकृष्ट करना चाहता हूँ कि इस इन्श्योरेंस रेगुलेटरी अथॉरिटी बिल का मूल लाभ इकोनोमी की तरफ है। जैसा मैंने पूर्व में वर्णन किया कि किसी भी इकोनोमी को चलाने के लिए, विशेष रूप से देश में आज जो स्थिति है और पहले भी हमारे विल मंत्री जी इस बात की चर्चा कर रहे थे कि आज भारत के ऊपर ९० हजार करोड़ रुपये का ऋण है। अगर पूरे अर्थतंत्र पर इस प्रकार से इतना बड़ा बोझ बना रहा तो संभवतः आने वाले दिनों में जिस निवेश की हम लोग चर्चा करते हैं, उसे करने में हमें सफलता नहीं मिलेगी। इसलिए इंस्टीट्यूशनल इनवेस्टमेंट के लिए आवश्यक है कि कहीं न कहीं इन्श्योरेंस रेगुलेटरी अथॉरिटी बिल के माध्यम से निवेश की संभावनाओं को बढ़ाया जाए।

>

"जहां तक गवर्नमेंट का सवाल है, गवर्नमेंट को भी इससे लाभ है। गवर्नमेंट को विशेष रूप से सोशल इंफ़ास्ट्रक्चर और इम्प्लायमेंट के सैक्टर में लाभ है। कई जगह यह चर्चा भी आई है कि इस बिल के आने के पश्चात लोगों के रोजगार में कमी आयेगी। लेकिन मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि आज भी इस देश में जितने अनुपात में इन्श्योरेंस की संभावना है, उतने अनुपात में जी.आई.सी., एल.आई.सी. और उसकी अधिकृत कंपनियों द्वारा इन्श्योरेंस की पोर्टेन्शियल को टैप नहीं किया जा रहा है, जिसके कारण रोजगार की जो संभावनाएं इस क्षेत्र में उत्पन्न हो सकती हैं, वे नहीं हुई हैं। जब यहां बाहरी कंपनियों का आना होगा, जब प्राइवेट कंपनियों का आना होगा तो नये तरीके से, नये ढंग से रिस्क असेसमेंट की कंपैसिटी में वृद्धि होगी। जिन नई प्रोजेक्ट्स के बारे में, नई प्रोजेक्ट्स के बारे में चर्चा हम करते हैं, जो संभावित रूप से बाहरी कंपनियों द्वारा आकर या फिर प्राइवेट कंपनियों द्वारा आकर, नये उद्यमियों द्वारा आकर, जिनकी निवेश करने की क्षमता है, आज तक हम उसको अपने बीच में स्थापित नहीं कर पाये हैं, जिसे हम कम्पटीशन या प्रतिस्पर्धा कहते हैं।

>

"इन्श्योरेंस कंपनियों के बीच में आज इस देश की क्या स्थिति है। जब भी हम लोग चर्चा करते हैं और मैं समझता हूँ कि यहां सदन में बैठने वाले कहीं न कहीं बीमा से किसी प्रकार से जुड़े होंगे, लेकिन मैं नहीं समझता कि जिस प्रकार भारत में बीमा कंपनियों द्वारा बीमा का स्वरूप बनाया गया, जिस प्रकार का उन्हें संरक्षण दिया जा रहा है, इस प्रकार से शायद ही विश्व के किसी कोने में होता होगा। आज भी छोटें-छोटे लोग जो अपने इन्श्योरेंस कवर के लिए जाते हैं, उन्हें कितनी कठिनाईयों का सामना करना पड़ता है। वे सरकारी तंत्र और सरकारी व्यवस्था के पार्ट हैं और इस कारण से इन्श्योरेंस का जो लाभ लोगों को मिलना चाहिए और बीमा कराने के बाद जिस प्रकार से सुविधा मिलनी चाहिए, इस देश में, इन चंद संस्थाओं की मोनोपली के कारण वह लाभ उन्हें तुरंत नहीं मिल पाता है।

>

"इसलिए मैं बार-बार इस बात को दोहरा रहा हूँ कि बाहरी कंपनियों के आगमन का जो खतरा बताया जाता है कि बाहरी कंपनियों के आने के बाद अधिक मात्रा में उनका शेयर होल्डिंग बढ़ जायेगा, उनका इस देश में उन कंपनियों पर अधिकार जम जायेगा, बिल में यह स्पष्ट रूप से अंकित है कि २६ फीसदी से अधिक उनकी भागीदारी नहीं हो सकती। इसलिए बार-बार इस चर्चा को उठाकर देश को दिग्भ्रमित करने का प्रयास मैं समझता हूँ कि अनुकूल नहीं है।

">

"उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इश्योरेन्स के विषय में पीछे भी कई स्थानों पर हम लोगों ने देखा है, विशेषकर हमारी प्रतिपक्ष की नेता उस सभा में भाग लेने के लिए गई थीं - चाहे वह 'ऑफिकर' के कार्यक्रम हों या चैम्बर ऑफ कॉमर्स के कार्यक्रम हों - हम लोगों ने यह देखा है कि देश में अर्थतंत्र के संदर्भ में जब किसी विषय पर हम चर्चा करते हैं तो आम सहमति बनाने का प्रयास किया जाता है और उसी क्रम में चैम्बर ऑफ कॉमर्स जो हमारी प्राइम संस्था है, देश में औद्योगिक गतिविधियों को बढ़ावा देने के लिए जिन पर चर्चा की जाती है, उन लोगों ने भी इसका स्वागत किया है। वे सब ऐसे फोरम हैं जो देश के अर्थतंत्र को मजबूत बनाने के लिए अपनी भूमिका निभाते हैं।

">

"जहाँ तक कर्मचारियों का सवाल है, कई माननीय सदस्यों का कहना है और उन लोगों का बड़ा विरोध है जो हमारे लैफ्ट के साथी इस विषय को मूल विषय वस्तु बनाकर कहना चाहते हैं कि देश में खासकर उन तमाम रोजगार से जुड़े लोगों को इससे हानि होगी। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं स्पष्ट रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि इम्प्लायीज का यह कहना कि अब इस देश में इश्योरेन्स के लिए अनटैप्ड पोटेंशियल नहीं है - मेरा कहना है कि यह सौ करोड़ लोगों का देश है और जिस बिंदु पर हम चाहते थे कि इश्योरेन्स कवर पहुँचे और गरीब तबका भी कम पूँजी लगाकर अपनी सुरक्षित पेंशन की व्यवस्था कर सके, उस बिंदु तक पहुँचने में इम्प्लायीज का कहना है कि अब इस देश में इश्योरेन्स सेक्टर में संभावनाएँ खत्म हो गई हैं।

">

"महोदय, यह अपने आप में एक दिग्भ्रमित करने वाला वक्तव्य है। इस देश में सबसे छोटे तबके तक पहुँचने का प्रयास अभी तक नहीं किया गया है। जब यह प्रतिस्पर्धा बाहरी कंपनियों और प्राइवेट कंपनियों के आने से जी.आई.सी., एल.आई.सी. और अन्य छोटी-छोटी कंपनियों के बीच होगी, तब इनकी क्वालिटी में इम्प्रूवमेंट हो सकता है।

">

महोदय, यह डर जाताया जा रहा है कि बाहरी कंपनियों के आने के बाद, उनकी भागीदारी के बाद लोगों के लिए रोजगार का अभाव होगा। मैं स्पष्ट रूप से बताना चाहूँगा कि आज भी इस देश में ६००० एल.आई.सी. और जी.आई.सी. की ब्रांचें हैं और उनमें अनेकों कर्मचारी काम कर रहे हैं, लेकिन जो इश्योरेन्स सेक्टर की भूमिका है, जितना बड़ा उसका क्षेत्रफल है, इस देश की जितनी आबादी है और जिस प्रकार से इस देश का अर्थतंत्र आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता विकसित हो रहा है और स्टीबिलाइज कर रहा है, उसमें इसकी संभावनाएँ बहुत ज्यादा हैं और यह कहना कि इसमें जाँव अपार्चीनिटीज को खतरा होगा, इसमें कंप्यूटराइजेशन होगा, इसमें नई तकनीक का उपयोग होगा, वह ठीक नहीं है। क्योंकि विश्व में यह कहीं नहीं देखा गया है कि जब भी कोई उद्योग या व्यापार बढ़ता है, तो नई तकनीक के उपयोग के कारण उसकी संभावनाओं में कटौती होती है। इस बात पर हमें कहीं न कहीं सोच व्यक्त करनी पड़ेगी।

महोदय, एक अंतिम बात, जो मैं इस विषय पर रखना चाहूँगा वह यह है कि एक धारणा व्यक्त की गई है कि जो विदेशी कंपनियाँ आएंगी वे निजी क्षेत्र में आएंगी, वे बाहरी की कंपनियाँ आपस में मिल-बैठकर अधिक से अधिक प्रॉफिट करना चाहेंगी और देहाती क्षेत्र और गरीबों के प्रति अपना आधार या दायित्व निर्वहन करने में अक्षम रहेंगी - यह बात सही प्रतीत नहीं होती है।

महोदय, मैं एक छोटा सा उदाहरण देना चाहूँगा। मैं बिहार प्रान्त से आता हूँ और मैं जानता हूँ कि साल में उस प्रान्त में जब मई, जून का महीना होता है, तो लाखों की संख्या में छोटी-छोटी झोपड़ियों में आग लगती है, खासकर उस मौसम में जब तेज गति से हवा चलती है, तो वहाँ लाखों की संख्या में छोटे-छोटे घरों में आग लगती है। जहाँ तक मेरी जानकारी है, राज्य सरकार की ओर से प्रतिवर्ष ६० लाख रुपये बीमा योजना के रूप में जी.आई.सी. को दिया जाता है ताकि उन सभी छोटे-छोटे फूस के घरों के मालिकों को जिनकी झोपड़ियों का इश्योरेन्स किया गया है, जलने पर उन्हें सहायता दी जाए। महोदय, मेरा निजी अनुभव है कि आज जितनी बड़ी मात्रा में इश्योरेन्स के पैसे कई राज्य सरकारों द्वारा इन कंपनियों को दिए जाते हैं और झोपड़ियों का बीमा कराया जाता है, यदि आप इनकी छानबीन करेंगे, अगर आप पता लगाएँगे, तो निश्चित रूप से देखेंगे कि पूरी की पूरी योजना का धन इश्योरेन्स कंपनी वसूल करके रखती है और यह पूरा का पूरा दायरा जो गरीबों तक पहुँचना चाहिए था उसे दूर कर दिया जाता है और उन्हें न बीमा का लाभ मिल पाता है न ही इन छोटे घर वालों को जो धन देने का प्रावधान किया गया है, वह मिल पाता है। ऐसी अनेक स्थितियाँ हैं। जो सरकारी कर्मचारी हैं वे इस व्यवस्था में अपने आपको प्रोटेक्टड महसूस कर रहे हैं, चाहे वह देश की ऊपरी स्तर की व्यूरोक्रेसी हो या निचले स्तर की व्यूरोक्रेसी हो या गवर्नमेंट की कोई भी संस्था हो। अब समय आ गया है कि इस देश को किसी न किसी ऐसे रास्ते पर ले चलना है जहाँ यह तय करना होगा कि देश में व्यूरोक्रेटिक तंत्र को रेस्पांसिबल बनाने के लिए हम किस प्रकार से अपनी भूमिका निभाते हैं।

महोदय, आज हम इक्कीसवीं शताब्दी में प्रवेश कर रहे हैं। इस मिलेनियम में ऐसी योजनाओं की आवश्यकता है जो इस देश के मूल तत्व तक पहुँच कर इस देश के आने वाले भविष्य में इन भूमिकाओं में अपनी भागीदारी निभा सकें। इन शब्दों के साथ, इस बिल को अपना पूरा समर्थन देते हुए, अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ। धन्यवाद।

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL (HOOGLY): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to oppose the Bill. But, at the very outset, I would like to make my party's position clear on one thing that as such we are not opposed to reforms. But in whose interest are reforms made? We oppose the quality and nature of reforms, the direction of reforms and, of course, taking into account the obtaining reality, the sequencing and the pacing of reforms. There is no consensus on the nature and quality of reforms undertaken in India.

">I am just making a reference to the B.J.P. Manifesto in 1998.

">They say:

">"It said, it was liberalising the economy and actually gave itself more opportunities for corruption."

">They are speaking about Congress. The BJP has been describing the Congress liberalisation since 1991 as phony liberalisation. I am not reading extensively, but there are many more things in this. At one place they say:

">"The last six years" - they are saying this in 1998 - "when the much touted reform has been under way, have been years of extreme difficulty for the common man. The wholesale price index of foodgrains has gone up, the availability of cereals for the common people has come down and there is an uneven playing field for the Indian industry. They assured that the BJP will be guided by the Swadeshi or economic nationalism."

">About FDI, they are saying - and which is their argument right now - and I am reading:

">"Even after the so-called reforms" - please note my Congress friends - "the share of FDI in national investment is less than two per cent, that is, out of the total national investment of about Rs.12,30,000 crore, FDI amounted to only Rs.18,500 crore during the years from 1991 to 1996." It is clear that foreign capital will be only of little value to the national economy, though crucial to some sectors like infrastructure."

">Then they said:

">"The BJP will clearly define the contours and schedule of the liberalisation. The procedural reforms like rectification of corporate law, tax law and other commercial laws will be separated from policy formulations, like the policy on Insurance and Pension Fund."

">This they said in 1998. Then came the NDA. What have they said? They said that they are setting for a consensus on a common cause. And to what end? To Swadeshi thrust. India shall be built by Indians...(Interruptions).

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Dr. Sengupta, you are not expected to be talking to the officers in the Gallery like that.

">SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : At the same time, they say that the country cannot look at others for employment, for technology and all these things. Then they assure they will not undermine but strengthen the national economy, the indigenous industry base and financial and service sectors. This is the assurance given by the NDA. Is there any consensus within the BJP? I am coming to that one by one. When Shrimati Sushma Swaraj was the Chairman of the Petitions Committee of the other House, what had the Committee to say? The Petitions Committee unanimously, I repeat, unanimously recommended. But the fifteenth report of the Standing Committee was not unanimous. We had submitted our notes of dissent. I am sorry to mention that if you go through the note of dissent you shall find how large number of people belong to different walks of life were denied the opportunity to depose before the Committee, I have already mentioned that more than 1.5 crore people have signed against this move to open up the insurance industry. Who are they? They are M.Ps. belonging to this side and that side also. Legislators, jurists of national and international stature, economists, social scientists, prominent journalists, a large number of people had also offered to depose before the Standing Committee.

">I am sorry to mention that I had to write that the Standing Committee was failing to perform its role. Such important people like bureaucrats, Members of the Planning Commission, former Members of the Planning Commission were deprived to depose before the Standing Committee and only the corporate friends were taken to give it biased views.

">You are not accepting your own leader's unanimous report and you are depending on the report of the Standing Committee whose chairman was from the Congress Party, who had ignored representations of important people who wanted to depose before the Standing Committee. What is the report given by Sushma Swaraj Committee? It says :

">"The Committee strongly feels that the time has not come for departing from the earlier nationalisation objectives of the insurance sector and would recommend continuing with the existing policy framework along with improving the systems of higher efficiency".

">It strongly felt that it should not be done.

">What, our good friend Shri George Fernandes, had to say? ...(Interruptions) Yes, I have everything with me. One by one, I will take them up. I find that the majority is against it. The majority of this House is against it. I shall mention them one by one as to who are the people who opposed it not long back but in 1997 or 1998 but even some people have come out in 1999 against this opening up and they are now changing their stances. Shri George Fernandes opposed to 26 per cent foreign equity.

">In India with 8 per cent of stake the largest Indian company can be controlled by someone. Shri Swaraj Paul, who is a Lord now, had come to India earlier in relation to the take-over bid of Escorts. When he was going back he made a public statement. He asked : "Is there any private company in India at all?" He was giving a list of private Indian companies which, totalling among them, have invested - at that point of time - Rs.264 crore only and were controlling Rs. 27,000 crore of money belonging to L.I.C.I., G.I.C.I., U.T.I. and other nationalised financial institutions.

">You are now speaking of 26 per cent of equity in the Bill. Let us see what Shri George Fernandes has to say with regard to foreign equity :

">देशी कम्पनियों के हाथ में देते हैं तो आज जो हमारी कम्पनियाँ हैं, चाहे कोई भी विदेशी कम्पनी हो, हिन्दुस्तान में शेयर खरीदने पर उनके लिए कोई रोक नहीं है। चाहे मुम्बई में, चाहे दिल्ली में, वे कहीं भी शेयर खरीद सकती हैं, उनके ऊपर कोई भी रोक नहीं है, उनके शेयर खरीदने को इजाजत देते हैं। वह उनको भी मालूम है और हमें भी मालूम है।"

">

">एक कांग्रेस लीडर की स्पीच पढ़कर सुनाना चाहेंगा। उन्होंने कहा, मैं कुछ दिन पहले इंग्लैंड गया था।"

">

">It is on record. I am reading from the proceedings of the other House. Sir, please listen.

">I had an opportunity to meet Members of Parliament in England, and some of the Congressmen have been asking me.... Members of Parliament were there. I met them and discussed with them. Congressmen from the United States were also there. We had a discussion there and during the course of the discussion they asked me whether our Government was going to privatise the insurance sector. I told them that the pros and cons of it would be looked into by the Government and no decision was taken. They were in such a hurry that one Member of Parliament told me - I do not want to name the Member - that he does not want to contest elections but would like to come and invest in India when we open up the insurance sector in India. That is the kind of anxiety which the Western countries are showing."

">Sir, Mr. Frank Wisner, who was the U.S. Ambassador in India is now the Chairman of Indo-U.S. Business Council.

">He said that insurance was their flagship and if we did not allow their flagship, why should the fleet like FDI come to India? I can go on quoting a number of things. Before you open up insurance, there are people who are already waiting. I can read out the names of a number of foreign insurance companies that are already waiting. They have entered into contracts, poaching has started, and more

than 246—I think, it has crossed that number—of our very efficient professionals have been taken away to lucrative posts and other financial attractions. Insurance involves national savings. Our own professionals, our own experts will be taken by foreign companies and our own people will be deprived of the same national savings now being used for nation building.

">When the BJP was in opposition, they moved an amendment opposing the opening up of insurance sector for the foreign insurance companies also. I am referring to Shri Rajesh Pilot. He was waxing eloquent. Let us not ignore their view points. I quote from his previous speech:

">"Social sector is very important. Rupees one lakh crore are going to the social sector. That safeguard is not there in the Bill. So, if you propose for a Standing Committee, we can give our view about that"

">SHRI RAJESH PILOT : I am maintaining that.

">SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Now, he has given a condition, but he has not yet suggested that it should not only be analysed and studied by Parliament but the expert views should also be taken into consideration. It is not concrete. It is very vague.

">I just refer to one of the Members of the Congress Party who spoke in the other House. ....(Interruptions) I shall come to the Manifesto of Congress Party and its interpretation by their important leaders later. Shri Vayalar Ravi, a Congress MP in the other House, had written one article and I have got that article with me. As Congressman, he had said: "We have no right to open up". He has gone to the extent of demanding conscience vote. I am also appealing to the conscience of this House because if I go on quoting, we shall find that there have been very serious reservations at some point of time or other. In 1993, when Shri T.N. Chaturvedi wanted to know why one more Committee had been set up, Dr. Manmohan Singh said that the Indian insurance companies were doing as well as the foreign companies. The Minister read out the Terms of Reference of the Committee to assure the Members that the question of foreign companies was not being studied and the aim was only to review the working of LIC and GIC. What has the Congress to say in its manifesto? It is mentioned at page 50 of their Manifesto.

">This was mentioned under the chapter "infrastructure". I may not be very intelligent, but I have a little bit of intelligence. The point is that they have referred to LIC and GIC in relation to infrastructure. It says:

">"The rapid expansion of the infrastructure that India desperately needs requires the mobilisation of long-term finances. The Insurance industry will be restructured to enhance the flow of long-term funds to infrastructure development. LIC and GIC will be strengthened, corporatised and professionalised to equip them to deal with competition. Private companies, with majority equity to Indians, will be allowed in all insurance and pension businesses ...."

">SHRI RAJESH PILOT : You have quoted our Manifesto. What is wrong with our Manifesto?

">SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I shall come to that later. What does the World Investment Report say?

">SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : You may refer to Shrimati Renuka Chowdhury also. She opposed the privatisation and the opening up of the insurance sector.

">SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I shall do that.

">SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (KHAMMAM): I have the courage of my conviction to stand today in this House and say that we are sensitive and responsive to the changes that a society dictates that you cannot view insurance in isolation, that we must see it in the comprehensive vision which takes India forward.

">SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : Within one year, you could change your vision!

">SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY (KHAMMAM): That is the accelerated process in which the country moves. That is the way the world moves.

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is going on in the House, Shri Acharia?

">SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : One year before, you opposed it, and within one year, you could change yourself!

">SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY : The nation has changed, the world has changed, but of course the Communists would not be aware of that. It is a little difficult for them to catch up with the times.

">SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : She has provoked me to make a reference to the very recent statement of the former Prime Minister, Shri P.V. Narasimha Rao, who initiated the reforms in the country.

">SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY : What about him? Please refer to the present Prime Minister also and to what he has said.

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Pal, you have taken 17 minutes.

">SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : He just started his speech.

">SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY : Please look at the time. That is how they estimate the time.

">SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : They are feeling uneasy; let them not feel uneasy. I am only appealing to their conscience.

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Rupchand Pal, it is Shri Acharia who is interrupting you and not any one of us.

">SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Now, I refer to the World Investment Report. In 1998, out of US 642 billion dollars of FDIs, 39 per cent



higher than in 1997. Bulk of the FDIs were used for mergers and acquisitions only. The World Investment Report says that the FDI inflows to developing countries have declined to the tune of US 166 billion dollars. India has lost a large amount of foreign direct investment inflow during this period. FDI has not gone up, and it will not go up.

">On the other hand, how did the LIC serve the nation? During the Sixth Plan, it was Rs. 12,000 crore; in the Seventh Plan, it was Rs. 25,000 crore; in the Eighth Plan, it was Rs. 56,000 crore, and in the first two years of the Ninth Plan, it was Rs. 43,000 crore. LIC alone can provide Rs. 1,30,000 crore for investment during the Ninth Plan. Who can do it? Will any foreign company do it? GIC can provide no less than Rs. 30,000 crore, and they are giving increasing dividends to the Government. During 1997-98, the dividend given by LIC was Rs. 198.35 crore.

">The dividend for the year 1998-99 was Rs. 235.70 crore. The Government is talking about the corporate tax. I would like to give some figures here. It was published last week that the Multinational companies are not paying income tax. The Grindlays Bank is not paying Rs. 700 crore in spite of the directives given by the Reserve Bank of India. They are looting Indian money. But these Indian companies have paid corporate tax to the tune of Rs. 563.06 crore. In the year 1998-99, they have paid corporate tax to the tune of Rs. 726.96. What was the Government equity in 1956? It was only rupees five crore for the LIC. The Government equity for GIC in 1971 was Rs. 21.5 crore. Not a single paise has been added by the Government since then. Sir, what about claim settlement? They are the best in the world. It is 98 per cent for the LIC and 74 per cent for the GIC. I would like to ask the Government as to what is the world average. It is only 40 per cent. Then, are we inefficient?

Sir, then I would like to come to the regulatory mechanism. It has been said that we are not privatising; we are not opening up and we are not going to disinvest. I have got a paper with me here which carries a statement by Shri Rahul Bajaj.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): He is the Chief Advisor of the Government ... (Interruptions)

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): He is the one who has appointed him as the Finance Minister. It is not Shri Vajpayee who appointed him as the Finance Minister ... (Interruptions) He is an agent of the CII sitting here.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : He has said that financial reforms are needed. These include the banking sector, the Insurance and the capital market. It also covers privatisation of banks. He has also said that finally there should be privatisation by disinvestment in all areas including the banking and insurance sectors.

SHRIMATI RENUKA CHOWDHURY : You please look that side.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I am appealing to their conscience.

SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR : Please look there, those people are against you.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : What had the management of the LIC and the GIC had to say? I would not quote elaborately here.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You please conclude now. You have already taken 25 minutes.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, I am making very valuable points.

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : Sir, it is just the preamble to his speech.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, this is what has been said by the Managing Director of the LIC and I quote:

"Once the private sector is allowed to enter the field it would be difficult to keep out the undesirable entrepreneurs in view of the temptations to raise their resources through the LIC. Capital is bound to be very low as has been stated in the previous paragraphs".

Sir, why should the foreign companies be eager to exploit the Indian market. It is only will Rs. 26 crore. No high technology is involved but there is high profit and the national savings would be used for speculative purposes which is now being used for purposes of social development. The pre-1956 scenario is going to be repeated.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Now, I am calling the next speaker. Shri B.B.Ramaiah.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : Sir, I am concluding within five minutes.

Now, I would like to quote what Shri C.D.Deshmukh replied once to Shri Feroz Gandhi. I hope, both the names are known to you.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (SILCHAR): Very much.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : It was about the private sector and how they were going to exploit the situation. We are going back to the pre-1956 situation.

C.D. Deshmukh told Feroze Gandhi:

"The number of ways in which fraud can be practised which was 42 in the days of Kautilya..."

