

an>

Title: Further discussion on the motion for consideration of the Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill, 2015 (Discussion Concluded and Bill Passed).

HON. SPEAKER: Now, we will take up Item No. 4 – further consideration of The Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill, 2015. Now, the hon. Minister to continue.

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI D.V. SADANANDA GOWDA): Madam, this is an exercise of repealing the Acts which are obsolete and redundant. After a lapse of 14 years, this exercise has been taken up by this Government. Earlier, it was brought up in 2001...(*Interruptions*).

12.32 hrs

At this stage, Shri Deepender Singh Hooda and some other hon. Members came and stood on the floor near the Table.

SHRI D.V. SADANANDA GOWDA: So, this is a great exercise by this Government to clean the statute book which is burdened with some redundant and obsolete laws. The Union Government under the leadership of hon. Prime Minister, Shri Narendra Modi has committed to bring reforms in the legal system so that it is more accessible to the common man...(*Interruptions*). The Government has taken several initiatives to simplify the complex registration, to convert the overlapping registrations, to repeal the redundant laws, etc...(*Interruptions*)

In this connection, several committee reports are there before the Government. Even the hon. Prime Minister had constituted a two-member committee on 1st September, 2014 to review the repeal of obsolete laws...(*Interruptions*)

HON. SPEAKER: We will take up 'Zero Hour' in the evening and not now. Only the statement of the Minister will go on record.

...(*Interruptions*) *

SHRI D.V. SADANANDA GOWDA: Even the Law Commission had given four reports for repealing these laws in 2000 numbering 248th, 249th, 250th and 251st...(*Interruptions*). So far we have identified nearly 1741 such laws which have become redundant and obsolete. Even in 1998, the PC Commission in its report had identified that more than 700 Appropriation Acts passed by Parliament have either become irrelevant or dysfunctional. So, the Law Commission also has clearly said that there is no meaning in keeping these statutes on the statute book. So, they have to be repealed...(*Interruptions*)

HON. SPEAKER: Please go back to your seats. He had also given a notice for adjournment motion. I had promised him to allow.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI D.V. SADANANDA GOWDA: Therefore, our Government has initiated the present proposal to repeal the Appropriation Acts up to 2012. We have consulted the Ministry of Finance as also the Ministry of Railways with regard to repealing the Appropriation Acts right from 1950 to 2012.

Recently, a Select Committee of the Rajya Sabha while examining the Repealing and (Amending) Bill, 2014, as passed by the Lok Sabha, had supported repealing of these Appropriation Acts. These Acts continue to pile up and are unnecessarily remaining on the statute book...(*Interruptions*)

HON. SPEAKER: You have to control your Members.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI D.V. SADANANDA GOWDA: The Select Committee had also recommended repealing of these obsolete and redundant Acts. The Select Committee has recommended exploring the possibility of having an idea for inclusion of an automatic repeal clause. Accordingly, we have examined it and from next year onwards in all the Appropriation Acts, we would be bringing a repealing clause as per the procedures which have been followed by the UK.

HON. SPEAKER: Please go to your seats.

...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI D.V. SADANANDA GOWDA: Now the total number of such Appropriate Acts has been identified. In this Bill, I have brought about 750 Acts which includes 111 State Appropriate Acts enacted by the Parliament during 1952-1976 in terms of clause 2 of article 357 of the Constitution. ...(*Interruptions*)

HON. SPEAKER: I am sorry. Please go to your seats first.

12.35 hrs

At this stage, Shri Deepender Singh Hooda and some other hon. Members went back to their seats.

HON. SPEAKER: All of you may please understand me. मैंने कहा था कि मैं वर्ड देती हूँ तो मैं वर्ड का पालन भी कर रही हूँ और इसीलिए आपका भी एडजर्नमेन्ट मोशन था, मैंने

उनको मौका दिया था, मगर आप भी जानते हो कि शून्य काल में अगर कोई व्यक्ति कुछ बात उठाता है, I cannot force the Minister to reply. You know it better than me because for the last many years, आप सब लोग ही सदन चला रह हो, आप इस बात को जानते हो। इसलिए मैंने आपको बार-बार मौका दिया था। मैंने आपको कहा था और मैं आपको मौका दे भी रही थी। मैंने सबको कहा था। मुझे सबके पूरा मातूम हैं। मैंने सबको कहा था कि एक-एक करके, जिन लोगों के मैटर आज जीरो आवर में लगे थे। In between also, I have been allowing you. ऐसा नहीं है कि मैं सब होने बाद मैं आपको एलाऊ कर रही हूँ। मैं बीच-बीच में एडजस्टमेंट कर रही हूँ और एडजस्ट करके सभी को मौका देने का कोशिश करती हूँ। मगर इसका अर्थ यह नहीं है कि हम हाउस में इस तरीके से करें। आपका फिगरमैं का इश्यू पहले भी उठ चुका था, फिर भी फिगरमैं के विषय के लिए मैं पहले मौका देती हूँ। I have given that opportunity. अब ऐसा नहीं होता है। मैंने दीपेन्द्र जी आपको भी कहा था कि मैं आपको मौका दूंगी।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

माननीय अध्यक्ष : मैं आप सभी को बोलने के लिए मौका दे रही हूँ। But that does not mean that you do anything taking things for granted. I am allowing you. I am trying to accommodate you. मैं हर समय बोलने का मौका दे रही हूँ। मैं अभी आपको बोलने के लिए उचित मौका पा कर समय दे दूंगी and I am giving you an opportunity but not now. This is not the way. I am sorry.

...(Interruptions)

माननीय अध्यक्ष : फिर वही बात हो रही है।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE (GULBARGA): In parliamentary democracy, such things happen always. Shri Deepender Singh Hooda has given notice for Adjournment Motion.

HON. SPEAKER: Shri K.C. Venugopal has also given notice for Adjournment Motion.

SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE : Then you told that it will be taken up. As it is a very important issue, naturally you should allow him. That is one point. Secondly, as per our own Directions of the Speaker and Rule 115,â€¦

माननीय अध्यक्ष : अभी उसकी बात नहीं हो रही है।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

SHRI MALLIKARJUN KHARGE: That is on the clarification of the Home Minister as to what he said in the other House and what he has said in this House. Everything is done as per the rules of the House. But I am unable to understand as to why we are not allowed to speak. ...(Interruptions) Madam, you told that it should be taken up as per the rules. Only as per the rules, notice for Adjournment Motion has been given. Only as per rules, he has raised the point. But still we are not getting an opportunity to speak. I request you to allow us to speak. This is a very important matter. Adjournment Motion is very important. You may kindly allow us in whatever form – maybe 'Zero Hour' or something like that because we are cooperating with you. We have agreed for extending the Session for three days.

