

1. Closure of Talcher Fertiliser Plant (FCI) due to stoppage of power supply by the Orissa State Electricity Board and also to make necessary arrangements for its smooth functioning.

[Translation]

SHRI. GIRDHARI LAL BHARGAVA (Jaipur): Mr. Speaker, Sir, in 1977, the Union Government and the Government of Rajasthan had implemented the Antyodaya Scheme for the first time for the welfare of the poorest among the poor and its good and effective results were coming out. The Central Government should provide more assistance in this regard.

2. Under the programme, 'Education for all by 2000', a scheme named 'Lok Jumbish' prepared by Union Government in cooperation with the Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA) was approved for Rajasthan. An expenditure of Rs. 600 crores will be incurred on this scheme. The Central Government should provide financial assistance to the State Government in this regard.

[English]

SHRI. CHITTA BASU (Barasat): I request that the following items may be included in the next week's agenda :

1. Chakma refugees problem.
2. Recent development in the Indo-U. S. relations.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani) : I request that the following items may be included in the next week's agenda :

1. Regarding the imminent danger of rivers Kamla & Koshi changing their courses thereby threatening hundreds of villages and lakhs of acres of land, road and rail communication etc. in North Bihar.
2. Regarding urgency of implementing the Rajiv-Longowal agreement to resolve the Pujab problem.

[Translation]

SHRI. NITISH KUMAR (Barh): Mr. Speaker, Sir, only 42 percent of the amount collected from the local resources by the nationalised banks in Bihar is being given to the State at present as loan. The rest of the

amount is diverted elsewhere. Due to the diversion of capital, there is diversion of labour and the State is rapidly going towards a deplorable situation.

SHRI JANARDAN MISHRA (Sitapur) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I request that the following items may be included in next week's agenda :

Discussion on providing all the departmental facilities to extra departmental employees working in various parts of the country treating them as departmental employees.

[English]

SHRI SYED SHAHABUDDIN (Kishanganj): Sir, I request that the following items may be included in next weeks' agenda :

1. Discussion on the progress in the implementation of the Report of the Sarkaria Commission on Centre-State Relations.
2. Discussion on Reorganisation of States in order to create small and ethnically homogenous and economically viable States.

MR. SPEAKER : The House shall now take up Statutory Resolution at item No. 3 of today's agenda.

Shri Ram Naik — Absent

Shri Bhogendra Jha — Absent

So the House shall take up Item No. 4 of today's agenda. Shri H. R. Bhardwaj.

12-11 hrs.

PARLIAMENT (PREVENTION OF DISQUALIFICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

As passed by Rajya Sabha

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ) : I beg to move :

"That the Bill further to amend the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The hon. Members may recall that the Joint Committee on Offices of Profit presented its second report to this House on 9th April, 1992. In that report, the Committee had examined the composition, character, functions, etc., of the National Commission for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, National Commission for Minorities, National Commission for Women and the Planning Commission, with a view to considering whether the Chairpersons, Vice-chairpersons, Members, etc. of the aforesaid Commissions, would incur disqualification under article 102 of the Constitution. The Committee expressed the view that though all the offices examined by the Committee in that report carried salary and thereby could, strictly speaking, be considered as offices of profit, for speedy implementation of socio-economic development programmes of Government, it is essential to associate Members of Parliament with the working of the aforesaid Commissions of national importance. Therefore, they recommended that the Government should amend the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959 expeditiously so as to include these offices under the relevant schedule to prevent the holders of these posts from incurring disqualification for being chosen as, or for being a Member of Parliament.

In view of the urgency felt by the Government and pending detailed examination of the report, the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Amendment Act, 1992 (20 of 1992) was enacted to prevent the holder of the office of Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission from incurring disqualification. On re-examination, it was found that the said Amendment Act did not achieve the purpose fully and, in order to confer the intended benefit to the holder of the office of the Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission, action was taken to further amend the Act. Accordingly, the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Amendment Ordinance, 1993 was promulgated on 19th July, 1993.

The present Bill seeks to repeal and replace the said ordinance. The Bill also proposes to give effect to the other recommendations of the Joint Committee relating to the office of Chairpersons of the National Commission for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, Minorities Commission (now the National Commission for Minorities) and the National Commission for Women. The Bill also provides for change of short title of Act 30 of 1954.