Hon. Finance Minister once quoted Kautilya and that is why I am referring to Kautilya.

"...which was 42 in Kautilya"s days has risen to astronomical figure these days."

If we go through this report we will find C.D. Deshmukh speaking about the importance of nationalisation. It is very important to remember. When nationalisation took place, there was Swatantra Party, the heritage of which is borne by some Members even now,

and there was Jansangh, although less in numbers, which opposed nationalisation. Ultimately, within the Congress there was a division in 1969 which started to be called as a division between the `Syndicate" and the `Indicate". BJP is carrying on with the same tradition, from Jansangh to BJP, with different tactics, with a different mukhauta and a different camouflage. Have the present Congressmen forsaken the old Congress leaders? Do they not respect their own leaders? Do they not agree with the reason and rationale based on which it was nationalised? They are casting away their own own ideology. They are leaving their own heritage. If they have to demarcate they should have the guts to say that Congress party oppose the privatisation of insurance sector. The Government is doing it out of compulsion, under pressure, out of expediency and out of opportunism.

Sir, in 1988, there was a discussion held in Mavalankar Hall on Super-301. Hon. Finance Minister, Shri Yashwant Sinha, said in that discussion that liberalisation was going to ruin our economy, that he would fight through his life against American imperialism for pressurising us with Super-301 to open up financial sector. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, Shrimati Sushma Swaraj, Shri George Fernandes, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan, Shri Murasoli Maran and Shri Karunanidhi, everybody spoke similar things in the past. Shri Karunanidhi inaugurated a demonstration in Tamil Nadu in the presence of Shri Murasoli Maran. I can show the photograph of that demonstration. Hon. Speaker also put his signature when 116 Members of Parliament had written to the Prime Minister opposing the move to open up. Many friends from Congress had put their signatures, the BJP leaders who opposed this had put their signatures and submitted memoranda. Sir, I am not trying to score any debating points. I am just appealing to the conscience of all those who love this country and in whom a little bit of patriotism is left. This is going to cause havoc to our national economy with so much of financial strain. If you read, `Failed Promises", the report of the House of Representatives the scenario in USA will become clear. Do they allow outsiders to operate in their country? Yes, they do, but only to the extent of a meagre three per cent. We talk of reciprocity. Everybody knows that WTO could not take up insurance sector because it is a highly protected market. We Indians are opening up when there is no compulsion on us and we are being party to it knowingly or unknowingly.

Sir, the scenario will be very very difficult. After privatising LIC and GIC, the most profitable areas will be taken away from them. Urban areas will be taken away. Some say that we do not have attractive products? But the products of LIC and GIC are for common people.

16.00 hrs.

But the products of LIC and GIC are for the common man, for the working people and the fashionable products are for the upper middle class and large number of such products as insurance for the cover for legs of the film actors and for the eyes of some artists may not be available with GIC and LIC (Interruptions) That is good. But more important is how the weaker sections and the poorer sections of our nation are being served by the LIC and GIC.

I am mentioning about the regulatory body, the SEBI. What is our experience with regulatory bodies like TRAI and RBI? In a highly regulated market like the US, they have failed and stories of "failed promises" have come. Do you want to break the State monopoly of insurance? The world over, the scenario is cartelisation, oligopoly, monopoly, merger and acquisition. Do you want more penetration? With such GDP, as with 425 dollars of per capita income in India, how can you expect more penetration? Look at the report of Switzerland on Insurance. There the insurance business is only three per cent. Very few people believe in the Insurance Companies in Europe and US. Will those same foreign companies come and serve our social sector and strengthen our process of nation building? They believe in premium. The Chairman of the Insurance Regulatory Authority has come out openly that the Authority will not have any particular functioning with regard to tariff and fixation of premium. MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: There is a limit. Please conclude. Enough is enough.

SHRI RUPCHAND PAL : I am concluding. While opposing the Bill, I want to say that the Bill is not IRDA in the true sense. The Bill could better be named as Insurance Deregulatory and Destruction Authority Bill. I oppose the Bill wholeheartedly. With these words I conclude. Thank you.

DR. BOLLA BULLI RAMAIAH (ELURU): Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, this Bill on Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority, as Shri Rajesh Pilot has mentioned, was taken up during 1993. Reforms have started in 1991, of course, and then at that time, this was referred to Shri Malhotra, former Governor of Reserve Bank of India, to go into these details and give a report on that. The report was submitted in 1994 and later on on 20th December, 1996 during the United Front Government, this was brought to Parliament and it was also submitted to the Ministry of Finance and the Departmental Standing Committee to give its own comments. Subsequently, it was introduced in March, 1998 and again it was referred to the Standing Committee on Finance. Then the Standing Committee submitted its report.

">Now this Bill has come for discussion in the House and it has gone to a number of sectors. People said that this would require some more time. It has not just come out without any proper investigation or opportunity for people to go through that. During the last six years, this Bill has come a number of times. It has been presented to Standing Committees and they have examined it and also submitted reports and finally the hon. Finance Minister has given all the consideration to it and it has come to the House. I am sure this has given enough time to make the drafting and to give whatever suggestions they want to make on this matter. Now this Bill has mainly come to the consideration of the House because insurance is one of the important factors for any economy. Today the amount of resources that we can develop in insurance is very important. We have also liberalised Indian Airlines and we have also seen lot of differences before the liberalisation and after that and lot of people opposed at the time of private airlines. Today they feel the difference in regard to the culture of the people, the attitude of the people and other developments and the same is the case with banking. We have given banking sector to outside country also and even foreign banks have expanded various banking operations. Here we want technology to come, as Shri Rajesh Pilot has put it.

">Why have you gone in for having a private sector in various sectors like telecommunications? Why do you want to be in competition? That is the policy of the Government today because after going through many difficulties, the same Government which nationalized several sectors, have realized that in the interests of the people and in the interests of the country, we have to go in for reforms and liberalization. So, wherever possible, we must bring in the private sectors also and provide competition which is essential. In the area of telecommunications, there has been a very fast expansion.

">The representation has come from the various associations of workers of the insurance companies. Their main anxiety is about job security. I can assure them that after liberalization, after the private companies come in and after the competition comes in, more jobs will be created. There will not be any problem. Today, we are employing two lakh people and it will be multiplied several times. More resources will also be generated.

">Shri Pilot referred to social obligations. I am sure, that will be a part of the obligations of private insurance companies. In Andhra Pradesh, the hon. Chief Minister has ensured that even the huts are insured by the State Government. He wants to support the people belonging to the lower class. So, a girl child born in a poor family is given an insurance policy for Rs.5,000 so that by the time she attains the age of 15 or 16, she will be able to get Rs.25,000 for marriage or education. I am sure, this new policy of opening up the insurance sector will generate more and more new developments.

">In the field of agriculture, there are various possibilities of expanding the insurance business. There are billions of cattle in this country. They also require to be insured. Today, we are talking of crop insurance. It requires to be expanded and they have to cater to a lot of people.

">We require a tremendous amount of resources to be generated for the development of our infrastructure. We need more than \$ 20 billion and we do not have enough money. The Government has brought in the private sector also. We need resources to come from outside. That is why in the Common Minimum Programme of the United Front it was proposed that an investment of \$ 10 billion have to come from outside. The idea is to see that some resources are generated for development. Thus, the development that can take place in probably twenty years, will now take place in five years.

">We are travelling by Boeing aircraft. Why do we not travel by jet planes? We want to give the facilities to the people. Everyone wants to take advantage of the developments that are happening in the rest of the world. We have a lot of technology. We have a lot of scientists. Look at what has happened in the field of software technology. We are producing the bulk of the world's software. Even George Bush Jr. has made a statement that in the next ten to fifteen years, 60 per cent of the world's software technology will come from India. That is where we have the opportunity. We must believe in the talent and abilities of the people of this country. We must open up and it is only in our interest.

">Look at what has happened in the case of airlines, shipping and other large industries. A substantial quantity is going in for refinancing. We do not have enough resources. We are doing a lot of refinancing. That is why we want to strengthen the insurance sector. We must improve the insurance sector. We have to expand the insurance sector. Our resources must increase. We must have technology and competition to generate resources. This is exactly what we are looking for and this is why social obligation, as Shri Pilot said, is very important.

">There are a lot of industries like hydel projects which require a long gestation period. This is where the resources generated by the insurance companies must be utilized.

">The Government will always be able to regulate it. The legislation that we pass today is not final. Parliament has got the right to modify it, to correct it and to develop it. The hon. Minister of Finance has to monitor whether we are going in the right direction and whether the implementation is going on properly. We can monitor it constantly; we can change it constantly. We can always take the advice of the people. We must take advantage of what is good today. If we require some resources for development from outside, we have to get them.

">What is being done in the Silicon Valley is basic, fundamental research. It is not done in Japan. But Japan would develop it much faster and start the commercial production also. So, we also should go in for applied research and make use of developments in other countries. We should always have international linkages. If we are talking today about globalization or liberalization, there is nothing wrong in it. We have also to utilize to our benefit the developments that take place in the world. A lot of countries are today waiting for the WTO.

">They are all very anxious to come in. If it is not good, they will not come. I know that people are approaching us, saying that they will also be introduced into the WTO. That is why, we should be able to stabilise our position. When we first started, we had the Marrakesh Agreement. We have done something; we are continuously improving; and our position will become stronger and stronger tomorrow. There is no way we can fail in that. We can always take the interest of our country. This is the policy which we are going to follow.

">There are some more items on which I feel we have done something. What did they tell here? What does the policy say? In 1956-57, 56 lakh of policy holders were there; now it has gone up to 850 lakhs. Income from premium has increased; the number of employees has increased; and the number of branches has increased. What we need today is the service to the policyholders. What percentage of people are doing it now? What percentage of people are covered in this? It is not even five per cent. We need to cover at least 30 per cent to 40 per cent people of this country. They should be given opportunities. That means, we require a lot of new technologies, new methods of approach, and new ways of doing all these things. The process of constant development is important. They should also have investment of funds which is important. These funds must be utilised for development, expansion of industries and infrastructure. ... (Interruptions) The Government has the right to do it. They can always put a lot on, what is called, social obligations; in the case of banks we are telling that we want to have so much money at a lower interest rate; for export, so much; for small scale industries, so much, etc. That is how we can also do it. We have always done it; we are always monitoring; and we can always dictate it with them. No sector or no company can do it without the assistance of the Government. ... (Interruptions)

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Ramaiah, please address the Chair.

">DR. BOLLA .BULLI. RAMAIAH : Thank you, Sir. That is why, we have this policy of liberalisation. We also have to see various figures that have been provided here. Income from premium has increased to Rs.19250 crore; the number of employees has increased to 1,25,000; the number of active agents has increased to 5,58,000. How many agents are working today? We see a lot of agents who just come in the last two months before close and for the rest of the time, they do some other business. I know quite a number of people like them. I have also explained to these people. That the need exactly is a good challenge. The young generation,

the dynamic generation, dynamic and active people have to come into the picture. They should be able to work full-time satisfactorily in order to make insurance sector economical. The economics of this depend upon how we reduce the cost of these things and how efficiently we can make use of them. Inefficient people are not good to help us. It is the efficiency and the capacity of the people who will be able to produce the best results, which is very important. We have a lot of our own resources and our own talent, but we need additional resources and talent at the appropriate time so that we can expand our activities. We are producing our own satellites and we are producing our own rockets. We are also producing so many things in this country. They are all not because we are lacking. If you take the pharmaceutical sector, people say that we are lacking here. But we do not have enough resources to put into the basic research, but with the applied research we are doing it. Today we are the largest producers of bulk drugs and we may be taking them from other people who have done it. We have that capacity.

So I feel that this policy of liberalisation is very important; this structural policy and this insurance policy is very important at this point in time of this country. I know that the Finance Minister will be able to constantly monitor it. I will give all the advice that is required. The House has got every right to check it with due modifications.

I thank you very much for having given me the opportunity.

श्री राजो सिंह (बेगूसराय) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, चार बजे वक्तव्य होना था।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मुलायम सिंह जी, एक मिनट।

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : चार बजे का समय तो निकल गया। अब मेरे भाषण के बाद करिये। मैं लंबा नहीं बोलूंगा।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : ठीक है, आप बोलिये।

">

">श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव (सम्भल) : माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बीमा विधेयक लाने की कोई आवश्यकता नहीं था, न है, इसलिए हम इस बिल का विरोध करने के लिए खड़े हुए हैं। १९५६ में जब सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में बीमा कंपनियां लाई गईं जैसा कि जिक्र किया गया था, उस समय केवल ५० करोड़ रुपये की पूंजी लगी थी।

">... (व्यवधान)

">पांच करोड़ है या ५० करोड़ है, सही तो यशवन्त जी बताएंगे।">

">हम लोग इधर-उधर से पता लगाकर बोल लेते हैं, १७ सौ करोड़ - इतना मुनाफा ये कंपनियां सरकार को दे चुकी हैं तो इसकी क्या आवश्यकता है - हम इस सवाल का सरकार से बिल्कुल स्पष्ट उत्तर चाहते हैं कि इसकी क्या जरूरत पड़े गई। यह काम नेहरू जी ने किया था और नेहरू जी बड़े फुल्ल के साथ इन्हें निजी क्षेत्र से सार्वजनिक क्षेत्र में लाये। पायलट साहब, आपने गांधी जी की विचारधारा को मार ही दिया। ... (व्यवधान) आप मत बोलिये, इन्हें बोलने दीजिए। अब नेहरू जी का नाम लेते हैं, नेहरू जी की विचारधारा को मिटाने में आप जूट गये हैं। आज आपको इस मुद्दे पर भाजपा का समर्थन नहीं करना चाहिए था। आपको इधर विपक्ष के साथ होना चाहिए था। आपका पता नहीं चलता है कि आप इसका समर्थन कर रहे हैं या विरोध कर रहे हैं।

">

">श्री राजेश पायलट : हम कंडीशनल सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं।

">

">श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : यह मुझे इसलिए कहना पड़ा चूँकि आप कह रहे हैं कि हम मन से इसका समर्थन कर रहे हैं, लेकिन हम तो इसका खुलकर विरोध कर रहे हैं। हम किंचित मात्र भी मन से इसके पक्ष में नहीं हैं कि यह विधेयक लाया जाए। लेकिन आप लाये तो हम इसका विरोध करते हैं।

">

">जहां तक भारतीय बीमा कंपनियों का सवाल है, विश्व में जितनी भी बीमा कंपनियां हैं, हमारी कंपनियां उनसे बेहतर हैं। अमरीका जैसे देश में बीमा कंपनियों में घोटाले हुए हैं, लेकिन भारत की बीमा कंपनियों में कोई घोटाला नहीं हुआ है। हमारे देश के सामने आज जो अर्थव्यवस्था है, उसमें आप देखें कि कितना योगदान इन कंपनियों ने दिया है। दूसरी तरफ आप देखें कि पहले ये कंपनियां सेठों की जेबों में थी, लेकिन अब गांवों गरीब झोंपड़ियों तक पहुंच गई हैं और इनमें जो पॉलिसीज हैं वे लगभग ५२ फीसदी ग्रामीण क्षेत्रों की हिस्सेदारी हैं। उनका यह कहना कि गांवों में अभी जागृति नहीं आई है, गलत है। इसमें गांवों की हिस्सेदारी ज्यादा है। बीमा कंपनियां सेठों की जेबों से निकलकर गांवों, देहातों में गरीबों की झोंपड़ियों तक पहुंची हैं। यह विधेयक गरीब किसानों और मजदूरों के पेट पर लात मारने का षडयंत्र है, इसलिए हम इसका विरोध कर रहे हैं।

">

">श्री राजेश पायलट (दौसा) : इसमें अर्बन ज्यादा है, गांवों की कम है।

">

">श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : गांवों की पॉलिसीज ज्यादा हैं। मंत्री जी बतायेगे कि इसमें कितने प्रतिशत हैं - ४५ होगा या ५१ होगा। हम इसे ४५ प्रतिशत से कम तो मानते ही नहीं हैं। लेकिन हममें और आपमें बहुत सारे ऐसे लोग हैं जो गांवों से शहरों में आ गये हैं जबकि वास्तव में रहने वाले गांवों के हैं। राजेश पायलट जी आपने यहां दिल्ली का पता दे दिया होगा, हमने अपने गांव का पता दिया हुआ है।

">

">उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, पिछले साल बीमा कंपनियों ने सात सौ करोड़ रुपये का लाभ कमाया है जब हमारे देश की अर्थव्यवस्था में हर स्तर पर सुधार करने और सहयोग देने में इनका योगदान है, उसके बाद भी विदेशी कंपनियों के हाथों में इसे क्यों दिया जा रहा है?

">

"सरकारी भवनों का निर्माण, रख-रखाव आदि में भी हमारी बीमा कंपनियों ने महत्वपूर्ण योगदान दिया है और धीरे-धीरे झुग्गी-झोपड़ियों तक पहुँचने का इनका प्रयास है। यह भ्रम है कि विदेशी कंपनियों यही पूंजी हमारे देश के इंफ्रास्ट्रक्चर के विकास में लगायेगी। यह इस सरकार का एक दिवास्वप्न है। चाहे इधर के लोग हों या उधर के लोग हों, हम बीच के लोगों की बात कर रहे हैं। हम बीच के लोग चाहते हैं कि ये दोनों हटें (भान्जा और कांग्रेस) और बीच में हम आये। यही हमारी नीति है और यह नीति कामयाब होगी। जब समय आयेगा तो बतायेंगे। मार्क्सवादी कम्युनिस्ट पार्टी के हमारे मित्र आपके बारे में कुछ कह रहे थे और आप उनके बारे में कुछ कह रहे थे। कांग्रेस के साथ मिलकर चुनाव लड़ा था। अब आपके गीत गा रहे हैं। कितनी जल्दी बदलाव आया है, अभी दो महीने भी नहीं हुए हैं और बदलाव आ गया है। इस देश में तीसरी शक्ति तो आनी है। आप कहते हैं कि बीच में बैठे हुए लोग मन से चाहते हैं कि बीमा विधेयक पास हो जाए। लेकिन हमारा कहना यह है कि हम नहीं चाहते, हम किसी कीमत पर नहीं चाहते। ठीक है बहुमत के बल पर, धांधली के बल पर आप इसे पास करा लें, कांग्रेस पार्टी का गुप्त रूप से इन्हे समर्थन प्राप्त है हम अभी तक नहीं जान पाये कि कांग्रेस पार्टी इसका समर्थन कर रही है या विरोध कर रही है। इनके यहां विचार-विमर्श हो रहा है या नहीं। दूसरी बात यह मत कहिये

">... (व्यवधान)

">

"श्री राजेश पायलट : हमने बिल्कुल साफ कहा है कि हम कंटीशनल सपोर्ट कर रहे हैं, हमने अमेंडमेंट मूव किये हैं।

">

"श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : अभी तो मुझे बोलने दो, आपको तो हम समझा रहे हैं।

">

">

... (व्यवधान)

">

"हम तो राजेश जी आपको समझा रहे हैं। आप और हम तो बाद में बातचीत कर लेंगे। आप यहां बैठे हैं। आप कहते हैं कि हमारा पूरा समर्थन है। मैं समझता हूँ कि आप भी मन से समर्थन नहीं करना चाहते हैं। इन्होंने कहा कि हमारी पार्टी में लोक तंत्र है और किसी पार्टी में लोक तंत्र नहीं है।

">

"श्री राजेश पायलट : मैंने कहा हमारी पार्टी में बेहतर लोकतंत्र है।

">

"श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव: तो क्या हमारी पार्टी में लोकतंत्र नहीं है? समयाभाव से हम इस सम्बन्ध में विस्तार में नहीं जाना चाहते लेकिन वास्तविकता यह है कि आपकी पार्टी में लोकतंत्र बिल्कुल नहीं है।

">

"ब्रहोदय, जैसा अभी बताया गया था कि यह पूरी की पूरी कार्रवाई अमरीका के दबाव में हो रही है। मैं उसका उदाहरण आपके सामने पेश कर रहा हूँ। अभी तक अमरीका में ३.२ से ३.५ प्रतिशत बीमा कंपनियाँ पालिसियों में वृद्धि कर रही हैं और भारत में यह वृद्धि १५ से १८ प्रतिशत हो रही है। इसके कारण पूरे विकसित देशों, विदेशी एजेंसियों, संपन्न देशों की निगाहें हमारे देश की तरफ हैं। जब हमारे देश में बीमा पालिसी वृद्धि की इतनी अच्छी दर है, तो फिर विदेशी कंपनियों को इस क्षेत्र में लाने का खतरनाक खेल क्यों खेला जा रहा है? यह बात समझ में नहीं आ रही है। इस पर मन से विचार किया जाए। मैं आपको बताना चाहता हूँ कि भारतीय बीमा कंपनियों का हमारी अर्थव्यवस्था में कितना योगदान है। बीमा क्षेत्र की कंपनियों ने छठवीं योजना में ७०० करोड़ रुपये, सातवीं योजना में १३०० करोड़ रुपये और बिजली के क्षेत्र में ८ हजार करोड़ रुपये दिए हैं और स्वास्थ्य सुविधाओं में १० हजार करोड़ रुपये और आवास क्षेत्र में १० हजार करोड़ रुपये दिए गए हैं। अगली योजना में लक्ष्य रखा गया है ३० हजार करोड़ रुपये देने का। इस प्रकार से देश के विकास में बीमा क्षेत्र की कंपनियों ने महत्वपूर्ण योगदान दिया है। फिर हम इस क्षेत्र में विदेशी कंपनियों को क्यों लाना चाहते हैं?

">... (व्यवधान)

">">

"श्री मणि शंकर अय्यर (मथिलादुतुरई) : सर, हमारी शकलें ही नहीं मिलती बल्कि हमारे दिल भी मिलते हैं। मैं आपके ध्यान में लाना चाहूँगा कि अभी श्री रूप चन्द पाल जी ने हमें बताया कि नौवीं पंचवर्षीय योजना में १ लाख ३० हजार करोड़ रुपये बीमा क्षेत्र देने को तैयार है और केवल पहले दो वर्षों में ४३ हजार करोड़ रुपये का निवेश हो चुका है। मैं मुलायम सिंह जी आपके पक्ष को ही रख रहा हूँ। जब ऐसी स्थिति है, तो आप अपने देश के मार्केट को मजबूत करने के लिए काम कीजिए न कि उसे कमजोर करने हेतु।

">

"श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव: ठीक है, वे देने के लिए तैयार हैं। यह उनकी योजना है। मैं तो वह बता रहा हूँ जो मुझे मालूम है। बाकी सही आंकड़े तो माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी बताएंगे।

">

"उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विदेशी कंपनियाँ हमारे देश में कमाने के लिए आ रही हैं, तो क्या ये हमारे देश की पूंजी और संपत्ति का पलायन नहीं करेंगी? इस बात की क्या गारंटी है कि देश की पूंजी का पलायन नहीं होगा ? विदेशी और निजी कंपनियाँ यहां आ रही हैं, तो वे मुनाफा कमाने के लिए आ रही हैं। हमारे देश को लाभ पहुंचाने के लिए वे कंपनियाँ नहीं आ रही हैं। जो भी व्यापार करता है, ठीक है वह थोड़ी बहुत सेवा करता है, लेकिन हमें सबक लेना चाहिए कि हम इन्हीं विदेशी कंपनियों के कारण गुलाम रहे और सबसे अधिक समय तक हमने गुलामी सही, लेकिन अब भी आप सावधान नहीं हुए हैं। हमें सबसे अधिक लंबी गुलामी झेलनी पड़ी थी। हमारी बीमा कंपनियों के प्रीमियम सबसे कम है। हमारी बीमा कंपनियों ने ९९ फीसदी जीवन बीमा और ७८ फीसदी साधारण जीवन बीमा का भुगतान उसी वर्ष में किया है जबकि उन्नतशील देशों में बीमा कंपनियों ने ५५ फीसदी क्लेमों का भुगतान एक वर्ष में किया है। इस प्रकार से देश की बेहतर कंपनियों की विदेशी कंपनियों के साथ प्रतिस्पर्धा कराना कहां तक उचित है और इस क्षेत्र को उन कंपनियों के लिए खोलना कहां तक न्यायसंगत है? क्या यह सच नहीं है कि जर्मनी, फ्रांस और जापान तथा अनेक

उन्नतशील देशों ने बीमा क्षेत्र में निजी या विदेशी कंपनियों में पूंजी लगाने से इंकार कर दिया है?