माननीय अध्यक्ष : हमने लैजिसलेटिव बिजनस शुरू किया है।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री महिलकार्जुन खड़गे: हम सदन में तीन दिन बैठने को तैयार हैं।

माननीय अध्यक्ष : मैं आप सभी को बोलने के लिए मौका द रही थी।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री महिलकार्जुन खड़गे : हम सब बातें आपकी मान रहे हैं। ... (व्यवधान)

माननीय अध्यक्ष : आप यह नहीं बोलिए कि मैं आप को बोलने के लिए मौका नहीं देती हूँ।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री महिलकार्जुन खड़गे: जो नोटिस आया है, आपको उसे मान्यता देनी चाहिए। ... (व्यवधान)

माननीय अध्यक्ष : शाम को उसके लिए अवसर दिया जायेगा।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

HON. SPEAKER: Yes, Mr. Minister.

...(Interruptions)

SHRI DEEPENDER SINGH HOODA (ROHTAK): Madam, please do not go back on your words....(Interruptions)

HON. SPEAKER: I am not going back on my words. I will allow you in the evening.

...(Interruptions)

माननीय अध्यक्ष : मैं शाम को बोलने के लिए एलाऊ करूंगी।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

HON. SPEAKER: The matter will be raised but not now. I am sorry. I am not going back on my words.

...(Interruptions)

HON. SPEAKER: Only the hon. Minister's Statement will go on record.

...(Interruptions)â€Œ*

SHRI D.V. SADANANDA GOWDA: Hence, the Government has decided to repeal the Appropriation Acts from the year 1950 onwards up to 2012. ...(Interruptions) The total number of Appropriation Acts comes to nearly 758 which include 111 State Appropriation Acts enacted by the Parliament during 1950 to 1976 in terms of Clause 2 of Article 357 of the Constitution. After the 42nd Amendment to the Constitution, the Appropriation Acts passed by Parliament during the President's Rule have to be repealed only by the State Governments concerned. Till 1976, we have got a right. So, we are repealing them. Therefore, we are taking up 758 Acts which have become irrelevant. They have become dysfunctional. Since the Appropriation Acts themselves are meant for spending money after the Finance Bill is passed, a saving clause is also made in this Bill to save the past transactions because certain transaction will come into scrutiny afterwards. For that reason, a specific saving clause is also made. So, after the gap of about 14 years, the Bill has been brought forward. Almost all the Reports of the Commissions and even the Committee Reports have said that these Appropriation Acts need to be scrapped from the Statute Book. The Appropriation Acts lose their importance as soon as the money drawn is spent. So, there is no meaning in continuously keeping these Acts in the Statute Book. This is a Bill which really removes so many Appropriation Acts from the Statute Book.

I enthusiastically hope that the whole House will wholeheartedly and fully support this Bill.

HON. SPEAKER: Now, Shri Abhijit Mukherjee.

...(Interruptions)

PROF. K.V. THOMAS (ERNAKULAM): Madam, I just take one minute.

HON. SPEAKER: Your Party Member is speaking on this Bill. Are you speaking on this Bill only?

PROF. K.V. THOMAS : When the Government decided to extend the Session for three days, all of us suggested that Members have already planned programmes for the coming days. This is the Budget Session. Since the Parliamentary Affairs Minister insisted, the House was extended. Important Bills are coming up for discussion. How many Members from the Ruling Party are there? What is the attendance of the House? I am not asking questions. If the Government is serious, it has to ensure attendance and maintain the dignity of the House. â€Œ (Interruptions) Please look at the Agenda. All these subjects are listed for discussion. How are they going to run the House?

HON. SPEAKER: This is not the issue.

PROF. K.V. THOMAS : This may be an issue.

HON. SPEAKER: Now, Shri Abhijit Mukherjee to speak.

SHRI ABHIJIT MUKHERJEE (JANGIPUR): Madam, I am thankful to you as also to our leader also for allowing me to speak on the subject. I am just making four points or observations.

This is basically on black money, social sector spending, subsidy, petrol and diesel prices and fertilizer subsidy.

HON. SPEAKER: Are you speaking on the Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill? What is it?

SHRI ABHIJIT MUKHERJEE : Yes.

HON. SPEAKER: This is about the Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill. Your name has come here.

Do you want to speak on this Bill?

...(Interruptions)

HON. SPEAKER: Rudy ji, this is not the way. No.

Nothing will go on record.

...(Interruptions)â€Œ*

HON. SPEAKER: Shri P.P. Chaudhary

SHRI P.P. CHAUDHARY (PALI): Madam Speaker, thank you very much for affording me an opportunity to speak on the Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill. I rise to support the said Bill. Since 1950 or even before that, we have been enacting two types of Acts which have limited life. One is Appropriation Act, and the other is Amendment Act. So far as the Appropriation Act is concerned, it has a life of one financial year. As far as the Amendment Act is concerned, it has a life of only a few seconds.

In the case of the Amendment Act, once the amendment is carried out, on account of the notification of that Act, then, the amendment is carried out in the principal Act forthwith. On account of carrying out of that amendment, the significance and the sanctity of that Amendment Act is lost. Basically, it dies a natural death.

In the case of the Appropriation Act, which is before this august House, and once that financial year is over, the Appropriation Act cease to be in force, and it becomes obsolete. The retention of that Act as separate, independent, and distinct is unnecessary. Basically, the object of the repeal is to remove superfluities and to remove redundant law. If these Appropriation Acts are not taken out from the Statute Book or from the library, then, unnecessarily it would pile up and create confusion. Since 1950, there are many Appropriation Acts. Since 1950, this is the first time that this exercise is being undertaken. Hence, I extend my thanks to the hon. Law Minister for undertaking this Herculean task for identifying all the Appropriation Acts, and bringing a composite Repeal Bill.

Basically, the Appropriation Act is for a period of one year. It serves its purpose, once the financial year is over. It loses its utility once the life of the Appropriation Act of one year is over. It is high time that we should bring such type of Bill for repeal.