It was passed by the Rajya Sabha without any discussion and unanimously. It is my earnest hope that the Bill will receive unanimous support from all sections of this House also.

MR. SPEAKER : I do not think that this Bill requires any discussion because there are other matters which you can take up.

[Translation]

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA (Mandsaur) : We have objections in this regard.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : This is just for removing the post from the list of...

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria) : We have read it.

[English]

SHRI NIRMAL KANTI CHATTERJEE (Dum Dum) : This is not exactly a primary school, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER : Yes, I am happy to hear that from you !

Motion moved :

"That the Bill further to amend the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

[Translation]

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to be brief, but the tendency of the Government first to bring an ordinance on any issue and then to get it passed here in the form of a Bill... (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : The Statutory Resolution regarding its disapproval is not moved.

(Interruptions)

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA : I know that very well, Sir... (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Then, how can you do that ?

(Interruptions)

[*Translation*]

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA : Whatever the hon. Minister has read and said...[*Interruptions*]...I will not say much about this Bill which is being brought here.

[*English*]

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani) : Sir, can I seek your indulgence ?

MR. SPEAKER : This is not the time. This is very lightly treating the Parliament. When you know that the item is on the Agenda, when you know that you have to do it and when we have gone to the next item, you are very lightly standing up and seeking my permission to do that. It is too lightly treating the Parliament.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA : I do not object to what you have said.

MR. SPEAKER : Now, nothing more on this point. I cannot deal with the matters like this. This is Parliament. You have to move the Resolution; you are not in the House; you know that this is the first item. Now, you are asking me to just swing from one to the other.

[*Interruptions*]

[*Translation*]

DR. LAXMINARAYAN PANDEYA : Sir, it has been mentioned in the Parliament (Prevention of disqualification) Amendment Ordinance 1993 that section 5 stands repealed. That is what I was asking from the hon. Minister that when they are now talking of repealing this clause, what was the necessity to bring an Ordinance. You had the report of the Committee with you which was presented on 9th April, 1992 and it was clearly recommended by the Committee that such amendment should be made in Act. The hon. Minister should clarify the reasons which necessitated to cover the period from April, 1992 to 19th July, 1992 by the Ordinance. What was the compulsions before the Government that it could not bring such Bill earlier. The Government could have brought such Bill during the Budget session. But the Government preferred the date of 19th July on which the Parliament session was to commence. It was in the knowledge of the Government that session of Parliament was being called from that date. Therefore, such practice on the part of the Government is not good.

Sir, one more thing I would like to say that many recommendations have been made by the Committee in this regard but instead of bringing a Comprehensive Bill the Government opted for issuing an Ordinance to facilitate Shri Pranab Mukherjee, who is holding the post of Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission, to get elected to Rajya Sabha. That is why such step was taken in hurry. The recommendations of the Committee were overlooked and no comprehensive Bill was brought. I would like to have an assurance from the hon. Minister about the time by which a comprehensive Bill will be brought by the Government on it and that such things will not be repeated in future. It is all right that such posts should be exempted from the purview of the posts of profit. But if an M. P. becomes the Vice-Chairman of Planning Commission or a Chairman of any other Commission and hold two posts simultaneously we express our discontentment to it. One person must hold one post only. If you want to encourage such things you have to stick to the principle of one man one post and we are not fully agree to the amendments brought in the Bill presented in the House. With these words I conclude with the request that such things should not be repeated in future and such Bill or Ordinance should not be brought in hurry. The Government should clarify as to when it is going to bring a comprehensive Bill in the House. We oppose this Bill in principle.

[*English*]

SHRIMATI MALINI BHATTACHARYA (Jadavpur) : Sir, the Amendment Bill which has been presented here to the House, of course, has just one Clause and that seeks to remove the disqualification of certain people holding certain Offices, from being the Members of Parliament.

