

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Sir, I beg to move :
"That the Bill be passed".

MR. CHAIRMAN : Motion moved :
"That the Bill be passed"

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : Sir, at this stage, my suggestion is relevant.

PROF. RASA SINGH RAWAT : The hon. Minister has not mentioned about the Standing Committee.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : What I am suggesting is, let this Bill be passed but let him bring an amending Bill along with the regulations. Let us discuss that when we resume our Session on 26th of August so that we can consider it indepth.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Sir, clause 27 says that every rule and every regulation made under this Act shall be laid as soon as may be after it is made before each House of Parliament while it is in Session, etc. etc.

Now that the Bill is being passed, let SEBI take a look at the regulations. With or without modifications made by SEBI, these regulations will be placed on the Table of the House. Then, if some hon. Members wish that some part of the regulations should be included in the Bill, they may let me know. Surely, I will consider what part of the regulations must be made a part of the Bill. Let them first take a look at the regulations when they are placed on the Table of the House.

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE : You send it to the Standing Committee

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : Only if it is necessary, will it be sent. If you are satisfied with the Regulations, then why should it be sent to the Standing Committee?

MR. CHAIRMAN : The question is :
"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted

16.58 3/4 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE : DISAPPROVAL
OF THE SUPREME COURT AND HIGH
COURT JUDGES (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE)
AMENDMENT THIRD ORDINANCE, 1996

AND

SUPREME COURT AND HIGH COURT JUDGES
(CONDITIONS OF SERVICE)
AMENDMENT BILL

MR. CHAIRMAN : The House will take up Item Nos. 9 and 10 together. Time allotted is one hour.

16.59 hrs.

(Mr. Deputy Speaker in the Chair)

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : Hon. Deputy Speaker, Sir, the Supreme Court and High Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Amendment Bill, 1996 is sought to be introduced as a consequence of a series of Ordinances.

17.00 hrs.

The Supreme Court and High Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Amendment Bill was first introduced as an Ordinance on 29th February, 1996 and later in the form of a Bill to replace the Ordinance. But on account of some serious lapses and mismanagement of the Government and the Party in Power at that time, this Bill could not be placed for the consideration of the House. Then, they came out with the second Ordinance. But to our great surprise - and it would be shocking to hear and note that - the second Ordinance again lapsed and then they came out with the third Ordinance. This is the result of prostitution of ordinance-making power under the Constitution.

Article 123 (1) of the Constitution specifically mentions that the Ordinance-making powers are to be used very sparingly in rarest of the rare cases. It says :

"If at any time, except when both Houses of Parliament are in Session, the President is satisfied that circumstances exist which render it necessary for him to take immediate action, he may promulgate such Ordinances as the circumstances appear to him to require."

Kindly note the words, 'the satisfaction of the President and existence of circumstances which make him necessary to take immediate action'

So far as the amenities and perks of the High Court and Supreme Court Judges are concerned, I am here to support them and I would support them when I come to the merits of the Bill and Ordinance. Therefore, I should not be misunderstood for having opposed them. But what I want to submit is that these conditions of service are there in the form of an Act, an Act which is basically of 1954. Since then various amendments had taken place from time to time and there was another amendment of the Act in 1958 and 1956. From 1958 we are now in 1996 and the question is regarding sumptuary allowance and travelling allowance or use of the car and for that purpose allowance in terms of money and petrol whatever it may be.

Now on one fine morning, the President finds that an emergency has existed or the emergency has arisen which requires his immediate action. The question is of increasing the money and that question can be taken up prospectively or retrospectively at any time when Parliament is in Session. The Parliament meets so often, at least three times in a year. Therefore, it is impossible to conceive of an emergency where His Excellency, the President, in his extraordinary emergency powers, can

issue Ordinance for taking some immediate action. Such conditions are: conditions of war, conditions of natural calamity, unforeseen exigencies, etc. Such developments can never be imagined or can never be conceived. Now, the question is : what amount should be paid to High Court Judge on account of increase of petrol price, which cannot be put in that category.

Therefore, I submit that this is a misuse, serious abuse and gross abuse of the Ordinance making power.