Apart from it, in Clause 3, of Bill, no doubt the savings Clause has been provided to the effect that the repeal by this Act of any enactment shall not affect any other enactment in which the repealed enactment has been applied, incorporated or referred to; and this Act shall not affect the validity, invalidity, effect or consequences of anything already done or suffered, or any right, title, obligation or liability already acquired, accrued or incurred, or any remedy or proceeding in respect thereof, or any release or discharge of or from any debt, penalty, obligation, liability, claim or demand, or any indemnity already granted, or the proof of any past act or thing.

"nor shall this affect any principle or rule of law, or established jurisdiction, form or course of pleading, practice or procedure, or existing privilege, restriction, exemption, office or appointment, notwithstanding that the same respectively may have been in any manner affirmed or recognized or derived by, in or from any enactment hereby repealed;

nor shall the repeal by this Act of any enactment revive or restore any jurisdiction, office, liability, right, title, privilege, restriction, exemption, practice, procedure or other matter or thing not now existing or in force;

nor shall the repeal of the enactments by this Act affect the audit, examination, accounting, investigation, inquiry or any other action taken or to be taken in relation thereto by any authority and such audit, examination, accounting, investigation, inquiry or action could be taken, and, or continued as if the said enactments are not repealed by this Act."

My humble suggestion to the hon. Minister is that we have the General Clauses Act and Section 6 (a) of the General Clauses Act takes care of this situation, whether it is an Appropriation Act or it is an Amendment Act. Once an amendment is carried out in the principal Act and once the purpose for which it is enacted is served or ceases to be in existence, then it shall be deemed to be inoperative. So, providing such a long clause is not required, in my humble opinion. Apart from that, a fear has been expressed time and again whether the repeal will repeal the amendment made in the principal Act. It will not because in Section 6 (a) of the General Clauses Act we have taken sufficient precaution and once an amendment is carried out in the principal Act, it will not repeal whatever amendment is carried out. So also, in the Appropriation Act, once the financial year is over, then it loses its sanctity and ceases to be in existence.

On the question of repeal of Amendment Acts as well as Appropriation Acts, the Commission on Review of Administrative Law suggested in 1998 that a large number of Appropriation Acts are there in the Statute Book, they are in the library since 1950 and they are creating a lot of confusion, but no action has been taken so far. This is the first time that such an attempt has been made by our hon. Law Minister because these Appropriation Acts are lying in the Statute Book since 1950 and they are irrelevant and dysfunctional. Besides this, the Law Commission of India also, in its 248th Report, has opined that obsolete laws warranting immediate repeal should be repealed. For that purpose, the hon. Law Minister brought a Bill for the repeal of the Amendment Acts and now he has come forward with the Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill. In 2014, while examining the Repealing and Amending Bill, 2014, the Select Committee of the Rajya Sabha made a recommendation for providing a sunset clause. For the first time, to my knowledge, I have suggested that instead of bringing a Repeal Bill every time before this august House and taking the valuable time of the House, we must have a sunset clause in the Amendment Act itself or in the Appropriation Act itself that once the purpose for which they are enacted is over, they shall automatically repeal themselves. This is because the entire matter is before the hon. House and we can examine whether we can provide a sunset clause and in what manner we can enact this particular law. But if we take all these laws, about 1,200 together, we are required to examine one by one. Then it will be a Herculean task and there is a chance that we may commit a mistake. So, for that purpose, the recommendation was made by the Select Committee that the Government should examine it and they should provide a sunset clause for automatic repeal. On the basis of that recommendation, I am happy that the Government has examined the issue and the Government has taken a decision that in future whenever they will bring the Appropriation Act, 2016, then a sunset clause for automatic repeal of that Act will be provided.

Again, we are not required to pile up all the statutes in our law library. This is not a solitary example in our country. But in UK and Australia, this exercise is being done. The sunset clause for automatic repeal is provided. In the United Kingdom, all Appropriation Acts usually contain a repealing provision which specifically repeal older Appropriation Acts. So far as Australia is concerned, the Legislation Act, 2001 is there. There, 302 sections have been provided and care has been taken for automatic repeal of such type of legislation.

So, I extend my thanks again to the hon. Minister, through you, Madam, that for taking a decision that in future we are not required to go for this exercise. The automatic repeal clause will be enshrined in the Amendment Act or in the Appropriation Act. Thank you very much.

PROF. SAUGATA ROY (DUM DUM): Madam, I support the Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill, 2015. I thank the Minister for making this effort. This is an example of how Government work piles up and multiplies. Every Act that we pass in Parliament, it has to be printed in the Central Law Book. Not only the Government publishes the Central Laws passed, but also the private law books publish them. Uselessly these Appropriation Acts are included.

As we know, no Government can spend money out of the Consolidated Fund of India unless it is appropriated by a proper Appropriation Act. But the validity of an Appropriation Act is only for one year. At the end of the Financial Year, the meaning and validity of the Appropriation Act ends. What has been happening is that over the year, there are four appropriations taken in the House. If you recollect, one is the vote-on-account appropriation. The second is the actual appropriation. Then there is Railway vote-on-account appropriation and then Railway Appropriation Bill. So, four appropriations are being done per year. From 1950, all these Appropriation Bills are there in the Statute Book, the Central Laws thick book that is published. Nobody cared to repeal them before.

In 1998, there was a Committee to study Government functioning. They recommended that all these should be abolished or repealed. Then the Law Commission also said, yes, the repeal should be done. A Standing Committee of the Rajya Sabha went into the matter. They recommended that there should be an automatic repeal clause in the Appropriation Act that at the end of the Appropriation Act there will be a clause that this Act will stand repealed at the end of 31st March, such and such year.

In the Statement of Objects and Reasons – we have studied – the Minister has mentioned Australia and UK. Australia has an automatic repeal clause; it is a Commonwealth country. UK repealed them in parts, from time to time. We are following the UK method in which we shall repeal clauses. Now, because many States go under the President's Rule, so, up to 1976, before the 42nd Amendment, the budgets of the States under the President's Rule had also to be appropriated in the Parliament. As a result of this, those also were acted. So, altogether there are 758 such Appropriation Acts out of which 111 relate to State Appropriation Acts. Now we are going to repeal all these Acts in one go. The Minister has earlier also taken some initiatives in repealing antiquated laws. You see, the Indian Penal Code is of 1860. All our laws are from British time. There are Police Acts, hundreds of Acts which have become redundant. A study should be made or the Law Commission Report should be sought for and these useless Acts should be deleted, be repealed from our Statute Book.

13.00 hrs.