">

"जब उन्होंने विदेशी पूंजी लगाने से, निवेश करने से इंकार किया है तो फिर आपको क्या जरूरत पड़ गई? क्या आप निवेश को रोक नहीं सकते हैं? आपने विदेशी कंपनियों को यहां बुलाने के लिए दरवाने खुले छोड़ दिये हैं। विदेशी कंपनियों के आने से दवाइयां बहुत महंगी हो जायेगी जिसके कारण गरीब, मध्यम वर्ग बिना दवाई के मरने के लिए मजबूर हो जायेगा। यह स्थिति हो चुकी है। कुछ देशों में उन्होंने जाल फंका है। मैंने मलेशिया का उदाहरण दिया था, अगर आप मलेशिया के प्रधान मंत्री का बयान पढ़ेंगे तो आप सावधान होंगे और उससे सबक लेंगे। लेकिन सबक लेने के लिए मलेशिया के बाद और भी देश हैं। आपने सबक किसी भी देश से नहीं लिया। जिन-जिन देशों में विदेशी कंपनियों ने निवेश किया और धन लगाया, वही देश आज सबसे गरीब, कर्जदार और परेशान हैं। इसका उदाहरण मैंने दिया था। एक साल पहले मलेशिया के प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा था कि इन कंपनियों ने मेरी अर्थव्यवस्था को ही नहीं लूटा बल्कि उन्होंने हमारे देश की राजनीति में भी दखलअंदाजी की है। यही कंपनियां आपके देश की राजनीति में भी दखलअंदाजी देंगी, ऐसी हमें आशंका है। आप कह रहे हैं कि आशंका क्यों है तो इस तथ्य से मैं आपको अवगत करा चुका हूँ। सभी पहलुओं पर विचार करने के बाद भी विदेशी कंपनियों को हिस्सा देकर देश का अहित क्यों किया जा रहा है? वित्त मंत्री जी इससे हम कभी भी संतुष्ट नहीं हो सकते। हम तो यह चाहते हैं कि आप इसे वापिस लीजिए। देश के हित के लिए इसे वापिस लेना ही उचित होगा। जब सारी की सारी बातें रखी गयीं तब बीमा कर्मचारियों, किसानों या गरीब मजदूरों को यह सना क्यों दी जा रही है? उनके पेट पर लात मारने का काम क्यों किया जा रहा है? जब इस क्षेत्र में हम हर स्तर पर आगे हैं और विश्व की अन्य कंपनियों से हमारी कंपनियां बेहतर स्थिति में हैं, तथा उन्होंने बेहतर कार्य हर क्षेत्र में किया है। तो फिर आप इनके लिए दरवाने क्यों खोल रहे हैं? आज आप देख रहे हैं कि इसके कारण लाखों लोग सड़कों पर उतर आये हैं। क्या आप जन-भावनाओं का आदर नहीं करेंगे? क्या आप मनमाने तरीके से या बहुमत के बल पर सरकार चलायेंगे? अगर ऐसे सरकार चलायेंगे तो हम आपको बता चुके हैं कि आपकी यह धांधली नहीं चलेगी। मैंने पहले कहा था और आज भी कह रहा हूँ कि धांधली करके आप सरकार चलायेंगे तो आपका हाल बहुत बुरा होगा। आपका वही हाल होगा जैसा मैंने सुबह आपको बताया था। अंग्रेज हमेशा यह समझते थे कि अब हम यहां से कभी नहीं हटेंगे लेकिन धांधली के कारण उनको देश को छोड़ना पड़ा। धांधली इन कांग्रेसियों ने भी की इसीलिए आपको जनता ने सत्ता से अलग कर दिया। मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस धांधली के कारण आप भी जल्दी हटेंगे।

">... (व्यवधान)

">

"कूर्नल (सेवानिवृत्त) सोना राम चौधरी (बाइमेर) : आप भी कोई दूध के धुले हुए नहीं हैं।

">... (व्यवधान)

">

"श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : दूध के धुले हुए कितने हैं, यह अभी थोड़ी देर में पता चलेगा। अभी आप ११२ रह गये हो, पता नहीं आगे कितने रह जाओगे। आप यह मत कहिये क्योंकि अब न तो आपको कोई पालिसी है और न ही कोई स्टैंड है। आपके हाथ में कोई बात नहीं है इसलिए हम आपसे चाहते हैं कि आप चुप सुनिये। क्या यह अमीर देशों को खुश करने का काम नहीं है? क्या यह सेठों को और अमरीका को खुश करने का काम नहीं किया जा रहा है? सीधे-सीधे अमीर देशों, कुछ सेठों को, कुछ उन्नतशील देशों को खुश करने के लिए यह विधेयक लाया गया है। आप देश के साथ जो खिलवाड़ कर रहे हैं, हम उसका विरोध करते हैं। हम ऐसा नहीं होने देंगे क्योंकि यह हमारी जिम्मेदारी है और इसलिए हम इस सदन में आये हैं।

">

"जहां तक इस बीमा विधेयक का सवाल है, तो इस पर कुछ सदस्य बोलेंगे कि यह कमेटी में भेजा जाये, कोई ज्वाइंट कमेटी में भेजने के लिए कहेगा तो कोई कहेगा कि इस पर पुनः विचार किया जाये। हमारी स्पष्ट राय है कि आप इस विधेयक को वापिस लीजिए।

">

"श्रेष्ठ के हित में एक ही रास्ता है। यह तो भविष्य में सामने आ जाएगा कि हम सच है या आप सच हैं। लेकिन हमको इस बात का डर है कि तब तक हम पूरी अर्थव्यवस्था की बदहाली में जकड़े न जाएं। आप देख रहे हैं कि दखलअंदाजी हो रही है। दखलअंदाजी केवल अर्थव्यवस्था में नहीं है, राजनीति में भी है। (व्यवधान) जहां तक हमारा साथ रहा, हम नहीं कहना चाहते, आपका अभी समय है, मेरी पार्टी के ऊपर टिप्पणी कर रहे हैं। ऐसा मत कीजिए। आप दोनों एक ही धैली के चट्टे-बट्टे हैं, ऐसा मुझे लग रहा है। ... (व्यवधान)

">

"श्री राजेश पायलट : १९७७ में आप इनके साथ बैठे, १९७९ में आप इनके साथ बैठे और हम चट्टे-बट्टे हो गए।

... (व्यवधान)

बुधवार को इक्के मिलकर आपका डिनर होता था।

... (व्यवधान)

">

"श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : हमारी बात मत कहिए।

... (व्यवधान)

औरों को कहने दीजिए, आप बैठे रहिए। पता चलेगा कि ये कहां मिले हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

दोनों मिले हुए हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

">

"श्री मणि शंकर अय्यर : आप ही के कारण ये आ गए हैं।

... (व्यवधान)

">

">श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव (संभल) : अगर ऐसा है तो उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं स्वयं इसी पर बहस मांग रहा हूँ।

... (व्यवधान)

एक दिन की बहस होनी चाहिए। अगर बी.जे.पी. की सरकार बनी है तो कांग्रेस पार्टी के कारण बनी है।

... (व्यवधान)

">

">श्री मणि शंकर अय्यर : यह आपने किया है।

... (व्यवधान)

">

">श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : आपने बनाई है।

... (व्यवधान)

">

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Nothing will go on record.

">(Interruptions) ... (Not recorded)

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav, do not provoke them.

">... (Interruptions)

">उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आप सन्नैक्ट पर आइए। आप बेकार क्यों भड़कते हैं।

">

">

... (व्यवधान)

">

">

">श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव (संभल) : आपने देश का हित नहीं किया है, बी.जे.पी. को बिठाने का काम किया है।

">... (व्यवधान)

">उसका नतीजा जनता के सामने आ चुका है। ... (व्यवधान) लेकिन हम कहना चाहते हैं कि समाजवादियों को मत छोड़िए, समाजवादियों को छोड़ने से आपकी दुर्दशा हुई है, और होगी।

">... (व्यवधान)

">इन्हें तो हम हटा ही लेंगे। भारतीय जनता पार्टी को हटाने में हमारे कुछ मित्र ये गलती कर गए नहीं तो हट गए होते। अगर आपका साथ हुआ होता,

">... (व्यवधान)

">जयललिता जी तो पश्चाताप कर रही हैं। इनके प्रस्ताव की रिपोर्ट पढ़िए।

">... (व्यवधान)

">

">उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मुलायम सिंह जी, आप राइट और लैफ्ट कर रहे हैं, सन्नैक्ट पर नहीं आ रहे हैं। आप बेकार हाउस का टाइम बर्बाद कर रहे हैं।">

... (व्यवधान)

श्री मुलायम सिंह यादव : संशोधन का सवाल नहीं है, हमारी मांग है। हम इनको समझा रहे हैं कि जब बीमा विधेयक पर वोट पड़े तो संशोधन को अलग रखिए और सीधा कहिए कि इसे वापिस लीजिए।

... (व्यवधान)

इसलिए हम इसका विरोध कर रहे हैं। वित्त मंत्री जी, भले ही आप भारतीय जनता पार्टी में चले गए हैं लेकिन विचार आपके कभी नहीं बदलेंगे, संस्कार कभी नहीं बदलेंगे। इसलिए हम चाहते हैं कि इस विधेयक को वापिस लीजिए। यह देश के साथ बड़ी कृपा होगी। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ, आपने घंटी बजा दी और मैंने पालन किया, अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूँ।

---

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA (CONTAI): Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, I rise in support of this Bill. The question of reforming the insurance sector has been agitating the nation since the Era Sezhan Committee in 1983, which was by and large accepted but somehow or other because of the pressure brought on by the trade unions, the then Government developed cold feet and did not pursue this matter.

">Since 1991, this matter has been coming up again and again, appearing and disappearing like King Charles' head. Today, I feel the basic issue is to get away from a certain mindset which has been bedeviling us for the last so many decades about everything should be in the nationalised sector.

">Sir, I do not disagree that insurance business has increased since then, since nationalisation in 1956 and 1973, but it could have increased much more. There, I fundamentally maintain that Government management and service industry do not go together. Wherever it is a question of Government management running a service industry, it cannot run economically, it cannot run efficiently. Although, figures were quoted to show how much the LIC or GIC's business has increased, I maintain that it could have been much more, many times more, had it been allowed under the private sector as also with the Government... (Interruptions) I have individually asked many of the insurance employees... (Interruptions)

">SHRI BASU DEB ACHARIA : What has happened in other countries?

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: This is his maiden speech. Please do not interrupt.

">DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : Shri Rupchand Pal gave a brilliant speech with a lot of facts and figures. It was more like a lawyer who is given a brief and he is asked to collect all evidence.

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Hon. Members, as there is no Panel Member available in the House, I would request, with the consent of the House, Shri Basudeb Acharia to preside over the House.

">1654 hours (Shri Basudeb Acharia in the Chair)

">DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : Mr. Chairman Sir, my friend, Shri Rupchand Pal gave a very eloquent speech, giving lot of facts and figures. But as it was found out that there was a lot of inconsistencies and contradictions in the figures given, as was pointed out by many Members. It was very much like a lawyer who is given a brief and asked to collect all possible evidence in his favour, but they may not be necessarily true to life.

">Sir, we are at the end of the 20th century and are moving into the new millennium. The basic question now is not what the LIC and the GIC have done but what more they could have done; and can we get away from allowing other players to come and operate in this particular field of insurance business.

">Sir, there are two aspects in this Bill. One is that of permitting the private sector initiative to come into this area and second one is that of permitting foreign investment in a limited way. Unfortunately, the second aspect seems to be the kind of dominating spectre, which is affecting everybody and not much was said about permitting the private sector initiative. It was mentioned that the United States, Japan, etc. do not permit foreign investment. What they do not understand is the fact that foreign investment comes in the form of a Japanese company or American company. The entire picture is different. Even in the United States, there is a great deal of foreign investment. I know of an Irish company which acquired a US company only two, three years ago. There were many such cases.

">First of all, I will take the arguments against them and then I will come to the arguments for them. The basic objections to this measure are three or four. The first one is ideological; the second one is undue fear of foreign investment; the third one is the question of security of employment; and the fourth one is the question of service to the public. Now, I will start with the job security. I appeal to my distinguished colleague, the hon. Finance Minister, that when this matter is discussed, the trade unions should also be taken into confidence and the matter should be discussed with them. Certainly we would like an assurance to go to them that nobody's job will be at stake and there will be a complete job security for some time. In the case of Sri Lanka ... (Interruptions)

">SHRI LAKSHMAN SETH (TAMLUK): Up to what time? ... (Interruptions)

">DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : Until they retire. ... (Interruptions)

">SHRI SUDIP BANDYOPADHYAY (CALCUTTA NORTH WEST): Mr. Chairman, Sir, how can they dominate the House every time? When the whole House is silently hearing him, why do they interrupt him? ... (Interruptions)

">MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Lakshman Seth, please take your seat. Please do not interrupt.

">... (Interruptions)

">DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : Let me tell that after they have destroyed West Bengal ... (Interruptions) Having destroyed West Bengal, having turned West Bengal, which was an advanced State, a forward State in the 1970s into one of the most backward States in the country, now they are trying to dominate everything and turn the entire nation ... (Interruptions)

">SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (BOLPUR): Sir, he has made a signal contribution. This is the loyalty that he has ... (Interruptions)

">DR. NITISH SENGUPTA: No, it is not the question of loyalty. ... (Interruptions)

">SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : We all know everything. Please do not force me to say things which you would not like to hear. ... (Interruptions)

">DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : Please tell anything that you want to say. ... (Interruptions)

">SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : It has become a fashion. ... (Interruptions)

">MR. CHAIRMAN : Dr. Sengupta, please confine to the subject.

">DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : Mr. Chairman, Sir, as I said, I appeal to the hon. Finance Minister that he should take the Unions into



confidence and talk to them. I have personally spoken to a number of people. Believe me or not, you talk to an average insurance employee separately, not in the presence of leaders, and ask him whether he would like denationalisation or privatisation. I think, in 99 per cent cases, you will get the reply, 'Please help us to go into privatisation. We are tired of this sort of stagnant atmosphere in which we are working everyday.' ... (Interruptions)

">SHRI MANI SHANKAR AIYAR (MAYILADUTURAI): Dr. Sengupta, may I ask you a question? ... (Interruptions)

">SHRI C.P. RADHAKRISHNAN (COIMBATORE): Sir, this is his maiden speech. Why are they interrupting him all the time? ... (Interruptions)

">MR. CHAIRMAN : He is not yielding.

">... (Interruptions)

">SHRI RAJIV PRATAP RUDY (CHHAPRA): Sir, Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar is a senior Member and he is talking in such a way ... (Interruptions)

">श्री मणि शंकर अय्यर : क्या डर गए? मेरा चेहरा देख कर डरते हो। ...

">

">SHRI RAJIV PRATAP RUDY (CHHAPRA): Sir, he cannot go on for long. Firstly he cast aspersions on the Finance Minister. Now he is interrupting him. ... (Interruptions) Sir, how can you run the House if a Senior Member is talking like this? ... (Interruptions)

">17.00 hrs.

">Every time he is using sentences affronting individuals. (Interruptions). He cannot say like that. (Interruptions).

">MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. Shri Rudy, please take your seat.

">... (Interruptions)

">

">।अध्यक्षपीठ के आदेशानुसार कार्यवाही-वृत्तान्त से निकाल दिया गया ।

">

">श्री राजीव प्रताप रूडी सभापति महोदय, यह ऐसा कैसे कह सकते हैं, ये शब्द कार्यवाही से निकाल दीजिये।

">

">सभापति महोदय : हम देखेंगे।

">

">श्री राजीव प्रताप रूडी ये व्यक्तिगत आक्षेप लगाते हैं

... (व्यवधान)

.. ये व्यक्तिगत रूप से सदस्य को संबोधित करते हैं।">

">MR. CHAIRMAN: I will go through the records.

">... (Interruptions)

">SHRI RAJIV PRATAP RUDY : Sir, this is not fair. This is not the way to talk. (Interruptions).

">SHRI PRAKASH PARANJPE (THANE): Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar is disturbing every time. He is advising Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav also. (Interruptions).

">SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Sir, this is not the only case. Every time he is getting up. (Interruptions).

">MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Swain, please take your seat. I have not allowed you.

">... (Interruptions)

">MR. CHAIRMAN: Nothing will go on record except Shri Sengupta's speech.

">(Interruptions)\*

">MR. CHAIRMAN: Please take your seat. Shri Swain, I am on my legs.

">... (Interruptions)

">MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Swain, you please take your seat.

">SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN : He cannot behave in this fashion. (Interruptions).

">MR. CHAIRMAN: Shri Swain, please take your seat.

">Nothing will go on record.

">(Interruptions)\*

">सभापति महोदय : रघुवंश प्रसाद जी, आप बैठिये।

">

">You please take your seat. Dr. Raghuwansh Prasad Singh, please take your seat.

">... (Interruptions)

">\_\_\_\_\_

">\*Not recorded.

">श्री. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (बैशाली) : सभापति महोदय, पांच बज गये हैं, माननीय प्रधानमंत्री जी सदन में नहीं आये। संसदीय कार्य मंत्री ने आश्चर्य किया था कि ५.०० बजे प्रधानमंत्री जी वक्तव्य देंगे। वे अभी तक नहीं आये, न ही एक्लेशन कोई दिया है और न सदन को सूचना दी है।

">

">सभापति महोदय : अभी आ जायेंगे।

">

">Shri Sengupta, you please continue.

">... (Interruptions)

">DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : Sir, as I emphatically stated, let there be no fear of job loss or insecurity in the minds of our friends in the insurance sector. Now, the total number of...(Interruptions).

">श्री राशिद अल्वी (अमररोहा) : सभापति महोदय, प्रधानमंत्री जी ५.०० बजे आने वाले थे, लेकिन आये नहीं।

">

">सभापति महोदय : अभी आ जायेंगे।

">

">

... (व्यवधान)

">

">सभापति महोदय : आप लोग ऐसा क्यों कर रहे हैं? ज़रा शान्त रहिये। रामदास जी, आप पहले बैठिये। अभी प्रधानमंत्री जी आयेंगे और बयान देंगे।

">

">DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : The number of employees of the GIC is about 79,000 or 80,000 and the LIC employees number about 1,20,000 or 1,29,000; altogether there are about two lakh employees in the insurance sector. I submit that for protecting the interests of these two lakh employees, are we not preventing the possibility of creation of new jobs, many times more than that? Unless insurance sector is opened up, this will remain stagnant.

">Now, there has been very little innovativeness in the last few decades, since they were nationalised. In the last few years, of course, with the possibility of competition, the insurance authorities have somewhat opened up, but earlier it was a total lack of innovativeness which characterised them.

">Sir, till today, we do not have any proper insurance scheme in place.

">Had there been proper insurance in Orissa, the people would not have been suffering so much.

">Health insurance is a sector which I should not even say has been neglected; it is just totally absent. There is no insurance. Even now I make bold to say that Hindustan Lever's presence is more felt in rural India than the presence of LIC or GIC because they have not been able to do that.

">1706 hours (Mr. Speaker in the Chair)

">The second thing is ideological objection and there my appeal to my friends - well, they are no longer to the Left but are now in the Centre - is that please try to come out of the ideological shell or the cocoon. Try to be at least like China or Vietnam. The world did not come to a halt with the Communist Manifesto of the 1848 or the Das Kapital of the 1864. The world has changed a lot. Specially with the new information technology, today the world has changed so much that we cannot shut ourselves from the rest of the world. Whether we denationalise insurance or not, with the information technology, with the Internet, I can tell you that there will be ways found where foreigners will enter this area, just as in the case of insuring our planes or satellites, we are always running to foreign insurance companies. So, many people will do their insurance abroad. By shutting ourselves off, it will not be possible to change the movement of the world.

">In China, they have permitted insurance. It is true that it is twenty per cent, but China has other means of control which we do not have. China has other means of dividend repatriation. About the fear of foreign direct investment, how little is the foreign direct investment in the total quantum of India's investment? Somebody said, it is not even one per cent of India's GDP, it is not even one or two per cent of the total aggregate corporate equity of our country. So, why are we so unduly worried about foreign investment? When my friends from West Bengal go all out in the world to seek foreign investment, why are they objecting to permitting 26 per cent of foreign investment in a company in the insurance sector where it can bring a lot of new technology, a lot of new services?

">According to an estimate, the opening up of the insurance sector will bring in six billion dollars of foreign investment. According to some of the estimates, it will create, I should say, not just these two lakhs of jobs as we have got now, but many times more. It will create a lot of new business, a lot of new innovatives.

">Now we come to the arguments for insurance sector. I told you about the possibility of much greater inflow of foreign direct investment, and once again I say that it is much better to seek foreign direct investment than to seek the foreign loans - loans from the IMF, from the World Bank or from any other country. Foreign direct investment is much more dignified, much more respectable. It is more economical, it is more productive than taking loans from the World Bank or the IMF or any other country. Yesterday or day before, while the Orissa debate was on, my esteemed colleague Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee, whom I hold in very high respect, mentioned that it should be declared a national calamity because then we will get international assistance, we will get the help of the Red Cross. May I ask, where does the money for these international agencies come from? Where does the Red Cross get its money from? Once again from companies. So, why do we not get them directly to invest? If some companies have 26 per cent of foreign capital, I do not think heaven is going to fall. With 74 per cent, our people can have greater control. On the other hand, there will be new technology. And when foreign direct investment comes, how does repayment take place? Repayment takes the form of a certain percentage of the profit earned, after the company has started earning profit, which can usually happen six, seven or eight years afterwards. Till that time that inflow of funds remains as a part of our foreign exchange reserves. By the time we start repaying them in the form of dividend, employment has been created, taxes have been paid, production has started and a lot of new things have already happened. Therefore, I would say that foreign direct investment is much more economical, much more productive and much more respectable and dignified than taking money from international agencies like the World Bank and the IMF...(Interruptions)

">DR. BOLLA BULLI RAMAIAH (ELURU): Some countries have refused external aid. Japan has refused it.

">DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : That is why Japan is in such a soup and Japan's economy is in such a soup. ...(Interruptions) Japan only wants to export and does not want to import or wants to take anything from outside. ...(Interruptions) That is why Japan's economy is in such a soup.

">The next thing is the question of innovativeness and service. Having been an L.I.C. policyholder for many many years, I always found that paying them their premium is as though it was a punishment and they were doing a favour to me, to the policyholder by accepting my payment. They will never remind me, whereas in the days of private sector they would always send premium notices which were coming. L.I.C. would never think it necessary to give you a proper notice. I hope things have improved now. But at least in my time I remember that it was always that they accept the premium as if they are doing you a favour by accepting your premium.

">Take the case of claims in regard to car accidents. How many times has it not happened? There is an accident and you have to go through a net of corruption between the inspectors of G.I.C. and so many others. Unless you pay money, your claims will never be settled. Well, someone questioned about the claim settlement record. That is all right to say that no claims will be given and it is settled. But then, is it really settled? How many people suffer whose houses have been burnt? They cannot go through a sort of web of bureaucratic delay and corruption and all that. Therefore, I would say that for the sake of greater service and better claim settlement ...(Interruptions)

">SHRI SUNIL KHAN (DURGAPUR): You were also in the same line. ...(Interruptions)

">DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : Sir, everytime they hold a threat of strike. They go on strike. ...(Interruptions)

">SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): He has been a bureaucrat for years. He had served the L.I.C. ...(Interruptions)

">DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : I have dealt with L.I.C., G.I.C. and everybody in my official career. But the point is that all the time they are holding the threat of strike. Let L.I.C. or G.I.C. go on strike. The Government should try to solve this problem as late Shri Charan Singh did solve the problem of Patwari strike in U.P. which was successful. You should always remember that in trying to protect the interests of these two lakh people are we not sacrificing the interests of many millions of people who are jobless and who are in the unorganised sector? In Bengal, there is a saying. The English translation of the saying is that you are putting oil in a oily head. I am afraid our trade union friends are all the time doing that. They are all the time trying to protect the interests of the organised sector which is not more than about 30 million in our country and forgetting the interests of 400 to 500 million workers in the unorganised sector who cannot put all barriers here and who cannot go on Dharna. ...(Interruptions)

SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR : Is there any guarantee in the Bill that the foreign companies will take care of the unorganised sector in the country? ...(Interruptions)

DR. NITISH SENGUPTA : You will have a chance to speak.

Sir, therefore, I would strongly support the Bill. As I went through the Bill I have felt the need for some minor changes in the Bill like, for instance, when you talk about insuring any applicant, you say of a quality company. When you talk about employment and about persons who will be employed as members of the insurance authority, you have given so many things like accountancy, administration etc You also try to add one more subject like business management or something. Today many management experts are there. ... (Interruptions) No, not for me. I have passed that age and I am not worried about that.

But the point is that there are some other little points here and there which, perhaps, I will come to when the Clause by Clause Consideration takes place. For the present I am ending here with my full-throated and complete support of the Bill as it is.

My Congress friends gave me some suggestions. I have not had time to go through them. But I can promise that I will go through some of the suggestions. I did appreciate Shri Rajesh Pilot's approach and speech very much. About the amendments I will go through them and raise them when the right time comes.

---

">17.17 hrs.

SHRI K. MALAISAMY (RAMANATHAPURAM): Hon. Speaker Sir, thank you very much for the opportunity given to me to make my presentation on this subject on behalf of the AIADMK which is functioning under the able and stable leadership of Dr. Jayalalitha, who is a mass leader, a magnificent leader, a marvellous leader, a field leader, a fearless leader and a famous leader. .... (Interruptions) It is our leader who, among a few personalities of the country, has come forward to oppose the Bill with millions and billions of people, and in conformity with her guideline and her views, let me make my submissions and divulge and dilate a little further.

">In fact, I am constrained and compelled to be a little critical for more than one reasons towards the Treasury Benches which has introduced this most unpopular Bill with undue haste, with hidden purpose and with untold agenda. I may hasten to join with my colleagues in this House who have opposed the Bill. As far as I am concerned, this is one of the most controversial and sensational Bills in the annals of this House in terms of public reaction by way of opposition to the Bill in writing by 1.5 crore people, by way of numerous demonstrations, protests, processions and other means to oppose this Bill and by way of discussions, debates and disputing the Bill through Press and media.

