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During the last two decades, there has been an unprecedented spurt in the use of illegal drugs throughout the world. Illicit drugs are now the world's second biggest trading commodity, next only to armaments. The scourge of drugs constitutes a grave threat to the security, stability and development of many nations. Illicit drugs have caused escalation of organized crime, corruption in public life, illegal banking operations, violence at home, neglect of children, general disruption in smooth family life, lower productivity at workplace, and epidemic spread of AIDS all over the world. In a nutshell, drugs have not only affected every walk of human life at present but are also likely to endanger our future generations, unless we are successful in checking this menace. International community has been quite responsive to the prevailing situation as is evident from the fact that a large number of international conventions, covering all aspects of drug abuse and illicit trafficking, have been adopted in the recent years.

In India, cannabis and opium have been widely abused for centuries. However, other narcotic drugs and psychotropic substances also came to be used by addicts after 1950s. Till 1985, the drug law was embodied in the Opium Act, 1857, the Opium Act, 1878 and the Dangerous
Drugs Act, 1930. The maximum term of imprisonment under these Acts extended to three years only, except in the case of repeat offences which attracted maximum term of imprisonment for four years. Such lax laws were out-dated in the context of the then prevailing situation in the field of illicit drug traffic and drug abuse in the country.

In order to provide for deterrent punishment to the persons indulging in illicit drug trafficking, the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985 was enacted. The Act prescribes stringent mandatory sentence of imprisonment for minimum of 10 years and a minimum fine of Rupees one lakh for most of the drug offences. In 1989, the Act was further amended to provide also for the imposition of death penalty for certain offences. However, these steps have not yielded any significant result so far as is evident from the fact that drug abuse as well as drug trafficking are constantly on the increase in the country.

The geographical location of the country makes it highly vulnerable to illicit trafficking in drugs. Heroin from the 'Golden Triangle' as well as the 'Golden Crescent' countries is smuggled into India through 1600 Kms. long Indo-Myanmar border and 3310 Kms. long Indo-Pakistan border, respectively. Indo-Nepal border too is highly prone to smuggling of ganja from Nepal to India. It is difficult to fully intercept the illicit drugs at these long and porous international borders. These factors have made it convenient for the international drug syndicates to use India as a major transit country.
for narcotics destined for Europe and the United States, in the last two decades. The spill-over effect of this transit trade has gradually transformed India into a major consumer of narcotics.

India itself is the world's largest producer and exporter of licit opium. Over 1,40,000 farmers undertake licenced cultivation of opium poppy in Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Uttar Pradesh. All the opium produced by them is legally required to be sold only to the Central Government, and is meant essentially for the purpose of meeting the medical requirements in India as well as in rest of the world. However, as there is a vast difference between the price at which the Government purchases opium from the farmer and the price at which such opium can be illegally sold by the farmer to a drug trafficker, about 35% of the opium leaks into the illicit market. Such illicit opium is sold as it is to the opium addicts, or is converted to crude heroin in make-shift laboratories for local consumption as well as for smuggling to the foreign markets.

There is a need for rationalizing the purchase price of opium by the Government so that farmers are not tempted to sell it to the drug traffickers. There is also a need for restricting the number of licenced growers of opium poppy to bare minimum so that their activities can be well regulated and monitored. No licences should be given for cultivation in the remote and far-flung areas as it is difficult to maintain vigil over such fields. Lastly, there is a need for proper and effective control over all the licencees by strengthening the enforcement machinery.
Apart from the licenced cultivation, referred to above, illicit cultivation of opium poppy and cannabis is also taking place on a large scale in many states. There is a need for strong political will to put an end to this illegal activity.

Lax control over chemists and druggists has also made psychotropic substances, meant basically for medical purposes, easily available to the existing as well as the potential drug abusers. There is a crying need for tightening the control over the drug stores so as to plug this illegal supply route.