So, nobody can take exception to the Government lightning its own paper work. Ultimately, the laws have to go online. If you go to a lawyer's chamber, he asks you fees depending on how many AIRs and how many law books are there in his chamber. There is no necessity. All the laws can go online. Anybody can have access without buying these costly law books because if the bare Act costs Rs. 200, there will be annotated versions costing Rs. 1000. So, to study any law becomes very difficult.

I would like the Minister to simplify our laws. Simplify the law making procedure and the whole system so that the common man need not interact with the legal system through lawyers only. For simple laws, the common man should know his rights. It is possible to simplify them. I am glad that the Law Minister has started the initiative. I think, in the coming days, this archaic language of the laws will be done away with, modern language should be brought in and all useless laws would be repealed from the Statute Book.

With that, I support the Bill.

SHRI BHARTRUHARI MAHTAB (CUTTACK) : Madam, I stand here to participate in the discussion relating to the Appropriation Act (Repealed) Bill, 2015.

As has been already mentioned by my predecessors Mr. Chaudhary and Mr. Roy, the principal object of such repealing Act and also by the Minister is to exercise dead matter, prune of superfluities and remove such redundant laws from the Statute Book to bring in clarity. This idea has been put forth for the last 20 or 25 years and the first attempt was made in 2001 when a large number of such redundant laws were pruned and removed from the Statute Book.

As has been mentioned, antiquated laws need to be removed. Our system of law making is more than 100 years old. A number of laws are there which are, actually, become redundant; they have become antiquated; and they need to be removed. The Law Commission has also repeatedly mentioned that which are those laws which need to be removed. Accordingly, I would expect the same from the Law Minister who will also be moving some amendment to that effect.

This Bill practically, while one goes through it, is confined to Clause 2 only which says:

"The enactments specified in the First Schedule are hereby repealed to the extent mentioned in the fourth column thereof."

This is the sum total of the Bill. But the Bill itself is only 22 lines and, I think, within 22 minutes we will also be passing this Bill. But the question here is that it encompasses 65 years or 62 years to be precise of appropriation burden which is going to be off-loaded. That is the main concern of this Bill. Two Committee Reports have also been mentioned here. The Select Committee of Rajya Sabha have specifically mentioned and gone into the details as to why it should be removed. They have gone into the functioning of two countries, one is the United Kingdom and another is Australia. In Australia, rather it is more comprehensive in nature. But as was mentioned by Saugata da, in United Kingdom, it goes in stages. In this Bill the provision that has been put forth is that we are going to adopt the United Kingdom's method.

My question to the hon. Minister is that why are we not accepting the Australian method, as was being mentioned, with the sunset clause which will automatically get it removed? Why are we adopting this United Kingdom's method which will allow the appropriation to continue to be in the Statute for two years and only after that it will be deleted? The Committee was of the considered view that a lot of time could be saved and utilized on urgent public interest issues that are pending with the legislature.

But here, the Australian provision, which is a comprehensive law – the Legislation Act, 2001, contains 302 sections and other annexures, which deal with lifecycle of legislation, that means, the financial year, improving its structure and content and simplifying its provisions where

practicable. Section 89 of the said Act deals with 'automatic repeal' of certain laws and provisions. Its Sub-section 2 says that 'Appropriation Act is automatically repealed on the last day of the financial year.'

Why are we not accepting that? If there is any genuine reason of accepting the United Kingdom's version, which systemically repeals Appropriation Act, and which is usually two sessions in arrears, why are we adopting the United Kingdom's System and not the Australian System? This needs to be explained.

The other point, which I would like to mention here is that the Appropriation is not only our concern – not the concern of the Lok Sabha or the Parliament, Appropriation Bills are also being moved in the State Assemblies. Can we not move a Bill as per the Constitution's Article 252, which becomes a model? So, about the Appropriation Bill, the respective State Governments also mount. So, once we move in Article 252, the respective State Governments burden also will follow this as a model Bill. They will also do the same thing in their respective States. So, by this, every State will be unburdened of this load, which is actually something antiquated and needs to be changed

With these few words, I support the Bill.

HON. SPEAKER: Now, the House stands adjourned to meet again at 1410 hours.

13.17 hrs

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Ten Minutes past

Fourteen of the Clock.

14.13 hrs.

The Lok Sabha reassembled at Thirteen Minutes past

Fourteen of the Clock

(Hon. Speaker in the Chair)

श्री मल्लिकार्जुन खड़गे (गुलबर्गा) : देखे तोरे संसार की हालत क्या हो गयी भगवान। सदन को देखिए।

माननीय अध्यक्ष : आ जाएं, खाना खा रहे हैं। आ जाएं।

â€¦(व्यवधान)

श्री मल्लिकार्जुन खड़गे : सत्तापक्ष का काम है हाउस को चलाना।...(व्यवधान)

HON. SPEAKER: The House shall take up further consideration of the Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill.

SHRI ABHIJIT MUKHERJEE (JANGIPUR): Thank you Madam, I sincerely apologize for the fiasco happened earlier. I am sorry for that and I apologize for that.

I am also thankful to my bosses and to you also for giving me this chance.

Madam, a number of speakers have already spoken on the same Bill. There are some Acts which are 65 years old and have become redundant. They have outlived their purpose. So, it should be removed or discarded. So, I agree with the Law Minister and the Government.

Although the Bill looks simple, it is not so. I have no doubt that the Law Ministry has put in lots of efforts to put in various Acts that are listed in this Bill. Valuable time of the bureaucracy and the Government has been put in, which can be avoided by incorporating a clause which will automatically make any law, which is redundant, to lapse. This has been pointed out by the Commission on Review of Administrative Law in its Report in 1998. Further, the Law Commission of India in its 248th Report on Obsolete Laws Warranting Immediate Repeal observed that 'Appropriation Acts' must be repealed to clear the Statute Book.

The Members, who spoke earlier, have pointed out the practices followed by other countries like UK and Australia. In Australia, the Bills, which are outlived or served its purpose, will get lapsed automatically. In UK it gets piled up and removed periodically, obvious, through the Parliament. I feel

that those laws which are very old and not in use, should automatically lapse.

Just as it is the primary duty of the Parliament to legislate, equally it is for the Government to reduce the burden of the Parliament. Every minute of functioning of the House is a cost to the public exchequer. It is the taxpayers' money which bears the cost of running this House. Therefore, if we follow a similar system as in Australia, we, as policy makers, will reduce the burden on the public exchequer.

Madam, we have seen a huge reduction by this Government in the spending on social sectors and the hon. PM is also asking people to give up gas subsidy. While this Government has sacrificed social sector, I see no reason why it is not acting quickly to follow a more efficient system to repeal obsolete laws to save the burden on the exchequer.

