

reference of the Bill to provide, with a view to the more effective realisation of the objectives of nationalisation of life insurance business, for the dissolution of the Life Insurance Corporation of India and for the establishment of a number of corporations for the more efficient carrying on of the said business and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, a Joint Committee of the Houses."

The Motion was adopted.

LIFE INSURANCE CORPORATIONS BILL

MOTION TO REFER TO JOINT COMMITTEE

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE
MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JANAR-
DHANA POOJARY) ON BEHALF OF
SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE : Sir, I
beg to Move :

"That the Bill to provide with a view to the more effective realisation of the objectives of nationalisation of life insurance business, for the dissolution of the Life Insurance Corporation of India and for the more establishment of a number of corporations for the more efficient carrying of the said business and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 30 members, 20 from this House, namely :—

- (1) Shri Satish Agarwal
- (2) Shri M. Arunachalam
- (3) Shri Dileep Singh Bhuria
- (4) Shri Mool Chand Daga
- (5) Shri Nurul Islam
- (6) Shri Bh'ku Ram Jain
- (7) Shri Kamal Nath Jha

- (8) Shri Ghayoor Ali Khan
- (9) Shri Sunil Maitra
- (10) Shri K. Mallara
- (11) Shri Braja Mohan Mohanty
- (12) Shri Shri Kusuma Krishna Murthy
- 13 Shri Ram Pyare Panika
- (14) Shri Janardhan Poojary
- (15) Shri Ram Lal Rahi
- (16) Shri K. A. Rajan
- (17) Shri Ratansinh Rajda
- (18) Shri M. S. K. Sathiyendran
- (19) Shri Natvarsinh Solanki
- (20) Shrimati Sukhbuns Kaur

and 10 from Rajya Sabha :

"that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee ;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the last day of the first week of Budget (1984) Session of Lok Sabha ;

that the other respects, the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the speaker may make ; and

that this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of 10 members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Now Shri Somnath Chatterjee.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur) : After listening to the reply of the hon. Minister, now I am more convinced that it has fallen his fate to pilot a useless and retrograde measure. I am sure that in his own heart of hearts,

he has very serious reservations. At least the employees of LIC all over India have almost unanimously rejected this proposal and from yesterday, they are on strike. It has been the most successful strike all over India. These employees have given their thought to it : responsible all-India organizations employees are there, and they have taken this decision, and their decision is being implemented though a 48-hour strik, to protest against this pernicious attempt to split up this organization. Therefore, this great concern shown by the Minister for the employees which the employees are unable to understand for themselves-we don't accept it.

The Bill, according to us, seeks to introduce in the Statute Book a constitutional monstrosity according to us ; and makes perversity of the concept of collective bargaining. This is the position. We find that in our country, this independent country, more and more people are brought under bondage. More and more restrictions are being put in, trying to denude them of their very minimal, right of association, right of demonstration, right of movement right to get what they can get by means of normal, ordinary, legitimate trade union activities.

The whole Bill is conceived for the purpose, not of benefitting the policy-holders because we would like to know whether the hon. Minister can cite in India, since Independence, an example of another organization which has increased its activity be such a vast magnitude in such vast proportions as LIC has done.

When I had taken part in a calling Attention motion, I believe last year, I had given particulars of how the business had expanded; and how the strength of employment was going down because natural vacancies werenot filled up in any case. And the position is this-that to-day in LIC, if one goes by efficiency it is on record that compared to the British Life Insurance Organization our LIC has a much better working result, which has never been disputed. There are people who think that the British standard of efficiency is very high. If ours is still higher, at least in LIC business, "We cannot but hold that the object of this split, the

object of this division is not for benefitting the policy-holders, not to make possible intimate relationship-I don't know whether the hon. Minister fully appreciates this term intimate relation-between the employer and the employees, between the management and the employee.

14.01 hrs

(SHRI N. K. SHEJWALKAR *in the Chair*)

Therefore, we are certain that this has not been conceived for the benefit of the people or for the benefit of the employees ; and it is nothing but an expression of the well-known attitude of this Government attitude of anti-working class, and antil people attitude of this Government-another manifestation.

