

तो एक राजनेता के लिए आजीवन कारावास की सजा सुना दी थी।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES): You just associate yourself. Don't make a speech. You can say what exactly you want to say. You are the last speaker. Please be very brief.

श्री मूलचन्द मोणा : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं न्यायाधीशों की प्रतिक्रिया बता रहा हूँ, न्यायाधीशों की प्रतिक्रिया की बात कर रहा हूँ। उन जज साहिब ने सजा दे दी और सुप्रीम कोर्ट ने उस पर प्रतिक्रिया जाहिर कर दी कि इस न्यायाधीश को क्रिमिनल लॉ का ज्ञान नहीं है। उस राजनेता की तो आजीवन कारावास की सजा का अखबारों में प्रचार हो गया और उनकी बेइज्जती हो गई लेकिन वे न्यायाधीश जिनको ज्ञान नहीं है आज भी न्यायाधीश के पद पर बैठे हुए हैं। आज भी निर्णय कर रहे हैं। वे तो ऐसे ही निर्णय दग। इनके प्रति कोई रोक होनी चाहिये। न्यायाधीशों के आचरण की जांच होनी चाहिए ताकि वे सीमा में रहे। यदि न्यायाधीशों के आचरण की जांच की गई तो मैं यह मानता हूँ कि वे भावनार्थों में बहकर कभी डिजिजन नहीं देंगे। इसलिए केन्द्र सरकार को इसके प्रति सचत होना चाहिये कि न्यायाधीशों के जो आचरण हैं यदि उनको किसी न्यायाधीश का आचरण दोषी पाया तो तुरन्त उसे बर्खास्त करें, उसको हटा दें। यही मैं कहना चाहूँगा।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES): Thank you. When the House debated this issue, I don't think it was the intention of the House either to discuss the conduct or the judgement of any court because they have their own jurisdiction. I think Members were agitated because of the limits exceeded by the judiciary. I hope that the Government will bring to the notice of the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court the views expressed by honourable Members. Now, that matter closes here.

**RE: IMF PRESSURE ON THE GOVERNMENT OF INDIA TO INTRODUCE EXIT POLICY IN INDIAN INDUSTRIES AND PRIVATISATION OF PUBLIC SECTOR UNDERTAKINGS**

SHRI JIBON ROY (West Bengal): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, I draw the attention of the House to a meeting between the IMF and the Government on 2nd July, under article 4. In that meeting they have discussed about clamping of an Exit Policy for the workers in Indian industries. Besides this, reduction of import duty, withdrawal of restriction on import of consumer items, disinvestment, privatisation and many other things were discussed. I will not raise other issues. But I am concerned with the Exit Policy. In a communique issued by the IMF on 16th July, it is said that another key priority for structural reforms should be to establish more effective Exit Policies in order to facilitate the re-deployment of the resources across the sectors. The thing is, this is discussed. But no communique has come from the Government of India about what has actually transpired on the matter. I would not have been concerned but for the past record of the Government following whatever the IMF says on the economy of Ministries. In fact, before the matter is discussed, the Government has started implementing the Exit Policy.

Sir, in our Industrial Disputes Act, section 25(k), 25(l) and 25(m) have given some protection to the workers. They provide that no factory could be closed without the permission of the State Government or the appropriate Government that a worker should be given three months' notice if he is permanent; and that lay-off would be also subject to permission of Government. These are the provisions of the Act. Now, a Bill is introduced in the other House seeking to amend the SICA. While introducing the Bill, it has been claimed that it is done as per the decision of the CMP. But in the CMP, it has been mentioned that the SICA will be amended to revamp the

sick industries, to revive the sick industries to, protect the interests of the workers in the industries. The three main objectives, directives, laid down in the CMP on the question of amendment of the SICA are to revamp, revive and to protect the interests of workers. Now, in the Bill which is introduced on the instruction of the IMF, nothing is mentioned about the revival of the industries; nothing is mentioned about the revamping of the industries. The quasi-judicial authority of the Board i.e. BIFR is sought, through the Bill, to be withdrawn, deleted. In the existing law, it is provided that a factory will be referred, to the BIFR only when its worth becomes negative by making continuous losses. Now, in the Bill it is provided that any creditor financial institution may appeal that a company is in default to pay dues for two years or one year and it can be referred. And the right of appeal to the higher court is being withdrawn, the right of appeal to the High Court is being withdrawn; the right of appeal to the apex court is being withdrawn, under the provisions of the Bill. If the Bill is passed, then the liquidation of companies will be automatic; the winding up of companies will be automatic. Section 25 of the Industrial Disputes Act negates it by itself.

I would like to tell the Government humbly that the Bill will have far-reaching repercussions if pursued with. We are with the Government and our difference is also known. We are a Party of workers. We cannot agree with any provisions which hamper the interests of workers and industries. Therefore, I would request the Government through you, Sir, to re-consider the Bill, even not to proceed with the Bill. We should not be blamed later. Even if it is pursued with, it may not be possible for us to support the Bill. We may have to, we may be compelled to, vote against the Bill if it is possible. Therefore, I once again draw the attention of the Government to the fact that all this has been done at the instance and instruction of the IMF. It should be stopped.

DR. BIPLAB DASGUPTA (West Ben-  
1). May I request the Minister to

communicate our feelings to the Government, Sir? This is a Zero Hour Mention.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES): Mr. Jibon Roy has said that he is in the Government. But I do not think that he is in the Government. He is in the Treasury Benches. (Interruptions). I know. There are others. He has to associate himself. Shri Bratin Sengupta.

SHRI BRATIN SENGUPTA (West Bengal): I associate myself with Mr. Jibon Roy, Sir. Thank you.

RE. NEWS-ITEM ABOUT LATA MANGESHKAR'S SINGING AT MID-NIGHT SESSION AND OPENING OF A BOTTLE.

SHRIMATI MARGARET ALVA (Karnataka): Sir, I rise with a sense of deep anguish to bring to the notice of the House facts that have appeared in the newspapers over the last two days. We are all celebrating the 50th year of freedom. It has become the watchword today, and perhaps, the most solemn part of the entire celebration is the function in the Central Hall of Parliament on the 14th midnight, when we are supposed to be rekindling the spirit of patriotism and the entire freedom movement. Sir, I am not involved with any of the Committees. I may be corrected if I am wrong. But I am quoting reports which have widely appeared. Mr. Bommai, we are told, is the Chairman of the National Celebration Committee, while no less a person than the Home Minister, is the Chairman of the Cabinet Committee for the Celebration. They are not ordinary people. They should be knowing what is happening. Now, I would like to quote something. "After Lata Mangeshkar, the Nightingale of India, sings *Sare Jahan Se Acha* in Parliament, and after she has sung those famous lines, she will open a bottle of a particular