With this, I conclude and thank you very much, Madam.

SHRI S.R. VIJAYA KUMAR (CHENNAI CENTRAL): Hon. Speaker Madam, at the outset I express my immense pleasure on the repeal of the earlier judgement and the comeback staged by our revered leader, *Maanbumigu Makkalin Mudalvar Amma*.

I thank the people of Tamil Nadu for their fervent prayer appealing before the Almighty for justice.

I thank the Chair for giving me an opportunity to speak on this Bill which is justified.

This is the year of 2015. We are now repealing 758 Appropriation Acts remaining in the law books from 1950. Of these, most of them are related to Appropriation for Railways between 1950 and 2012. Madam, 111 Appropriation Acts are related to various States under the President's Rule from 1950 to 1976. Appropriation Acts are financial allocations for a particular Ministry or a State. Such Acts spend themselves after a particular financial year.

The 248th Report of the Law Commission of India referred to a large number of Appropriation Acts and said that they have lost meaning and are still shown on the Statute Books. Ensuring that they may not have any negative impact on actions that were taken validly under these Acts, these 758 Acts are now repealed.

Even in delay we get good relief at times. Now we have got our beloved leader Amma relieved after a long delay. Likewise, our law books will be relieved of these Appropriation Acts lying there for many years. They continue to pile up and remain effective till repealed. This may give rise to petty litigations lingering for long.

The Select Committee of the other House expressed its considered view that the repeal of these Acts will help us to save a lot of time and can be utilized on urgent public interest issues.

One may wonder why there is no automatic repeal clause when such Appropriation Acts are meant for one financial year. The 'life cycle' of such legislations goes beyond one year to enable the stakeholders to make use of the provisions of such Acts. But still care should have been taken by either the Railway Ministry or the Union Law Ministry or the Union Finance Ministry to avoid a vast accumulation.

'Old order changes yielding place to new' is the order of our world. Every year new Railway and Finance Appropriation Acts are introduced. Unless repealed, the previous years' Appropriation Acts remain effective. It is also necessary to explore the introduction of identical clauses in other Bills. So, a way out has been found now to repeal the old laws that are irrelevant after a financial year.

In countries like the United Kingdom and Australia, there are automatic repealing practices. In UK, the moment a new Appropriation Act is introduced, the older Act is automatically repealed. In Australia, on the last day of the financial year, the Appropriation Act automatically comes to an end. This Bill proposes to adopt the United Kingdom model to repeal old Appropriation Acts.

On this occasion, I would like to urge upon the Government to identify certain laws which have been amended many a times. Such Bills causes delay in interpretation of law before the courts of law. Even in the computer age, certain amendments and re-interpretations are not readily available. The only way out would be to bring out a comprehensive law reviewing every Act in the Statute Book.

I thank the Chair for giving me this opportunity and I also thank our revered leader *Maanbumigu Makkalin Muthalvar, Puratchi Thalaivi Amma* for enabling me to be here in this House, I conclude. Thank you.

SHRI THOTA NARASIMHAM (KAKINADA): Thank you, Madam, I completely support the Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill, 2015 and I would like to thank the decision of our Prime Minister, Narendra Modi to do away with archaic laws hindering efficient governance. I would also thank to hon. Law Minister, Shri Sadananda Gowda for bringing out this Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill, 2015, which will repeal around 758 Appropriation Acts, which have lost relevance and become obsolete, redundant or dysfunctional including certain Railways (Appropriation) Acts and Finance Appropriation Acts. Repealing the non-current laws is in consonance with the recommendations of P.C. Jain Commission. It will be a positive step and will help in bringing reforms in the country's legal system.

Out of a large number of Appropriation Acts passed in the past, several are confined only to Statute Books. The Appropriation Acts are intended to operate for a limited period of time, authorizing expenditures for the duration of one financial year, which are not usually included in any list of Central Acts.

The Bill also provides repeal of 111 State Appropriation Acts enacted by Parliament between 1950 and 1976. These Acts provide budgetary support to States. They were enacted when the States were under President's Rule. Certain Acts like the Andhra Appropriation Act, 1954, the Andhra

Appropriation Act, 1955 and the Andhra Appropriation (Vote on Account) Act, 1955 have completely lost their relevance in the present political system.

After 1976, the right to repeal such Appropriation Acts was given to States. This initiative is also in consonance with the report of the 20th Law Commission of India headed by retired justice A. P. Shah and the recommendations of the Select Committee of Rajya Sabha to repeal outdated Acts. Around 1741 laws in the country have become redundant but still they are in existence.

I would also recommend the Government to put a repeal clause in the Appropriation Acts which will help in bringing new reforms in the present legal system and will put an end to the outdated Acts, which have outlived their utility. Appropriation Acts are intended to operate for a limited period of time to authorize expenditure for one financial year or less.

It must be emphasized that repealing Appropriation Acts whose terms have ended will in no way cause any negative impact on actions that were validly taken under these Acts.

I thank you once again for giving me this opportunity to speak on the Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill, 2015.

SHRI P. KARUNAKARAN (KASARGOD): Thank you, Madam, Speaker. I am glad to support the Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill, 2015 presented by the hon. Law Minister, Shri Gowda ji. I think there is no opposition or contradiction on any part of the House because the Bill has become a need of the day. There are many unnecessary laws that have accumulated in the judicial arena. I appreciate the initiative taken by the Minister to have a rational stand on the issue.

Madam, some of the laws become outdated as the situation changes and some of them get defunct. So, we should take this issue into consideration very seriously. Madam, we should do a re-thinking of the law-making process itself that we are engaged now-a-days. This is my view. Though the Parliament discusses the legislation, we discuss only half of the portion while half of the portion is completed by the bureaucrats or by the Secretary level members of concerned Ministry regarding the rules, regulations, sub-rules etc. It is true that these rules and regulations are placed before this House, but at the same time, it is quite clear that even the Ministers or the Members are not going through these rules. Sometimes, these rules become really contradictory even to the principal Act itself. So, it becomes much difficult and brings hardship to the common people. If they want to get justice, they have to go to the High Court or the Supreme Court for further definition or clarification thereof. In such a case, getting justice through the law becomes an expensive affair. It is not possible for the common people to go to the High Court or the Supreme Court. As a result, what happens is that though the Minister himself or the Parliament itself thinks that some positive steps have to be taken, but due to defect in the rules, it really brings much hardship to the common people and it is not possible for them to get justice. So, this issue has to be taken into consideration as far as the law-making process is concerned.

