

के रूप में दे देते हैं। उन्होंने समाज विरोधी तत्वों को अपने पास जमा कर रखा है। विरोध करने वालों को बह गौली मार कर हत्या कर देने की धमकी देते हैं। उन के कदाचार के बारे में मुझे एक मुद्रित पर्चा मिला है, जिस में उन के विरुद्ध 32 बड़े ही गम्भीर आरोप लगाये गये हैं। मैंने अपने स्त्रोन से इन आरोपों की जांच करवाई है जो सच पाये गये हैं। मैं उस पर्चे को वित्त मंत्री के पास आवश्यक कार्यवाही के लिए भेज रहा हूँ।

पर्चे से यह स्पष्ट है कि स्टाफ एसोसिएशन का उक्त पदाधिकारी बैंक का राजा बना हुआ है। वह जो चाहता है करता है। कोई पूछने वाला नहीं है। उक्त बैंक में वह दस वर्षों से काम कर रहा है। पता नहीं, उस के लिए ट्रांसफर का कोई कानून है या नहीं ?

उक्त अधिकारी के विरुद्ध 32 सूत्री आरोपों की जानकारी भारतीय स्टेट बैंक के बड़े बड़े अधिकारी को है। परन्तु पता नहीं, वे शांत क्यों हैं। अतः मंत्री महोदय से मेरा अनुरोध होगा कि वह उस बैंक में चल रही घूसखोरी, धांधली तथा अन्य गड़बड़ियों की शीघ्र जांच करवा कर उचित कार्यवाही करें ताकि वहाँ से अंतक का राज समाप्त हो सके।

SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY : Sir, I share the concern of the hon. Member and about the specific instances which have been brought to the notice of the House we will make an inquiry. So far as that is concerned, there is no doubt about it. But if we generalise it, it will be counter-productive.

I have stated earlier in my main reply that we are making all our efforts to

check malpractices, even corruption. I personally went, as I stated, to Rajasthan. In one district we had more than 1,500 beneficiaries. When I made enquiry, only one beneficiary stood up and said that he had parted with Rs. 100 and Patwari took that money, not the bank people. Then immediately I asked the Collector to take action. There were 1,499 beneficiaries who stated that they gave no money amounting to corruption. So, that is why I say if you generalise it, it is going to be counter-productive. On the contrary, the people, particularly the weaker sections, will be under the impression that hereafter for getting any loan they have to part with some money as corruption. It is not correct also. We should not create such a panic in the minds of the people. Wherever there are such instances we are assuring the hon. Members that we will be very serious and we will take action.

SHRI SUNIL MAITRA (Calcutta North-East) : Just for Minister's information. I am only requesting the Minister to go through the report brought out by the Comptroller and Auditor General of India in this regard published only recently.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now the question is : "That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MR. CHAIRMAN : Now we go to next item, that is, Motion under Rule 388.

15.52 hrs.

MOTION UNDER RULE 388

Suspension of first proviso to Rule 74

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JANARDHANA POOJARY) : On behalf of Shri Pranab Kumar Mukherjee, I beg to move the following :—

[Shri Janardhana Poojary]

"That this House do suspend the first proviso to Rule 74 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha in its application to the motion for 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, to a Joint Committee of the House."

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): Mr. Chairman, thanks to the Indian Airlines, yesterday I could not reach here in time to express my opposition to the introduction of the Bill. Anyway, I will briefly make up for the lapse yesterday by expressing my views on the motion that is already moved by the hon. Minister.

While moving the motion, in fact while formulating the Bill, the entire basis has been the recommendations of the Era Sezhiyan Committee, whose report he has already submitted. But, strangely enough, even while accepting the proposal for the break-up of LIC into five corporations, they have isolated and accepted only one recommendation of the Era Sezhiyan Committee, while totally disregarding the rest of the recommendations. In relation to the promotional policy, investment norms, bonus to shareholders and all other related matters, they have remained conspicuously silent about all these recommendations and they have taken up only this particular recommendation.

As far as the motivation of this Bill is concerned, we are told that if there is an element of competition in the working of the LIC, they will augment the business of the LIC particularly in the rural side, and that will augment the efficiency of

the operational functioning of the LIC. It is far from the truth. It is an accepted fact that, if there is to be an element of competition between a number of entities, in that case, there must be certain dissimilar conditions that prevail among themselves. For instance, as far as the promotional policy, the investment policy, the investment policy, the bonus to the shareholders and all related problems are concerned, as far as these five Corporations are concerned, you will find that they have identical policies. There is nothing to compare and there is nothing like competition. Therefore, to think in terms of projecting an element of competition in these five Corporations, wherein competition itself cannot exist, I think that is a meaningless rationale that is sought to be built up.

Then, again, we are told that LIC is unwieldy. As far as LIC is concerned, there are 940 branches. But, as far as the State Bank of India is concerned, it has more than 6,000 branches.

Again, we are told that the proportion of rural business will increase. In 1957, when the LIC was formed, at that time the share of rural business was of the order of 5 per cent, whereas in 1982, for which year the report has already been submitted, we find that this share would be actually more than 32 per cent and, in the further report, it is likely to go up further.

16 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER *in the chair*]

What is the rationale behind referring a Bill to a Joint Select Committee. It is an accepted fact that when there is consensus on the basic approach to the Bill, only to work out the details, for scrutinising the details, a Bill is generally referred to the Joint Select Committee. As far as this Bill is concerned, consensus exists against the LIC split up; it does not exist in favour of the LIC split up. Therefore, referring this Bill to the Joint Select Committee will be a meaningless proposition.

The Government should review its policy and withdraw the Bill, even at this stage, rather than recommending a reference of this particular Bill to a Joint Select Committee. Already, the scrutiny is completed. The proposal was already scrutinized by the Select Committee and Shri C. D. Deshmukh in that debate said that it is a meaningless proposition to have this referred to a Committee.

The Estimates Committee of the Second Lok Sabha in 1961 has also rejected the concept of dividing the LIC into corporations. Even the Study Team of the Administrative Reforms Commission has rejected it. More than that, even the Morarka Committee had rejected it in toto. Shri C. D. Deshmukh in this very House has stated,

"On general grounds, it seems to me that if the LIC has to be ultimately responsible for life business, it should be extremely difficult to bring to work a number of corporations. For instance, the state of competition is bound to be restricted. It would be difficult to justify the existence of different corporations..."

The Estimates Committee of the Second Lok Sabha in 1961 said the same thing; so also the Study Group of the ARC and the Morarka Committee. So, in view of all these considerations and, since the successive committees, including the Estimates Committee,.....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : You are not opposing the motion under the rules?

16 hrs.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : I am coming to that... (*Interruptions*). Therefore, I say that since this problem was scrutinised by a number of Committees including even the Administrative Reforms Commission and a clear-cut base was built up, I feel that instead of suggesting reference to the Joint Select

Committee, even at this stage the hon. Minister for Finance can show the courtesy to the House, accept the consensus in the House and withdraw the proposal to refer the matter to the Joint Committee, and on the contrary withdraw also the original Bill, and maintain the *status quo*. Then we will try to work out the details of the efficiency of the administration of the LIC.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We will complete this now.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South) : Tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : We will finish it today.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE : There is going to be a stiff opposition to it.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : That is all right. It will take only 10 minutes.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY ; How can you do this?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : The House can do it.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER : All right, if you do not want, we will take it up tomorrow.

Now, let us take up discussion under Rule 195.

16.02 hrs.

DISCUSSION ON ESPIONAGE ACTIVITIES OF CERTAIN PERSONS INCLUDING RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE DEFENCE SERVICES

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I