">In spite of all these things, unmindful of the public reactions, the Government seem to be very keen in passing the Bill.

">Coming to the Bill, I am able to see two major objectives; I can divide the objectives into two parts. One is to regulate, promote, protect, enable or to ensure the smooth growth of the insurance industry. As far as this objective is concerned, none will have any objection; it is most welcome.

">Coming to the second part of the objective, namely, to enable the entry of private companies, both from foreign as well inland, and destroying or removing the monopoly or the exclusive privilege enjoyed by the nationalised companies, I could see that the sponsors or the promoters of the Bill expect a huge flow of money from foreign countries as well as inland on the one side. They expect a huge business penetration in the insurance sector and also better services and better products in the market. These are all the major points or the merits or advantages advanced on behalf of privatisation.

">Out of these three or four advantages, the real advantage which the Government is very keen to derive is the flow of money from outside. In respect of others by making structural changes, by making some changes here and there and in the system by efficient personnel management etc., the business can be improved or the system can be improved, and new products can be introduced. All these things could be possible. As such the core or the real or the main reason behind going for privatisation seems to be that they are in need of money. They want to get a huge inflow from outside. As far as I could see and I am given to understand from the Press and other materials, including the number of statements made by our hon. Finance Minister, that the country is in great peril, in terms of financial crunch or financial crisis. On account of financial indiscipline, on the one side and inefficient financial management on the other, the country is in doldrums, as far as the financial aspect is concerned.

">It may not be out of place to touch upon some of the reasons for the financial crisis. There is a sharp decline in the annual growth rate; there is a high non-Plan expenditure, while there is a gradual decline in the Plan expenditure; the revenue receipts have come down, and the fiscal deficit has gone up because of subsidies, populist measures and unproductive expenditure; the

">Fiscal deficit for the first time has touched six digits, exceeding more than rupees one crore; internal liability and external debt have gone up to Rs. 3.5 lakh crore amounting to 58.8 per cent of GDP resulting a huge outflow by way of interest alone. This liability would still go up in the next Budget. It is again seen that 57 per cent of the Budgeted expenditure for this year has been spent in the first five months itself. This, of course, exclusive of Kargil expenditure. If such things continued, then there would be a record deficit. This is not only the position of the Central Government but also that of the State Governments. Many of the State Governments are on the brink of bankruptcy.

">Sir, under these circumstances the States in general and the country as a whole are in dire need of funds. We agree that there is a need for it. If globalisation, liberalisation or privatisation is the way out to this crisis, - having been a former bureaucrat for the last so many years and having seen the system of the Government and how the Governments function -- I would not object to the initiation of any economic reforms or for taking any appropriate measures which would lead to the improvement and upliftment of the financial position of the country.

">While considering the wayout and measures, one should be extremely careful, selective and elective as well. Instead of choosing a right course the Government has chosen the wrong course by means of privatisation. They could have chosen so many other areas.

There are umpteen number of Government undertakings, Government companies and institutions which might have been in need of assistance in terms of foreign capital.

">We have seen that there are several sick undertakings and companies which need such kind of revival packages. Instead of doing that the Government has now chosen the wrong line of going for privatisation. As our leader Puratchi Thalavi has said, this is more like killing a goose at one stroke which has been laying golden eggs everyday. What I mean is that the LIC and the GIC have been performing exceedingly well. Our friends here have already said in so many words giving elaborate details with facts and figures highlighting their performance and achievements the performances of the LIC and the GIC are really excellent. In terms of providing insurance cover, settlement of claims, return on investment, Budgetary support. As such it is time that the LIC and the GIC have done exceedingly well. It is also seen that the growth level and claim settlement is much higher than the international experience. Even the WTO agreement has not covered this area. As such there is no compulsion from W.T.O. to go for privatisation.

">It is to be noted that speaking from past experience of our country with other foreign nations the expected capital outflow has fallen. In 1997 it was 3.35 billion dollars, in 1998 it had come down to 2.28 billion dollars. Again, there is a big gap in regard to FDI also. The approved FDI was 308 billion dollars but actually obtained was 133 billion dollars. As such, what I am trying to point out is that the hon. Members from the Treasury Benches cannot afford to be sure of a huge flow of money from outside under this scheme as proposed. The earlier experience has shown that there is a sea of difference and a very big gap between what is expected and what is actually achieved. Not only that, in foreign countries, insurance business to outsiders has been restricted to three to five per cent only and not 26/- as proposed here.

">We do not understand why 26 per cent participation is being allowed for foreign companies. The Government says that multinational companies will enter this field subject to certain safeguards and conditions. But, by virtue of their money power and their influence through international organisations like IMF, World Bank and WTO, they could succeed to become a monopoly in this sector by driving out all domestic companies out of business. A scenario may develop in which, instead of the domestic companies being a monopoly as is the case now, foreign companies may come to hold the monopoly in the industry. Though the Government say that they are going to ensure safeguards to protect the interest of domestic insurance industry, in practice it is not likely to happen.

">In practice, it may not be possible to achieve the objective of the proposal through this measure of privatisation. This is what our past experience has shown. We have seen Governments regretting for having taken decisions of this nature in the past. Instead of going in for privatisation of insurance, industry to get more the flow of capital, Government should concentrate on the inherent strength and unexploited potentiality of the country. For example, India has a tremendous potentialities in terms of vast domestic market which is yet to be exploited. We have a lot of cheap manpower which has not been exploited fully. We have a well-defined system of governance and a time tested democratic system over the past 52 years. There are vast area of unexploited natural resources. By taking advantage of these, the Government can do a lot without touching the sensitive areas like privatisation of insurance. As such the Govt. can explore and exploit the said areas with in our country for the growth and development of infrastructure.

">In this connection may I make a mention of some relevant areas to be exploited. We have been talking for decades together about the Setusamudram project which is expected to bring in economic transformation to the Southern districts of Tamil Nadu. It is yet to take a concrete steps. The eastern coastal area touching Ramanathapuram constituency. It has a great potential for sea wealth. Why cannot such projects be taken up by the Government and develop for the upliftment and growth of such most backward areas? There are a number of minor ports potential like Tondi, Rameswaram, Mookkaiyur, Valinokkam, etc., which can be developed and which would contribute to the economic growth of the country. Broad Gauge conversion of railway line from Tiruchy to Rameswaram has great economic potential. Presently the broad gauge conversion is sanctioned up to Manamadurai only. It requires to be done up to Rameswaram. There are umpteen number of such projects which would contribute handsomely to the economic development of the country. This would help for the creation of assets and infrastructure facilities besides ensuring inflow of money. The Government, instead of disturbing the sensitive areas L.I.C. & G.I.C. which would affect the interest of millions of people, should concentrate on areas which I mentioned for development country. Under these circumstances, let me reiterate my stand of opposing the Bill and the Bill may either be withheld or dropped once for all.

SHRI ADHI SANKAR (CUDDALORE): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am thankful to you for giving me the opportunity to speak on this Bill. I rise to support this Bill on behalf of my party the DMK.

">The Bill in question has created a furore in the country apart from generating a lot of political propaganda. However, one should keep in mind that this Bill, when it comes into effect, will not immediately lead to privatisation of insurance. It will only pave the way in that direction.

">Governments keeping a tight hold on certain industries would only result in a lack of responsibility on the part of people and lack of healthy competition in those industries.

">At the same time, it should demarcate the sectors which are to be privatised on the basis of the nature, profit, achievement and service to the society. In the case of Insurance Sector, healthy competition is a must for its growth.

">Further, competition can ensure awareness of the benefits of Insurance, timely payment of the premium, immediate release of loan and timely disposal of the matured amount.

">As per the present Bill, private organisations cannot act on their own. The Bill makes it clear that conditions like benefits to the society, needs of the villages and some conditions on investments or deposits would be imposed. Hence, the chances of an economic gamble on the entering of the private organisations in this arena are very remote.

">Even during the regime of the United Front Government, this Bill was presented before the Parliament, but not enforced and various parties of our country have felt its need.

">When healthy competition comes in, the mind of the labourers extends not only to salary and rights, but also responsibility and

duties.

">Though the Indian population is about 100 crore, insurance has not become popular. Hardly one per cent of the population is under medical insurance.

">Viewing from the political angle also, the time is conducive and it is also the correct time to open the insurance sector for private parties.

">This Bill can be considered as an economical tool for deriving some benefits from the international arena. The Central Government should pave the way for this.

">To protect the interest of the policyholders and to promote the growth of Insurance Scheme, this Bill is very essential to the country.

">Healthy competition is a must and essential for the growth and development of the insurance sector because then only the people of this country can get several benefits from the Insurance sector.

">I support this Bill on behalf of the DMK Party. Thank you.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI (RAIGANJ): Mr. Speaker, Sir, this major initiative in tune with the economic reforms of the country, is in controversy for the last few days in the electronic media, in the print media including the positions of respective parties towards this Bill.

">Before I speak on this Bill, I would like to share the agony, the apprehensions and the anxiety of those employees of the insurance sector who are on strike today. I do not like to disregard their call and their struggle. They are part of us. They are part of our family and they are a part of our system in the trade union movement. But we have to deal with a very important matter today just on the eve of the new millennium.

">I am grateful to the trade unions that while I receive their memorandum at least for once respectfully they have quoted the contribution of late Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru and late Prime Minister Shrimati Indira Gandhi whom they have traditionally criticised and abused year after year.

">The Congress policy on this subject right after Independence is known to everyone of this country. The members sitting on the opposite on the treasury benches, members here and members there, cannot deny the fact that right after the national struggle, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, the then Prime Minister, picked up the basic issues. It is the people of India who will decide their destiny through the system called democracy and, therefore, the concept of mixed economy was relevant at that time and the struggle for the process to accelerate the goal of democratic socialism further culminated in the pattern of socialism by late Shrimati Indira Gandhi and was incorporated in the Preamble of the Constitution.

">The abolition of the zamindari system in this country, the fight against feudals for aggressive land reforms in various States and the acceleration of the process of rural development leading to the establishment of the panchayati raj system were the dreams and contributions of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

">We never tried to undermine the importance of economic growth of this country be it on the industrial front or the agricultural front. Today, we are placed in a situation where we have to share the reality of the global economy. It is true. Let us admit the fact today that the entire Third World, the entire developing world has suffered a serious political and economic jolt because the Soviet Union got destabilized or dissolved. The dissolution of the Soviet Union and the destabilization of the Eastern Bloc, the socialist world did create a situation which was rightly or wrongly well exploited by the western countries to their own advantage. The developing world could not express anything except its helplessness for some of their projects were undone and the concept of economic self-reliance in countries like India and Malaysia were in jeopardy.

">In such a grim situation, it was not India alone which was affected. Even the then leader of the Communist movement in China, Deng Xiaoping, in his first address in the Chinese People's Congress said, 'We now look forward to a new era and we have to cope with the situation. It was not only Deng Xiaoping but it was Jiang Zemin who came forward to say that it was time for China to enter into WTO and, after the prolonged negotiation with the US, got the status of the Most Favoured Nation. These are facts of history. Let us be very objective and address this issue free from all other prejudices.

">We are very much concerned about the fate of the LIC and the GIC. These issues have been addressed as if the LIC and the GIC are going to be casualties. If that is so, the Congress has to equally think about it because the LIC and the GIC were a continuation of the concept of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru in 1956 and Shrimati Indira Gandhi when she also abolished the privy purses and declared that the right to property is not a birth right of a few in the cover of the fundamental rights. In that era of evolution or revolution, this was stated by the Indian National Congress from the Treasury Benches. The Congress policy is therefore not to compromise with those who want to exploit and plunder our country.

">It was Mahatma Gandhi, who, on the first day of his arrival in India, being a very competent and articulate advocate in South Africa, decided first not to wear the type of dresses which were worn by the British in those days. He was projected as a half fakir and in reply, he said in the Round Table Conference, 'I have not come here for drama but just to give you an image of how you have plundered India so that this much of cloth is not available for the poorest of the poor.' This message of Mahatma Gandhi was further translated into action to the extent possible by the Constitution of India, by Pandit Nehru and further established by Shrimati Indira Gandhi.

Can anybody deny - from any side of the House - that there was not a single programme in the panchayati raj system, be it in Gujarat, Rajasthan, Bengal or Bihar, be it in States ruled by the BJP, the CPI(M), the Congress or any other party, which was not drafted or articulated by Shrimati Indira Gandhi in her 20-Point Programme. You put all the programmes for the rural poor in a basket and pick

out any one blindfolded and you will find that that programme was either declared or articulated or projected by Shrimati Indira Gandhi. Yet, the leader had to suffer many things. In a democracy, criticism is natural. Pandit Nehru was not spared. Shrimati Indira Gandhi was not spared. That is why, while saluting the workers and the trade unions today, I congratulate them for quoting at least once the contributions of Pandit Nehru and Shrimati Indira Gandhi in this vital sector. Since this sector is very vital, I would like to refer to the memorandum which I fully support. It has been stated that the investment of the Government is very low; in LIC, it is Rs.5 crore and in GIC, it is Rs.21.5 crore.

We still feel that it is low. Therefore, to strengthen our argument, I address the hon. Finance Minister to first remove the apprehension of the GIC and LIC. Please consider in your Cabinet, if it is possible, so that LIC and GIC are made as Board-managed companies like the ONGC under the Companies Act, so that the share capital of the LIC is increased from the present Rs.5 crore to at least Rs.100 crore and of the four GIC subsidiaries is increased from the present Rs.40 crore to Rs.100 crore.

I think this will give a message to the employees and the nation that the dream of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru on his eight objectives and the subsequent policy of Mrs. Gandhi on the General Insurance are not going to be frustrated and also the question of dilution would never arise in the growth of LIC and GIC.

I will address you, Sir, the hon. Finance Minister and also the Members of the Opposition. Let us handle this issue today with great care. About 70 million people have life insurance today. About two million have health insurance. We talk a lot of health insurance, but only two million have health insurance. About one million only have pension policies and about 20 million have some form of provident fund cover. Thus there is a vast scope to augment the efforts of LIC and GIC, within the broad-based network, if they expand the share capital along with competition from the other side.

I repeat that let us not undermine the contribution of GIC and LIC, to the limited capacity in our economy of the country. They did contribute. They did contribute to the planning; they did contribute to the social sector and they did contribute to the Government securities. I do not deny the fact. I am not going to argue with the juggleries of the figures. But let us also understand that the challenge is huge.

Today no State Government in the country can deny that the situation is in such an order that in the basic infrastructure development, the output of the State's revenue and the output of the national revenue are not enough. I thank the Chief Minister of West Bengal, Shri Jyoti Basu, for having his wisdom to understand that, to fight the situation in Calcutta's road traffic, a big flyover cannot be constructed with the State's revenue alone and that unless Japanese funding is assured, he could not do it. Thus, he has done so with their assistance. I thank him for his wisdom.

These are realities. What happened in Bakreshwar Power Plant? We could not have the Bakreshwar Power Plant without the funding from Japan. It is true. That is the reality. If you simply keep aside these realities and say that since the Congress took the initiative to have economic reforms, it is selling out, I would say that it is not selling out. It is to cope up with the reality and to keep pace with accelerated growth of the country, to the demand as it is responded by the people in this country. I do agree that all the reforms are not good.

I was talking to Dr. Manmohan Singh the other day. We initiated economic reforms. I did mention this to him. When I go to a particular village at midnight or during summer, whether it is in Gujarat or in Bihar, and ask somebody to bring a glass of drinking water, he might hesitate and say that, Sir, it is a village; either water is full of arsenic contents or fresh water is not available and that he would ask me to please wait for five minutes so that he could bring me a drink. He would rush to a pan shop and bring a pepsi or coke; and say that here is a drink and not drinking water.

It is the reality. We do not deny the fact. This reality demands much more resource mobilisation; this reality demands much more technical inputs; and this reality demands much more investment mobilisation. Are we in a position to cope up with the network, with the existing structure that we have? The answer is no.

Therefore, each one of us is looking for as to what best could be available in the present circumstances? The insurance sector, with pain I say this, should not have been touched, if our approach to rural economy would have been exploited in the right earnest by all of us. Rightly or wrongly, we could not do so. I will not explain the political reasons. I do not want to invite any political acrimony to this debate. I only want to invite the reality, the realistic situation in this hour of crisis. ... (Interruptions) I am just coming to the point. Please try to understand.

We would like to make clear that the Congress Party would not compromise with any attempt which would destabilise, dilute, wind up and discourage the growth of the LIC and the GIC. That is very clear. The Bill itself is not attempting to do that. The Bill is providing certain safeguards in some sectors. The sector which needs to be safeguarded the most is the social sector. Should the benefits which will come out of the participation of the private and foreign investments to the tune of 26 per cent, be totally converted at appropriate time after ten years and some amount of profit be repatriated in a manner that the country will suffer? No. The Government has to ensure that safeguard at appropriate time, either through the authority or through the legislation or through appropriate notification. What we demand is the investment in the sector and obligation to the social sector should be on par with the public sector. If the GIC and the LIC can participate in the social sector in a pattern that has been developed so far, why can they not do that? In fact, it should be more. That is our demand. This is the issue which the Government should address.

We cannot afford to adopt double standards. I am sorry to say that when we initiated reforms, many have objected and criticized the Congress Party, the way usually the Congress Party is criticized. We are attuned to being criticized in many ways for the last fifty years, either by this side or that side. But we stick to one gun. For political purposes, we have not joined one party to defeat the other, and then coming out of that one fine morning, and saying that 'X' is right and 'Y' is wrong. We never shared power with the BJP or the Jan Sangh at any point of time before or after Independence. Shri Ram Manohar Lohia used to criticize the Congress vehemently. But I have great respect for the great social leader whose books I have read and learnt many things. Shri Sharad Yadav is a product of that socialism. Today, he might have changed his stance and joined the saffron clan, but I have not done that; and we have not done that.

We took a very convincing line that economic reforms is the call of the day to the extent permissible in India. The economic reforms should not be done in such a manner which would compromise with the interests of the poor and the rural sector. We took that line step by step. ... (Interruptions) I do not want to talk about the State Governments. I do not want to join the political debate. Please do not compel me. If you compel me to open the Pandora's box, it would help neither me nor you. ... (Interruptions) Since you compel me, I would say that I am proud of Shri Jyoti Basu as he had the guts to say in the open session of the CII in Calcutta that the time has come to improve the infrastructure through foreign and private investments. If you defy him, then it is your business and not mine. I do not want to go into the details. Today, in this hour of crisis, not a single new project could be executed with the State revenue or the Central revenue. I think he is correct. I am not saying that he is not a Marxist. We have to do this within the limited option available to the developing nation; and we have to do it within the limited framework of parliamentary democracy. Theoretically, you can accuse us. I can also join some seminar and debate how Das Kapital is wrong and Gandhiji is right. That is for the consumption of certain intellectuals. But at the end of the day, you would see that it has not served the poorest of the poor who wants drinking water first and not Pepsi. So, the country has to think as to how to mobilise the resources. I personally feel that on this aspect we should not indulge in jugglery of words and we should not fight over facts and figures. We must respond to the reality. So, our first duty is to remove the apprehensions of the thousands and thousands of employees of the LIC and the GIC. I do not agree with Dr. Nitish Sengupta that they have delayed the settlements. Dr. Sengupta, as an ex-bureaucrat, knows well as to how difficult it was to move the files. It took longer and longer days. You people used to say that it is not Shrimati Indira Gandhi or Shri Vajpayee who has to rule. When you sat in bureaucracy, you thought that we are the fools of the politics and that will go out. You are the bureaucrats who have to rule. But I am glad that you have come here. Ultimately, this is your place and not that.

Today, the reality is, we have to understand the situation in the most objective manner. What we said in our election Manifesto, about the infrastructural structure, we stand by that. We got vote, though we did not come to power. We told the people that this was our Manifesto. We are simply sitting in the Opposition. We have never said that since the Congress Party could not get a mandate to form the Government, we have to volte face. To adopt such double standards, is not the policy of the Congress. It may be the policy of others.

The Congress has made it very clear that it will not only act as constructive Opposition, but it may even confront with the Government whenever the situation arises. We shall stand by whatever we have said. We will never think that we have no role to play in the law courtyard of the country. We are the architects of many legislations. We are the initiators of many dialogues. They have changed themselves but we have not.

I remember, in 1972 when Simla Agreement was signed between Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Bhutto, there were different comments made by many people. It is on record. What were the comments made by the RSS then? I am glad and I thank Shri Vajpayee who in his wisdom has found in Lahore Declaration that the ultimate Indo-Pak talks can only be articulated within the framework of the Simla Agreement. He has proved that we were right. We have proved that we have never done wrong in history. We proved to ourselves that we were correct. The Non-aligned Movement which was founded by Tito, Nasser and Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru, still carries the flame that India was right. The Congress was right. Pandit ji was right. We have not devalued our position. We have not changed our concept and the character. We had differences. Aberrations are always there in every political Party and the system. There may be fight within the Party, that is a different thing. When the challenges come, we do not compromise on the people's issue and at the same time we do not confront on the issue of politics.

The Prime Minister is here in the House. I am sorry to say that it pains me to say that a spokesman of BJP said on television that the Congress is bargaining on IRDA Bill on the removal of Shri Rajiv Gandhi's name from the Chargesheet. It pains me. Shri Rajiv Gandhi will never come to us. He has gone for ever. The Congress Party and its commitment in its Manifesto is not equated on such issues. For that, we know how to play the role outside the Parliament through the people. After her victory from Chikmanglur, when Shrimati Gandhi was prosecuted in the House by the Shah Commission, we did cry in this House. But nothing could happen. The people of India rose to the occasion and replied rightly. We have faith in democracy and the people. We are ultimately answerable to the people. So far as this Parliament is concerned, it is sovereign and supreme. It is above everything and in Parliament we cannot play double standards. Indian National Congress may or may not come back to power, it should never be recorded in the history that it played double standards and played as hypocrite whenever it was convenient. That is why, we have taken a decision that we shall participate in this debate. We shall extend our support to the Bill if some of our amendments are taken care of by the Government ... (Interruptions) I am not yielding.

MR. SPEAKER: Please take your seat. He is not yielding.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: The social sector is most important. Foreign equity will come. Private companies will come. Why did we nationalise the banks. The banks have to support 14 or 16 houses in the country. At that time, many on the other side did not support us. But today, when a rickshaw puller says with pride that he is not indebted to Birlas or Tatas but is indebted to a particular bank in which he is also a partner, I feel proud and feel that Shrimati Gandhi is still alive. Shri Venkaiah Naidu can abuse Shri Rajiv Gandhi and say that Congress has compromised on bargaining, I hold his statement with utter contempt. This is not the way the responsible Party should talk when an important issue is being discussed in the House. A rickshaw puller feels proud that his rickshaw has come to him through a bank and Birla is not its owner. Equally a policyholder, be it a barrister or a peasant or a politician or a clerk, feels proud that he is also a partner in contributing to the nation-building process through LIC or GIC. So, please for God's sake, Mr. Finance Minister, do not take away that pride of the nation, through LIC and GIC, from the people.

18.00 hrs.

That is our submission from Congress to you. That is our appeal to you. I must thank Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and the hon. Finance Minister -- whatever you said against our economic reforms while you were in the Opposition -- because at the end of the day you have agreed to accept our initiative in respect of economic reforms. I thank you for your belated wisdom. But I again repeat, please do not make a mistake of allowing them to do whatever they like. You have made an authority of ten people. What is the point in it?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Members, still we have 24 speakers. So, unless we extend the House till 8 o'clock, we cannot cover all of them.



I think the House agrees to extend the House till 8 o'clock.

SEVERAL HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI: Sir, India's life insurance premium as percentage of the GDP is 1.3 per cent as against 5.2 per cent in the United States of America, 6.5 per cent in the United Kingdom and 8 per cent in South Korea. Only 22 per cent to 23 per cent of the insurable population in India currently has a life policy. The life insurance accounts for just about 6 per cent of the domestic savings in the country. It is 24 per cent in the United States of America, 41 per cent in the United Kingdom and 32 per cent in South Korea. Our economic reforms are not for surrendering the nation. The Congress' viewpoint of economic reform is not to compromise the Constitutional obligations. The Congress viewpoint is not to dilute the public sector or to dilute its expanded growth or to curtail the commanding height. But in the insurance sector, we feel that large areas of the nation has to be covered in a manner it is required at this moment. Our neighbouring country Bangladesh and another smaller nation, who is our good friend, Nepal are planning to give insurance coverage to the last man of the village. If they have started the negotiations, should India be left behind? We are asking the industry to grow and we are asking many new ventures to come. At the dawn of information technology which has taken the business today right in the drawing room through Internet, in that atmosphere we should not place India into isolation from the entire economic situation of the globe. We must compete by not causing harm to the cherished goals of the public sector. But we should motivate them. I therefore, demand that the Finance Minister must professionalize the functioning of LIC and GIC. I know that you have given them computers. But computer is not a machine. It is also motivation. You gave Internet to many offices. I know that. But it is not merely a technological innovation. It is the technological upgradation of the man and motivation.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I therefore request to all the Opposition Members not to misinterpret our approach on economic reforms which is given in our election Manifesto. We would like to make a clear distinction between the approach of the Bill and ours. The approach of the Bill is just to say that the authority with ten people will take care of the entire thing. We feel it is too much. I think it is just to please a few professionals who have retired or who are on the verge of retirement. You make it a little smaller and make clear-cut provisions for the investment in the social sector in line with public sector. You give a guarantee that if the private companies further violate your obligation, they will be penalised by economic fines and then their registration should be cancelled. You begin with this and see how they behave. If they do not behave properly and come back to Parliament we will further give amendments and we will further endorse our view. Again I repeat please do not destabilize the GIC and the LIC.