As such, we have no objection to the Bill. But what we object to is the way in which these things are being brought before the House, in a piecemeal fashion, when for a very long time now, for the last few years now, the Opposition—our party and other parties—have been pressing for a full scale and a comprehensive change in the electoral laws. The details have been given by the parliamentary parties—by the opposition about these full scale electoral reforms and also what they should be. We have said that in recent years, there has been a certain degree of criminalisation in politics. Money power has been entering into politics more and more. The fact of defections from one

party to another in the Parliament is becoming a serious problem to the continuance of the democratic traditions in our country. In this context, it is very necessary to have wholesale electoral reforms. Instead of that, the Government has just brought this one clause which offers certain small convenience to a limited number of people. We have no objection to that.

But recently the manner in which the Election Commission also has behaved in a very very arbitrary manner has created concern for us. This has caused concern for us. It has put a very great difficulty in the continuation of the democratic process, in the continuation of electoral process in this country. This is something that we have seen. It has been obstructed again and again.

I am not here saying that one person is responsible for the arbitrary behaviour of the Election Commission. What I am saying is that this arbitrary behaviour, this *tanashahi* is symptomatic of certain defects which are there within the electoral laws themselves.

So, in order to make the electoral process truly democratic, a full-scale reform of our electoral laws is demanded. We object very strongly. We protest very strongly to the casual manner in which this House and the Opposition parties are being treated by the Parliament. Even the treasury benches have been vocal in their protest against the things which have been perpetrated by the Election Commission in recent times. Our demand was that there should be a multi-Member Commission rather than a single Member. If there had been a multi-Member Commission, there would have been less of arbitrariness, one can hope. We had wanted various measures to be taken to stop criminalisation of politics to stop this incursion of money power into politics.

Now, we very strongly object to the fact that while you are not tinkering with the electoral laws, you keep on postponing the demands which have been made by the opposition parties again and again on the floor of the House for democratisation of the electoral laws, for a representative character being brought into the electoral laws. With this, I thank you for the indulgence allowed to me.

[Translation]

SHRI MOHAN SINGH (Deoria): Mr. Speaker, Sir, Article 102 of the Constitution says that a person shall be disqualified for being

chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament if he holds any office of profit under the Government of India or the Government of any State other than an office declared by Parliament by law not to disqualify its holder. Under the present legislation four posts i.e. Chairman of SC/ST Commission, Chairman of Minority Commission, Chairman of the National Commission for Women and Vice-Chairman of Planning Commission, have been excluded from the office of profit. I condemn this practice. Our Constitution has been imitated from the British Constitution. When such legislation was brought there certain criteria were fixed. It has to be determined whether such post has any incoherence with the working of elected Members of Parliament, whether any individual can remain present at two different places at a time, whether there is monetary gain in it. Whether there is any incoherent between the duties of such post and the duties of a Member of Parliament?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, the way public life is being corrupted and the Government is giving allurements to the Members, all the members are changing their loyalty. In this context I think, the exclusion of some new posts is against the dignity and prestige of the Parliament. It has been seen in the States that the MLAs who cannot be accommodated in the Council of Ministers are appointed Chairmen of different commissions. It is a regular allurements. Now the Government is trying to bring this practice to the Centre also. The standard of commitments of the Members and independent functioning of the Parliament are gradually declining. The four posts, which have been mentioned in the Bill, require full time job. The Vice-Chairman of the Planning Commission works round the clock for the formulation of plans for the entire country so it is not understood as to how he can work as a Member of Parliament. All the four posts require similar type of responsibilities and they cannot fulfil their responsibility as a Member of Parliament. Many social workers do not get elected to Lok Sabha or Rajya Sabha but such workers have special significance for the country so some posts should be given to them. I condemn the tendency of giving temptations to the Members of Parliament and oppose this Bill and request the Government to put a check on the increasing number of such posts.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA (Madhubani): Mr. Speaker, Sir, the way this Bill has been moved, I think that as my friend Shri Mohan

Singh said that these posts are important and it will take a lot of time. Standing Committees have been constituted in the Parliament with your efforts but we are not able to do justice with them as we have no time. There is no objection if these four commissions get special facilities but it will create a serious situation if the Members of the commission are deprived of their Membership of the Parliament. At present, there are 72 Ministers in Bihar and 42 have been selected as Chairmen. (Interruptions).