At the time of Freedom Movement, we have had many experiences where many of the freedom fighters were in jail. It was also done in the name of the law. Since they were fighting against the British Rule, as far as the British Government was concerned, it was against their interest. So, they were put behind the bars. It did not happen only during the time of the British Rule. Even after, we have had such experiences. The first Leader of the Opposition of this House, Shri A.K. Gopalan, was in jail for a long period, during the British Rule and even after that. He appeared before the court and argued for himself. I would like to say that in the first speech that he had made in his House, he said that 'I am not a single graduate, but I may not speak of broken rules, but I may speak in broken English.' That is the first sentence that he had made. He had argued in the Madras High Court for his case and that charter – A.K. Gopalan *versus* Madras High Court - has become a lesson for the law students to study. It is true in the case of Shri Sampath, who is a Member, also. His father, Shri Anirudhan, was also a Member of this House. He was also in jail for a long time. At last, it was said that there was no case against him. There are so many examples which we can give.

As far as law is concerned, it should be giving equal treatment to the people, whether they are big or the poor, but we see that in many cases, law is not implemented in such a way. There are many instances where we can see that law is implemented, as far as the Muslim youths as stated by Shri E.T. Mohammed Basheer earlier and backward people are concerned, differently because they are not able to argue for their cases in the High Court or the Supreme Court. Therefore, there is an impression, as far as the common people are concerned, that law is not giving equal treatment to the people, but it is in favour of the rich. Here, we have to think that there should be such vigilant exercise as far as law-making process is concerned.

It becomes more important when many Bills come in this House and we say that they have to be sent to the Standing Committee. It is not asked on the political basis. The Bills have to be screened in detail as far as possible. It should not be discussed just because we have the majority in the House or the minority in the House. We have the experience in respect of the other Bill. When we submitted many of the amendments, they were defeated. When the Bill went to the Rajya Sabha, the amendments were accepted. It came back to this House and then, they were accepted here also. So, this House and the Parliament has to take a serious note of this, irrespective of whether we have the majority or the minority, and merit has to be considered as far as law-making process is concerned. Otherwise, again we have to go in for repeal of many of the laws that we have passed.

I really congratulate the Minister for having taken this effort to rationalise, at present, this, but at the same time, there should be a conscious effort as far as the law-making process is concerned. It should not be taken just because of the majority or the minority. At the same time, the sense of the law has to be taken consideration.

Thank you.

श्री एस.एस.अहलुवालिया (दार्जिलिंग): अध्यक्ष महोदया, मैं 'द एप्रोप्रिएशन एक्ट्स (रिपील) बिल, 2015' के समर्थन में बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ।

महोदया, जैसे देखा जाए तो यह रिपील बिल, जो लॉ कमीशन की 248वीं रिपोर्ट के तहत लाया गया है, इसमें हम उन एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल्स को रिपील कर रहे हैं, जो वर्ष 1950 से लेकर 2012 तक आम बजट और रेल बजट के लिए लाए गए थे। साथ ही साथ, उस वक्त जहां-जहां राष्ट्रपति शासन थे और राज्यों के लिए भी जो एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल्स लाए गए थे, उन्हें हम इस बिल के माध्यम से रिपील कर रहे हैं। अगर हम देखें तो लॉ कमीशन ने इसके पहले अपनी 18वीं, 21वीं, 81वीं, 96वीं, 148वीं और 159वीं रिपोर्टों में बहुत सारे कानूनों को रिपील करने के लिए कहा है।

महोदया, जब हमें आज़ादी मिली थी, उस वक्त वर्ष 1834 से लेकर वर्ष 1949 तक जो कानून इन्वेंट हुए थे, उनकी संख्या करीब 2,910 थी। उसमें से हम आज तक 2,530 सेंट्रल एक्ट को रिपील कर चुके हैं, क्योंकि उनमें बहुत सारे एक्ट्स ऑब्सॉलीट और रिडन्डेंट थे, जिसकी जरूरत ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यवाद या कोलोनियल रूल को चलाने के लिए थी। हमने उन कानूनों को समाप्त किया। हम वर्ष 1950 से लेकर अक्टूबर, 2014 तक 3,702 सेंट्रल एक्ट्स पास कर चुके हैं। उसमें भी करीब 1,301 कानूनों को हम रिपील कर चुके हैं। आज जो कानून स्टैंडस्टूट बुक पर हैं, उनकी संख्या 2,401 है। इसका मतलब करीब 6,612 सेंट्रल एक्ट्स हैं, जिनके माध्यम से हमारा देश चल रहा है।

महोदया, मैं आपके माध्यम से सरकार का ध्यान इस ओर आकर्षित करना चाहूंगा कि सातवीं अनुसूची के माध्यम से जब लिस्ट-1 में केन्द्र सरकार अर्थात् पार्लियामेंट कानून बनाती है, उसमें सिर्फ 97 विषय हैं। लिस्ट-1 के माध्यम से जब राज्य सरकारें, राज्य विधानसभाएं कानून बनाती हैं, उसमें 66 विषय हैं। लिस्ट-111 में समवर्ती सूची में 47 विषय हैं। हमारे ऐसे बहुत सारे कानून हैं, जो राज्यों में भी चल रहे हैं और राज्यों के स्टेट लॉज की फ़िताबें भी बहुत बढ़ गयीं हैं। वहां पर भी बहुत ज्यादा कानून हैं। जब तक हम उन कानूनों को भी रिपील नहीं करेंगे तब तक ज़मीनी हकीकत में बदलाव नहीं होगा। हम केवल लाइब्रेरी का आकार छोटा करने के लिए इसे नहीं कर रहे हैं, हमारे पास बहुत सारी अड़वनें आ रही हैं, जिन्हें समाप्त करने के लिए हम इस बिल को ला रहे हैं, जो लोग किसी को न्याय मिलने में कानूनी अड़वनें पैदा करते हैं, वे इन कानूनों का दुरुपयोग करते हैं। इसे ही रोकने के लिए हमने यह किया है। इसलिए वर्ष 1998 में पी. सी. जैन कमेटी बनाई गई थी। पी. सी. जैन कमेटी ने अपनी रिपोर्ट दी, जिसके आधार पर यह सब कुछ हुआ।