With these words I commend. I request the Finance Minister to consider our observation in the Bill in terms of amendments and suggestions at an appropriate hour. Thereafter, we shall certainly be happy to support this Bill.

It is because it is not a Bill, as Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav has predicted on the political terminology -

**इसमें बी.जे.पी. और कांग्रेस की मिलीभगत जैसा कुछ नहीं है।**

If anybody had fought consistently with BJP and Jan Sangh right from the birth of Jan Sangh, it was Pandit Nehru and the Congress and nobody else.

**आप लोगों ने बहुत कुछ सोचा था। इमरजेन्सी में फ्रंट बनाया था, तब सोचा। श्री रानीव गांधी के खिलाफ लड़ाई की, तब सोचा। ठीक है। हम लोगों की मुसीबत यही है कि जो लोग हमें गाली देते हैं उनकी गाली हम बदस्तूर करते हैं, लेकिन दुख इतना ही है कि जो लोग हमारी मदद से मंत्री बनें थे, वे भूल जाते हैं कि हम अच्छे हैं या बुरे हैं।**

\*SURESH RAMRAO JADHAV (PARBHANI): Mr Chairman, Sir, I represent Shiv Sena party and Parbhani constituency of Maharashtra. I represent rural area of Maharashtra. Insurance Regulatory Authority Bill has been discussed in the House for the past few days. I do not propose to discuss all salient features and aspects of this Bill. I would like to highlight only one particular aspect of this Bill. Insurance, insurance company and the beneficiary of the insurance are three important factors. We have to consider whether the actual beneficiary gets benefitted through insurance and insurance agencies. I welcome the Insurance Regulatory Authority Bill brought forward by the Finance Ministry. I extend the support of Shiv Sena party for this Bill and I also extend support on my own behalf also for this Bill. But while implementing provisions of this Bill especially in rural areas certain difficulties may come up. India consists of rural areas. 70% of our population resides in rural areas. Whether farmers, artisans labourers, agricultural workers living in rural areas are going to be benefitted by implementing this Bill is the real question? We have to think how the insurance companies would be implementing the provisions of this Bill and whether the beneficiary would face harassment at the hands of these companies. I welcome the Insurance Regulatory Authority Bill brought forward by the Finance Ministry because it would allow foreign companies to enter the insurance sector. This will enable in putting an end to the monopoly of the domestic insurance companies. Whether it be LIC or GIC. The holder of the policy will certainly be benefitted on account of this Bill. Insurance has become an inseparable aspect of life. Whether it is an insurance of one's life or tractor, jeep, electric motor, house, animals like cows or buffalo. A common person or a farmer should have the facility of insuring these things. He must get sufficient amount of compensation if he insures his life or his belongings. Whenever there is an incident because of which the beneficiary claims the insurance amount, he should not face hurdles and difficulties in getting the claim settled. Farmers or agricultural workers who have insured their life or belongings should actually get the benefit. When we are discussing this issue, I feel it is necessary to ensure that common man does not face any hurdles and obstacles while getting the amount of insurance. No technical difficulties should come in the way while he is seeking his insurance claim. I feel it is necessary to ensure this so that actual beneficiaries get their claims settled without difficulty.

">I do not want to discuss much on this issue. But through this discussion I would only like to point out that while the insurance claim is

settled, the common man should not be harassed by the insurance company, the agent or the insurance inspectors. Technical considerations should not come in the way and deprive the beneficiary of the benefit which he is going to get on account of his insurance. I request Hon. Finance Minister and Finance Ministry that the benefit of insurance should go to the farmers, agricultural workers, artisans, persons belonging to Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, backward class people and above all the people living in rural areas. We have to see that no technical problems come in their way and their insurance claims are settled without any difficulty. This is the aspect which I want to emphasise in this debate.

">With these words I conclude my speech.

">\* Translation of the speech originally delivered in Marathi.

डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह (बैशाली) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, बीमा विनियामक और विकास प्राधिकरण विधेयक, १९९९ का घनघोर विरोध करने के लिए मैं खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

">

">अध्यक्ष महोदय : रघुवंश प्रसाद जी, आप इतनी जोर से क्यों बोल रहे हैं?

">

">डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं धीरे बोलूंगा। जोर से तब बोलना पड़ता है जब हमारी कोई सुनवाई नहीं होती।

">

">अध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा यह दृढ़ मत है कि यह विधेयक प्रतिगामी है और केवल प्रतिगामी कदम ही नहीं बल्कि स्वदेशी अर्थव्यवस्था और स्वदेशी अर्थशास्त्र की मृत्यु का दस्तावेज है। एक बीमा विधेयक १९३८ वाला है, एक बीमा विधेयक १९५६ वाला और एक १९७२-७३ वाला। हम सुनते थे कि टू-इन-वन, ग्री-इन-वन, लेकिन महोदय यह तो वन-इन-ग्री है। तीनों विधेयकों के ऊपर एक कानून बना रहे है। १९५६ में इश्योरेंस का कारोबार जो कंपनियां कर रही थीं वे चौपट थीं इसलिए उन्हें नेशनलाइज कर दिया गया और १९५६ में लाइफ इश्योरेंस का गठन हुआ और तमाम कंपनियां नेशनलाइज कर दी गईं। फिर १९७२-७३ में लोगों ने महसूस किया कि जनरल इश्योरेंस के क्षेत्र में जो कंपनियां थीं, वे ठीक प्रकार से कार्य नहीं कर पा रही थीं तो उनका भी नेशनलाइजेशन कर दिया गया और जी.आई.सी. बनी। अभी तक लोगों ने जिन रिपोर्टों से पढ़-पढ़ कर बताया उससे लगा कि वे कंपनियां खूब तरक्की कर रही हैं और लाभ में जा रही हैं। ठीक कर रही हैं आगे बढ़ रही हैं, देश को ज्यादा पूंजी दे रही हैं, तो किस वास्ते और क्या जरूरत पड़ रही है कि प्राइवेट कंपनियों को उसमें आने की छूट दी जाए और दरवाने खोल दिए जाएं।

">

">केवल प्राइवेट कंपनियों को ही नहीं बल्कि विदेशी कंपनियों को भी यहाँ आने का न्योता दे रहे हैं। यह कैसा अर्थशास्त्र है, किस कारण ऐसा हो रहा है, इसे हम समझ नहीं पा रहे हैं। हम देख रहे हैं कि सरकार बैचने क्यों है? वह चाहती है कि किसी न किसी रूप में, चाहे सौदा करके यह बिल पारित हो जाये। क्या गरज पड़ी है? क्या एल.आई.सी. और जी.आई.सी. चौपट हैं, जिसका आप सुधार करना चाहते हैं। किसी पहलवान आदमी के लिए लोग कहे कि इनका आपरेशन कर दिया जाये क्योंकि इनको बीमारी है जबकि वह पहलवान कुश्ती सब जगह जीत रहा है, तो क्या वह ठीक बात है? हमारी जी.आई.सी. और एल.आई.सी. फायदे में चल रही है तब भी आप प्राइवेट कंपनियों को यहाँ आने का न्योता दे रहे हैं। इसमें तीनों लोग बैचने हैं - एक तो विदेशी कंपनियां बैचने हैं कि किसी भी हालत में उनको हिन्दुस्तान के एल.आई.सी. सेक्टर में आने का मौका मिले, दूसरा, प्राइवेट कंपनियां बैचने हैं और तीसरा अमरीका बैचने होगा। ये तीनों लोग बैचने होंगे, ज्यादा लोग बैचने नहीं हैं। लैफ्ट पार्टी के लोगों का तो आंदोलन चल रहा है। उनकी यूनियन के लोग हड़ताल कर रहे हैं। ये तो एन्टी डेमोक्रेट हैं। जो आदमी काम कर रहा है

">... (व्यवधान)

">">

">शुभि मंत्री (श्री नीतीश कुमार): आप धीरे बोलेंगे तो भी सुनाई देगा।

">

">डॉ. रघुवंश प्रसाद सिंह : ये लोग धीरे से सुन लें तब तो ठीक होगा। डेढ़ करोड़ लोगों ने हस्ताक्षर करके दिया है। वह पेटिशन कमेटी में लंबित है उसके बाद भी यह मान नहीं रहे हैं। कहते हैं कि आहिस्ता बोलने से हम मान जायेंगे। डेढ़ करोड़ आदमियों ने हस्ताक्षर करके दिया है। इम्प्लायज एसोसियेशन के लोग लड़ने के लिए सड़कों पर आ गये हैं। आप उनको नहीं सुन रहे हैं। ये कहते हैं कि हम आहिस्ता से बोलेंगे तो सुन लेंगे, यह बात सही नहीं है। ये कैसे सुन लेंगे। हम जानते हैं कि रुपये पैसे में कितनी ताकत होती है। मल्टीनेशनल कंपनियां चाहती हैं कि इसमें हम आ जायें। प्राइवेट कंपनियां चाह रही हैं कि हम आ जायें, विदेशी कंपनियां चाह रही हैं कि हम आ जायें जबकि सरकार के अधीन जो इश्योरेंस कापॉरेशन है, वह बढ़िया तरीके से काम कर रहा है। सब लोगों ने आंकड़े देकर बताया है। अभी समय नहीं है, नहीं तो हम भी आंकड़े देकर आपको बता सकते थे। विदेश में जो प्राइवेट कंपनियां हैं, उनका हाल खराब है। अमरीका में तीन हजार कंपनियां हैं जिसमें से तीन सौ कंपनियों का दिवाला बोल गया है। वे लोग चाहते हैं कि हमें हिन्दुस्तान का बाजार मिले। इसी तरह दूसरे मुल्कों में भी लाइफ इश्योरेंस का कारोबार ठप्प हो गया है। सारी कंपनियां घाटे में चल रही हैं। वे चाहते हैं कि हिन्दुस्तान के इश्योरेंस सेक्टर में आने से बढ़िया तरक्की हो सकती है इसलिए उनकी जबरदस्त लांबी है। ये इनके दबाव से ही दबे हुए हैं, नहीं तो कोई बैचने नहीं है। हमारा लाइफ इश्योरेंस सेक्टर जब तरक्की कर रहा है तो फिर इसमें नियामक लाने की क्या जरूरत है? ये कहते हैं कि हम नियामक से सब ठीक करेंगे। मैं इस सरकार को चुनौती देता हूँ कि कोई भी नियामक लाने से आप सुधार नहीं कर सकते।

">

">नॉन बैंकिंग कम्पनी में कुबेर, जे.बी. जी. कम्पनी है - उनके बारे में नीतीश जी ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से जानते हैं। इन्होंने गरीबों की कमाई को लूट लिया। लोगों ने पेट काट-काटकर पैसा जमा किया और वे कम्पनियां उनका पैसा लेकर भाग गयीं। लोग दौड़ रहे हैं कि हमारा पैसा कहाँ गया। कुबेर, बर्नस इंडिया आदि किस-किस नाम से नॉन बैंकिंग कम्पनियां खुलीं जिसमें गरीबों लोगों ने अपना पेट काटकर पैसा जमा किया और वे सब कम्पनियां गायब हो गयीं। अब ये प्राइवेट कम्पनियों को यहाँ इश्योरेंस सेक्टर में ला रहे हैं। जब ये कम्पनियां भी लोगों का पैसा लेकर भाग जायेंगी तो ये क्या करेंगे, इसकी जवाबदेही दे। देसी कम्पनियां भी सब पैसा लेकर भाग जायेंगी तो गरीब लोग त्राहि-त्राहि करेंगे, उसकी भी जवाबदेही क्या उनके पास है? ये नॉन बैंकिंग कम्पनी को लाइसेंस देते हैं। इस मामले में जांच कमेटी बैठी और कुछ लोग जेल भी गये परन्तु गरीब तो मारा गया। एक गरीब हमारे पास आया और उसने कहा कि आप जरा पैरवी कर दीजिए तो हमें पैसा मिल जायेगा। वह एक विधवा थी जिसने तीन लाख रुपये पेट काटकर जमा किया था। उसकी बेटे की शादी थी तो वह हमारे पास आयी कि आप फोन कर दीजिए तो मिल जायेगा।

">

"इनके मंत्री कह रहे थे कि उनको फोन कर देंगे तो हमको पैसा मिल जाएगा। ये लोग इस तरह की प्राइवेट कम्पनियों में हिस्सेदार हैं जो गरीबों का पैसा लूटकर, दिवालीया घोषित करके, हजम करने वाले हैं। हमको इनकी नीयत पर बड़ा भारी संदेह है। ये मांग करते हैं कि संयुक्त प्रवर समिति बना दी जाए, उसमें डानवीन की जाए। फिर कहते हैं कि स्टैंडिंग कमेटी ने कुछ असहमति के साथ उसे पारित कर दिया है। इन्हीं की पार्टी की अध्यक्ष, श्रीमती सुषमा स्वराज की अध्यक्षता में राज्य सभा में जो कमेटी बनी थी, उसने सर्वसम्मति से कहा था कि इसमें प्राइवेट कम्पनियों को नहीं आने देना चाहिए, विदेशी कम्पनियों को नहीं आने देना चाहिए। कुछ लोग यह भी कबूल करते हैं कि विदेशी कम्पनियों के आने से खतरा है। कहते हैं कि आप विरोध मत कीजिए, २६ प्रतिशत शेयर हो रहेगा। इनकी बातों से पता नहीं लगता है कि ये ऐसा क्या कह रहे हैं। इनको लगता है कि विदेशी कम्पनियां आएंगी तो वे पूंजी निवेश करेंगे, देश से गरीबी हटा देगी और देश की आर्थिक स्थिति का सुधार हो जाएगा। यदि यह हिसाब जोड़ा जाए कि विदेशी कम्पनियां हिन्दुस्तान से गरीबी हटाने के लिए आतुर हैं, पूंजी निवेश करने के लिए, रोजगार पैदा करने के लिए, हिन्दुस्तान के आर्थिक सुधार के लिए, ऐसा ये लोग सोच सकते हैं कि विदेशी कम्पनियां लाभ कमाने आएंगी। कांग्रेस के भाई सोशल सेक्टर की बात कहते हैं लेकिन सोशल सेक्टर से विदेशी कम्पनियों को क्या मतलब है? हमारे यहां गरीबों की झोपड़ियां हैं। गरीब आदमी १०-१५ हजार रुपये की बढ़िया गाय पालता है। यदि गाय को कोई बीमारी हो जाती है और वह मर जाती है, उससे गरीब आदमी का आसरा खत्म हो जाता है। उसके लिए क्या प्रबंध किया है और क्या प्रबंध करेंगे? विदेशी कम्पनियों और प्राइवेट कम्पनियों से गरीब व्यक्ति का कुछ भला नहीं होने वाला है। वे लोग अपनी तरक्की के लिए आएंगे, मौका पाएंगे तो यहां से लेकर चले जाएंगे। हमको नहीं लगता कि ये गरीबों के हितों का संरक्षण कर पाएंगे। हमारे पास उदाहरण है।

">

"जे.बी.जी. कम्पनी वाले यहां से भाग गए जिसमें गरीब लोगों ने अपना पेट काटकर हजारों रुपये लगाए थे। उसे देखने वाला कोई नहीं है। इसलिए हमारा दृढ़ मत है कि किसी भी हालत में विदेशी और प्राइवेट कम्पनियों को यहां आने की इजाजत नहीं दी जानी चाहिए। लाइफ इंश्योरेंस और जी.आई.सी. कम्पनियों में अच्छा काम हो रहा है।

">... (व्यवधान)

">मुलायम सिंह जी ठीक कह रहे हैं। संशोधन और प्रवर समिति से कुछ नहीं होगा। इसे वापिस कर लेना चाहिए, नहीं तो ये बताएं कि किन हालात में वापिस नहीं करना चाहते हैं, क्या जल्दबाजी है, क्या बेचैनी है, क्या आवश्यकता है, देश को उसकी क्या जरूरत है? लाइफ इंश्योरेंस का प्राइवेटाईजेशन १९७३ में खत्म हो गया था। उसके बाद से उस सेक्टर में तरक्की हो रही है।

">... (व्यवधान)

">कोई क्षेत्र सरकारी हो जाता है तो उसके बाद उसमें घाटा होने लगता है। लोग कहते हैं कि प्राइवेटाइज कीजिए, सरकारी होने से खराब हो गया है लेकिन यही एक सेक्टर है जो सरकारी होने से बढ़िया हो गया, तरक्की कर रहा है। लेकिन ये कहते हैं कि इसे ठीक करने के लिए हम प्राइवेट सेक्टर में लाएंगे। हमको लगता है कि यह प्रतिगामी कदम है और हम जो आगे जा रहे हैं, उसे यह पीछे धकेलने वाला है। यह रूढ़िवादी अर्थशास्त्र की मृत्यु का दस्तावेज है। इसलिए हमारी सदन से प्रार्थना है कि गरीब जनता के हित में इस दस्तावेज को रद्द कर दिया जाना चाहिए। यदि सरकार इसे वापिस न करे तो कांग्रेस के भाई कभी ठीक बात करें। सदन इस प्रस्ताव को रद्द कर दे। यदि यह प्रस्ताव गिर जाएगा तो इनकी सरकार भी चली जाएगी। ये कहते हैं कि पांच वर्ष तक रहेंगे, पहले तो तेरह महीने हुए थे, लेकिन हमको लगता है कि ये कुछ ही दिन में जाने वाले हैं।">

"इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं। धन्यवाद।

">

SHRI KHARABELA SWAIN (BALASORE): Sir, I rise to support this Bill. I was listening with rapt attention to the ghangore virodh of Raghuvansh Pratap Singhji which was very high in sound and low in substance. Of course, since it is always like that, I just do not want to comment on that.

">But anyway, very strong opposition was made by Shri Mulayam Singh ji and Shri Rupchand Pal Ji. I listened to them with rapt attention. I also listened to the very spirited speech given by the hon. Shri Dasmunsi, which was full of self-eulogy for the Congress Party. Since he has supported our Bill, I will not enter into any argument with him, I will not point out any of the duplicacies shown by the Congress Party several times within these 50 years. I will not mention all those things here. Since he has supported us, I will also like to seek all help from him because we require it now.

">Already very illuminating defence has been given by Shri Rajiv Pratap Rudy and Dr. Nitish Sengupta from our side, from the Treasury Benches. I will not go into the details of what they have already told. I will not repeat it. My point is that there are two-three myths, which are being spread.

">In the Twelfth Lok Sabha, when I was speaking on the Patents Amendment Bill, hon. Members from the Leftist parties raised the spectre of great East Indian Company again coming to India, engulfing the entire country, engulfing LIC, engulfing the social fabric of this country, engulfing the General Insurance Company and everything. They raised that spectre at that time. They are saying the same thing now also.

">But my point is that society has changed, the economy has changed. Shri Rupchand Pal read many paragraphs from the 1998 BJP manifesto and he reminded us that previously we were supporting Swadeshi and now we have become Videshi. So, we are the people who have changed our views. But I want to make this point here that economy of a country is a variable proposition.

">In 1886, when there was a famine in Orissa, three lakh people died. At that time, there were almost about 15 lakh people in Orissa. Three lakh people died and the Government could not do anything. But now, even after this super cyclone, now the entire world has come to its help. Whether the Government of Orissa is capable or incapable or whether they want to retain their Chief Minister or they do not want it, that is a different matter, but now the world has become small. Now the world will never allow three lakh people to die in a State. That is why I said that the Congress, the Leftists Parties have all changed their economic policies in due course of time from the Nehruvian Era.

">The Congress Party had the economic ideology of socialism first. Then during Shrimati Indira Gandhi's time, they came to nationalisation policy and again during the time of Narasimha Raoji, they again came to the policy of globalisation.

">I want to say that the Swadeshi which was enunciated by the Sangha Parivar or the Bhartiya Janata Party has its own meaning. What is the meaning of Swadeshi?

">Swadeshi means that India will be made by Indians and Indians will stand on their own legs. Now, every time we are being told that the East India Company and other foreigners will come; the foreign direct investment will come; and the FIs will come and capture the Indian economy.

">I will give you two or three examples. Take the example of Maruti Company. It was basically an Indian company. Maruti Company identified itself with India. Now, the automobile sector in India has been opened up. The foreign manufacturers have come in a large number. The Indian road scenario has been revolutionized and now you will see so many foreign cars. Have they been able to drive out Maruti company from competition? Compare the Maruti car of today with the Maruti car of ten years back. The technology has improved. The quality of the Maruti car has improved. Now, Maruti company has also been able to produce cars of the international standards. I was just seeing the other day in a magazine about a new medium range car, 'Maruti' 'Baleno', which they have produced. Take the example of the banking sector. We have opened it up. Many foreign banks have opened their branches in India. But after all these operations, if you take the total deposits in the entire Indian banking sector, the deposits of all the foreign banks combined together do not come up to more than eight per cent of the total deposits. They have not been able to elbow out the Indian banks out of the business.

Take the example of mutual funds. Now, this sector has also been opened up. Now, the foreign companies, the multinational companies have also opened up their mutual funds in India but still the Unit Trust of India is the leading player. They have not been able to elbow out the UTI from the business.

I will give you another example. In the two-wheeler market, Suzuki, Honda and other companies have entered India. The Indian company, Bajaj has not been closed. They competed with them and now, 300 Indian two-wheeler companies are selling their goods in Europe, Africa and the United States of America. So, why do you have a fear that all the time the foreigners will come and will make India small? Why do you not think that Indian companies will go to America and capture their market also? I will give you the example of the computer sector. Take the case of WIPRO. It is now the number one computer manufacturing company in the United States of America. The owner of WIPRO--I am forgetting his name--is considered to be the richest Indian in the world today.

1833 hours (Mr. Deputy-Speaker in the Chair)

One day the time will come when the Indians will go abroad; India will also create its own multinational companies and we will go to other countries and also capture their markets as Japan has captured half of the Hollywood companies. It is not true that the American market is a totally protective market and other companies are not entering it. It is not true. As Dr. Sengupta has said, other companies have also entered it and have captured a greater part of the American economy and American companies. So, we can do that.

We want to make India great. We want to make India a world power. How? It cannot be done by resorting to protectionism; by giving protection to our own companies, who do not improve in quality and who do not improve in giving qualitative service.

I agree that the insurance companies of India - Life Insurance Corporation and General Insurance Corporation - have done a good job. I do not deny it. But I also agree with hon. Member, Dr. Nitish Sengupta, that much better could have been done. Everyone has already mentioned that about 22 per cent of the insurable population of India have been insured. Why not more? Why could we not do more? I am saying that there is a place for everybody in India. If the foreigners come, if the multinationals come, they are not going to weed out others.

I will just give one example. Take the example of Philippines and Taiwan. Even after the entry of the multinational companies and insurance companies, they are having only 5.5 per cent market share in Philippines and only 2.9 per cent market share in Taiwan. If you ask me why their market share is not more, then how will they provide money for our infrastructure for which we are inviting them?

Sir, I mean to say that it is just a signal. I am not saying that insurance companies will bring money. They may not bring much of money, but it is the signal we are giving to the West; it is a signal we are giving to the multinational companies that India has opened up its economy, opened up its sector in real terms. We require 60 billion dollars for only the power sector.

We require Rs. 1,25,000 crore for the National Highways and the Express Highways, a pet project by our hon. Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. Where do we get all this money? This money will have to come from outside because this requires a long gestation period for recovery because to construct a road and to gain profit on this, you require 30 to 40 years. Not many investors will come and invest their money and just wait for 30 years or 40 years to get back their money and profit. So, for this gestation period, we require them and they will only come, if they are really convinced that India has opened up and Indian economy has opened up.

The General Insurance Corporation and the Life Insurance Corporation are having a wide network of more than 6,000 branches. These are the two institutions which are having their branches outside India; they are having their branches in Baharin and in the United Kingdom. So, I am saying that these are the institutions which are capable of giving a tough fight to the foreign multinational companies and if the multinational companies come and if there is a competition, then the quality of service provided by the Life Insurance Corporation and the General Insurance Corporation will improve. As a result of that the people will be benefited and they will get better qualitative service at a low premium.

I mean to say that the small companies or multinational companies which will come, will not be able to compete with the Life Insurance Corporation and the General Insurance Corporation for ten or twenty years to come and they will not be able to elbow them out of their business. So, let the General Insurance Corporation and the Life Insurance Corporation stand up as Indian Companies like the Maruti and WIPRO and let them fight with the multinationals and prove that they are the best in the world and they do not require any protection from the Government of India.

So, finally, let me say, as Dr. Nitish Sengupta, has told that only because some people will lose their leadership in trade union activities, let us not go to deprive the millions and millions of people of this country from getting benefit from the private insurance company and from the insurance sector.

Lastly, I would say that because of the fear that the multinational companies might come and might engulf us, let us not do away with this golden opportunity of just inviting other companies which will give us the advance technology and which will provide us with better quality service so that the Indian companies will also improve.