No serious attempt has been made in the country to ascertain the number of existing drug addicts, or to ensure close and constant monitoring of the changing patterns of drug abuse. Without these basic details, it may be difficult to chalk out an appropriate strategy to control this menace. It is, therefore, desirable that household surveys on a regular basis, on the pattern of those conducted in the United States, should be undertaken throughout the country. In view of the meagre funds available for drug abuse prevention, the vast youth potential in the Universities and other institutions of higher learning can be mobilized for this exercise. As all sections of society are adequately represented in such institutions, a survey conducted by the students, during their holidays or vacation, in their own home places will be quite broad-based and authentic. Besides, it may also result in dissemination of drug education amongst the students, and relay of anti-drug message to the masses. In addition, it may prove to be an important step in creating awareness in the students as well as in the educational institutions about their role and responsibility towards the society.
In spite of the lack of official statistics about the current number of addicts in the country, it can be estimated on the basis of available facts and figures, mentioned in Chapter II of this work, that there are more than 25 lakh addicts in the country at present.

**Sentencing policy**

The NDPS Act, 1985 has failed to make any major impact on the drug scene in the country. It appears that the sentencing policy behind this Act has not been based on sound principles of criminology, as explained in Chapter III of this work. The mandatory minimum sentence of rigorous imprisonment for 10 years, irrespective of the gravity of the offence, seems to be very harsh particularly in respect of offences of petty nature. This study has revealed that the courts are reluctant to convict the offenders as the mandatory minimum sentence is disproportionate to the gravity of offence in most cases, and the lack of discretion with the judges in the matter of sentencing appears to leave them with the only option of letting off the accused on technical grounds. Consequently, the conviction rate for drug offences is below 35%, as compared to about 45.5% in respect of general crimes, and is estimated to nose-dive below 10% after the first appellate stage. Therefore, there is a need for rationalizing the sentencing policy so as to make the punishments graduated and proportionate to the offences. It is suggested that the sentences provided under the NDPS Act, 1985 may be revised as indicated below:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offences</th>
<th>Punishments under the existing law</th>
<th>Suggested punishments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Illicit cultivation of coca, cannabis or opium poppy:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Where the total number of such plants does not exceed fifty.</td>
<td>Irrespective of the number of plants or area under cultivation, the offence is punishable with rigorous imprisonment which shall not be less than 10 years but which may extend to 20 years, and fine which shall not be less than one lakh rupees but which may extend to two lakh rupees.</td>
<td>Imprisonment which may extend to six months, and fine which may extend to twenty thousand rupees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Where the total number of such plants exceeds fifty.</td>
<td>-do-</td>
<td>Rigorous imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than six months but which may extend to 5 years, and fine which shall not be less than twenty thousand rupees but which may extend to two lakh rupees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Illicit production, manufacture, possession, sale, purchase, transport,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(1) Import, transhipment or diversion of opium or charas:

(a) Where the quantity exceeds 50 gms. but does not exceed 1 kg.

Irrespective of the quantity of drug involved, the offence is punishable with rigorous imprisonment which shall not be less than 10 years but which may extend to 20 years, and fine which shall not be less than one lakh rupees but which may extend to two lakh rupees.

(b) Where the quantity exceeds 1 kg. but is less than 25 kgs.

Rigorous imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than one year but which may extend to five years, and fine which may extend to twenty thousand rupees.

(c) Where the quantity is 25 kgs. or more.

Rigorous imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than five years but which may extend to ten years, and fine which shall not be less than twenty thousand rupees but which may extend to five lakh rupees.

Death sentence or life imprisonment, and forfeiture of all property possessed.
(3) Illicit production, manufacture, possession, sale, purchase, transport, export, import or transhipment of heroin, morphine or any other derivative of opium:

(a) Where the quantity does not exceed 5 gms.
   -do-
   Rigorous imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than one year but which may extend to five years, and fine which shall not be less than fifty thousand rupees but which may extend to one lakh rupees.

(b) Where the quantity exceeds 50 gms. but is less than 10 kgs.
   -do-
   Rigorous imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than five years but which may extend to twelve years, and fine which shall not be less than one lakh rupees but which may extend to ten lakh rupees.

(c) Where the quantity exceeds 10 kgs.
   -do-
   Rigorous imprisonment for a term which shall not be less than ten years, and fine which shall not be less than five lakh rupees but which may extend to ten lakh rupees.
(c) Where the quantity is 10 kgs. or more.