His excellency, the President is certainly duty-bound under our Constitution to approve any matter, whenever the Cabinet decides it. That is his constitutional duty. But the Ordinance-making power is another constitutional duty of the President, apart from his normal executive power. Therefore, I would submit that while using the constitutional power of issuing Ordinances, it is necessary for the President to have a satisfaction that extraordinary emergency, urgency or circumstances exist which require immediate and prompt action, and not once but all the three times The Government is trying to lower the hon. President's exalted constitutional position to that of a rubber stamp, seal. He is required to put a seal, irrespective of the satisfaction which he is required to have under article 123. Therefore, I hereby condemn this attitude, this practice, this method and his system of misusing the constitutional Ordinance-making power of the President under article 123 of the Constitution.

Sir, you will find several rulings of the hon. Charri - not one, two or three - where the Government has been reprimanded, where the Government has been censured, where the Government has been reprimanded, the Ordinance-making power and not to come out with Ordinances so frequently, on such flimsy pretexts and in such a cursory manner, against the spirit of the Constitution, by frequent disregard, clear contravention and violation of the sacrament and duties which have been cast on the President of this country.

Therefore, I would like to oppose this Ordinance on the precise ground that it is beyond the spirit of article 123 of the Constitution and it is a misuse and a serious abuse of that power. The Government has issued three Ordinances one after the other, which is unprecedented in the constitutional history. Once they falter, once they commit a mistake, once they commit a lapse, then again they come forward for a second time and for a third time. In such circumstances, I would submit that the Ordinance-making power of the President under the Constitution has not been properly used under the constitutional spirit. Our forefathers who framed the constitution, never thought that a time would come when the Government would come forward with an Ordinance every morning and have the signature of the President so easily. I would, therefore, request that this Ordinance which has been placed before this House for the third time, be rejected on the precise ground that it is beyond

the scope of article 123 of the Constitution and it is against the spirit of article 123. That is my first point.

Coming to the merits of the matter, I would submit that this legislation was long awaited. The Service conditions of the Judges of this country who are required to act as watchdogs of the Constitution, as the sentinels of the Constitution, and who have brought great name and fame to the Indian Judiciary in the world, deserve to be improved. Today we are seeing that when the Government falters, when the Government commits mistakes one after the other, when the Government becomes partisan and when the Government goes on committing scams and scandals one after the other, then functionaries of the Government who are VIPs - maybe Members of Parliament, maybe Members of legislatures, maybe holding the rank of Cabinet Ministers, maybe the former Prime Minister or the present Ministers all come under the "rule of law" and who are liable to be prosecuted by the prosecuting agencies like CBI which earned great reputation once upon a time for being fair and for acting as watchdogs of the people for eradicating corruption also rather than the judiciary is required to step in and order prosecutions and proper investigation.

I remember the first case of Madhya Pradesh where one Minister was caught red-handed in a Delhi hotel - at that time it was Vindhya Pradesh - and the C.B.I. caught that Minister red-handed and trapped him under the Prevention of Corruption act and prosecuted him and got him sentenced. But since then, there is no other case thereafter when the C.B.I. has come to that expectation, against ruling party VIPs.

Now the position is that fortunately for us, because of the judicial activism, on account of public interest litigations by the social activist groups who are taking up litigations one after the other to eradicate the corruption of higher-ups from the public life, the judiciary has come to rescue. It is now recognised throughout the world, by the media, by political leaders, by statemen, by educationists, by social reformers that but for the judiciary but for the Supreme Court of India these scandals which have come out one after the other would not have come out.

Take the Hawala scandal or the Jain diaries in which so many politicians are involved. I am not commenting on the merits of the cases as the matter is to be decided by the Court. I am not going to talk about the individual persons involved in it as a few may be innocent like Advaniji. I am talking generally. For four or five years the diaries were in the possession of the C.B.I. Prime Ministers changed one after the other; Ministers changed one after the other. But the C.B.I. allowed the diaries to remain in the drawers, in the almirahts without taking any action. It was only when the Supreme Court started looking into it and the Judges of the Supreme Court, as watchdogs of the Constitution, took the C.B.I. to task for sheltering, for providing

protection or for somehow or the other harbouring those criminals by not prosecuting them, that some challans were filed.