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (SILCHAR): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I do not know whether I rise to support this Bill or oppose this Bill. It is in between. This particular Bill was the baby of the Congress, as a follow up of the Malhotra Committee. This was hijacked by Shri Chidambaram. All our friends had supported it at that time, though CPI(M), as usual, opposed it, I must say. But afterwards it was tactically kidnapped by Shri Yashwant Sinha. Why we were worried and why I particularly was trying to stop it for the last two days was, as Shri Dasmunshi has said, because of a very unmannerly remark by your spokesman. He is a good spokesman, but he should take the reality of life. You cannot browbeat a party of 136 Members and get the support in that manner. Your Parliamentary Affairs Minister says that this is your Bill and is going to be passed. Your spokesman says that this is a bargain by the Congress to save Rajiv Gandhi. Rajiv Gandhi will save himself. Shri Bhagat has come out, Shri Jain has come out, Shri Balram Jakhar has come out. Nobody with political vendetta can do anything to anybody. The Indian Supreme Court and the Indian High Courts are still alive. My hats off to them. What the CBI do, let them do, but justice will come from the proper place. Today what makes you to think that we are going to oppose this Bill? If you say this is your Bill and you are going to pass it and the Congress has to support it, this is not fair. We dialogued for two days. I tried to resist, but hats off to my leader, Shrimati Sonia Gandhi. She stood firm and said: This is our commitment; they are doing it and we should support it. Even then you are saying that Sonia Gandhi is not supporting, that they are doing this thing, that thing. She has overruled our opinion. Even then I have one small submission to make and I know the Finance Minister will appreciate it. I do not know of many things which have been said against him today. I know he is basically a sportsman, a tennis player. I am also a player. So, we know each other very well. What I want to say is that I have been a victim of this liberalisation. I was the first man to do delicensing in steel. I was the first man to take away freight equalisation. I was the first man to do decontrol. The Finance Ministry had assured me that they would always see that we did not get an unhealthy competition from outside. To my surprise, within two years, the customs duty was reduced. Officers like N.K. Sengupta and Montek Singh Ahluwalia say, it is a level playing ground. Level playing ground I have seen in cricket and tennis, not in economics. I went to my P.S. and asked him what is this that all should be given equal facility to fight? The power rate is going up, the railway freight is going up, the employees' salary bill is going up, the bank interest is going up, everything is going up.

">At the same time you reduced the custom duty and you asked the Steel Ministry to fight with you.

">I am glad that today, of late, you have made some reduction. I will appeal to you to see that such things should not happen here. Why am I saying this? During the briefing on this over the last three days, one of the greatest economists of the country or the world, in reply to a question, said that the premium will come down when the foreign companies or the private sector comes. How does it help L.I.C. and others? If the premium goes out, L.I.C. may again become sick and they might have to go to B.I.F.R. Premium should not go down to outlive L.I.C. if there is a reason. But do not forget that the establishment cost of the L.I.C. is much higher than that of a small private company coming in the market. They go to Calcutta and have a small, computerised office and say that so much is the premium for this. All will go from L.I.C. to "A" Company and then what will happen after some time? There will be an agitation. They will say: "Hell with this staff of L.I.C. and G.I.C."

">I am not a Communist. They are always against me. But I want to say that the employees must also be protected. I have seen what had happened in I.I.S.C.O. The Ministers were coming and I was advising them. But I.I.S.C.O. is not revived. The staff is still there without work. What is the help? Nothing else is happening. We must learn from history. Some protection has to be given.

">Secondly, L.I.C. is doing very very good work in the field of social justice in the country. They have a number of schemes. I have seen in my constituency. I have seen a good L.I.C. Manager. I have got it done. They help. Even in fire-fighting, they have come and helped. It is the attitude of the L.I.C. which the Government has inculcated, and imparting it depends on you and me.

">They are coming with this 26 per cent and doing business. You must take care that it does not happen like the Steel Ministry. All the people of steel sector are crying. They do not come to pay donation during election time saying that there is no money and they cannot pay. That is their condition. You be very careful. We have to see to it.

">We are definitely going to support this Bill. But it should not be diluted. If you accept what the Standing Committee has said and the amendments that are coming before you, it is good. If you can convince us that you cannot do it, that is another thing. We are open to it. But we have thought over it very very carefully and we thought that these things can be accepted by your Government.

">SHRI TARIT BARAN TOPDAR (BARRACKPORE): What apprehension is there for it? ...(Interruptions)

">SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : Sir, I will not make a big speech. I would like to say that I do not go with the opinion that the employees of L.I.C. and G.I.C. are irresponsible. Their unions are very strong. They do this thing and that thing. Generally they have proved well and they have contributed to the national exchequer for various things by collecting the premium and other things. Today we are on the street. Their representatives should be called by the Minister of Finance or the hon. Prime Minister. The views and the apprehensions expressed by them should be taken care of. You have said in a public meeting - I have seen it - that you have no intention to see that the L.I.C. goes out of business or they go out of the social cause which they are serving. You yourself have said it. Why are they not believing? ...(Interruptions) It is because they are seeing what happened in the past. It may not be your Government. Many Governments have not kept their word. As I said, I was the Minister looking after the steel sector. I did many things. I could not keep my word when I told the industry people and others.

">You say you are going to build a new India. It is good. Many people said about it. Shri N.K. Sengupta, a former bureaucrat said something. You are also a reasonable bureaucrat but not a bad bureaucrat. Within your circle, you are doing well.

">The functions of the LIC should be considered vis-a-vis the functions of the private sector. We have seen in the past that North-Eastern sector is a sensitive area. We have no objection to private companies going there, but the companies having foreign investment should be restricted from going to the North-East. Why am I saying so? It is better to ask the Home Ministry, not me. In the guise of the agents of LIC and other companies, many persons will land there and contribute to destabilisation. That has to be monitored by the Government in one way or the other. You know that at one time, there used to be a lot of foreigners in the tea industry and other industries. Gradually, the Government of India had to ask them to go back and Indians took over. They have to see on this factor also.

">Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, Shri Bhakta is not here. You are from Lakshadweep. He told me that neither Andaman and Nicobar Islands nor Lakshadweep was looked after by the LIC. I do not know whether it is correct or not. You cannot speak sitting on the Chair. I am speaking and you look at me. In these sectors also, the insurance companies can get better business than in many of the big cities because people use to keep their money in a place where it is secured. As you know, many of the finance companies have ditched money of the investors in this country. The Government is taking action, but it is a long process. So, more branches of the LIC should be opened in remote areas. Let cities be taken over by the private companies. Let the expansion of the LIC be in the rural areas, in the remote areas whereby we can avail of the facilities provided by the LIC. At the same time, the message goes that the facilities to the rural sector and urban poor will be maintained.

">With these words, under constraint, I am supporting this Bill, which I was not supposed to do originally. But something came in the newspaper against me. I do not know how it came. My point was only that the issue has been mishandled by your managers. Many more Bills will come where we have to cooperate with you and you have to cooperate with us. Kindly tell them tonight that thus far and no further. When they go in front of Zee TV or Star TV, they become mad thinking that the whole nation is listening to them and they do not know what to say and what not to say. They should not say anything at the expense of the Government or at the expense of the relationship between friendly parties here. Everybody is here for constructive work.

">Shri Nitish Kumar, are you listening to me?

">SHRI NITISH KUMAR: No.

">SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : Okay, you are not listening. Let some Bill pertaining to your Ministry come. I will see how you get it passed.

">Mr. Deputy-Speaker Sir, with these words, I request that ....

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Are you supporting it?

">SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV : No, I am not opposing it. I am toeing the line of my party. But we were hurt when it was equated with Rajivji. We do not want to see that. Whatever might be the constraints of the Government relating to CBI or other things, that is another issue. It should not be tagged up with this particular issue. Tomorrow, there will be a headline in the newspaper that the Congress party, at last, sacrificed Shri Rajiv Gandhi and taken Shri Jaswant Singh in their lap and supported the Bill. This also should not come. If it comes tonight, the situation may change overnight and voting is to take place tomorrow.

">

श्री जोवाकिम बखला (अलीपुरद्वारस) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आपने मुझे बीमा विनियामक और विकास प्राधिकरण विधेयक पर बोलने का मौका दिया, इसके लिए मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

">

"श्रक संवेदनशील विषय पर आज हम लोग चर्चा में भाग ले रहे हैं। आज हमारे देश की जो परिस्थिति है, हमारे देश की परिस्थिति के अनुसार हम चाहते हैं कि एक नीति तैयार की जाए।

">

"लॉकिन वर्तमान सरकार जो कदम बढ़ाने की कोशिश कर रही है, इश्योर्स कंपनी को प्राइवेट कंपनियों के लिए खोल देने का काम, विदेशी कंपनियों को इश्योर्स सैक्टर में लाने की जो कोशिश यह सरकार इस विधेयक के माध्यम से कर रही है, मैं आर.एस.पी. दल की ओर से इसका विरोध करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। हमारा अनुभव कहता है कि बाहरी देशों में आज जो इश्योर्स कंपनियों की हालत है, चाहे आप अमेरिका को लीजिए, चाहे यूनाइटेड किंगडम को लीजिए या चाहे यूरोपियन देशों को लीजिए, उन देशों में जितनी भी इश्योर्स कंपनियाँ हैं, उनमें से असंख्य कंपनियों की हालत आज बदतर हो गई है। मुझे लगता है कि हमारी सरकार उन बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियों के दबाव में आकर, महाशक्तियों के दबाव में आकर उन्हें हमारे देश में जगह देने की कोशिश कर रही है। इसीलिए मैं इस विधेयक का विरोध करता हूँ।

">

"र्रिन विदेशी बैंकों ने हमारे देश में शाखाएँ खोल रखी हैं, आप उन शाखाओं को देख लें। हम चाहते हैं कि गाँवों के लोगों की भलाई के लिए, उनके विकास के लिए ये संस्थाएँ काम करें और हमारी आम जनता की सुविधाओं की ओर नजर रखें। लेकिन हमारे अनुभव के अनुसार ये बड़े शहरों, अर्बन क्षेत्रों और महानगरों में ही बैंकों की शाखाएँ खोलते हैं। क्या हमें अपने इस अनुभव से शिक्षा नहीं लेनी चाहिए। आज हम क्यों इश्योर्स सैक्टर को बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियों के हाथों में देना चाहते हैं, निजी क्षेत्र की कंपनियों के हाथों में देना चाहते हैं।

">

"उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मेरा सवाल है कि जब विदेशी बैंकों और कंपनियों की शाखाओं को आप कंट्रोल में नहीं रख सकते, उन्हें रेगुलेट नहीं कर सकते और सोशल ऑब्लिगेशन फुलफिल करने में वे असमर्थ रहें, क्या इससे हमें शिक्षा नहीं लेनी चाहिए। आप इश्योर्स कंपनियों को विदेशी कंपनियों के हाथों में देना चाहते हैं। आप हमारे देश की परिस्थिति के अनुसार इंतजाम नहीं कर रहे हैं। बल्कि किसी के दबाव में आकर आप बहुराष्ट्रीय कंपनियों को मदद पहुंचाने की कोशिश कर रहे हैं, जो कि हमारे देश की हित में नहीं होगा। आज बीमा क्षेत्र के डेढ़ करोड़ से ज्यादा लोग हड़ताल पर हैं। वे धरना दे रहे हैं। उनकी भावनाओं की कद्र करना आपका कर्तव्य है। क्योंकि हम जन प्रतिनिधि उनके बहुमूल्य वोट से निर्वाचित होकर सदन में आये हैं, उनकी भावनाओं की कद्र करना हमारा कर्तव्य और फर्ज है। हमें अपनी नीतियों को ऐसा बनाना चाहिए ताकि जो नीचे के तबके के और पिछड़े हुए गरीब लोग हैं, जो गाँवों में रहते हैं, उनकी भलाई हो। उनके विकास के लिए हम जो भी कदम उठाना चाहते हैं, जो भी नियम या नीति बनाना चाहते हैं, उन्हें बनाने की आज आवश्यकता है। लेकिन यह सरकार इस विधेयक में आज जिस प्रकार संशोधन करना चाहती है, उससे ऐसा लगता है कि इसमें कोई साजिश है। हमारे देश की एल.आई.सी. और जी.आई.सी. जिस तरह से काम कर रही हैं, जिस तरह की सेवा यहाँ के लोगों को प्रदान कर रही हैं और दूर-दराज के क्षेत्रों के लोगों को सेवाएँ प्रदान कर रही हैं, यह सरकार नहीं चाहती है कि उन सेवाओं की उन्नति हो। उन्हें समर्थन न देकर उनकी आलोचना करते हुए उन्हें इस बीमा विनियम से हटाने की कोशिश की जा रही है।

">

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, हमें मालूम है जब हमारे यहाँ विदेशी कंपनियाँ आयेगी तो धीरे-धीरे एल.आई.सी. और जी.आई.सी. का भविष्य खतरों में पड़ जायेगा। इसलिए देश हित का ख्याल करते हुए हम इस विधेयक का पुरजोर विरोध करते हैं और चाहते हैं कि यह विधेयक पारित न हो। इतना कहकर आपको धन्यवाद देते हुए मैं अपना वक्तव्य समाप्त करता हूँ।

19.00 hrs.

कुंवर अखिलेश सिंह (महाराजगंज, उ.प्र.) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, सदन में कोरम नहीं है। मेरा आग्रह है कि पहले कोरम पूरा कराएँ और उसके बाद भाषण हों।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Let the Quorum bell be rung--

Now, there is quorum. Hon. Member Shri Amar Roy Pradhan may continue.

SHRI AMAR ROY PRADHAN (COOCHBEHAR): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I associate myself with the views that have been expressed by Shri Rupchand Pal and others of the Left Front and also of Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav.

">Sir, I rise to oppose this Bill vehemently. I would like to raise my voice as high as possible against this Bill because of the fact that this is a Bill which is not only anti-people and anti-labour but is also an anti-national Bill.

">The two lakh employees of the LIC and GIC have done a lot and their contributions have been mentioned here by so many hon. Members from both the sides. The LIC and the GIC are profit-making companies. According to my knowledge, I am not an economist, and according to the data available with me, let us try to look at the performances of the LIC and the GIC. In 1998, there was a growth of 13.3 per cent in respect of new policies; growth on first premium was 22.55 per cent; growth on total premium income was 22.66 per cent. Total income during the last fourteen years, that is from 1984 to 1998, is Rs. 36,352.59 crore. Total assets is to the tune of Rs. 1,32,764 crore. They also have contributed a lot towards the social security net.

">There are a lot of companies in India which are not profit-making. But these two companies, namely, the LIC and the GIC, are performing very well. I do not know the reason as to why these two companies would have to be privatised and would also require foreign investment.

">One major criticism that has been levelled against the LIC and the GIC is that it has not spread according to the population and the GDP. Mr. Finance Minister you would be knowing better as to what is meant by GDP? GDP is the total growth of the economy. GDP does not mean as to how much money has been distributed. What is the position of our country at this moment?

">About fifty per cent of total population of India lives below the poverty line. Is it not a fact that about forty per cent of total population of the country lives in thatched houses? Is it not a fact that in our country a great number of people are half-fed, ill-clad and without shelter? After allowing for this fact, you will find that the data of insurance coverage in foreign countries like USA and UK is not much more than that done by LIC and GIC in India. In a country like ours, who will go in for insurance cover? Will those who are living in thatched houses go in for insurance cover? Will they go to LIC and GIC and buy insurance policies? Only ten per cent of population in the country can afford insurance and they have taken insurance cover. When you consider the figure of insurance coverage by LIC and GIC in India for the year 1998 in the light of these facts, you will find that it is actually much more than what it is shown to be. In these circumstances, why should the Government go in for this measure?

">Sir, my 'hats off' to insurance employees who had submitted a detailed memorandum to the Joint Committee of Parliament. That memorandum says:

">"In such a situation what will be happening is, the savings of our economy channelled through insurance companies would be taken out of the country in diverse ways without India being in a position to have a share in the foreign insurance market and savings and capital in their economies. This is what has happened in regard to all developing countries. ... Insurance markets in foreign countries, particularly in advanced and industrialised countries are very tightly regulated and are closed markets. There is no scope for registration of Indian companies in USA. For example, only three per cent of total insurance premium collected in USA was controlled by non-US companies in the year 1990. In case of France it is five per cent; in UK it is five per cent; and in Japan it is three per cent."

">If that is the position in other countries, India is better off now than it would be after allowing foreign participation. The memorandum further says:

">"There is an interesting study of the RBI as published in The Hindu dated 11th November, 1998, where it is mentioned that in the process of foreign collaboration more money has flowed out of the country than received, causing apart from balance of payments problems, several other destabilising effects."

">In India, a Reserve Bank study on foreign collaborations reveals that the operations of the 458 survey firms with foreign share-holding resulted in a net drain of foreign exchange over Rs. 15 billion over a five year period. If it is a fact that we have lost this heavily, why is the Government still insisting on inviting foreign private companies into this sector? We know that in the insurance sector there are some private companies, this way or that way, which are having some scope for insurance. What is the fate of those companies? They have been paid their due share.

">Sir, the report of the Reserve Bank of India is something which we should take note of. They said that whenever we invited foreign companies into our country our units became losing concerns in that particular sector. This should be taken note of.

">Dr. Nitish Sengupta talked of what happened in China. China has a controlled economy.

">Can you tell me which are those foreign countries which have allowed LIC and GIC to do insurance business in their countries? None. Can you be guided by them? Never. I know the difficulties that you are facing today. Can you guide the WTO? No. It is because

India's position is not so much that you can guide all the foreign companies in India. This is the position. China can direct the Italian and US firms that they can guide only in hotel industry. They have directed the USA to just invest money only in hotel sector. But here in India can you dictate the foreigners in such a manner as has been done in China? Can you direct the multinationals in that manner? You cannot do at this present moment because India is a very poor country. Why are you having so much craze about foreign companies? You speak about the swadeshi but what have you done about swadeshi? When I travel in trains, I saw that only dahi was in the earthen pot and then I felt "Yes. The Vajpayee Government have done something for keeping dahi in earthen pot". We have not been able to keep up the culture of swadeshi. It is not possible at this moment because India is not a new member of the WTO.

">How much export have you done? It is simply 0.9. If it is so, then our position is very very weak and in that respect at this fag end of this debate, through you I have to appeal to the Ministry, to the Finance Minister and others that in the interests of the two lakh people of our country, those who are working in the LIC and GIC and for the interest of the country and of the people, you please do not take up this Bill. You please withdraw this Bill. That is my request to you because this Bill will not do good work. It will give signals to the other organisations which are making profit, like the LIC and the GIC. If you put 26 per cent shares to these companies and if you put the private parties here, if you put the foreigners here, if you put the multinationals here, then the signal will go to the other organisations. Even in India till today there are some organisations which make profit just like the GIC and LIC and then the employees of those companies will feel shaky and the production will be less. If it is so, we should not handle those profit making bodies in such a manner through privatisation.

">So, my appeal to you is to please withdraw this Bill even at this stage.

">1915 hrs.

DR. JAYANT RONGPI (AUTONOMOUS DISTRICT--ASSAM): Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I rise to register my total opposition to the IRA Bill. I have been listening to the debate and specially listening to the Treasury benches and to the Congress who are engaged in friendly match that has been going on.

">The entire debate has been limited to the Congress saying that they are placing some amendments and requesting that they be considered and the ruling party saying that it was basically a Congress commitment and that the Chairman of the Standing Committee belonged to that Party. The entire gamut of the debate was restricted to that.

">I feel that the crux or the essence of this Bill is far more deeper and far more consequential to our national life than what both the major political formations have put forward. More than 1.5 crore people of India have signed a memorandum asking the hon. Minister of Finance and the Government to reconsider the Bill. Here is a Government, which, from the very first day has been speaking about consensus. They are not bringing in the Bill to provide for reservation to women saying that there is no consensus. They are not bringing in the Statehood Bills for three new States saying that consensus has to be evolved. In the case of the present Bill, there is no consensus at all. There has been no consensus not only in Parliament but lakhs of workers have openly registered their resentment in the street. There is no consensus. Still, they are pushing through this Bill because they have the majority and maybe they are assured of support from the major Opposition Party. It is evident from this that their main intention is to go by the diktats of the World Trade Organization.

">I was a Member of this House when the entire process of liberalization started by the Congress in 1991. The then Minister of Finance used to say that initially there might be some difficulty but after two years the results of globalization and liberalization would trickle down to the village level. He used to say this giving out much data and many explanations. He painted a very rosy picture that the effect of globalization, the effect of more funds coming into India would solve unemployment, that the Government could spare more funds for developmental work. What is the reality today? Now, it is the fag end of the century. Eight years have already passed after the process of liberalization started. Has the benefit of globalization trickled down to the village level? Could the Government spare more funds? They can say on paper that so much funds have gone to the social sector or villages. Is it a fact? Is it not a fact that half the population of Orissa is devastated by the cyclone? We have the Government of Orissa saying that they do not have the money to tackle the problem. The Government of India is also saying that they are facing problems.

">For the North-East, many packages have been declared by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance but the money has not gone there. So, in spite of the theories that globalization will strengthen the economy nothing has been done as they had promised. I still remember how again and again the advocates of the New Economic Policy have been pointing towards Thailand and Phillipines. If you go through the records of the proceedings of those years, you will find that they have been convincing us that Thailand has gone ahead of us and Phillipines has gone ahead of us because of globalization.

">But these days, they do not give the example of Thailand and Phillipines because the result was very much obvious. Their entire economy, the very backbone of the economies of Thailand and Phillipines, the very essence of self-reliance which they had earlier to the new economic policy had been smashed due to the process of globalization.

">This particular Bill, the Insurance Regulatory and Development Authority Bill, is a part of a bigger design to economically destabilize India and to economically smash whatever self-reliance the people of India had been trying to build up. So, it is a bigger conspiracy to make us weak economically so that we can succumb to the pressures of the multinationals and we can succumb to the global players especially the United States of America and other super powers.

">Therefore, this Bill is not only anti-people and it not only involves LIC and GIC, if you go deeper into this Bill, you can also see that in the larger interest, if I am permitted to say, it is anti-national.

">So, I register my strongest protest. If I had more Members in my party, I would have definitely not restricted myself only to giving this speech, I would have stalled the proceedings so that this Bill could not have been introduced. But maybe luckily for them and unfortunately for me I did not have the requisite Members to stall the proceedings.



">With these words, I conclude my speech.