I am thankful, Sir that you called me late, because I could hear hon. Minister's laboured attempt to give a reply to Prof. Madhu Dandavate. He quotes Mr. Chintamani Deshmukh, i.e. one sentence from his speech, viz. "if the working is staisactory". Obviously, if the working was not satisfactory, nobody would have come and tried here to support it. We should have criticized it, have had a proper discussion on the functioning of LIC ; but the solution is not necessarily a division and splitting of this organization. What is meant by "not satisfactory performance" if the business has increased, the number of policy-holders has increased the area of operation has increased ? Then, what is the basis of saying that it has not satisfactorily worked ?

The hon. Minister has to-day become a great votary of decentralization, a great supporter of decentralization. He says that it is an attempt to decentralize the business and he says that all over India, 53 districts are not covered. So to cover these 53 districts are these four units being brought into being ? Why don't you give a directive because under the Act you can give a directive to LIC that at least the Minister's district should be covered specifically ? The Minister's district is not covered ; so, you can say that there is a deliberate attempt to ignore the rural sector. Now, who is deliberate attempt to ignore the rural sector. Now,

who is deciding policy matters ? Policy matters are not decided by employees. Your officers will decide that. When you have regional LICs, wherefrom will you import these officers ? What type of officers will you have ? Why this sudden great faith in and infatuation for top bureaucracy, and top-level administration ?

We don't accept that this is a genuine reason for bringing in this Bill. The hon. Minister said that it would be such a nice thing ; there would be more employment, more promotions and more Jobs . For every office opened, more people would be employed. I would request him to let us know : after the break-up of LIC if that unfortunate thing happens-- inspite of the united protest of the working class and the employees of LIC, and our various other organizations and also inspite of the opposition based on merit--if that unfortunate thing happens, this serious thing happens, how many Class III and Class IV employees will be appointed or how many new officers will be appointed ? There will be Chairman for each organization, Managing Director for each organization, a Board for each organization, then every tier of officers will have to be brought in for each zonal organization. Instead of one Chairman, there will be five Chairmen. Very nice. Having these people will mean greater employment in this country ; When 2 crores of people are registered in the employment exchanges, there will be five more Chairmen. Will the Minister put himself on the back ?

That is why we say :

That is why we say, that this is nothing but a complete surrender to some bureaucratic scheme only to help the top echolons of the administrative set-up of this country. It may not be for the benefit of the policy holders. In a vast organisation like this, it is not difficult to find four, five, ten, twenty or even one hundred people having some grievance. If that is the excuse for disbanding this organisation, then this Ministry should be disbanded first. People are aggrieved. There are so many complaints coming. And this decentralisation, this efficiency if it is based on this concept of decentralisation that the Minister is postulating today then in the Finance Ministry/Department

why Banking is given to Mr. poojary, why insurance is given to him, why currency is given to him, why not have separate Deputy Ministers or Ministers of state ? This type of analogy, I respectfully submit, is totally out of place. Now he has mentioned about State Bank of India and other banks and decentralisation. The State Bank of India is being managed with 6,000 branches. The hon. Minister says, "how can you give it as an example the functioning of the State Bank because there are other banks ?" But is it not a historical fact that those banks have been nationalised recently and that they are functioning ? How can you compare the State Bank of India and the other nationalised banks which have been nationalised much after the State Bank came into being ? And is not correct that they are there ? The question is, one unit, namely the State Bank of India is supervising, and managing the 6,000 branches. That is the point. Then, are you thinking of decentralising the Stat Bank of India ? And so far as the analogy of State Bank and other banks is concered, should you not make them one unit ? Here you are trying to disrupt one unit, that has been functioning. This is not a case where other units have been brought into the LIC. You are disrupting the existing LIC and trying to bring into effect separate organisation.

Now the hon. Minister says that the emphasis will be on zonal operation and zonal efficiency -- sort of an effective zonal improvement. Now, when it is seen that with four zones there is difficulty there cannot be any question of healthy competition between two zones because they will be operating separately. Now, my answer is, well they will go into other's territories also. They will go into other zones. One zone will operate in another zone also. Now only one thing that is felt zonal is top level, that is top changes. There will be more opportunities for top level administrators, bureaucrats and managers and so on and so forth.