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barb) : There are nearabout 60 ministers in Bihar. The Assembly has a strength of 325 members and the Council has 98 members. Their total number can be added. Haryana does not have bi-cameral legislature. There are 90 members in the Legislative Assembly and more than 30 Ministers.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA : I will be glad if the number given by my friend is correct. If there are 62 Ministers and 42 Chairmen, it means that 90 percent members from the ruling party are covered. Haryana has a large number of such members who follow the policy of Aya Ram Gaya Ram. It will not be a matter of joy either for him or for me, if the number of such Members start increasing in Bihar also.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : If the strength of the ruling party is 129, how much of it will be 90 per cent. Besides, the ruling party has the support of allies as well as the independents. So, there is a majority of two-thirds and there are nearabout 60 members.

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA : I would like to thank my friend for his courage as well as his audacity. There are 62 Ministers and 42 Chairmen, who are also of the rank of Ministers. So, as Shri Mohan Singh said it has become a matter of joke and the expenditure involved is also high. It is a matter of shame for Bihar if it goes beyond Haryana. Those who can not be given ministership, are made the chairmen of new committees and justified in the Parliament saying that it has been done in the public interest. This is like letting anyone to enter from the window instead of the main door. The issue is not concerned with four or eight, but it should have been moved here for proper discussion. All should have been consulted, so that we could have openly told the country that we have done right.

Several issues were raised here about the different parts of our constitution, such as the issue concerning the Speaker of Manipur and the

Supreme Court and the issue concerning the Election Commissioner and the Supreme Court. In practice a clash like situation arises among these constituents and so it was necessary to amend the relevant Act of the Constitution in view of all these things. I am not saying that the Election Commission should be deprived of its rights during the elections. Only God knows what would have happened in Tripura if such was the case*...

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : No, no. That will not go on record.

[Translation]

SHRI BHOGENDRA JHA : I am not levelling allegations on any constituent. It is necessary to solve the crisis which has arisen at present. But it does not appear that this Bill is going to solve this crisis, instead it appears that we are giving dakshina to some people.

The main responsibility of the Planning Commission is to plan for 90 crores people of this country. It is a full-time work for the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission. We people are also not fulfilling our responsibilities properly. He should also have been included in it, but the inclusion of chairman is not appropriate. The Hon'ble Minister should withdraw this Bill for proper consideration or should constitute a small committee for its full amendment, so that such clashes do not occur. Everyday we express different reactions of opposing or favouring any Bill and this is not good for a great democracy like ours. We oppose the habit of the Government to issue ordinances. This is the 29th Ordinance which has been issued just few hours before the commencement of the session. This is a new disease which has affected the Government of India. This is increasing in the States also. One should not be let to enter from the window. This Bill should be brought after full consideration. I am opposing it.

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH (Aonla) : This Bill which has been brought here, is theoretically wrong. It appears that the intention of the Government is not good about this Bill. Earlier, the Deputy Chairman of Planning Commission Shri Pranab Mukherjee was the Union Commerce Minister. I was much surprised when...

[English]

SHRI OSCAR FERNANDES (Udupi) : I think the name should not be mentioned. Here, the discussion is regarding a particular provision that we are going to make.

[Translation]

SHRI RAJVEER SINGH : I am saying when the Deputy Chairman of Planning Commission was made the Union Minister of Commerce, he did not had the Membership of either of the House and when 6 months were going to be completed, he resigned from the Ministership just one day before. He again became the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission. What is your intention now? He has been again elected. But it appears that these are some difficulties in making him a Minister, as he has been elected to the Rajya Sabha. It is intended that if he cannot be made a Minister, he should be atleast given his earlier post, but there are legal difficulties in this regard. This Bill has been brought in much haste so that he can be protected.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to ask why these facilities are being provided to a Member of Parliament? The people are already much distressed about the facilities being provided to the Members and along with them, they also become chairmen of some commission and get benefits from there also. The Bill seeks to remove this problem. The committee has submitted its report and I do not agree with it. This Bill is concerned about four commissions—Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes Commission, Minorities Commission, National Commission on Women and Deputy Chairman Planning Commission.

The Prime Minister is the Chairman of Planning Commission and this does not apply on him. As the name of a particular person has to be proposed and has to be given economic benefit, the name of Deputy Chairman has come here. Whether all these four commissions will be filled up with congress Members or is there any difficulty in inducting them into the cabinet? So, they should be appointed on other posts. How this will go?