(4) Illicit production, manufacture, possession, sale, purchase, transport, import or transhipment of any other narcotic drug (except those covered by (2) and (3) above, poppy straw, coca leaf or ganja) or psychotropic substance, where the quantity exceeds 5 gms.

Irrespective of the quantity of drug involved, all these offences are punishable with rigorous imprisonment which shall not be less than 10 years but which may extend to 20 years, and fine which shall not be less than one lakh rupees but which may extend to two lakh rupees.

(5) Attempt, abetment, criminal conspiracy, financing or any other activity of similar nature towards the commission of an offence.

Same as provided for that particular offence. However, punishment for financing illicit traffic or harbouring offenders is the same as mentioned against (1) to (4) above.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(6) Any other offence under the Act, which is not covered by (1) to (5) above.</td>
<td>Differs from offence to offence but generally the same as mentioned against (1) to (4) above, except in the case of 'ganja'. The offences relating to 'ganja' are punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to 5 years, and a fine which may extend to fifty thousand rupees.</td>
<td>Rigorous imprisonment for a term which may extend to five years, and fine which may extend to fifty thousand rupees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Second and subsequent offence after previous conviction.</td>
<td>Twice of the sentence prescribed for the first offence. Death penalties in certain cases.</td>
<td>Twice of the sentence prescribed for the first offence, or death sentence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

So far as some of the serious offences relating to large-scale drug trafficking are concerned, the punishments proposed above are even more stringent than those currently provided under the NDA Act, 1985. However, the broad rationale behind these recommendations is to make the punishment commensurate with the gravity of offence in each case.
Procedural provisions

This study reveals that the procedural provisions in the Act are excessively complex, cumbersome and impractical. There are also conflicting judicial pronouncements about the interpretation of some of these provisions. In addition, there is no unanimity of opinion amongst various courts as to which of the procedural provisions are so vital and mandatory in nature that their non-compliance would vitiate the entire proceedings against the accused. Resultantly, many offenders are able to escape conviction on the sole ground that the procedural provisions have not been strictly complied with during investigation. The courts insist on strict compliance of each and every provision as the punishments provided under the NDPS Act, 1985 are very stringent. If the sentencing policy is rationalized as suggested earlier in this Chapter, there will be lesser chance of courts going into the extreme technicalities of procedure. Still, it will be desirable that procedural provisions may be simplified to leave minimum scope for conflicting interpretations. The provisions which do not appear to serve any meaningful purpose should also be dropped. The recommendations in this regard are as under:

a) Section 41 and Section 42 of the NDPS Act, 1985 require that any information, on the basis of which any search or seizure is made, should be recorded in writing before making such a search or seizure. As explained in Chapter IV, this requirement is impractical at times. Hence, it will be preferable to delete it from the said Sections.
b) The provisions contained in Section 50 of the NDPS Act, 1985 provide that the person to be searched shall be taken to a Gazetted Officer or a Magistrate if such person so requires. The provisions have been subjected to varying interpretations as indicated in Chapter IV. For the sake of clarity, this Section may be amended so as to make it obligatory that if a person is going to be searched under the provisions of Section 41, Section 42 or Section 43, he shall invariably be taken to a Gazetted Officer or a Magistrate, and the search shall be made only in the presence of such Officer or Magistrate. It may be further stipulated that where a person is searched under the provisions of a statute other than the NDPS Act, 1985 but his search leads to the recovery of any contraband drug or evidence relating to commission of an offence under the NDPS Act, 1985, such search will not be rendered illegal merely on the ground that the provisions of Section 50 have not been complied with.

c) Section 51 of the NDPS Act, 1985 makes the provisions of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 applicable to all warrants issued and arrests, searches and seizures made under the Act. Section 100 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 requires that two independent and respectable witnesses of the locality be associated
with the search. As mentioned in Chapter IV, the members of general public often show their reluctance to be associated with the search as witnesses, particularly in the drug-related matters. Secondly, the need for taking quick action in a case may not allow the enforcement officials to waste time in looking for willing public witnesses. Therefore, it may be provided specifically in Section 51 that where the search of premises is made in the presence of a Gazetted Officer of the State Government or the Central Government or a Magistrate, it shall not be mandatory to comply with the provisions of Section 100 Cr.P.C., 1973 so far as these relate to the presence of public witnesses during search.