Therefore, I oppose this Bill. According to us this Bill should not become a law. There is a deliberate attempt to take away the minimal rights of the workmen employed. Collective bargaining becomes a matter of maternal dispensation. The political rights of the employees are being taken away which have been now conceded even by the

supreme court of India that this type of right cannot be taken away. Every citizen, even an employee will have a right to participate or to hold political views. Now this type of restrictions are being brought. The object of this legislation even if it is under a facade of a zonal policy of functioning, is the dilution of the strength of the employees, cutting at the root of their minimal rights and providing some more jobs to their favourites which cannot be for the benefit of the country or for the life insurance organisation as a whole.

Therefore, I submit that there is no need for sending this Bill to the Select Committee. It should be withdrawn wholly or it should be buried, lock, stock and barrel.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Shri Chitta Basu.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat) : At the outset, let me clear my doubts. The Government proposes to refer this Bill to a Joint Select Committee. A Bill is generally referred to a Joint Select Committee when there is a consensus on the principle of the Bill. Now it has been made quite clear that there has been no consensus on the principle of the Bill. Outside this House, the entire LIC employees have not only protested but have also started protect action. There is a vast difference between protest and protect action. The action has taken the shape of 48-hour general strike all over the country and it has become a grand success as per the reports now available. I am opposed to the very principle of the Bill. Therefore, I do not find any reason for the reference of the Bill to a Joint Select Committee. Rather it should be withdrawn.

Why opposed to this Bill? Certain laudable objectives have been stated for this enactment like development of life insurance in rural areas, manageable size of the administrative apparatus, increase of operational efficiency, reduction of expenses healthy competition and a greater degree of dynamism. As Mr. Somnath Chatterjee has pointed out I also say that none of these objectives will be fulfilled by this Bill. It will not lead to reduction of the expenditure. On the other hand, it will increase the expenditure. It will not

increase operational efficiency. Rather there is an apprehension that there will be further complication in the administration. Therefore, the sole objective of the Bill is to weaken the unity of the LIC employees, who have gained this through their struggle. The LIC employees' unity does not speak of the struggle of LIC employees only but it is a source of strength for the entire working class of our country, because on earlier occasions the unity and struggle of the LIC employees has roused the entire working class in the matter of trade union rights of the working class, on the right to collective bargaining. By this Bill the Government seeks to take away the right to form association and the right to collective bargaining. If by this method the Government is successful to take away the right to collective bargaining from a large section of organised employees, it will follow in other areas also. Therefore, we oppose the objective of this Bill on behalf of the entire working class, who feel that after the enactment of this Bill similar or in some other form attacks are likely to be made on their rights also. Therefore, my conclusion is that this Bill will not confer any benefit to the policy holders, the Corporation or its employees. This Bill, on the contrary, will give birth to parochialism, regionalism and other fissiparous tendencies which are already very much evident. As a matter of fact, it will strengthen the strange hold of the bureaucracy over the administration of the LIC. It will give rise to unethical practices and corrupt methods on the plea of encouraging competition. Therefore, none of these objectives, as has been stated earlier, is going to be fulfilled by this Bill. Therefore, I oppose it and I feel this proposal of splitting the LIC is pernicious, perverse and fraught with greater consequences on the economy, the industry and the rights of the working class.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE (Panskura) : Like my predecessors. I also rise to oppose this proposal of sending this Bill to a Joint Select Committee.

What is the purpose of splitting the LIC? During 70s I came to Delhi once. After coming over here I saw on almost every second building on the third floor

there was a signboard of some corporation or the other, I exclaimed : 'Oh God, we have so many corporations in our life but we do not feel the working of them.' I asked from my friend who was accompanying me and who was not a politician, about these corporations. He gave me a straightforward answer: 'Take the name of any corporation and find out its Chairman. You will invariably see that most of these corporations are created to give berth as Chairman to some favourites of the ruling party.' That was his summing up of the working of many of the corporations. Whether I agree into to with that or not is another matter. I do not think setting up a corporation is a bad idea. But doubtless there is an element of truth in what he said that in many of these corporations, actually the favourites of the ruling party are in the saddle as Chairmen.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
Discarded.

SHRIMATI GEETA MUKHERJEE :
...favourites because they are accomplice in certain criminal acts.