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this is joking and the Parliament has been made a thing of joke. This has become a habit to bring any Bill in a haste and without much consideration. This Bill could have been brought earlier, in the starting of the session or in the earlier session, but this was not done. The person—objections are raised if take

his name—was not elected then. Now, it is four days since he has been elected and he has to be employed. So, a wrong tradition of providing economic benefit to the Members of Parliament is emerging. I oppose it.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to support this Bill. Every thing should not be opposed and opposing just for the sake of opposing should not be done atleast. As I have to speak on the next item in the agenda, I did not want to speak on this Bill, but it is my duty to clear any of the misunderstandings, which may arise due to the views expressed here.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Bill has a limited purpose. It is concerned with the Disqualification of office-bearers of four commissions. I would like to remind the hon'ble Members of this House that during the regime of National Front Government, Shri Ramkrishna Hegde, who was the then Member of Karnataka Assembly, was made the Deputy Chairman of Planning Commission. He was disqualified from the Membership of the State Assembly, as the post of Deputy Chairman of Planning Commission was taken as an office of profit. It became a different story later on. I welcome this Bill and expect that it will be implemented from retrospective effect. The hon'ble Minister is sitting here. He should tell whether Shri Hegde will be saved or not?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ) : He had won the case and got the final order.

SHRI NITISH KUMAR : I would like to thank the Hon'ble Minister for the final order. It means that the court did not accept it as the office of profit. If this Bill is passed, it is proved that when the Prime Minister is the Chairman of any Organisation, how the post of Deputy Chairman in it, can be the office profit? From the election point of view, the post of Chairman held by the Prime Minister is not considered an office of profit, so, how the post of Deputy Chairman can be included in it? An expert should hold the post of Deputy Chairman and it is not necessary that he should be from outside the Parliament. Experts are available inside the Parliament also. Any of our hon'ble Members either from the Lok Sabha or the Rajya Sabha, can be a greater expert, whom the Country needs and so, he should be made the Deputy Chairman. Shri Ram Dhan, who is a Member of Parliament, was appointed as the

Chairman of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes Commission. Any of the Members of Parliament, whom the Government finds capable of holding the post, should be made the Chairman of the Commission. I do not think that this will arouse doubts on the intention of the Government. When any party comes to power, it can appoint any legislator on Member of Parliament as the Deputy Chairman of the Planning Commission.

When any Member of Parliament has been appointed as the Chairman of Scheduled Castes Commission and a bill has been brought by the Government in this regard, just to say that there are 70 or 60 Ministers in Bihar and there are so many Boards and Corporations and only the ruling party legislators are appointed as Chairman and Deputy Chairman is not good. Bihar or Shri Laloo Prasad Yadav has not started any new tradition. I do not want to say anything about what Shri Bhogendra Jha referred here, but there should not be anything unclear on the record. Shri Bhogendra Jha may have another complaint, but due to it, I found it necessary to express my views on this issue. His party still supports it. One can see in the records that in 1967, when the Sanyukta Vidhayak Dal Government was formed, it had been a tradition then also to appoint legislators as the Chairmen of Boards and Corporations. We have 28 Boards in all, out of which, some are to be chaired by the government officials. For example, the Chairman of the Electricity Board. This post can not be held by any political person. Only an Engineer can hold this post or during the congress tenure, some bureaucrats had held this post for some time. But in other times, this post has always been reserved for an engineer or a technical expert. There is a provision in its Act that no non-government employee can hold that post.

If such passing references are made that there are so many ministers, I would like to tell that an Administrative Reforms Commission was constituted to find out the ideal situation. It was told that there should not be more than 11 or 12 per cent Ministers out of the total Membership of both the Houses. I support it and when the percentage at 11, 12 or even 10 per cent has been fixed, it should be properly implemented in both the Parliament and the State Assembly. Whichever party comes to power it should follow the rule of percentage. But until the law is enacted, if there are more than one-third Ministers in Haryana or any state, it should be checked and the responsibility should be left with

the State Assembly. Bihar is a big State and has several departments. 57 or 58 Ministers are essential for their proper administration. This should be seen properly. 60-62 Ministers are essential for the proper functioning of the Government of India. Such passing references are taken very lightly. This is a democratic country, where there are two to three thousand bureaucrats, hundreds of departments and it is natural to have 60-62 Ministers to control them. We have only seen but we never think about what we are saying.