">

श्री रामदास आठवले (पंढरपुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, जो इंडियोरैस का बिल फाइनेंस मिनिस्टर ने इस हाउस में पेश किया है, मैं इसका कड़ा विरोध करता हूँ। इसका कारण यह दिया गया है कि फॉरेन कम्पनियों को यहाँ निमंत्रित करके हमारे देश की इकोनोमी इम्प्रूव हो जाएगी, डेवलप हो जाएगी, सरकार की इस तरह की सोच है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अपने देश की इकोनोमी को डेवलप करने के लिए यहाँ की ही डेवलपमेंट योजनाओं को हाथ में लेने की आवश्यकता है। यह बिल यहाँ पास नहीं होना चाहिए, हमारा ऐसा प्रयास था, मगर कांग्रेस के लोगों ने सपोर्ट करने की बात कही है। यहाँ जो प्राइवेटाइजेशन की बात हो रही है, इसमें हमारा पूरा विरोध इसलिए है क्योंकि ऐसा होने से एस.सी. और एस.टी. के लोगों पर बहुत असर पड़ेगा। कांस्टीट्यूशन ने एससी और एसटी को साढ़े २२ प्रतिशत रिजर्वेशन नौकरियों में देने का वायदा किया है। अगर प्राइवेटाइजेशन बढ़ता जाएगा तो एससी, एसटी की नौकरियाँ कम होती जाएंगी।

">

">महोदय, हम शुरू से मांग कर रहे हैं कि अगर आपको प्राइवेट सैक्टर को डेवलप करना है तो क्या प्राइवेट सैक्टर में एस.सी., एस.टी. को प्रोटेक्शन देने के बारे में सरकार कुछ सोच रही है या नहीं। इस बिल में कोई भी इस तरह का प्रावधान नहीं है कि फॉरेन कम्पनियों या जो भी दूसरी प्राइवेट कम्पनियाँ यहाँ आएंगी, उन प्राइवेट सैक्टर की कम्पनियों में रिजर्वेशन की पालिसी होनी चाहिए। हम अपने कांग्रेस के मित्रों से भी निवेदन करना चाहते हैं कि एस.सी., एस.टी. के बारे में आपने बहुत बार अच्छा सोचा भी है। मगर जिस तरह प्राइवेट सैक्टर बढ़ता जाएगा तो एस.सी., एस.टी. की नौकरियाँ कम होती जाएंगी। इसका परिणाम यह होगा कि इस देश का जो पिछड़ा वर्ग है उसे फिर मैदान में आने की आवश्यकता महसूस होगी। इसलिए हम इतना ही कहना चाहते हैं कि आपके पास मेमोरिटी है, आपने भी सपोर्ट कर दिया है। हम बिल को विरोध करने पर भी नहीं रोक सकते हैं मगर हम आपको रोक सकते हैं। अगर आप यह बिल पास कराते हैं तो सरकार को भी इसके बारे में सोचने की आवश्यकता है। एल.आई.सी. और जी.आई.सी. कम्पनियाँ इतना अच्छा काम कर रही हैं। इनमें दो लाख कर्मचारी नौकरियाँ कर रहे हैं। इसका कम से कम एक करोड़ ५० लाख लोगों ने विरोध भी किया है, इसके बावजूद भी इन्होंने इस बिल को लाने की गड़बड़ क्यों कर दी, यह बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आई है।

">

">आप अगर कुछ दिन और रुक जाते तो अच्छा रहता, लेकिन आप रुक नहीं सकते। वित्त मंत्री महोदय की भी अपनी मजबूरियाँ हैं जो यह बिल यहाँ लाये हैं। मैं इस बिल का विरोध करने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। अगर यहाँ प्राइवेट कंपनियाँ आयेगी तो हमारे देश का बहुत सारा पैसा बाहर चला जाएगा। उपाध्यक्ष जी, हम आपके द्वारा सरकार से कहना चाहते हैं कि इस गरीब विरोधी बिल को रोकिये जिससे विदेशी कंपनियाँ इस देश में न आने पायें। यहाँ एल.आई.सी. और जी.आई.सी. को ही काम करने दीजिए। मेरा आपसे यह भी कहना है कि झुग्गी-झोपड़ियों में रहने वाले लोगों को इनसे कुछ भी फायदा मिलने वाला नहीं है। इंडियोरैस कंपनीज में भी भ्रष्टाचार होता है, इसलिए भ्रष्टाचार की जांच करने के लिए भी कोई कमेटी होनी चाहिए जो इन कंपनीज में भ्रष्टाचार की जांच करे। अगर इस क्षेत्र में प्राइवेट कंपनीज आ जायेगी तो ब्लैक-मनी और भ्रष्टाचार के और बढ़ने की आशंका पैदा हो जाएगी। जब तक आप भ्रष्टाचार और ब्लैक-मनी को खत्म नहीं करते, तब तक देश में प्रगति होने वाली नहीं है। जो लोग भ्रष्टाचार करते हैं और कानून को तोड़ते हैं उन के विरुद्ध जब कार्रवाई होती है तो वे कोर्ट से स्टै लो लेते हैं।

">... (व्यवधान)

">

">उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आठवले जी, दो-तीन और आदमी हैं, आप जल्दी खत्म करें।

">

">श्री रामदास आठवले : आठ बजे मैं अपना भाषण खत्म कर दूँगा। जब तक मेरा भाषण खत्म नहीं होगा, तब तक वित्त मंत्री जी का भाषण होने वाला नहीं है। मेरा इतना ही कहना है कि अगर सत्तारूढ़ पार्टी को पांच साल राज करना है तो उन्हें इस बिल को वापस लेना चाहिए। इसके विरोध में हमारे कम्युनिस्ट मित्र और हम एक हैं। कांग्रेस वाले भी हमारे साथ हैं लेकिन उनकी कुछ मजबूरी है क्योंकि वे इस बिल को पहले लाये थे। यह सन्नैक्ट कांग्रेस का ही है। उनके सन्नैक्ट को इन्होंने उठाया है। कांग्रेस के सन्नैक्ट को ही आप लाये हैं। हम आपसे विनती करते हैं कि आप इसे वापस ले लें।

">

">उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं आपसे विनती करता हूँ कि आप अब अपना भाषण समाप्त करें।

">

">श्री रामदास आठवले : आपकी बात मानते हुए मैं इस बिल को वापस लेने की अपील करता हूँ और अपना भाषण विरोध के साथ समाप्त करता हूँ।

">

">

श्री हरीभाऊ शंकर महाले (मालेगांव) : उपाध्यक्ष जी, आपने मुझे बोलने का समय दिया, इसके लिए मैं आपका आभारी हूँ। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मंडल तो बहुत है लेकिन किसी मंडल का हाथ नहीं है किसी मंडल का पांव नहीं है किसी मंडल की आंख नहीं है और किसी मंडल का मुँह नहीं है, लेकिन फिर भी दफ्तर में बाबू वहाँ बैठे हैं और जो सेवक हैं वे पैसे खा रहे हैं और मंडल चला रहे हैं। आज ऐसी स्थिति है। अर्थमंत्री और अर्थ राज्य मंत्री को इन मंडलों को सुधारने के लिए लक्ष्य देना चाहिए। जो मरीज हैं उसको दवाई देनी चाहिए।

">

पूर्व वित्त मंत्री श्री मनमोहन सिंह ने ऐसा ही किया। उस समय सिन्हा साहब ने इसका कड़ा विरोध किया था। यह बिल पास करके माननीय मंत्री जी यश प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं। राज्य मंत्री भी इनका साथ दे रहे हैं। हमारे देश में विभिन्न नदियाँ हैं। उत्तर में गंगा और दक्षिण में गोदावरी पर कुम्भ का मेला लगता है। बीमा महामंडल महत्त्वपूर्ण मंडल है। उसने विजली क्षेत्र में काम किया, बड़े बांधों का निर्माण करवाया और कई जगह गृह निर्माण का काम करवाया। यह कई क्षेत्रों में आर्थिक सहायता भी देते हैं। बीमा कम्पनियों का राष्ट्रीयकरण होने से पहले बहुत धोखाधड़ी होती थी। राष्ट्रीयकरण होने के बाद इस क्षेत्र में बहुत अच्छा काम हुआ। मेरे क्षेत्र में एक आदमी ने बीमा करवाया और उसका पैसा भी जमा किया लेकिन १५ दिन बाद उसको मृत्यु हो गई। इस बारे में वित्त राज्य मंत्री जी को भी मालूम है। उनको मालूम है कि मेरा निर्वाचन क्षेत्र बहुत कठिन स्थिति में है। वहाँ यातायात की व्यवस्था नहीं है। वहाँ जंगल हैं। ऐसी स्थिति में भी बीमा कम्पनी ने एक लाख रुपए उसकी पत्नी को दिए। मैं विरोध करने के लिए विरोध नहीं कर रहा हूँ। जिन जगहों में ठीक-ठाक काम चल रहा है, उसमें हस्तक्षेप नहीं करना चाहिए। बीमा कम्पनियों का राष्ट्रीयकरण सब के हित में रहा। उसने सामान्य लोगों में विश्वास पैदा किया। सेवक वर्ग जन कल्याण के कामों के साथ जुड़े होते हैं। महाराष्ट्र के भूतपूर्व मुख्यमंत्री श्री यशवंत राव चव्हाण थे। उन्होंने १९६२ में जिला परिषद बनायी। उस वक्त ग्राम सेवक वर्ग को निकालने का सवाल आया। उन्होंने इस समस्या को सॉल्व कर दिया। अब बहुराष्ट्रीय कम्पनियाँ आएंगी। वे हमारे लोगों को निकाल देंगी। कम पढ़े-लिखे लोगों को बाहर नौकरी मिलना मुश्किल है। यह वर्ग देश की अच्छी सेवा करता है। सेबी पर नियंत्रण करने के लिए सरकार

बैठी है। शोयरो पर लोगों ने बहुत पैसा लगाया है। विभिन्न म्यूचअल फंड्स हैं। बड़े लोग इसमें लगा पैसा खा गए लेकिन सरकार ने कुछ नहीं किया। बाहर की कम्पनियों पर सरकार कैसे नियंत्रण रखेगी? कामगार वर्ग की समस्या का आप समाधान करें। यह बिल तो पास होने वाला है क्योंकि कांग्रेस आपका साथ दे रही है। सत्ताधारी पक्ष बिल पास करवा लेगा। मेरी प्रार्थना है कि मेरी इन दो मांगों को सरकार पूरा करे।

">

श्री सत्यव्रत चतुर्वेदी (खजुराहो): माननीय उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं सदन में प्रस्तुत बिल पर अपने विचार प्रस्तुत करने के लिये उपस्थित हुआ हूँ। पिछले कुछ दशकों से हम देख रहे हैं कि विश्व में बहुत बड़ा परिवर्तन आ रहा है, आर्थिक और सामाजिक क्षेत्र में नये विचार आ रहे हैं और नये तरह के चिन्तन से एक नई फिलासफी डेवलप हो रही है। मैं समझता हूँ कि चाहे कोई भी देश हो, एशिया या अफ्रीका का विकासशील देश ही क्यों न हो, विश्व में होने वाले इन परिवर्तनों से वह अपने आपको अलग करके, घोंघे में बंद करके इन्हाइबरनेशन की स्थिति में नहीं रह सकता है। उसे समय के साथ, इस प्रवाह के साथ कदम से कदम मिलाना पड़ेगा, ऐसी आज आवश्यकता है।

">

"उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आर्थिक उदारीकरण की पूरी सोच, जिस पर आज हम यहाँ सदन में चर्चा कर रहे हैं, उसी के एक हिस्से के रूप में आर्थिक सुधारों को लाने का प्रयास किया जा रहा है। इस उदारीकरण की व्यूह रचना पहली बार कांग्रेस पार्टी इस देश में जब लाई, तो मुझे याद है और आपको भी स्मरण होगा, उस समय देश के विभिन्न राजनैतिक दलों और चिन्तन करने वालों ने टीका-टिप्पणी की थी। उस समय ऐसा प्रयास भी किया गया जिसका मैं विशेष रूप से उल्लेख करना चाहूँगा कि आज उन लोगों को, जो इस समय सरकार में हैं और यह बिल लाये हैं, हम उस तरफ थे और ये इस तरफ थे, यहाँ जब आर्थिक उदारीकरण की बात होती थी तो न जाने कितनी शंकायें व्यक्त करके, अनेक तरह से आर्थिक सुधारों का विरोध किया जाता था। मुझे प्रसन्नता है और मैं हार्दिक बधाई देना चाहता हूँ कि आज कम से कम श्री यशवंत सिन्हा ने इस बात को महसूस किया है कि इस देश में आर्थिक सुधारों को लाये बिना देश की अर्थ-व्यवस्था को सही पटरी पर नहीं लाया जा सकता। यही कारण है कि उन्हें इन विचारों को स्वीकार करना पड़ा जिसे कांग्रेस पार्टी निरंतर देश के सामने और इस सदन में रखती रही है।

">

"उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मुझे याद है और आपको भी स्मरण होगा कि जब

">

">GATT

">

">पर चर्चा की गई,

">

">WTO

">पर चर्चा की गई तो देश में इस प्रकार का वातावरण बनाने का कुछ लोगों ने प्रयास किया, कुछ राजनैतिक दलों ने ऐसा ही वातावरण बनाने का प्रयास किया। गांव में लोग हम से बराबर पूछते थे कि क्या हमारी गाय का बछड़ा भी ले लिया जायेगा, हमें अपनी नीम का दातून करने के लिये मिलेगा या नहीं - इस प्रकार का वातावरण बनाने वाले आज कम से कम इस बात से सहमत हैं, जिसकी हमें प्रसन्नता है। मैं इसके लिये उन्हें बधाई देना चाहता हूँ।

">

"उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज यूरोप के सारे देशों में वैश्वीकरण की ऐसी प्रक्रिया चल पड़ी है जिसे रोकना संभव नहीं है। सारी लिमिटेशन्स खत्म हो गई हैं। सारा यूरोप एक हो रहा है। न केवल यूरोप अपितु उनकी करेसी जिसे छोड़ने के लिये वे कोई तैयार नहीं थे। आज करेसी का यूरो के नाम पर एकीकरण हो रहा है। वह इसलिये हो रहा है क्योंकि आज विश्व में आर्थिक परिवर्तन हो रहा है। उन परिवर्तनों को देखते हुये हमें आने वाली समस्याओं का चिन्तन करने के लिये स्वयं को तैयार करना पड़ेगा और वह प्रक्रिया आज शुरू हुई है जिसकी मुझे ख़ुशी है।

">

"श्री गत लोकसभा के डोटे से सत्र में श्री यशवंत सिन्हा को सुन रहा था, जब वे आर्थिक व्यवस्था पर चर्चा कर रहे थे। उन्होंने देश की आर्थिक स्थिति पर एक वक्तव्य दिया था जिसमें बताया गया था कि देश ८८ हजार करोड़ रुपया पुराने सूद के रूप में चुका रहा है। हमारे पास जो आर्थिक स्रोत संसाधन उपलब्ध हैं, वह भारत की चिन्ताओं और आवश्यकताओं को देखते हुये कम हैं।

">

"उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आज यूरोप के सारे देशों में वैश्वीकरण की ऐसी प्रक्रिया चल पड़ी है जिसे रोकना संभव नहीं है। सारी लिमिटेशन्स खत्म हो गई हैं। सारा यूरोप एक हो रहा है। न केवल यूरोप अपितु अमरीका में भी ऐसा हो रहा है जिसे छोड़ने के लिये कोई तैयार नहीं है। आज करेसी का यूरो के नाम पर एकीकरण हो रहा है। वह इसलिये हो रहा है क्योंकि आज विश्व में आर्थिक परिवर्तन हो रहा है। उन परिवर्तनों को देखते हुये हमें आने वाली समस्याओं का चिन्तन करने के लिये स्वयं को तैयार करना पड़ेगा और वह प्रक्रिया आज शुरू हुई है जिसकी मुझे ख़ुशी है।

">

"श्री गत लोकसभा के डोटे से सत्र में श्री यशवंत सिन्हा को सुन रहा था, जब वे आर्थिक व्यवस्था पर चर्चा कर रहे थे। उन्होंने देश की आर्थिक स्थिति पर एक वक्तव्य दिया था जिसमें बताया गया था कि देश ८८ हजार करोड़ रुपया पुराने सूद के रूप में चुका रहा है। हमारे पास जो आर्थिक स्रोत संसाधन उपलब्ध हैं, वह भारत की चिन्ताओं और आवश्यकताओं को देखते हुये कम हैं।

">

">ह निश्चित है कि हम सबको पार्टी लाइन से अलग हटकर इस पर विचार करना होगा। राजनीतिक विषयों पर हमारे मतभेद हैं और रहेंगे, लेकिन जहाँ देश की अर्थव्यवस्था का सवाल आता है, कम से कम मैं इस बात का हामी हूँ कि हमें इन तमाम चीजों से ऊपर उठकर कुछ ऐसे मुद्दे हैं, जिन पर एक राय बनानी होगी, अगर देश को आगे ले जाना है। सरकार में आप हों या हम हों, या कोई और हो, ये वह बुनियादी प्रश्न हैं, जिन पर अगर हम संकुचित दृष्टिकोण रखेंगे तो कुल मिलाकर हम राष्ट्र की सेवा नहीं कर रहे हैं। कम से कम मेरी यह मान्यता है।

>

">फॉरें डायरेक्ट इनवेस्टमेंट हमने यहाँ आरम्भ किया। मैं सहमत हूँ, जब हमारे कुछ साथियों ने कहा कि फॉरें डायरेक्ट इनवेस्टमेंट से जितनी हमारी कल्पना और अपेक्षा थी कि हमें आय मिलेगी, निवेश होगा, उस मात्रा और अनुपात में निवेश इस देश में नहीं हो सका। ठीक है। इसलिए तो और भी जरूरी हो गया है कि हम यह सोचें कि नये आर्थिक संसाधनों के स्रोत और कौन से विकसित किये जा सकते हैं। ऐसे स्रोतों को खोजना हमारी प्राथमिक जिम्मेदारी बन चुका है और मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर इस दृष्टि से हम देखें तो आज जिस बिल पर हम चर्चा कर रहे हैं, हम और बातों को छोड़ दें, मैं उन तमाम राजनीतिक चर्चाओं में नहीं जाना चाहता कि किसने कैसा हल्का कमेंट किया, किसने क्या कहा, पर कांग्रेस पार्टी का नेता सोनिया जी ने, हम लोगों से जब चर्चा हुई और हम लोगों ने अपनी-अपनी बातें उनके सामने रखीं तो उन्होंने स्पष्ट रूप से कहा कि ये सारे मतभेद हो सकते हैं और रहेंगे, लेकिन जहाँ देश का सवाल है, जहाँ देश की आर्थिक स्थिति का सवाल है, वहाँ अपने छोटे राजनीतिक मतभेदों को राष्ट्र से ऊपर उठकर हम नहीं देख सकते और इसलिए हमारी नैतिक जिम्मेदारी बनती है कि हम ऐसे हर काम को जो राष्ट्र को मजबूत करता है, वह चाहे किसी पक्ष की तरफ से आता हो, हमें उसमें समर्थन देना चाहिए। मैं उसी के तहत यह बात कहने के लिए उपस्थित हुआ हूँ।

>

">आज सकल घरेलू उत्पाद का मात्र १.३ प्रतिशत हम बीमा क्षेत्र के अंतर्गत ला पाए। आज भी ८८ प्रतिशत हमारे देश की आबादी बीमा क्षेत्र से बाहर है। अगर इतने बड़े पोर्टेन्शियल को जो हमारे सामने पड़ा है, आखिर ५० वर्ष से अधिक हो गए, हमारे बीच में जीवन बीमा निगम भी है, और संस्थाएं भी हैं, वे संस्थाएं इतने पोर्टेन्शियल को क्यों ट्रेप नहीं कर पाईं। निश्चित है उनकी अपनी कुछ सीमाएं हैं, उस सीमा से अधिक वह ऐक्सपेंड नहीं कर पा रही हैं। उन आर्थिक संसाधनों और स्रोतों को वह संगठित नहीं कर पा रही हैं और ऐसी स्थिति में अगर हमारी नई बीमा कंपनियां यहाँ आती हैं जिनके पास पोर्टेन्शियल है, क्षमता है, ऐक्सपर्टिज है और वे अगर इन आर्थिक स्रोतों को ट्रेप करती हैं और उसके बाद वे आर्थिक स्रोत इस देश के आर्थिक और सामाजिक विकास के लिए उपलब्ध हो सकते हैं, यह पहली शर्त है -- सिन्हा जी, मैं भी यह निवेदन करना चाहूँगा, अन्य लोगों ने भी कहा है, और मैं विशेष रूप से ज़ोर देकर कहना चाहूँगा कि समूचे संसाधन जो एकत्र हों, उसमें इस बात के लिए सेफगार्डज़ रखने होंगे, हमें इस बात की शर्त रखनी होगी, प्रावधान करना होगा। मैंने देखा है कि कुछ आपने प्रावधान किये हैं पर मैं समझता हूँ कि शायद वे पर्याप्त नहीं हैं। अभी उन्हें और सख्ती से लागू करना होगा, मैण्डेटरी बनाना होगा और इस रूप में लागू करना होगा कि जो आय होती है इस आय का बड़ा हिस्सा बल्कि मैं कहूँगा कि

>

">larger share of the income should go to the social sector, agricultural sector, rural development sector and in building up infrastructure like power and so on. That is the requirement of the day.

">इसलिए मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह प्रावधान करने पर ज़रूर ध्यान दें कि जो भी आय होती है इस क्षेत्र में, उसका निवेश हो, यह सुनिश्चित करना जरूरी है। उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं जल्दी अपनी बात खत्म करना चाहूँगा।

>

">दूसरा सुझाव यह है कि आपने प्रोविज़न किये हैं, उसे और सुनिश्चित कर लें कि यह धनराशि देश से बाहर न जाने पाए। जो भी आय एकत्रित होती है, उसका उपयोग देश के अंदर हो। अगर कोई लीगल लिटिगेशन्स इस सिलसिले में उठते हैं, क्योंकि हमारा पिछला अनुभव कई मामलों में रहा है, उन्होंने हमें विदेशों में जाकर घसीट लिया, लीगल लिटिगेशन्स में। अगर हम ऐसा प्रावधान करें कि इससे जुड़ी कोई लीगल लिटिगेशन हो तो उसका ज्यूरिस्टिकशन इंडिया में होना चाहिए, हमें विदेशों में न जाना पड़े।

>

">मैं वामपंथी दल, राष्ट्रीय जनता दल और समाजवादी पार्टी के अपने साथियों की बातें बड़े ध्यान से सुन रहा था। इन पार्टियों के माननीय सदस्यों ने यहाँ अपने विचार व्यक्त किये। मैं उन्हें सुनकर आश्चर्यचकित हूँ। जब श्री इन्द्र कुमार गुजराल को यूनाइटेड फ्रंट सरकार थी, उस समय उनके कॉमन मिनीमम प्रोग्राम का एक बिन्दु इन इश्योर्स कंपनियों को लाना था। उस समय हमारे ये सब साथी उसमें पार्टनर थे। तब उन्हें उसमें कोई खोट, बुराई, शंका या आशंका कहीं नजर नहीं आई। लेकिन आज जब यह बिल यहाँ लाया गया है, तब उन्हें अनेकों प्रकार की आशंकाएं हैं। ऐसा लगता है कि जैसे आसमान ही टूटकर गिरने वाला हो।

>

">उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक दूसरी बात कहना चाहता हूँ। प्रियदा ने यह बात यहाँ कही और अगर मैं आज कहूँ तो कोई अतिशयोक्ति नहीं होगी कि हिंदुस्तान में अगर सबसे ज्यादा लिबरलाइजेशन का फायदा किसी स्टेट को मिला है तो मैं समझता हूँ कि शायद वह वेस्ट बंगाल को मिला है और वहाँ के मुख्य मंत्री श्री ज्योति बसु को मैं बधाई देता हूँ। यह अच्छी बात है कि उन्होंने कितनी विदेश यात्राएं कीं और विदेशों से उन्होंने इनवेस्टमेंट को इनवाइट किया। कई प्रोनेक्टर की चर्चा श्री प्रियरंजन दासमूंशी ने की। अब हम एक तरफ तो गुड़ खायें और दूसरी तरफ हम गुलगुलों से परहेज करें।

>

">श्री रूपचन्द पाल : क्या आप आधा मिनट रुकेंगे? वेस्ट बंगाल के चीफ मिनिस्टर ने कहा था कि लिबरलाइजेशन म्यूचुअल बेंचिफिट के लिए हमारी शर्तों पर होगा, उनकी शर्तों पर नहीं होगा।

>

">श्री सत्यव्रत चतुर्वेदी : पाल साहब ने मुझे उठकर याद दिला दिया। जब वह अपना वक्तव्य दे रहे थे तो उन्होंने अनेक नेताओं के वर्ष १९८९, १९९१, १९९३ आदि पुराने वक्तव्यों को यहाँ कोट किया। मैं मानता हूँ, जरूर कहा होगा। इस देश में हमारे पूर्वज हमें चरण छूने के बाद आशीर्वाद दिया करते थे - शतपुत्रवान भव। उस समय यह बात उचित रही होगी। लेकिन अगर आज कोई शतपुत्रवान भव कह दे तो वह हमें मार डालने के बराबर लगता है, शाप के बराबर लगता है। परिस्थिति बदलती है, समय बदलता है, अंतर हो जाता है। वही चीज जो कल सही थी आज गलत हो जाती है और जो आज सही है वह कल गलत हो जाती है। इसलिए तत्कालीन समय में उन परिस्थितियों में उनकी सोच ठीक रही होगी। उस समय यह कहा होगा। लेकिन इस दौर में बहुत सारा पानी पुल के नीचे से निकल गया बहुत परिवर्तन आ गया। नये कॉन्सेप्ट्स आ गये हैं, परसेप्शन चेंज हो गये हैं। इन परसेप्शंस के दायरे में रहकर जब हम आज देखते हैं तो यह निश्चित कह सकते हैं कि इश्योर्स के लिए जो व्यवस्था, जो अथॉरिटी आप क्रीएट करना चाहते हैं वह जरूरी है। इसके अलावा मैं इतना जरूर कहूँगा कि जिन बातों का मैंने सुझाव के रूप में उल्लेख किया है, मुझे आशा है कि आप उन्हें जरूर ध्यान में रखेंगे। इसके अलावा मैं एक अंतिम बात कहना चाहता हूँ

">... (व्यवधान)

>

">उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : अब आप समाप्त कीजिए।

>

">SHRI SATYAVRAT CHATURVEDI : I am finishing it.

">SHRI PRIYA RANJAN DASMUNSI : Sir, it is his maiden speech.