d) Section 55 of the NDPS Act, 1985 relating to the custody of seized drugs, sealing and taking of samples, has been a subject of conflicting judgements as mentioned in Chapter IV. To avoid uncertainty and confusion in this regard, Section 55 may be deleted from the Act, and the Central Government may instead lay down a detailed procedure for all matters relating to samples. Such procedure may either be contained in the rules to be made by the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred on it under Sec.76 of the Act, or communicated to all the enforcement agencies in the form of executive instructions.
e) There is a lack of unanimity amongst various courts as to whether the procedural provisions contained in the NDPS Act, 1985 are mandatory or directory, as pointed out in Chapter IV. Therefore, a provision may be inserted into the Act for stipulating that no proceedings under the Act shall become void on the ground of non-compliance of procedural provisions unless the court is satisfied that such non-compliance has caused failure of justice.

**Speedy trial**

As mentioned in Chapter V, the stringent provisions relating to bail contained in Section 37 of the NDPS Act, 1985 become repugnant to the precept of justice in cases where the accused, whose guilt is yet to be proved, has to remain languishing in jail for years for want of a speedy trial. Consequently, the courts appear to have inclination to interpret these provisions in a liberal manner, contrary to the apparent intention of the legislature. The matter relating to the setting up of Special Courts in all districts for dealing exclusively with drug offences has been given low priority so far, as pointed out in Chapter V. It is suggested that the concerned State Governments should take immediate steps to set up adequate number of Special Courts.

In view of the conflicting interpretations of Sec. 37 NDPS Act, 1985 by the courts, as pointed out in Chapter V, there is a need for amending it so as to make it clear whether the section covers the offences in relation to 'ganja', and also whether Sec. 167(2) of the Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 overrides Sec. 37 of the NDPS Act, 1985 in the matter of grant of bail to an accused.
Preventive Detention and forfeiture of property

The implementation of the Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1988, has been an utter failure as vast majority of detention orders issued under the Act get quashed by the courts for the reasons mentioned in Chapter VI. This study reveals that, in almost all cases, detention orders are issued against persons who are already facing trial on specific charges under the NDPS Act, 1985. This finding leads to a prima facie inference that such orders are aimed either at interdicting their release on bail or at rendering bail orders, already issued, ineffective. Therefore, speedy trials can do away the need for invoking the provisions of the said Act of 1988 in majority of cases. The detention laws should be invoked primarily in those cases where it may not be possible to secure the conviction of an offender due to lack of evidence which may stand judicial scrutiny.

This study further reveals that the matters relating to the Prevention of Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1988 are handled in a lackadaisical manner by the sponsoring as well as the detaining authorities who apparently have no clear perception of the Constitutional provisions in relation to preventive detention. It is suggested that handling of such matters should be entrusted only to the senior officers who have been especially trained for this purpose.
The enormous profits generated by the illicit drug trade are often laundered and put further in legitimate or illegitimate business transactions entered into by the drug trafficker himself or by his relatives or associates. The drug money contaminates the economic, political and social structure of the society. With the objective of providing for the forfeiture of any income, earning or assets derived or obtained from or attributable to illicit traffic and held by the trafficker himself or by his relatives or associates, the NDPS Act, 1985 was amended in 1989 by inserting Chapter VA in the Act. However, these provisions have failed to take off due to drafting errors which have been pointed out in Chapter VI of this work. Under the law as it exists at present, no action for the forfeiture of property of a drug trafficker can be taken till he is charged for the second time for a drug offence after having already been convicted previously in India or abroad for a similar offence, or till he is put under preventive detention and is charged for an offence thereafter. Section 68A of the Act needs to be amended so as to bring all drug offenders within the scope of these provisions.

Addicts

The provisions contained in the NDPS Act, 1985 with respect to the addicts do not offer a judicious and practical solution to the problem, as explained in Chapter VII. An addict is unquestionably a sick person who needs sympathy and help rather than punishment. It appears unnecessary to bring the addicts into forced contact with the police or other enforcement agencies, hardened criminals in the prison,
defence lawyers and the courts. As the existing legal framework has apparently failed to cope with the problem of addiction, an alternative strategy based on a non-punitive and sympathetic, yet sufficiently deterrent, system of reformation is suggested and outlined hereafter.

