

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Madam, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

**The Prevention of Illicit Traffic in
Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic
Substances (Amendment) Bill, 1996**

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE
(SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM): Madam
Deputy Chairman, I move:

"That the Bill further to amend the
Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Nar-
cotic Drugs and Psychotropic Sub-
stances Act, 1988, as passed by Lok
Sabha, be taken into considera-
tion."

Madam, in recent years India has been facing a serious problem of illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances. Being sandwiched between two major sources of narcotic drugs i.e., the Golden Crescent (Pakistan, Afghanistan and Iran) on the one side and the Golden Triangle (Myanmar, Thailand and Laos) on the other, India is highly vulnerable to transit traffic. Even though a number of legislative, administrative and preventive measures have been taken in the past such as the deterrent penal provisions in the NDPS Act, 1985 and the provisions for preventive detention under the PITNDPS Act, 1988, illicit traffic in narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances continues to be a serious threat.

The PITNDPS Act provides for two types of cases in which persons engaged in organised drug trafficking can be detained. The first relates to orders of detention issued under section 3(1) of the Act wherein the maximum period of detention is one year. After a person is detained, the case is referred within 35 days to an Advisory Board consisting of three High Court Judges for its opinion. If the Advisory Board recommends that the detention is not justified, the detenu

is released forthwith. In other cases, the detention orders are confirmed within 90 days.

The second type of cases relates to persons who deal in drug trafficking in areas categorised as highly vulnerable under section 10 of the Act. These areas include the international airports, sea-ports, international borders with other countries, coastal areas, etc. If the Competent Authority issues a declaration under section 10 of the Act to the effect that a person has engaged in illicit trafficking in a highly vulnerable area, the maximum period of detention is increased from one year to two years, as per section 11 of the act. In such cases, the opinion of the Advisory Board is required to be obtained within six months of detention, instead of the usual period of three months.

Past experience shows that the provisions of section 10 of the Act have been a strong deterrent to drug traffickers. I may say, Madam, that unlike the other Act, the success ratio of the detention orders under this Act has been extremely high and almost 75—90% of the detention orders issued under this Act have been upheld by the Tribunals or the courts, as the case may be.

It is, therefore, necessary to continue the provisions of section 10 of the Act in respect of detention orders which may be issued even after 31st July, 1996.

Madam, this Bill is virtually a mirror of the other Bill. We have discussed the other Bill at great length. I would be grateful if hon. Members can pass this Bill without discussion.

The question was proposed.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA
(West Bengal): Madam, we can pass it without discussion. *(Interruptions)*.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I have other names. Let me ask the other people. I have got Mr. Kohli's name. If he does not want to speak ... *(Interruptions)*

कोहली जी, वह यह रिक्वेस्ट कर रहे हैं कि यह वैसा ही बिल है, आप खाली ... (व्यवधान)