Sir, you know it very well that the Supreme Court had to monitor it directly and pursue the prosecution by the C.B.I. on a day-to-day basis, at one hearing after the other and asked them to again and again look into the matter. It was only when they were thrashed upon and reprimanded by judiciary that the C.B.I., their advocate, their Director and their Officers - when they found that the Supreme Court and High Court Judges were out to eradicate corruption which is normally an area of the Government, an area where the Home Minister and the Law Ministers of the Government should have acted - that they started filing challans one after the other, may be Hawala or Chandraswami on Urea Fertilizers or Bihar fodder Scam.

Now more than a dozen Cabinet Ministers and M.Ps. are in the dock facing the trial. That being so, I should congratulate the judiciary for its bold stand. It is the judicial activism which has been exhibited by the Supreme Court not in one but in several cases that has brought glory to this country; brought fame and glory to the Constitution of India and has brought glory to the people of India. Therefore, I congratulate the Supreme Court judges and the institution of the Supreme Court; the High Court judges and the institution of High Court for rising to the occasion saving 80 crore people of the country from the galore of scandals of Hawala Urea, swami and Bihar fodder...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI A.C. JOS (Idukki) : What about the Magistrates?...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P.M. SAYEED (Lakshadweep) : A former Chief Justice acting against the interests of the judges...*(Interruptions)*

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : Sir, I am now coming to the Magistrates. The compliments which are paid to the hon. Judges of the Supreme Court and the High Courts equally apply to those judicial magistrates. I may say here that the judicial magistrates are very small in stature or are low in the ladder.

[Translation]

SHRI KALPNATH RAI (Ghosi) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like to ask one question. Lodhaji is a learned person. I have great regard for him and want that he should become judge. Assuming Lodhaji a judge, I would like to say that if I am found guilty in this House, I should be hanged outside this Parliament today itself. Atrocities and excesses have been committed against me. I was imprisoned for three months in a false case under TADA. I was not allowed to attend Parliament even, though I am a Member of Parliament. I was not granted bail. I was taken to jail custody alongwith other ordinary criminals. The criminals who had committed almost 30 murders each, were allowed to file a bail application but I was not allow to do so. I had filed an

application to the effect that I might be allowed to visit my constituency only for two days but I was not given an opportunity by the judge to go there. Perhaps, I am the first person on the earth who has been insulted to the greatest extent and badly treated by the jail authorities. I consider you a judge and want to say that if I am found guilty, I should be hanged in front of Gandhiji's statue. What is the status and dignity of a Member of Parliament? Here they call this a "sovereign Parliament". Is this sovereign Parliament and are we its Members?

Please forgive me. About 75 per cent of the MPs are defeated in the election every time. Out of the total number of MPs who won the elections to the Lok Sabha in 1989, 75 per cent of them were defeated in 1991. Out of the total number of MPs who were elected in 1991, 330 MPs have been defeated in the recently held elections and similarly, whenever next elections take place, 330 more will be defeated again. Only 5 to 7 per cent persons get the opportunity to be re-elected as MP twice or thrice and 90 per cent persons are elected as MP only once in their entire life. In spite of being a member of Parliament, I have been treated so badly that I feel whether I should commit suicide? You all are MPs, please protect my dignity...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Kalpanthji, please...*(Interruptions)*

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : The way hon'ble Member has narrated his agony story, I would not like to say anything on any particular case. The reason is that our Parliament...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI KALPNATH RAI : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I would like to say one thing that today, the most honest and truthful person is this public servant who is called Member of Parliament. No other person is there in the country more honest and truthful than an MP. A drive has been launched in the country against the members of Parliament. You say that we are wrong and we say that you are wrong, this is not fair. Democracy cannot survive in such a way...*(Interruptions)*

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Kalpanath ji, the case is still pending, therefore, do not say more in this regard.

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : Mr. Deputy Speaker, sir, the hon'ble Member has expressed his sufferings and narrated his own experiences. As you know there are some rules and decorum of this House. As per rules, we cannot pass any comment either in favour or against any case which is sub-judice under a judicial Magistrate.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : I have said the something.