About increasing the efficiency I was trying to imagine what efficiency would be increased by its splitting up. There will be employment of some more discarded people at the highest level. But at the lowest level, the appointments will be very few. When the Corporation is one Corporation, the fact remains that in the last few years there were a few appointments. If the Minister is eager to spread it to his own home district, let the Corporation give more employment to the people from that area.

Nobody was prevented. So, one or two more additions in each one will not improve the situation in my opinion.

Now, I would like to raise one thing. Firstly, it is all accepted that among the Government undertakings or Corporations, LIC is one of the relatively more efficient organisations though I never say that, that is the be all and end all. All our organisations should try to raise their efficiency more. That is another thing altogether. But this is one of the relatively more efficient ones. Now if even this organisation is to

speed more, then he should think over what is actually preventing. Is it just because it is not split? I do not think so because I also have some experience of the villages as he has. I have worked in the village. My constituency is entirely rural. In my constituency, also in my working, place for longer and longer years I find that there are several other organisations which are doing business, not that they are not tempting with more lucrative offers. For example, this Pearlless, with more lucrative offers, are catching more and more people not because they are not an agency of LIC but because some more lucrative offers are being made. And then, if this Sanchaita kind of business cannot be prevented, I can definitely say if this is encouraged by different ways, then again giving some money and berth to certain persons and remaining quiet about it till the disaster will not do any good. That is again one of the things which is preventing the spread of LIC. So, instead of really hitting there, and noting these kinds of evils by firstly making LIC's policies more lucrative, secondly, hitting at the fraudulent practices and later on the organisation putting the depositors in jeopardy, if these things are not done, just splitting up of this organisation will never increase the efficiency.

Lastly, I would say another thing. I now remember while listening to other friends also, that since we came into this House, this Lok Sabha itself we are hearing about one thing that there is a reason from many of the measures that Government are taking. You will remember that while introducing the National Security Act, one of the reasons in the Statement of Objects and Reasons was given as labour unrest in the country. So many new Bills are pending before the House— Hospitals and Other Institutions Bill, some other Trade Union Bills. These are not unrelated things. Now, these things are being done in order to directly prevent the employees from enjoying the right to organise, right to mobilise and right to struggle. These are some other ways of disrupting because if there is a big chunk of employees in one organisation, well-organised, then they can fight back the Government offensive tooth and nail. By doing that, they not only fight for themselves but they also inspire others who

may not be, because of their circumstance, in a position immediately to fight. Actually, the attack on the LIC employees on this score is not only for cowering the present LIC employees but also the break up all congregation of workers which can inspire the other workers to an organisation fight. Therefore, I fully support the voice raised by the LIC employees who are on strike today also. Even the Government machinery could not deny that the strike was very good. They did not say very good like me but even by the figures given out by them, it is clear that the strike is really very widespread. So, fully sympathising with them and also to tally negating to the fictitious reasons advanced by the Minister, I thoroughly oppose this measure and I want that the Bill be withdrawn.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : Sir, I have given reply to the points raised by hon. Member Shri Dandavate. Some identical points have been raised by hon. Member Shri Chatterjee. I know also that it is impossible to satisfy the hon. Members sitting on the opposite side... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE :
Not always. Sometimes you can satisfy us.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He can try now.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I think we have an open mind.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : About the quality of the service that is prevalent in the LIC, number of Committees and Commissions have been appointed. The Estimates Committee submitted its report on 14-4-1961, the Committee on Public Undertakings submitted its report on 24-3-1965, the Administrative Reforms Commission submitted its report on 10-12-1968. Morarji Committee submitted its report on 30-4-1969. Era Seziyan Committee submitted its report on 30-9-1980. All these committees and commissions agreed regarding the deficiencies in the working of the LIC... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA (Calcutta North East) : Can he cite one example of one institution which does not have deficiency ?

Does it follow automatically that therefore it should be split up ?

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARY : They differed so far as the remedy is concerned. Now, let us come to the recommendations date-wise. The Estimates Committee favoured maintenance of the existing unitary structure but reduction in the size of the central office and greater autonomy for the zonal units. It also advocated elimination of one of the two tiers in a zone—either zonal office or the divisional office. *(Interruptions)*.