श्री ओम्पी० कोहली (दिल्ली): मैडम, मैं बहुत संक्षेप में दो-एक बातों का जिक्र करके अपनी बात खत्म करूंगा। मैडम, वित्त मंत्री जी ने जो विधेयक प्रस्तुत किया है यह बहुत टैक्नीकल नेचर का संशोधन है इसलिए इसको पास करने में ऐतराज नहीं होना चाहिए और मैं भी इसका समर्थन करूंगा। किन्तु उन्होंने अपने भाषण में इस बात का जिक्र किया कि यह जो कानून है इसकी सक्सेज रेशो बहुत अधिक है और जो भी प्रिवेशन आर्डर पास किए गए उनको एडवाइजरी बोर्ड वगैरह ने अपहोल्ड किया। मैं समझता हूँ कि किसी कानून की सफलता की यह कसौटी नहीं होनी चाहिए जो कसौटी वित्त मंत्री जी बतला रहे हैं। कसौटी तो यह होनी चाहिए कि इस कानून के कारण क्या मादक पदार्थों की तस्करी और उसके अवैध व्यापार में कोई कमी आई? क्या उस कानून के कारण मादक पदार्थों की देश में उपलब्धता कम हुई? क्या उसके कारण मादक पदार्थों का देश में सेवन कम हुआ? अगर मादक पदार्थों की तस्करी में कमी नहीं आती, मादक पदार्थों का अवैध व्यापार का धंधा फलता-फूलता है और अगर मादक पदार्थ देश में बहुत सहज तरीके से कहीं भी उपलब्ध हो जाते हैं और उनका सेवन उसकी प्रवृत्ति बढ़ती रहती है तो फिर केवल यह कहना कि इसकी सक्सेज रेशो बहुत अधिक है और जो हमने प्रिवेशन आर्डर पास किए उनमें 75 परसेंट अपहोल्ड हुए, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह इसकी सफलता की कसौटी नहीं होनी चाहिए। महोदया, देश में मादक पदार्थों का अवैध व्यापार और तस्करी का धंधा खूब फल फूल रहा है, नशीले पदार्थों की सेवन की प्रवृत्ति बहुत तेजी से बढ़ी है, आज देश में नशीले पदार्थ इतनी आसानी से उपलब्ध हैं विश्वविद्यालयों में, होस्टलों में, झुग्गी-झोपड़ियाँ कलस्टर में, सम्पन्न और संप्रांत पारा कलोनीज में, धार्मिक स्थानों पर, गावों में और देहात के लोगों को भी सहज उपलब्ध हैं। जगह-जगह देश में नशीले पदार्थों के वितरण के केन्द्र बन गए हैं। यह प्रवृत्ति अगर नहीं रोकी गई तो इसका युवा पीढ़ी पर, छात्रों पर, अच्छे घरानों के बच्चों पर बहुत खतरनाक असर होगा और उनका जीवन और उनका स्वास्थ्य तबाह होगा। यह एक बहुत चिंता का विषय होना चाहिए, न केवल इतना ही बल्कि जो नशीले पदार्थ हैं उनसे छुटकारा पाने के लिए जो दर्दनाक दवाएं दी जाती हैं अब उन दर्दनाक दवाओं के सेवन की प्रवृत्ति बढ़ रही है। जो उन नशीले पदार्थों के प्रभाव से मुक्त होते हैं, अब वह दर्दनाक दवाओं का सेवन नशे के तौर पर

करते हैं, यह एक और बात सामने आई है। महोदया, बड़े पैमाने पर मादक पदार्थों के अवैध व्यापार के कई कारण हैं। भारत की भौगोलिक स्थिति की बात माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी ने की। गोल्डन क्रॉसरोड और गोल्डन ट्रैडिंग के बीच में भारत स्थित है। भारत की लम्बी खुली सीमा है। भारत-पाक सीमा, भारत-बंगला देश सीमा, भारत-नेपाल सीमा, भारत-बर्मा सीमा। यह धंधा, वह व्यापार बहुत लाभदायक है, इसमें भारी मुनाफा कमाया जाता है, रतों-रत लोग अमीर होते हैं। सबसे बड़ी बात यह है कि यह धंधा करने वालों का एक बहुत मजबूत नेटवर्क देश के बीच में, देश के बाहर, अंतर्राष्ट्रीय स्तर पर व्याप्त है। नारकोटिक्स माफिया का तो बहुत मजबूत है। उनकी जड़ें बहुत गहरी हैं। न केवल इतना ही बल्कि आतंकवादियों के और मादक पदार्थों के तस्करो के बीच में एक नेक्सस है। भारत-पाक सीमा पर यह नेक्सस देखा जा सकता है, भारत-बर्मा सीमा पर यह नेक्सस देखा जा सकता है। भारत नेपाल सीमा पर यह नेक्सस देखा जा सकता है और नशीले पदार्थों के तस्करो से जो पैसा कमाया जाता है, उससे फिर हथियारों की स्मगलिंग होती है। यह जो चिंताजनक स्थिति इस नेक्सस के कारण बनी है, इसकी ओर ध्यान देना बहुत आवश्यक है।