SHRI KALPNATH RAI : I have said nothing like that.

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : Whatever you said may be true or may not be true. I cannot take any decision in this regard either in your favour or against you—Anyway, I should not say anything. If the Judiciary

has done injustice to anyone, there are several ways to seek justice. For example one can approach another Court and file an appeal, revision, writ application in the Supreme Court.

If Judiciary has done any injustice, one should approach Appellate authority of the Judiciary against it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Please leave this issue here itself.

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : I was requesting about principle...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK (Cuttack) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, he cannot go on and on. Please ask him to stop speaking on this point.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER . I have already told him

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : Sir, I have not followed what he said...*(Interruptions)* That is for the Chair to say.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK . I am requesting the Chair to stop you from speaking on this point again and again

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER I have already told him

[Translation]

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA Mr Deputy Speaker, Sir, I was not talking about any particular person, particular prosecution and particular judge. I had requested and again I want to say that the Ordinance or act in respect of judges should be appreciated as the judges of India have brought the name of our country to light.

Sir we have an impartial Judiciary. You know that in Pakistan, Bhutto was hanged over a night. In Bangladesh, a legislation was enacted that if they give their judgement in favour of a political party they would be allowed to remain but later on it was removed. What happened in Sri Lanka you know very well. But in India as far as Judiciary is concerned it has held India's head high in the world but sir today there is a controversy on the way judicial activism is going on in this country. Since, this subject is not included in today's agenda I would not speak on this.

I would like you to make self introspection as to why the judicial activism has taken such an alarming shape. Be it the hon. Home Minister or the Minister of the State Governments, director prosecution or investing agencies, if they do not perform their duties impartially then in this situation only Judiciary seems to be a silver lining in the dark clouds. *(Interruptions)* You may make your point when you get a chance to speak but what I am saying at present is my individual opinion. *(Interruptions)*. It is my considered opinion that Indian Judiciary has maintained dignity, thus carved a niche for itself in the world.

I would like to submit that in America on some people's provocation, Mr. Roosevelt told the Judges to accept the new deal of legislation and threatened them to pack the Court with judges in case they intended to declare that legislation invalid. The judges out of fear surrendered which resulted into coining a proverb. They saved their skin by changing their verdict but this incident infamized the American Judiciary.

[English]

"A stitch in time saves nine".

[Translation]

Sir, there are thousands of such cases in our judiciary where Ordinances were declared anti-constitutional and thus the Constitution was amended. Be it the issue of land reforms, Nationalisation or 9th Schedule, suitable amendments were made therein which clearly shows that Indian Judges have time, maintained the highest standard of judiciary. But like other spheres of life Judiciary also has black sheeps. It is impossible to say that Judiciary can be an exception to it. There has been some stances like the one in respect of privy purse judgement in which the order of abolishing privy purse by executive order was nullified. After that three Supreme Court Judges were superseded and the junior most was made the senior most. He was elevated to such a higher-post because he was one of the judges of the bench which had given this verdict in the favour of the Government. Such blacksheeps as Ray as have also been there in the Judiciary.

Sir, I would also like to say that while walking or travelling in a bus or train, if you happen to listen to a common man, you will come to know that he has all praise for Indian Judiciary which has started taking action against the persons who have been misusing their position. I am a Member of Parliament and I have my own dignity. I enjoy a good status but I am not above the law. Law is the king of kings and considers a king as well as a poor person alike. You might have seen that the Governor had to resign and several Ministers too had to resign. But how all this happened? Because under this Rule of Law and to administer this Rule of law the Judges of High Courts and Supreme Court started imparting their justice with boldness.

I want to say something in praise of Judiciary but our hon. Members forbid me from doing so. Their views may be different. Differences in opinion in the best guard of our democracy and this difference of opinion never creates any bitterness. But I would like to urge upon the Government that in the prevailing situation we should provide all sorts of facilities and security to the Judges of High Courts and Supreme Court.