MR. CHAIRMAN : What is this quotation and what is its date ?

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : That is Estimates Committee's recommendation. They submitted their report on 14-4-1961. Then, in the year 1965, on 24-3-1965 as I have submitted earlier, the Public Undertakings Committee of the Parliament submitted its report and according to that report, they felt that nothing short of major reorganisation of the Corporation to convert its present zones into completely independent Corporation would do. I quote :

"If the standard of efficiency in Corporation is to be improved with better service to the policyholders the Corporation is to expand its business on a massive scale."

That had been stated by a responsible Committee of Parliament in the year 1965.

Now, coming to Morarka Committee and the Administrative Reforms Commission, both of them had favoured maintenance of the existing unitary structure but within the structure, they advocated creation of a three-tier set up by abolition of zonal offices and effective decentralisation of functions and powers to lower levels.

Then let us come to the Era Seziyan Committee. That is the latest report which was submitted on 30-9-80. After having gained more experience about the deficiencies, after finding deterioration in the quality of service in the LIC the Committee observes—I am told he was an ex-employee of the Corporation—the Committee points out:

“Despite LIC’s achievements in various areas of operation, it had not been able to fulfil most of its Primary objectives and, the present unitary structure had been a major factor inhibiting progress.”

Therefore, the Committee recommended that the existing Zonal Offices should be set up as independent competing corporations with the jurisdiction of the present areas. It also recommended that the Zonal Corporation should work on the basis of common premium rates and policy conditions. The Committee further recommended that the Zonal Corporation should have a common actuarial valuation and uniform bonus rates, at least to start with.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : Are you aware that when the LIC Bill was being debated in this House in the year 1956, the All India Insurance Employees’ Association had submitted a memorandum to the Government of India, which was taken up by no less a person than the late Shri Feroze Gandhis. In that memorandum the All India Insurance Employees’ Association had requested the Government to make the Branch unit as the servicing unit, not the divisional office or zonal office, which today, in the matter of decentralisation of LIC, has already been introduced. There is complete decentralisation. You must know the meaning of decentralisation. By that you mean, from the stage of underwriting a proposal right up to the stage of payment of claim. Now all those stages are tackled by the branch office. So, there is already decentralisation in the LIC now. It is in the process of being done for the last two years. For your information, you may check it up from the official box.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : So far as the efficiency of the service is concerned, it has not come to the satisfaction of the people of this country, to the expectation of the people of this country. Like in other organisations, in the LIC also the quality of service has gone down. There is no doubt about it.

So far as growth of business is concerned, there has been no spectacular performance, Shrimati Geeta Mukherjee said, I

did not say it, that the Unit Trust has done very well.

We have to render better service to the policy holders and there should be close monitoring. All these things should be taken into consideration... (*Interruptions*).

A responsible committee like the Public Undertakings Committee has given its verdict. The Era Seziyan Committee went into the matter in detail, toured the country obtained evidence and after evaluating the performance has come to the conclusion that there should be an independent organisation, there should be decentralisation. These are the recommendations that have been given.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Decentralisation would mean functional decentralisation.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : So far as the functions are concerned, there will be decentralisation. There is no doubt about it. Is it the stand of the hon. Members that there should be decentralisation ?

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Yes, so far as power is concerned.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : Are you for centralisation or decentralisation ?

(*Interruptions*)

An important advantage of this re-organisation is that, instead of the present four-tier set up—Central Office, Zonal Office, Divisional Office and Branch Office—which is wasteful and cumbersome, a three set-up is contemplated, where there will be the head office, divisional office and branch office. Then it will be more compact.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : The only effect will be that your Board will be transferred from Bombay to Delhi. That is what is intended by the Bill. You are not informing the House correctly.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : Shri Chatterjee is an eminent lawyer and he knows how to argue. He wanted to trap

me by asking, after this measure comes into effect, what will be my stand, how many branch offices will be opened and how many more people will be covered. I want to make it very clear at this juncture that if the employees and the management do not penetrate into the rural areas, if they are not going to expand business, if they are not going to be useful to the people of this country...