मैडम, मैं एक बात का जिक्र करना चाहूंगा कि लॉ ऐनफोर्सिंग एजेंसीज की मिलीभगत के कारण यह तस्करी का व्यापार फल फूल रहा है। पूर्वांचल में अभी कुछ समय पहले पैरा मिलिटरी ट्रक नशीले पदार्थ ले जाते हुए घटना में पकड़े गए। अभी कुछ दिन पहले की खबर है कि इंदिरा गांधी अंतर्राष्ट्रीय हवाई अड्डे के कस्टम अधिकारियों ने 423 किलोग्राम हशीश के एक कन्साइनमेंट को क्लीयरेंस दे दी जिसे टोरंटो में कस्टम अधिकारियों ने पकड़ा। ढाई करोड़ रुपए की कीमत के इस कन्साइनमेंट को कैसे कस्टम अधिकारियों ने क्लीयरेंस दे दी? बिना उनकी मिलीभगत से यह व्यापार नहीं फल फूल सकता। पुलिस फोर्स में ऐक्साईज फोर्स में, कस्टम फोर्स में मादक पदार्थों का अवैध धंधा और तस्करी करने वालों के दाऊद और एजेंट मौजूद हैं। जब लॉ ऐनफोर्सिंग एजेंसीज इस तरह की हों तब माननीय वित्त मंत्री जी यह दावा करें कि इस कानून की सक्सेज रेशो बहुत अधिक है और प्रिवेंटिव आर्डर्स जो हमने पास किए, उनमें से 75 परसेंट अपहोल्ड हो गए, मैं समझता हूँ कि यह कसौटी नहीं हो सकती। जितनी बड़ी मात्रा में देश में नशीले पदार्थों के जखीर हैं, उनके मुक़ाबले में जितनी कितनी होती है? उनके मुक़ाबले में जितनी तो बहुत कम होती है। इसलिए महोदया, यह जो कानून है, इस

कानून से समस्या की व्यापकता को हम हल नहीं कर सकते। समस्या बहुत बड़े पैमाने की है, बहुत गंभीर चुनौती है, यह एक बड़ा सामाजिक प्रश्न है। इसको महज़ प्रिवेंटिव कानून बना कर हल कर पाना संभव नहीं है, इसके लिए व्यापक जन-जागरण की जरूरत है। इसमें मीडिया की महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका की जरूरत है। शैक्षिक पाठ्यक्रमों में मादक पदार्थों के सेवन से होने वाले खतरों को शामिल करना आवश्यक है। काउंसलिंग और डीएडिक्शन कार्यक्रमों की व्यवस्था करना जरूरी है, रीहैबिलिटेशन के लिए उपाय करना जरूरी है। महोदय, मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करते हुए एक बार इस बात का जरूर उल्लेख करना चाहता हूँ कि देश में मादक पदार्थों की बड़े पैमाने की तस्करी का तब तक इस चुनौती का सामना हम नहीं कर सकते जब तक हम लाॅ एनफोर्सिंग एजेंसीज़ को प्रश्र्वाचार से मुक्त न करें, उनको प्रभावी न बनाए और सरकार दंड के प्रावधानों को और मजबूत न करे। जब तक यह नहीं किया जाएगा, तब तक बड़े पैमाने के मादक पदार्थों की तस्करी की रोकथाम इस प्रकार के संशोधनों से नहीं होगी और अंत में मैं यह निवेदन करके अपनी बात समाप्त करूंगा कि आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि जो हमारे मौजूदा कानून हैं मादक पदार्थों की तस्करी रोकने के लिए, उन कानूनों का रिव्यू किया जाना चाहिए और कांप्प्रिहेंसिव लेजिस्लेशन लाना चाहिए। केवल इस तरह के छोटे-छोटे अमेंडमेंट्स से समस्या का समाधान नहीं होगा, बहुत-बहुत धन्यवाद।

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA:
Madam, he has spoken for all of us.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I don't know. I have the names written before me. I read out the names. Let the Members volunteer to withdraw because being in the Chair, I cannot ask them not to speak. I have Shri John F. Fernandes's name, Shri Sanatan Bisi's name, Dr. (Shrimati) Bharati Ray's name.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES (Goa):
Madam, may I?