Mr Deputy Speaker, Sir, as a Member of Parliament, I would like to request that if any injustice is done to me, it will be considered an injustice done to Guman Mal Lodha and similarly Sh. Kalpnath Rai should, as

per the Law, oppose this injustice and safeguard his right. Shri Maithili Sharan Gupta had said :

"Adhikar ko kar baith rahna, yah maha dushkarma hai Nyayakar mein band ko bhi dand dena dharma hai is bat par pandvon ka kauravon se ran hua Jo kalpant ka karan hua."

Use that right fully in Judiciary as well as in other forums. You are expected to oppose the injustice wherever it is done. But I would like to say one thing that I do not commit any crime and I do not exaggerate when I say that if situation requires we may prove ourselves innocent in a court but only after resigning our post to which we were elected by the people. I am not saying it with any ill will or malice that being an MP is not a license of breaking the Law and claiming myself innocent. It has not been provided in the privileges. It is not my privilege that no Law was brought against me anywhere myself, the members of Parliament and the Ministers are not extraordinary human beings. The great thinkers of our country who had sacrificed their lives for the country, had prescribed the 'Rule of Law' and not the 'Rule of Jungle'. There was a time when the word of the king was the law and that rule used to be dictatorial, feudal a rule of terror and that used to be instrumental in exploiting the people and committing atrocities on them. But today with the freedom of the India and bidding good bye to that injustice and atrocity, we framed our own Constitution. It has been mentioned in our Constitution and when our Constitution says so, we should express our full faith in the Judiciary and praise our judges. I would also like to mention that when we express concern for the judges of High Courts and Supreme Court, we should not forget Munsifs. I had written an article - 'Munsif the have nots' in which I had stated as to how a poor Munsif who does not have a conveyance visits a village. He hires a tonga or cycle rikshaw. He does not have his own house so he lives in a rented House. But when his house owner who has rented out his house to the said Munsif appears as a party in his Court, how can he impart the impartial justice. Therefore, when we talk of 'lowest in the ladder' and say that it has been mentioned in the preamble that the poor, the Dalit, the weaker section and the exploited one will live in the country with dignity and respect, we should not forget the Munsif who trods village to village and jungle to jungle and who does not get the residence facility. He should be provided with all sorts of facilities alongwith the facility of residence so that he may impart impartial justice.

I would also like to state that we, in our Constitution, have made provision for separating Executive from Judiciary and that we have done to the maximum extent. But when I visited Pali, my Parliamentary Constituency, the day before yesterday, I was pained to note that due to non-separation of Judiciary from the Executive and due to entrusting the power of sections 107, 151 and 122 to SDM, the atrocity is committed on the poor. The

workers of Maharaj Umed Mills were on strike. After the strike, the owners of the mill declared lockout and with this all the workers were put in jail...*(Interruptions)*. The SDM issued an order in which the Administrative Magistrate ordered the labourers to produce bails each of Rs.50 thousand...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : He is the mover of the Resolution.

[Translation]

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : If you have sympathy for workers for the weaker section of the society and for the Dalit, please listen to what I say...*(Interruptions)*

[English]

DR. ASIM BALA (Navadwip) : The total time allotted for this is one hour and he has already taken thirty five minutes.

[Translation]

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : A worker is asked to produce four bails worth Rs.50 thousand...*(Interruptions)*. From where would he procure Rs. two lakhs or four lakhs.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : One hour's time has been allotted for one Bill. Please try to conclude.

JUSTICE GUMAN MAL LODHA : I am concluding. Actually a context came before me it has been written in the Constitution that Judiciary should be separated from Executive. I am talking theoretically...*(Interruptions)*. Actually my heart was overpossessed with pain and emotions. So, I poured my heart out. I would like to urge that this Bill should be passed. I am not opposing this Bill. I would also like to state that the Ordinance making authority, the Constitution should not be misused in future. I would withdraw my Statutory Resolution but the prostitution of Ordinance making power by bringing Ordinance thrice and putting the hon. President in such a position of being a rubber stamp concerns us. The misuse of his rights is not proper. This Bill should be passed. However, I would like to say to the Law Minister that attention should be paid to extend the facilities to lower ranked, poor, helpless munsif Magistrates and District Judges because they are the bedrock of the judiciary. If we do not pay any attention to the foundation or the weaker sections of the judiciary and concentrate only on providing facilities to the judges of the High Courts and the Supreme Court, this would not be fair and there would be inequality. Attention should be paid to bring equality and to remove inequality.