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Then the LIC would be abolished :

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : No abolition. Their performance will be reviewed. It is not a question of once again going in for rationalisation. I will make it very clear that it is the responsibility of employees, the management, even of the union leaders, to go in for expansion of business. If there is more business, which requires more branch offices, if it requires more employment, it will be given. Otherwise, if there is no business, no expansion, there will not be any more opportunities for further employment. So, they should go in for more business and for expansion. I want to make it very clear that Government is very serious on this point and that we will see to it that business penetrates into the rural areas and more expansion takes place. That is our intention.

We have come with this measure in order to serve the people of this country, to serve the policy-holders, at the same time, to give more employment opportunities and promotional avenues. That is also one of the factors.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Are you going to improve the service conditions ?

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : We have been improving them ; there is no doubt about it. If I compare them the employees in other undertakings, if you want me to do that...

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : If you compare them with the bank employees; they are getting Rs. 300 less at the first stage...*(Interruptions)*.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : There is a complaint, it has been alleged, that the LIC employees are living in high wage islands; this is the complaint we are receiving. We are not touching this now.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : If he does not know the facts about it, is there any rule to shut him out ? If there is no rule...

MR. CHAIRMAN : There is also no rule to force him to say anything.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : Then why is he saying that ? Is it fair ? He is not aware of the fact. He said that the LIC staff is getting more than the bank employees.

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : We are not at all against the employees.

(Interruptions)

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : In the first stage he is getting Rs. 69 lacs. Is he aware of it ? And he is saying that LIC employees are getting more.

MR. CHAIRMAN : He has not said that they are paid more than the bank employees.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA : How does he say about high wage island ?

(Interruptions)

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : I am not yielding. I have yielded to him earlier, but now I am not yielding.

Now, my point is, we are not against the employees. On the contrary, we are for the employees. As I have stated earlier when Mr. Sunil Maira has pointed out, it may not be palatable to some of the union leaders, but I can say that this measure is in the interest of the employees. Not only that. We are always talking about the organised sector. I appreciate. I have seen in the newspapers this morning one news item that they are to organise this unorganised sector also. We have to do that, I appreciate it. But if we have to say that we are for this institution or corporation

and everything is for employees, there we do not agree. These institutions are for the people of this country, particularly the weaker sections. Then only we have to take into consideration this organised sector. Let them not be under the impression that these corporations are meant for employees only. It is not the intention; even I don't think that it is the intention of the people of this country. This is why I have stated it and I went to make it very clear also that we are not, anti-labour, we are for the employees of the organisation also. We will take care of them also and according to me, it is the interest of the employees, the policy-holders and also in the interest of the efficiency of the organisation. We want to give a better service. That is why I have come with this measure. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN : I shall now put the motion moved by Shri Janardhana Poojary to the vote of the House.

The question is :

"That the Bill to provide with a view to the more effective realisation of the objectives of nationalisation of life insurance business, for the dissolution of the Life Insurance Corporation of India and for the establishment of a number of corporations for the more efficient carrying on of the said business and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto, be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 30 members, 20 from this House namely :—

- (1) Shri Satish Agarwal
- (2) Shri M. Arunachalam
- (3) Shri Dildeep Singh Bhuria
- (4) Shri Mool Chand Daga
- (5) Shri Nurul Islam
- (6) Shri Bhiku Ram Jain
- (7) Shri Kamal Nath Jha

- (8) Shri Ghayoor Ali Khan
- (9) Shri Sunil Maitra
- (10) Shri K. Mallanna
- (11) Shri Braja Mohan Mohanty
- (12) Shri Kusuma Krishna Murthy
- (13) Shri Ram Pyare Panika
- (14) Shri Janardhana Poojary
- (15) Shri Ram Lal Rahi
- (16) Shri K.A. Rajan
- (17) Shri Ratansinh Rajda
- (18) Shri M.S.K. Sathiyendran
- (19) Shri Natvarsinh Solanki
- (20) Shrimati Sukhbun Kaur

and 10 from Rajya Sabha ;

That in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee ;

"That the Committee shall make a report to this House by the last day of the first week of Budget (1984) Session of Lok Sabha;

that in other respects, the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees shall apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House do recommend to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and Communicate to this House the names of 10 members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

The motion was adopted.