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Yes, if you want to make a suggestion.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES:
Madam, I fully support this Bill and I refuse to believe that this is a mirror of the other Bill. This is a very serious matter, Madam. I feel that there should

be a stronger deterrent in this Bill. I would expect that the Minister makes it even five years instead of two years.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Let me clear the notion. This is a law of preventive detention. It is exceptional preventive detention. It has to be supported under Article, 22, sub-Article 4(A). If you make it five years, the law will be struck down.

So, I don't think we should make it five years.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES: No, no. I think it could be made for more than three years.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Under the normal law, you can detain a person for one year and in an exceptional situation, two years is long enough. I don't think we should....you cannot do whatever you like. This law will be stringent enough.....(Interruptions)....

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES: Okay, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: It is his viewpoint.

SHRI JOHN F. FERNANDES:
Madam, my point is that stringent punishment should be given under this law. I want to make a point because we have this problem in my State which is a tourist destination for foreign tourists. As mentioned by the hon. Minister the other day, India has been basically a transit point as it gets drugs from the 'golden triangle' and the 'golden crescent'. Madam, we have four designated international airports, i.e., Bombay, Calcutta, Madras and Delhi. We also have three more airports designated as international, but they are basically used for charter, like Goa. Then we have Trivandrum and Calicut. What I want to tell the hon. Minister is that the law enforcing agencies are not up to the mark. We don't have the sniffer dogs there. Basically, the tourists come in the charters and land in those airports. Then they come to Delhi, collect their drugs and go back. So, we should strengthen

the efforts of the customs, especially in Goa where we don't have sniffer dogs. How can the police and the customs detect these crimes?

Madam, I would not say that there is abuse of power by the judiciary under this Act. The power under this Act is so vast that a lot of discretion has been given to the judiciary. If a man violates this Act by getting hold of about two-ten grams of morphin or whatever it is, the judge is empowered to show leniency and he can just give him a warning and the man can get away. So, I would request the hon. Minister to see that a minimum punishment is specified, say ten thousand rupees fine and two months imprisonment. Otherwise, there would be misuse of power by the judiciary. When the foreigners come into our country, we try to be more coterous to them. Unless we amend this Act and see that a minimum penalty is there, mandatory penalty is there, this problem would not be solved.

Madam, I would also say something about the rewards. It is a commodity which has to be destroyed by the Government and the Government don't get any revenue out of it. On the other hand, in the customs cases when gold and silver is seized and impounded, they can sell and make money out of it. In this case, the drug has to be mandatorily destroyed. I don't know how the Government gets the revenue to pay the rewards. I don't think that this system of rewards under this Narcotic Act is foolproof. I don't know as to what type of mechanism the Government follows for transfer of funds which the Government gives to the informers. The reward is about ten to eighteen per cent of the seized drugs. The information has to be clandestine and confidential; the informer cannot go to the Court; he cannot take the Government to the court and demand his reward. I would be very grateful, if the hon. Minister would reply on these points. Thank you, Madam.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Shri Sanatan Bisi. I know Bisiji takes the minimum time, even otherwise.

SHRI SANATAN BISI (Orissa): Madam, I want to seek one clarification so far as section 10 is concerned. In accordance with the provision of sub-clause 1 of clause 4 and article 22 of the Constitution, the opinion of an Advisory Board has to be taken for a period longer than three months. To my mind, this provision has been amended. So far as the amended clause is concerned, it is very much clear. Section 3 of the 44th Constitutional amendment of 1978 is very much clear about it. In article 22 of the Constitution for clause 4, the following shall be substituted:

"No law providing for a preventive detention shall authorise detention of a person for longer period than two months."

But, here it is three months. When the concerned provision had been amended in 1978, why has no amendment been made here? Why has this thing not been enforced? This is the only thing I want to ask of the Minister.

DR. (SHRIMATI) BHARATI RAY (West Bengal): Madam, I rise to support this Bill. I will be extremely brief. In my view, drug trafficking is certainly a case which justifies the most stringent prohibitive and preventive measures because it poses a two-fold threat to our country—one to its very existence and the other to its growth.