With these words, I support the Bill I also request that ordinance should not be promulgated in such a manner in future. I once again congratulate the Judiciary of India for having taken a vow with courage and boldness to free India from corruption, much in a similar

manner as Lord Rama had once resolved to free the society, the earth from the evils of the wicked people and the demons. Today the Supreme Court has reaffirmed the same thing that 'Nishichar heen karoon mahi, kar uthaye bhujdand'...(Interruptions) you are not in the court. Are you a criminal? Why are you worried? Are you also a criminal?...*(Interruptions)*.

[English]

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER : Let the hon. Minister move the Bill.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF LEGAL AFFAIRS, LEGISLATIVE DEPARTMENT AND DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (SHRI RAMAKANT D. KHALAP) : I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Supreme Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Act, 1958 and the High Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Act, 1954, as introduced in the Lok Sabha on the 11th July, 1996 be taken into consideration."

This Bill has been introduced with the specific intention of increasing the quota of petrol and sumptuary allowance to the High Court Judges and Supreme Court Judges. Substantial improvements in the service conditions of the Judges have been made from time to time and the present Bill is as a result of our concern for bringing about further improvements in the conditions of service of the judges.

There had been an increase in the price of petrol from time to time. The Judges have to undertake more journeys for attending seminars and conferences these days. The Chief Justices and judges are also required to hold periodical meetings of Judicial Officers and with the members of the Bar. Considering the increase in the cost of eatables and considering the increase in the price of petrol, it has become necessary to amend the aforesaid Acts to increase the sumptuary allowances and conveyance facilities to the Chief Justices and Judges.

I, therefore, expect the wholehearted support of the House to this Amendment Bill.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER : Motions moved :

"That this House disapproves of the Supreme Court and High Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Amendment Third Ordinance, 1996 (No.29 of 1996) promulgated by the President on 21 June, 1996."

"That the Bill further to amend the Supreme Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Act, 1958 and the High Court Judges (Conditions of Service) Act, 1954, be taken into consideration."

Now Shri P. Chidambaram, the Minister of Finance will make a statement on interims relief to Central Government employees.

17.39 hrs.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER

Interim Relief to Central Government Employees

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE AND MINISTER OF COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM) : Mr. Deputy Speaker, Sir, I am pleased to inform the House that based on our discussions with the Pay Commission and the representatives of the staff side, we have requested the Pay Commission to consider whether another instalment of interim relief may be granted to the Central Government employees and, if so, to make suitable recommendations in this regard. Any amount of interim relief recommended by the Pay Commission and accepted by the Government will be fully adjusted against and subsumed in the final recommendations of the Pay Commission. The aforesaid formula is acceptable to all parties concerned.

The Pay Commission has also informed us that the final report will be available towards the end of September, 1996.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK (Cuttack) : Have you got Rs.5000 crore?

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : It is only to be adjusted.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK : What do you mean by "adjusted?" Do you mean more income?...*(Interruptions)*

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM : No. It will be adjusted against the final recommendations in the final report.

17.40 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE:DISAPPROVAL OF SUPREME COURT AND HIGH COURT JUDGES (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) AMENDMENT THIRD ORDINANCE, 1996.

AND

SUPREME COURT AND HIGH COURT JUDGES (CONDITIONS OF SERVICE) AMENDMENT BILL, 1996—CONTD.

SHRI BIJU PATNAIK (Cuttack) : Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I would take just a minute. All that I wanted to say about this Bill is that some more emoluments be given to the Judges. As you said, one hour has been allotted to this Bill. We should pass this Bill without any discussion and we can adjourn for the day. Some more emoluments have to be given because of the increase in the price of petrol etc. Let us pass it and forget about it. As far as we are concerned, the nation is thankful to them. They are doing a good work for the nation. Therefore, we should take care of them. Whatever little increase is given here and there, they must have the