महोदया, हमारे संविधान में आज सौवां संशोधन हुआ है। इसमें भी कई संशोधन ऐसे हैं, जो सिर्फ किसी राज्य में राष्ट्रपति शासन को बढ़ाने के लिए किए गए थे। पर, जिन कानूनों के आधार पर जनता को न्याय मिलता है, जैसे कानूनों की संख्या 100 भी नहीं है, बल्कि उससे कम है। जैसे जो कानून हैं, उनके बारे में भी हमें सोचना चाहिए। जब हम एप्रोप्रिएशन बिल्स को रिपील कर लेते हैं या अमेंडमेंट एक्ट को रिपील कर देते हैं, इनको रिकॉर्ड में से निकालने की बात करते हैं तो हमें यह ध्यान रखना चाहिए कि हम इन्हें सर्वदा के लिए न जलाएं, जो डिजिटल इंडिया बन रहा है, उसमें आर्काइव में रखे कि आने वाली पुश्तैतें उसे देख सकें। मैं आज अगर एक शोध करने बैठूँ कि जिस वक्त इस देश में राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ था, उसके पहले निजीकरण था। उस निजीकरण को समाप्त करके राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ और आज राष्ट्रीयकरण को समाप्त करके फिर निजीकरण हो रहा है, तो क्या अवस्था उस वक्त थी और क्या अवस्था अब है? बीच में जो राष्ट्रीयकरण हुआ, तो उस समय कितना शोषण और दोहन हमारी भारतीय संपदाओं का हुआ है, उसका अगर उल्लेख करने के लिए, शोध करने के लिए कोई छात्र बैठेगा तो उसे ये सारे कामजात नहीं मिलेंगे।

महोदया, मैं एक और चीज की तरफ आपका ध्यान आकर्षित करना चाहता हूँ। आप रोज यहां विधेयक पास करती हैं, विधेयक पास करते वक्त आप किसी सदस्य का नाम पुकार आप कहती हैं कि आपने अमेंडमेंट नंबर 44 दिया है, तो वह उस अमेंडमेंट मूव करता है। आप उसे आइज और नोज बोलकर निगेटिव कर देती हैं। दूसरे दिन मैं अगर प्रोसीडिंग में लूटना चाहूँ कि वह 44वां अमेंडमेंट क्या था, वह प्रोसीडिंग का हिस्सा है या नहीं, तो वह नहीं होता है। हमारी क्या मांग थी, किसको निगेटिव किया गया और किसको पॉजिटिव किया गया, वह लिखा नहीं होता है। अगर वह नहीं लिखा होता है तो वह आधार नहीं बनता है। कल जब संविधान के बारे में या कानून बनाने की पद्धति के बारे में पार्लियामेंट की प्रोसीडिंग को लेकर कोई शोध करने के लिए छात्र या छात्राएँ बैठेंगी तो उनको ये सारी चीजें नहीं मिलेंगी। मेरा आपके माध्यम से कहना है कि इनको रिपील करते वक्त इनको आर्काइव में भी डालकर रखें।

दूसरा, मैं दार्जिलिंग क्षेत्र से आता हूँ, उसमें सिलीगुड़ी, नक्सलबाड़ी, फासीदेवा भी है। ब्रिटिश साम्राज्यवाद में एक दार्जिलिंग इंप्रूवमेंट फंड नाम से एक रूल बनाया था। वह रूल आज भी विद्यमान है। सब जगह जर्मींदारी खत्म हो गई, किन्तु वहां जर्मींदारी अभी तक नहीं खत्म हो पाई है। उसका जो रेट था, लीज पर जो बाजार दिए गए थे, छोट दिए गए थे, दुकानें दी गई थीं या मकान दिए गए थे, उसका आर्बिट्रेटरी वहां के डिस्ट्रिक्ट मजिस्ट्रेट या राज्य का कानून उसका रेट बढ़ा देते हैं। मेरा कहना है कि डी.आई. फंड को रिपील करके आज के हिसाब से रैंड रिफॉर्स के अनुसार नया कानून आना चाहिए। इसीलिए जब भी रिपील करने की बात होती है, तो जमीनी हकीकत को भी जानने की जरूरत है। सिर्फ क्रोनोलॉजिकल कोड ऑफ एक्ट्स से लिस्ट उठाकर उसे रिजेक्ट नहीं करना है। अगर यह समिति हर एक जगह जाकर वहां के लोगों की बात सुनकर अगर कानूनों में संशोधन करेगी, रिपील करेगी तो बहुत सारे कानून ऐसे हैं, जिनको उठाने की जरूरत है। यही कहकर मैं आपसे निवेदन करूंगा कि सरकार इस पर ध्यान दे और अगर हो सके तो मंत्री जी इस पर जवाब दें।

SHRI N.K. PREMACHANDRAN (KOLLAM): Thank you very much, Madam, for affording me this opportunity to make my observations in respect of this Bill. I rise to support the Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill, 2015.

Madam, before entering into the contents of the Bill, I would like to say that we have to bow our head to the framers of our Indian Constitution as well as the makers of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. It is the best written Constitution in the world. So far as the Rules of Lok Sabha are concerned, they are the best rules relating to parliamentary practices in the world. My first submission to the Government is that we have to abide by the provisions of the Constitution as well as abide by the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. It is only because of the Constitution and the Rules that this parliamentary democratic system in our country is prevailing in a better way. From 1950 onwards, if we see, the biggest democracy in the world is India, definitely. Even the transformation of power from one Government to another Government – right from the 13 days of Vajpayee Government, followed by Shri Deve Gowda's Government and subsequently by another Government – it is a series in terms of continuation and the entire process being handled in a very democratic way. We are able to protect our parliamentary democratic system in the country only because of the Constitution. The parliamentary procedures are also moving in the right direction only because of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha. So, my submission is that we have to abide by the provisions of the Constitution, whatever be the political situation which is prevailing in our country, and also one has to observe the Rules of Procedure of this House. Otherwise, the system will be diluted and that will result in the weakening of parliamentary democratic system of our country.

Coming to the point with respect to this Bill, I fully support the Bill moved by the hon. Minister because so many redundant Bills are pending in the Statute Book. We have to remove the redundant Bills from the Statute Book so that it will be very easy to implement those Bills. I have gone through the provisions of our Constitution as well as the Bill. It is a wonderful thing. We have to vote for each and every paisa to be spent from the Consolidated Fund of India, by means of Demands for Grants. Not only that. Even though Demand is being voted by this House, yet the Government has no power to take the money. We have to pass an Appropriation Bill or a legislation to appropriate the money. That means, the Government is empowered to take even a single paisa only if we pass an Appropriation Bill. How *pucca* and strict is it being made, without any loophole? That is why, I am saying that we have to bow our heads to the Framers of the Constitution as well as the makers of the Rules of this House.