It is right if a law is enacted that there should be 8, 10 or 12 per cent Ministers and it is strictly implemented by amending the constitution, but if we say illogical things, what message we are sending to the people of this country. It appears that those who are elected become Ministers for their own benefits. I am not saying this. There are laws regarding corruption and whoever indulges in corrupt practices, is disreputed in the public. This is a different aspect. Whoever indulges in corruption should be punished. Accountability of a Minister is not an easy task. Can any Minister live very peacefully and sleep for hours? We should keep all these things in mind. It is a crown of thorns. It is not so easy as saying that there are 60, 62 or 70 Ministers. I do not want to go into this, but would like to say a few words. Political wisdom has also to be applied on such posts.

For the post of Chairman of Planning Commission, we have to see our political commitments. Whenever any party comes to power the opposition tries to ensure that it works within the frame work of the Constitution. But the ruling gets political mandate, so it has the freedom to include something of its choice in the Scheme.

If they have a political outlook their services must be availed of in order to fulfil the mandate. I don't think that there is any harm in appointing Members of Parliament or Legislative Assemblies to the post of Chair-person of various Commission, be it—Commission on Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, Minorities Commission, National Commission on Women or Planning Commission etc. That is why these posts should not be considered offices of profit and the same should be exempted from any disqualification. I, therefore, support this Bill.

41 *Parliament (Prev. of Disqualification) Amendment Bill*
[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ): Mr. Speaker, Sir, I must draw the attention of this august House that this Bill is brought in pursuant to the Report of the Joint Committee on Office of Profit, which was presented on 9th April, 1992. The Committee had gone into details about what offices of profit, what offices should not incur disqualification. It is absolutely and totally non-controversial. I had been the Minister of Planning Commission. If the Deputy Chairman is the Member of this House, this House will be benefitted because you will have the advantage of hearing him as a Member of Parliament. There are many cases where an hon. Member is a Chairman of an organisation, which is very useful. The Planning Commission is the nerve centre of the infrastructure and every other thing of the country. If he is a Member of the House and if he is a Member of Parliament, it is advantageous.

Similarly, there is a National Commission on Women; there is a Minorities Commission. They are all very important Commissions. If the Chair-person of those Commissions is an hon. Member of Parliament, we should be happy about it, because we are giving such important position to an hon. Member of Parliament. If you go through the whole Report, you will find that they have suggested various other offices of profit. Also disqualification should not be there. We are processing that in consultation with the States; and I am hopeful that I will be able to bring another comprehensive legislation with regard to other offices of profit.

For the time being, I seek support only with regard to this Bill which is in pursuant to the recommendations of the Joint Committee of Parliament.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Parliament (Prevention of Disqualification) Act, 1959, as passed by Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: The House shall now take up clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill. The question is:

"That Clauses 2 to 5 stand part of the Bill."

30, 1915 (SAKA) *Prev. of illicit traffic in Narcotic drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Amendment) Bill & Disapproval of Ordinance*
The motion was adopted.

Clauses 2 to 5 were added to the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That clause 1, The Enacting Formula and The Long Title stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

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

SHRI H. R. BHARDWAJ: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. SPEAKER: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: There are some other items which we will be taking up now. May I request all the hon. Members to note that we are sitting on Saturday to complete the Bills and other business which is before the House so that it may not become necessary for us to extend the sittings of this House beyond 27th August, 1993. So, may I request again all the hon. Members to make their points very forcefully but not repeat them and will help the House to transact its business which is before the House.

12.50 hrs.

STATUTORY RESOLUTION RE: DISAPPROVAL OF THE PREVENTION OF ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES (AMENDMENT) ORDINANCE, 1993 AND PREVENTION OF ILLICIT TRAFFIC IN NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES (AMENDMENT) BILL.

As passed by Rajya Sabha

[English]

SHRI NITISH KUMAR (Barh): I beg to move:

"That this House disapproves of the Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psycho-