First the question of national security. Madam, I will not go into the details. Drug trafficking is increasing. The reason is obvious. The investment is small and the return staggeringly high. The real profit is at the retail-level and not at the production stage. How is this drug-money used? First, bulk of the *hawala* money is accounted for by narcotic drugs. Second drug traffic has links with international arms smuggling. Third, it is known and the global studies also indicate that drug-money is used to finance terrorist

activities. It is even believed that some of the neighbouring countries are involved in espionage system and, are inciting, fomenting and financing terrorist activities in Kashmir and elsewhere in India. There is a nexus between drug hawala, arms smuggling and some businessmen and politicians and this nexus is threatening the security of the country.

Another and perhaps a more important cause for worry is that drug is corrupting the younger generation. Madam, the quick selling and buying of street-drugs is going up. I, as an educationist, am really worried that college students and even school students are stealing money, joining anti-socials and destroying the promising potentials of a bright future. Drug was initially confined to metropolitan areas but now it is being extended to rural areas as well. Heroine abuse by injection is spreading which also contributes to AIDS infection. Madam, under the circumstances, our country is confronted with very serious threats, the security threat and the threat to growth. I think, there should be deterring not only for those people who are involved but to those who may be involved in the crime.

Just one more point, Madam. I want to mention this to the hon. Finance Minister that this crisis is global and the problem is global. So, a global strategy has to be evolved to control the production, distribution and consumption of drugs and the money peddling. I hope that our Finance Minister and our Government are giving adequate thought in this direction.

Thank you, Madam.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Madam, I am grateful to the hon. Members for supporting this Bill with a very brief discussion. There were some questions about what do we do with seized drugs. As far as opium is concerned, the seized opium is taken over by the Government to the opium and alkaloid factories to manufacture alkaloids for medicine.

Some opium is also exported by the Government factories to similar factories abroad. All other drugs are destroyed. There is a very strict procedure and drugs are destroyed under the supervision of high level officer. The rewards have indeed a bearing on the Government-budget and the Government bears that burden in the interest of law enforcement. This law for preventive detention is to control the supply of drugs. There are parallel efforts by the Ministry of Welfare and the Ministry of Health to create social awareness on the danger of drugs so that more and more people do not demand drugs and people are weaned away from addiction to drugs. Madam, this law is consistent with article 22. The first part of the law deals with detention for a period of three months and the second part of the law deals with detention for a longer period, more than three months without obtaining the opinion of the Advisory Board.

I request the hon. Members to pass this law.

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN (Tamil Nadu): Madam, (*Interruption*)....

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Let me finish this business. (*Interruptions*) Members do not want to have any more Bills after this (*Interruptions*) ...

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: No, no, certainly not. ... (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We are trying to solve the situation because we have another Resolution, namely, the Employees Provident Funds, etc. (*Interruptions*) ... So, let us finish one business first.

Now, the question is:

That the Bill further to amend the Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1988, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now, we shall take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Madam, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Madam, may I request that the two Appropriation Bills be passed because they are formal Bills. *(Interruptions)* ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The point is that the Appropriation Bill was reported just about two hours back. So, I have to use my discretionary powers to waive the rule and allow it to be passed today. For this delay, no reason was given. When the letter came from the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs they just said that it should be put as the first in order. I did not know why. *(Interruptions)* ... So, I said, "Let us finish the Business which is before us." There are two legislations. We will finish this and then there should be some explanation as to why there is this hurry because we just cannot come at the fag end of the day with an Appropriation Bill and give away so much money. ...*(Interruptions)* ...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, I must explain why ... *(Interruptions)*

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Mr.

Gurudas Das Gupta, you are not the Parliamentary Affairs Minister.*(Interruptions)* I want the Parliamentary Affairs Minister to reply. ...*(Interruptions)* ...

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: Madam, I am agreeing with you that they must explain as to what the hurry is. ...*(Interruptions)* ...