Coming to this Appropriation Bill, it is good thing to remove all these legislations. Another point which is to be discussed is about the automatic repeal clause. The Rajya Sabha Select Committee has made a specific recommendation. I think it is a good suggestion because instead of having

this bundle of legislations of Appropriation Act, it is better to have automatic repeal clause along with the Appropriation Act. Definitely, it will be easier for the Government also and we can avoid unnecessary legislation also.

At the same time, when I support the automatic repeal clause, I would like to know from the hon. Minister whether the Government is thinking in terms of the Finance Bill also. We have passed so many Finance Bills. Those Finance Bills are also for a particular financial year. That is also pending. I would like to know whether the Government is thinking in that direction also. As far as the Finance Act is concerned, so many financial obligations are there; so many cases and consequential Acts are also there. So, it is difficult in respect of the Finance Act. But as far as the Appropriation Bill is concerned, it is only empowering the Government to withdraw money from the Consolidated Fund of India. So, it is better to have an automatic repeal clause along with the Appropriation Bill so that the time of this House can be saved.

With these suggestions, I would conclude and congratulate the Minister for bringing such a Bill.

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI D.V. SADANANDA GOWDA): Madam Speaker, at the very outset, I thank all the Members who have whole-heartedly supported this Bill. Supporting is one thing but whole-heartedly supporting is another thing. So, all the Members who spoke on this Bill, they have whole-heartedly supported this Bill with a few suggestions. It should be made much more clear. The law should be made clear so that it becomes accessible for the common man and to see that the stringent laws are taken out of the Statute Book which have become obsolete and redundant.

This is the vision of the hon. Prime Minister. We have taken up this initiative. Nearly, 1,741 Acts have been identified for repeal. Out of this, two Bills have already been tabled and passed. One is having 35 Acts and another one is having 90 Acts. Today, this Bill is having 758 Appropriation Acts. Another Bill with 187 Acts is ready. I am going to table it in the near future. Altogether, out of 1,741, nearly, 1,700 Acts which are obsolete and redundant and dysfunction, will be taken away from the Statute Book within a short span of one year of this new Government.

Earlier, this exercise was made last in the year 2001 during the regime of hon. Prime Minister Shri Atal Behari Vajpayee. Of course, about ten times these repealing and amendment Acts have been taken and about 1,291 obsolete laws have been repealed earlier.

Of course, our Members have sought a few clarifications. I will not take much of time. My friend hon. Shri P.P. Chaudhary was suggesting me to have an amendment to Section 6A of the General Clauses Act. Section 6A of the General Clauses Act is practically not applicable to Appropriation Acts. Section 6 is a general provision which deals with the effect of the repeal of the Acts. As far as 6A is concerned, it is not applicable to Appropriation Acts. So, that matter will not come into the purview of this.

Of course we have to follow a few legislative precedents. For that reason right from 1901 we were following the procedures which have been laid down by the UK. Even certain repealing Acts have been done during 1901 and 1903 where a saving clause has been provided to see that certain clauses would be in force in the future days also. Similarly, here also we have made a saving clause to see that if, because it is an Appropriation Act wherein as rightly said by Shri Premachandran we are drawing money from the Consolidated Fund of India, something that needs to be looked into.

Hon. Members Saugata Roy and Bhartruhari Mahtab brought to my notice why we have not taken, of course we have included this automatic repeal clause, from next year onwards in all 2016 Appropriation Acts, a repeal clause will automatically be there. Automatic repeal clause of two years in arrears will be there. The 2013 Appropriation Act will be repealed in 2016 Appropriation Act. So, one year for spending, and if there is any money is left out it will be carried forward to the next year in the next Appropriation Bill. So, automatically from 2016 onwards continuously all the Appropriation Acts which will come into force from 2013 onwards will be automatically cleared. It will be just like a sunset clause.

Of course we examined the Australian Legislation Act 2001 and the UK procedure which is followed which is accepted by us. It is not only accepted by us even the Law Commission, even the Standing Committee also examined in detail and said that the UK model is the right model for us to take into consideration, so we have taken it. As far as the Australian legislation Act is concerned, it is a very comprehensive Act. Of course it contains about 302 sections and other annexures also. Of course one section 89 which provides for automatic repeal has about 12 sub-sections. It has to look into all the Acts which have to be repealed in detail. So, it is a very lengthy procedure. So, our Standing Committee as well as the Law Commission and our legal experts came to the conclusion that the UK model is the right model. So, we are opting for the UK model and that will be in force in future.

Hon. Member Bhartruhari Mahtab observed why Article 252 should not be amended so that even the States also have this. As far as Article 252 is concerned, a resolution has to come from the State Government. Two or more State Governments have to send a resolution to the Central Government. Then only the Central Government can look into the matter. But I hope that hon. Member Bhartruhari Mahtab's suggestion will be complied with by this because after passing this Act, the same procedure will be followed by the State Governments in the coming future. I think it will be a model for the State Governments also. They can have a sunset clause in their Appropriation Acts in the coming days.

Of course up to 1950 to 1976, 111 State Appropriation Acts which were passed by the Parliament during the President's Rule were taken into consideration. After 42nd Amendment, the power was vested with the State Governments.

Some other suggestions have been given by our friends, which will be certainly taken care of. The Law Commission in its 248th Report has clearly said that repealing of Appropriation Acts whose terms have ended will in no way cause any negative impact on actions that will validly be taken under this Act. They further observed that the existence of the dead law with the living law creates confusion even in understanding. So, it is a matter of simplification of law and it should be made very clear that confusion should not be there with the living laws and certain laws which are really obsolete.

Finally, Madam Speaker, the Statutes, unlike human beings, do not die a natural death with possible exception of Statutes whose life is pre-determined by the legislation at the time of their enactment. So, this is a step where we are putting the natural death to the Acts which will become dysfunctional. As already all the Members have whole-heartedly supported this Bill, I commend that this Bill may be passed.

HON. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Appropriation Acts (Repeal) Bill, 2015 be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

HON. SPEAKER: The House shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 and 3

HON. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That Clauses 2 and 3 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

The Schedule was added to the Bill.

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

HON. SPEAKER: The Minister may move that the Bill be passed.

SHRI D.V. SADANANDA GOWDA : I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

HON. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.