">श्री सत्यव्रत चतुर्वेदी : सर, मैं अभी खत्म कर देता हूँ। मैं एक ही बात कहना चाहूँगा कि कृपा करके ऐसे मामलों में राजनीति को न घसीटा करें। यह हमारे, आपके, सदन और देश के लिए बहुत हितकर होगा और इतने हल्के स्तर के स्टेटमेंट आपके बड़े और जिम्मेदार लोग देते हैं तो बड़ी पीड़ा होती है। मैं समझता हूँ कि एक शरीफ आदमी के तौर पर आप शायद उस पीड़ा को ज्यादा अच्छी तरह से समझ सकते हैं। इसी के साथ मैं अपना वक्तव्य समाप्त करता हूँ।

">

">

श्री राशिद अल्वी (अमरोहा) : जनाब डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं अपनी पार्टी बहुजन समाज पार्टी की तरफ से खड़ा हुआ हूँ। मैं सबसे पहले आपसे कहना चाहूँगा कि मेरी पार्टी बहुत पिछड़े लोगों की पार्टी है, कमजोर लोगों की पार्टी है। पूरे देश में उनके साथ डिसक्रिमिनेशन होता है, लेकिन इस हाउस में डिसक्रिमिनेशन नहीं होना चाहिए। हमें बहुत कम टाइम मिलता है, बहुत देर से मिलता है, बहुत कहने के बाद मिलता है। इसलिए मैं दरखास्त करूँगा कि पहले मेरी पार्टी छोटी पार्टी थी, लेकिन अब बड़ी हो गई है यदि आप हमें थोड़ी बड़ी पार्टी ट्रीट करेंगे तो मैं बहुत शुकुंगुजार होऊँगा।

">... (व्यवधान)

">

">श्री हरीभाऊ शंकर महाले : सर, छोटे बच्चे के लिए ज्यादा ध्यान देना चाहिए।

">

">उपाध्यक्ष महोदय : आपकी पार्टी एक मੈम्बर की पार्टी है, आपको बोलने का पहला मौका मिला, इसलिए उन्हें कम मिल रहा है।

">

">श्री राशिद अल्वी : डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मैं इस इश्योरेस रेगुलेटरी एंड डिवेलपमेंट अथॉरिटी बिल, जिसका समर्थन कांग्रेस पार्टी भी कर रही है और शायद सबसे पहले कांग्रेस पार्टी ही इस बिल को पास कराना चाहती थी और उसके बाद आने वाली कई सरकारों ने लगातार इसका सपोर्ट किया है और आखिरकार मौजूदा सरकार भी इसका सपोर्ट कर रही है। जो कुछ मैं कहने वाला हूँ वह इस देश और देश के लोगों को मद्दे नजर रखकर कह रहा हूँ। हालाँकि बहुजन समाज पार्टी ने इस बिल का सपोर्ट करने का निर्णय लिया है, तो उसमें बी.जे.पी. की सरकार के साथ किसी तरह का मुद्दायदा होने जा रहा है, ऐसी बात नहीं है और इसमें कोई गलतफहमी नहीं होनी चाहिए। बी.एस.पी. के आम आदमी का फायदा किससे हो रहा है, वह चीज मैं देख रहा हूँ और वह प्रपोजनल किस तरफ से आ रहा है, यह बात कोई अहमियत नहीं रखती है। इसलिए मैं इस बिल का सपोर्ट कर रहा हूँ।

">

मेरा कहना है कि हिन्दुस्तान की आजादी को ५२ साल हो गए और ५२ साल में पूरी दुनिया का नक्शा बदल गया और हमारे अपने मुल्क का नक्शा भी बदल गया। १५ अगस्त, १९४७ में कागज पर जो नक्शा था, आज ५२ साल के बाद वह भी तब्दील हो गया। विचारों के अंदर, आइडियोलॉजी के अंदर, पूरी दुनिया के अंदर तब्दीली आ रही है। दुनिया के वे मूवालिग जो १०० फीसदी सोशियलिस्ट कंट्री माने जाते थे, वे भी आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता अपनी सोच के अंदर तब्दीली ला रहे हैं। रूस की भिसाल हमारे सामने है। जो कुछ उस मुल्क में हो रहा है वह सबके सामने है। हमारे मुल्क में भी तब्दीली होनी चाहिए।

डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, मेरी राय यह है कि हमारे मुल्क में जो तब्दीली हो रही है वह बहुत आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता हो रही है। उसकी गति को तेज करना चाहिए। अभी हमारे आम आदमी को यह मालूम नहीं है कि किसी चीज के प्राइवेटाइजेशन करने से उसे क्या फायदा होगा। जिसने शहद खाया नहीं, उसे क्या मालूम कि शहद मीठा होता है या खट्टा। जब तक उसे शहद खिला न दिया जाए तब तक उसको क्या पता शहद का स्वाद कैसा होता है। हमारे यहाँ लिबरलाइजेशन का जो प्रोसेस आया है वह बहुत आहिस्ता-आहिस्ता आया है, लेकिन जिस क्षेत्र में आया है, उससे आम आदमी को फायदा पहुँचा है। हमने बैंकों के अंदर देखा है कि काफी तब्दीली आई है। जो नेशनलाइज्ड बैंकों के अंदर अपने पैसे जमा करता है और जब वह पैसा लेने जाता है, तो उसे ऐसा महसूस होता है कि वह कर्जा लेने जा रहा है। वह अपना ही पैसा लेने जा रहा है फिर भी एक घंटे तक उसे खड़ा रखा जाता है। उसके साथ भिस-बिहैव किया जाता है। यह किसी एक बैंक का हाल नहीं है बल्कि जितने भी नेशनलाइज्ड बैंक हैं, वे सभी एक जैसे हैं। जो विदेशी बैंक इस क्षेत्र में आए हैं, उनकी परफार्मेंस, उनकी कारगरदी है वह बहुत अच्छी है। वे आम आदमी के पास पहुँची हैं। आज नेशनलाइज्ड बैंक में खाता खोलना कोई साधारण बात नहीं है जबकि विदेशी या निजी क्षेत्र के बैंक का आदमी, आम आदमी के पास जाता है, अपने कैमरामैन को ले जाता है और वहाँ उसके पर उसका खाता खोल देता है। हम क्यू के मँडक बनकर दुनिया को नहीं देख सकते हैं। मैं सिन्हा साहब को एप्रोशिएट करूँगा-

In the private joint venture insurance companies, the Indian promoters will hold 74 per cent stake in the venture initially leaving foreign partners with 26 per cent.

आप २६ प्रतिशत कर रहे हैं। यह कोई बहुत बड़ा परसेंटज नहीं है। यह बहुत मुनासिब है, लेकिन इसके अंदर मैं यह भी चाहूँगा कि जो आपने कहा है और सभी मੈम्बरान ने कहा है, उसके लिए हमें सख्त से सख्त कदम उठाने चाहिए और इस बात पर जोर देना चाहिए कि जो पैसा फॉरेन कंपनीज में आएगा वह देश के अंदर खर्च हो, बाहर नहीं जाना चाहिए और यह मैडेटरी होगा कि ये कंपनियाँ रूरल एरियाज के अंदर जाएँगी।

अभी तक यह सही है कि जो गरीब आदमी है, आम आदमी है, जो गाँव में रहता है, उस तक इश्योरेस का फायदा नहीं पहुँचा है। लेकिन मैं इस बिल के बारे में श्री यश वन्त सिन्हा साहब से कहूँगा कि ज्यादा जरूरत ईमानदारी और नीयत की है। आप कितना भी अच्छा काम करें, अगर नीयत अच्छी नहीं हो तो काम अच्छा नहीं होगा और नीयत अच्छी होगी तो देश का भी फायदा होगा। एक ही बात नीयत से बदल जाती है। उर्दू का एक मिसरा है-ठोबा-तोबा शराब से तोबा"। ऐसा लगता है कि शराब से तोबा की जा रही है। लेकिन दूसरी तरफ वही आदमी कह रहा है कि तोबा, शराब से तोबा। एक ही ज़ुमला है, एक ही मिसरा है लेकिन दोनों के मतलब में जमीन और आसमान का फर्क है। यह नीयत का फर्क है। एक पीने वाला कह रहा है कि तोबा शराब से और दूसरा तोबा कर रहा है कि तोबा शराब से तोबा। एक ही मिसरा है लेकिन दोनों की नीयत में जमीन और आसमान का फर्क है। इसलिए मेरी दरखास्त होगी कि इसमें सरकार की नीयत का बहुत ज्यादा दखल है। अगर उनकी नीयत ठीक होगी और देश का हित होगा तो यह बड़ा काम होगा, जो वह करेंगे।

इसके साथ-साथ एक सवाल यहाँ यह भी उठता है कि दो लाख इम्प्लायज इस बात को बहुत जोर-शोर से कह रहे हैं कि उनका बहुत बड़ा नुकसान होने वाला है। मेरा कहना यह है कि अगर हैल्दी कम्पीटिशन होगा तो उसका फायदा देश को होगा और हैल्दी कम्पीटिशन नहीं होगा तो उसका फायदा न देश को होगा और न इश्योरेस कम्पनीज को होगा। दुनिया के अंदर सिर्फ वही काम ज्यादा इज्जत के साथ रहती है जो दौड़ के अंदर दूसरों से आगे निकलती है। कमजोर काम, कमजोर ईसान, कमजोर मुल्क इज्जत की जिंदगी बसर नहीं कर सकता है। इकबाल ने कहा है:

तकदीर के क्राजी का यह

फतवा है अजल से।

है जुर्म जयिष्की की सजा

मर्गे मफ़ानात।।

यह तकदीर का फैसला है, खुदा का फैसला है। जो कौम कमजोर होगी, जो मुल्क कमजोर होगा, जो इंसान कमजोर होगा, मौत उसका मुकद्दर बन जायेगी। इसलिए हमें कम्पॉटिशन के अंदर आगे आना पड़ेगा। अपने मुल्क को ताकतवर बनाना पड़ेगा। अपनी कौम को ताकतवर बनाना पड़ेगा और उसके लिए जरूरी है कि लिब्रलाइजेशन की तरफ हम आगे बढ़ें और इसलिए मैं इस बिल का पूरी तरह से सपोर्ट करता हूँ।

SHRI M.V.V.S. MURTHI (VISAKHAPATNAM): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, thank you for giving me this opportunity for saying something about this Insurance Regulatory Bill.

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please say it in short.

">SHRI M.V.V.S. MURTHI : I will be as brief as possible. But I should convey the message.

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Yes, please do it.

">... (Interruptions)

">SHRI M.V.V.S. MURTHI : There is a wrong notion that attracting foreign investment into the insurance sector will create problems for the country. It is not so. The present insurance sector - either the Life Insurance or the General Insurance - is mostly covering the urban areas. It has not reached 65 per cent of the people in agricultural sector. In many of the villages, only few people will go for insurance. Unless we make it competitive, unless we liberalise it, unless we attract international players into the field, I am sure that with these monopolistic tendencies and protective nature, it will be very difficult to grow this sector. We have also seen so many other sectors. After liberalisation, they have grown beyond our expectations.

">Some of the friends in the House mentioned about cars. For example, you take the case of Maruti cars. After the other players arrived into the field, the growth rate has increased in the case of Maruti cars. Likewise, in the insurance sector also, if you liberalise it, if you attract the other players, a competitive nature will come into the insurance sector. Ultimately, you have to take into account not only the employees but also the beneficiaries. The employees will continue to have their jobs. I am sure, more jobs will be created if you liberalise it because it has to spread for survival. It has to reach the

">other sectors where there is no insurance at all. The agricultural sector is not having any insurance. The hon. Minister of Finance and other hon. Members are here. Only a limited number of crops are insured. The other crops have not been insured.

">20.00 hrs.

">Unless you make it competitive, the economy will not grow. The hon. Finance Minister is here to say what are our interest rate. The insurance rates are higher, our interest rates are higher and still we wanted to be very competitive. With the manufacturing activity, it is very difficult to be competitive, that is why, our friends in the Opposition also have agreed for liberalisation of Insurance sector also. I am very glad that the nation's interest is paramount in this hour of juncture. So, we should all unite together in making this liberalisation full and expanding in other sector also.

">Unless you expand the economy, we will not be able to achieve a good growth rate. The slow growth rate which India is facing in the past few years is being observed elsewhere and also some of the people feel why India is not able to attract the deserved level of investments? Why China is attracting more investment, because there is a consistent policy in China and their approach to economic policies. There is more stability in China for attracting foreign investment whereas in our country too often or too frequently, changing the policies or uttering something and doing something which will be affecting our economy in the years to come. So, I feel that this Insurance Bill as it is, should go and we should also make so many other things liberalise so that the foreign investment or the money that is required by way of equity would come to the country. Otherwise borrowing money from institutions will not help this country. We have to get money by way of equity, by way of investment so that the country will grow further and further and we will have the fruits of liberalisation.

">Everybody is looking at the time, so I do not want to continue. With these words, I fully support the recommendations of the hon. Finance Minister so that the Bill should go through as it is.

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Hon. Members, the House was extended up to 8 o'clock. There are three more Members who are waiting for a chance to speak. It would be a good gesture, if all of us sit and hear in short all the three of them so that tomorrow to that extent we will minimise our job.

">Is it the pleasure of the House to extend the time of the House by fifteen minutes?

">SEVERAL MEMBERS: Yes.

">SHRI E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN (SVAGANGA): With great respect to the hon. Deputy-Speaker, I have got certain locus standi to speak because I do not want to make it as a very great thing. But in Mahabharata there is a story that Kunti tried to use the vow given by the God sun and she bequeathed a child even before her marriage. That was Karna. Karna was treated as an orphan and subsequently he became a king.

In the same way, this Bill was bequeathed and unnoticedly a floodgate was opened by my best friend, Shri Chidambaram against whom I contested and I defeated him with a margin of more than one lakh votes. I am not just claiming myself to say about it but I have to express my views because when I opposed Shri Chidambaram I put forth these ideas that foreign investment and other things should not be so easily allowed in India. That was one of my speeches made during the election period.

">Actually I was supported by the Communist Party of India, Marxist Party of India, other Left Parties, and especially the AIADMK headed by a very strong and dynamic leader, Puratchi Thalaivi Dr. Jayalalitha. Therefore, I have got certain duty to express my views and their ideas also because I have got the votes from them. That was the difference I could wedge with my opponent. Therefore, I feel that even though I have got the duty to say certain things supporting my party line, I would like to express my views.

">If Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Shrimati Indira Gandhi and Shri Rajiv Gandhi were alive now; if our hon. Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav had not turned like that and Shrimati Sonia Gandhi was the Prime Minister now, I do not feel that this type of a Bill would be introduced because from the very beginning we were having the feeling that our Indian entrepreneurs should be developed. We were having the mixed economy as the policy of the Congress party. Even in Avadi Congress Session, Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru very clearly said that it was the socialist pattern of society. Indiraji amended the Constitution making it as a socialist country. We cannot go away from our Constitution. We have to be very clear in telling the country whether we are signing in the WTO or any other pact that we are socialist. Our country is a socialist country. We cannot go away from it. We have not amended our Constitution. It is a declaration made in the Preamble. Therefore, socialism should be the touchstone whenever any Bill comes before this august Parliament.

">I feel that these type of Bills should have that flavour when they come before this august Parliament. I feel that there is a great difference from our election manifesto.

">Unfortunately we are having a party which is ruling now, who has stolen away the Swedeshi, Gandhiji from us during the election period. Now they have forgotten Gandhiji and Swedeshi. Now, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee is sitting as the Prime Minister and he forgot about Swedeshi. He forgot about his own speeches made in the Parliament when he was the Leader of the Opposition. He forgot about the RSS programme or Sangh Parivar's programme that the foreigners should not come inside; our entrepreneurs should come up and they should have a healthy competition within India; we have got a very big market; our national companies should come up and then only we could compete with the international companies. That was the thinking of the BJP at that time. I feel that they have changed everything now while sitting in the Treasury Bench. Actually, I am feeling very unhappy. Are we going in a wrong way?

">We should be very patriotic when we are looking after our own industries. LIC and GIC are our own assets. They are our community assets. They are our nation's asset. We invested the money of our people. We have spent crores of rupees for the health of the country and for the health of our people. When we attained Independence, our mortality rate was around 69 or 70 per cent. Now, our mortality rate is very low, 13 or 15 per cent.

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

">SHRI E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN : Sir, I would like to continue my speech for some more time.

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: We have to accommodate other Members. Please make your speech short.

">SHRI E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN : Therefore, I feel that we should have that feeling that a proper leadership is very important for making the people patriotic and the institutions to come up.

">As you all know, any insurance company, any proprietor will think about the profit. It should go to the shareholders or to the policy holders. Now, the Life Insurance Corporation and the General Insurance Corporation are having the fourth area and that is social obligation. We are spending more than Rs. 1,00,000 crore for the community upliftment. Even Sivaganga water facility is given by the Life Insurance Corporation; roads are laid from the Life Insurance Corporation funds. Many houses are built by the Life Insurance Corporation. In the same way, Other Backward Classes are getting employment and Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribe people are getting employment in the Life Insurance Corporation and the General Insurance Corporation. Where will they go for employment when a lot of foreign companies come here? We have to think about it. I am telling you that you are denationalising it. You are making it an elephant and then you want to run it like a lion. It cannot run like a lion because it is an elephant. You have to feed more because it is having power to pull things. Therefore, elephant cannot become a lion and lion cannot become an elephant.

">Now, foreign companies cannot take away our money. It is a saving. We are creating assets- cash in hand. It is just like a territory - our own land was given for the East India Company. So, are we going to give money to the foreign companies? They will take away our money. You may have restrictions that they should not take it away, but they will reinvest it which will be detrimental to our own interest. So, I request you to keep it in mind when you are bringing these types of Bills that we should protect our economic rights. We are having only political rights just remaining with us and if we go on giving everything to the foreign countries, I do not think we may survive. In due course of time, we may have some other countries dominating upon us.

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

">SHRI E.M. SUDARSANA NATCHIAPPAN : Regarding the amendments, I would like to tell you only one thing. At page five, there is a clause giving authority to regulate. I am quoting from Section 14(2)(a):

">"issue to the applicant a certificate of registration, renew, modify, withdraw, suspend or cancel such registration."

">If they are not doing it properly, why do you not add one word `nationalise'?"

">If they are not doing it, we can nationalise it. In that way if it is added, then it will be good.

">The other thing is that 26 per cent is only promoters' share. If it goes to the secondary market, then they will grab the entire area. Therefore, we cannot control them in the secondary market. They can purchase it and only promoters will just oblige for having 26 per

cent initially, but they will increase their shares subsequently. Therefore, the Government should have at least 20 per cent share in any insurance company so that they can have social control over private insurance company. In that way, we can invest the money in the social sector.

">

श्री उत्तमराव ढिकले (नासिक) : आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए समय दिया, इसके लिए मैं आपका आभारी हूँ। बीमा क्षेत्र में स्पर्धा होनी चाहिए, उसकी कार्यक्षमता बढ़ानी चाहिए, बीमा-धारकों को ठीक से सेवा मिलनी चाहिए, इसलिए निजीकरण हो रहा है। इसलिए मैं इस बिल का समर्थन कर रहा हूँ। सत्र में आने के एक दिन पहले हमारे जिले के एल.आई.सी. के कर्मचारियों ने मुझे और हरीभाऊ महाले को बुलाया था।

">

">मैं तो बी.जे.पी. के साथ काम करता हूँ और ये अपोजीशन के हैं। दोनों एक सभा में एक ही मंच पर थे। तीन-चार हजार कर्मचारी थे। उन्होंने बताया कि यह होने वाला है। मैंने कहा कि ठीक है। इसलिए जो उनकी गलतफहमियाँ हैं उनको बताने के लिए मैं एक मिनट का समय लेना चाहता हूँ। उनके मन में यह बात है कि उनको नौकरी से निकाल दिया जाएगा और वे बेरोजगार हो जाएंगे। इस तरह से तीन लाख कर्मचारियों का क्या होगा? जो शर्तें और क्वालिफिकेशन एजेंट के लिए, प्रतिनिधि के लिए रखी थीं कि ग्रामीण भाग में आठवीं कक्षा तथा शहरी भाग में एस.एस.सी. पास, उसका क्या होगा। मैं ज्यादा विस्तार में जाना नहीं चाहता हूँ। अपना समर्थन देते हुए मैं सिन्हा जी से केवल इतना ही कहना चाहता हूँ कि किसी भी कर्मचारी को वहाँ से निकाला नहीं जाना चाहिए। दूसरा यह कि तीन साल में यह कोर्स करो या १२वीं पास करो या वह कोर्स करो, यह भी नहीं होना चाहिए। उनको यह यकीन दिलाना चाहिए कि उनको नौकरी से निकाला नहीं जाएगा। इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ आपने जो मुझे मौका दिया उसके लिए मैं आपका आभारी हूँ।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The extended time of the House is also over now. Is it the pleasure of the House to extend the time by another ten minutes?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: So, the time of the House is further extended.

SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN (TIRUNELVELI): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I thank you for giving me this opportunity to express the views of the All India Anna DMK on the IRDA Bill. Privatisation of insurance is a challenge to the Indian sovereignty. The Finance Minister is sitting here. He needs no transfer of technology. Money is an essential commodity, both for the insurance industry and the banking industry. It need not come from outside, from a foreign country; we can generate funds from our own resources. Instead of introducing this Bill, if the Finance Minister had concentrated on the recovery of some other dues like excise duty, income-tax, loans due to the banks, which amount to crores of rupees - two thousand or three thousand crores of rupees - he need not have piloted this Insurance Bill.

">Insurance is not a sophisticated industry. A foreign investor or a foreign company need not enter India to promote our existing insurance industry. Our insurance and banking industries have been carrying on well for so many decades, since 1938. This Bill is based on a novel classical principle, that is, public interest versus private interest. Whether this Bill has been introduced or piloted and debated in public interest or in private interest, only the Government will know.

">The BJP Government is bent upon getting this Bill passed and has given top priority to it. On 27.11.1999, our General Secretary, Dr. Jayalalitha had issued a statement that the All India Anna DMK expresses its grave concern on the move of the Government of India to get this IRDA Bill passed in this Session. When so many legislations which are necessary for our rural and social sectors are pending and are yet to be debated, this Bill has been given priority.

">So, as I said, this privatisation is a challenge to the sovereignty and economy of our country. The Ministers take oath saying that "We bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitution of India, as by law established".

">We are not promoting any legal company. We are not promoting any Indian. We expect a foreigner, a foreign company to enter into this market. I have seen a newspaper item wherein it is said that the foreign insurers are waiting in queue to join this Indian insurance. The following firms have already engaged Indian partners - Allianz AG of Germany, Prudential Life of U.K., American International Group of U.S., Commercial Union of U.K., General Accident of U.K., Sun Life of Canada, Chubb Corp of U.S., ING Group, Standard Life, CIGNA of U.S., Canada Life, GIO Australia Holdings, All State, Guardian AXA, Zurich, Metlife of U.S. and AMP. The following firms are looking for Indian partners - Legal & General, Manulife of Canada, Royal & Sun Alliance, Yasuda Fire, Tokio Fire & Marine, Aegon, Sumitomo, Mitsui Marine, GE Capita, New York Life International, Swiss Re and Munich Re.

">I would like to stress that all these companies are not going to transfer any technology or they are not going to invest the whole money. It is only 26 per cent. With this 26 per cent they are going to dominate our existing insurance industry. Since you are bent upon passing the Bill, where is the safeguard introduced in the legislation? I want to know whether, for a violation of the I.R.A. Act by the companies, if it is passed, any monetary penalties are to be imposed or not. It is not there. What is the penal action to be taken? It is not there. It is well evident from the fact that the Standing Committee's Report on Finance for 1998-99 of the 12th Lok Sabha concerning Ministry of Finance, on page 27 said that there is no such provision for considering imposing stringent punishment including monetary penalties.

">I have gone through the Bill. This Bill has no relevance to Indian social and rural sectors. To develop rural and social sectors we have enough human resources and natural wealth. We have money. Why do the Finance Minister not explore the possibility of expanding the resources or augmenting the resources by investing our own brains and our own money? We have men.

">Shri Yashwant Sinha, you are the Finance Minister. Can I ask the Finance Minister of the U.S. to come and occupy this chair? He can develop India. I will not allow it. I want you to be the Finance Minister. We do not want them. We select the best among our people. In that way, there is no transfer of technology. If that is so, after some years, they will say that they will also want to get a berth in the Cabinet. The foreign investors may ask this question. Then, will you provide a seat here just like the East India Company? Then India will become a colony in that way.

">This Bill has no sanction of the poor people. The poor people do not understand what are the implications of this I.R.A. Bill. The Bill does not guarantee the ploughing back of the profit into the nation. What is the profit that you are going to get back to the nation? There is no prescription enunciated in the Bill.

">As it is, L.I.C. and G.I.C. are participating in the nation-building activities like housing. They have invested thousands of crores. They invested Rs. 10,000 crore for electricity.

">The equity prescribed for the private companies is Rs. 100 crore. If there is a calamity that had occurred in Orissa or the Bhopal gas disaster, these companies will prefer to go to litigation. What is the check? How about the Union Carbide? We are not able to get even Rs. 400 or Rs. 500 per family. The case of Union Carbide is a vivid example.

">If you allow a foreign investor, a foreign company to prosper here and they go back on the commitment, what is your jurisdiction? Can you try them? Can you summon them? Can you take action against them? You have no cover. They will file a liquidation petition. They will file a winding-up petition. You had bitter experience in India that if the foreigners come in, they live like parasite. They are leaches and they will suck Indian blood. So, I appeal to the Finance Minister to withdraw this Bill because we oppose this Bill tooth and nail, having gone into the fact that it is not going to help the nation, it is not going to improve our social and rural sectors.

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude. We are crossing the extended time. Otherwise, we will have to go in for a further extension.

">SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN : Just a minute. I wanted to say these things initially. Hon. Deputy-Speaker has given me the opportunity to speak now.

">I quote an item from The Hindu. It says:

">"When life insurance was nationalised in 1956, C.D. Deshmukh, the then Finance Minister said, insurance in the developing country must be seen as an essential service which a Welfare State should provide to its people and not as a business proposition or additional source of investment to those who put their money in the stock market."

">So, Mr. Finance Minister, please see it in this perspective that if you allow these industries to prosper, then we can also ask the British to come back and rule, we can also ask America to come back and rule. These companies will dictate terms.

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude. I cannot seek further extension.

">SHRI P.H. PANDIYAN : Therefore, I appeal to the Finance Minister that even at this moment, he has got time till tomorrow. He may go to his house and think over this, think over all the deliberations and withdraw the Bill.

">I oppose this Bill on behalf of the AIADMK tooth and nail.

">MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The list of the speakers is over. The reply of the Minister will be tomorrow after the Question Hour.

">20.27 hrs

">The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on

">Thursday, December 2, 1999/Agrahayana 11, 1921 (Saka)

">\_\_\_\_\_