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You are agreeing with me; I am very happy — at least once. ... *(Interruptions)* ... Now, let us find out as to what the reason is because this is an appropriation and the House is going to give money to the tune of so many crores of rupees. At least members have a right to know why.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Madam, this Bill was passed by the Lok Sabha, I think, on Friday and the Message should have come to this House immediately — I believe the Message was sent by that House late on Friday. Since Saturday, Sunday and Monday were holidays, I think, the Message was received in this Secretariat only today. So, this morning I found that it was not listed in the Business. Then we tried to find out as to why this was not listed. We were told that a list for Supplementary Business can be issued only after the Message reaches. But, again this morning, as you will kindly note, there was some dislocation of business and we had to adjourn the House. Now, the reason why I am anxious that the Bill is passed today is, Madam, this Bill has to go to the President again for his signature and the Vote-on-Account which was taken by the previous Government, will expire tomorrow, the 31st July. So, hon. members may kindly agree that we pass this Bill today so that the message can be sent to the President tomorrow. And then tomorrow I will have to get the President's signature so that effectively the Government would be able to expend money on the 1st of August.

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI SIKANDER BAKHT): I have no objection to the passing of this Bill. ...*(Interruptions)* ... But, it has become sort of a regular feature that the communication from the Lok Sabha is not as smart as it used to be.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Forget the Lok Sabha. ...*(Interruptions)* ... The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs is here. *(Interruptions)*

श्री सिकन्दर बख्त: मेहरबानी करके इसको दुरुस्त कर दीजिये। वैसे मुझे कोई एतराज नहीं है अगर यह एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल पास कर दिया जाये।

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE (West Bengal): I do agree with the Minister that we should pass it. I think we should have discussed the Business in the morning. If we had been told by the Government, it would have been better. Even if the formalities of getting the notices and other things have been delayed, at least there should be somebody on behalf of the Government to let us know the business of the House. In fact, at one point of time, we were inclined to sit up to six O' clock. In that case, the Minister would find it difficult. Therefore, in future either the Parliamentary Affairs Minister or any other Minister should keep the House informed about the urgency of the business, so that we can take appropriate notice of it.

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: I have no hesitation in apologising for any lapse that might have occurred in not informing the House or the Chair of the supplementary business of the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I want to set the record straight that I was informed at quarter to six when I was just to come here that we have to take out a supplementary list of business to have this. I am a stickler to rules which is necessary to run this House in a proper order. I said 'no' till I have an explanation because in the morning it was not discussed, it was put in the business and we were informed very late. So I won't sign on the dotted lines. So I said first I should have a proper explanation for the reasons given and then if the House so agrees to pass it, we will pass it. But the record should be absolutely correct. This is the only time I am permitting because of the reasons the Minister gave that the Money Bill has to go to the President. But in future, please make it a point to inform the hon.

Chairman or in his absence, me about the problem. (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI JAYANTHI NATARAJAN: Madam, we do not have copies of the Bill. We do not know what we are passing (*Interruptions*)

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I wish Mr. Gurudas Das Gupta had behaved the same way when he was on this side of the House.

SHRI GURUDAS DAS GUPTA: To put the record straight, we do not appreciate, I do not appreciate the way the Government has behaved and they have been behaving on a number of occasions. They should mend their ways.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House agrees that we pass this Appropriation Bill without discussion. The copies should be distributed.

THE MINISTER OF STATE FOR PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (DR. U. VENKATESWARLU): Madam, I have got a small announcement to make. Arrangement for dinner has been made.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can arrange lunch tomorrow. Now the Minister to move the Bills.

I. THE APPROPRIATION (VOTE ON ACCOUNT) NO. 2 BILL, 1996

II. THE APPROPRIATION (NO. 2) BILL, 1996

SHRI P. CHIDAMBARAM: Madam, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to provide for the withdrawal of certain sums from and out of the Consolidated Fund of India for the services of a part of the financial year 1996-97, as passed by Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The Vote on Account for the period of six months including the four months for which approval was obtained at the time of interim Budget in February 1996 a total amount provided in the Bill is Rs. 238717,98,00,000 of which