As a first step in the proposed strategy, Addiction Control Boards may be constituted in each district to deal with all matters related to drug addiction. The Board may have four members: one medical doctor, one psychologist, one social worker engaged in drug counselling, and a presiding officer qualified to be a Magistrate.

Any person from whom a small quantity of any narcotic drug or psychotropic substance is seized, may be presumed to be an addict, and produced at once before the Board or any member thereof. If there is any evidence available with the seizing officials at the time of seizure, or comes to light during subsequent investigations, that the seized drug was meant for sale or distribution, such evidence may be summarily examined by the Board to reach a tentative conclusion whether the person produced before it is: (i) an addict as well as a peddler, or (ii) an addict but not a peddler, or (iii) a peddler but not an addict. Only if the Board reaches a prima facie finding that such person is not an addict, it may cause him to be transmitted to a court for regular trial. In case of such a person being found to be an addict as well as a peddler, he may undergo treatment, as decided by the Board, before being tried by a court for the offence of peddling of drugs. Where such person is adjudged to be solely an addict, the Board may have exclusive jurisdiction in the matter.
No enforcement agency should have the power to arrest a person merely on the ground that he is an addict, unless the Board so orders after taking into consideration any information supplied by such an agency. However, the Board may not order the arrest of a person unless he has failed to appear before the Board in response to summons sent to him directly or through the parent or guardian if such a person is a minor.

An addict who is a minor, may also be voluntarily produced before the Board by the parents or by the close relatives, for being dealt with in accordance with law.

Where any person including a parent or a relative gives information about an addict, verbally or in writing, to the Board, it may summon such addict to appear before it or order any enforcement official to produce him before it if he does not respond to the summons.

All proceedings before the Board may be in camera, and no legal practitioner may be allowed to be present, unless specifically permitted by the Board. The Board may allow the parents, relatives and friends of the addict to participate in the proceedings, as it may facilitate proper inquiry about the character of the addict, and the nature and extent of his addiction.

Pending further inquiry, the Board may order that the person appearing or produced before it as above be kept in an "Observation Home", to be set up for the purpose, under close medical supervision. If it appears to the Board after due inquiry that either such a person is not an addict or that he is an addict who does not require, looking to the nature of addiction,
any de-toxification, rehabilitation or after-care, he may be discharged immediately after admonition, if necessary. On the other hand, if such person is found to be an addict, the Board may order for his transmission to an 'Addiction Control Centre', to be set up for the purpose of reformation of the addicts, having all de-toxification, rehabilitation and after-care facilities.

The Addiction Control Centre may function under the overall control of the Board. Where such Centres cannot be set up immediately, the existing facilities in the hospitals or other institutions, funded by the Government, may come under the direct control of the Board.

No person confined to an 'Observation Home' or 'Addiction Control Centre' may be allowed to leave the same without orders of the Board. Any person unauthorisedly leaving such confinement may render himself liable to punitive custody in the Centre or such other place as the Board may direct.

The Board may review the progress of each inmate of the Addiction Control Centre at periodic intervals, and may order for release of any such person at any time subject to the condition that he will be under the supervision of a social worker or a field officer, appointed by the Board, for a mandatory period of two years. During the period of such supervision, the supervisor may at any time bring the ex-addict to the Centre for urine analysis or any other test in order to verify whether he has been abstaining from drugs. If such a test gives positive result for drug use, the ex-addict may be confined within the Centre for such a period as the Board may determine.
In appropriate cases, the Board may order the addict or his parents to pay for his maintenance and treatment. Such amount may be recovered, if not voluntarily paid, by attachment of the property of such person as if it were an arrear of land revenue.

The Board may have the judicial powers of a First Class Magistrate while dealing with any act or omission of any person appearing or produced before it, or under confinement in the 'Observation Home' or the 'Addiction Control Centre'.

The proposed strategy does not put any significant burden on the State exchequer. It can sustain itself partly on the proper management and re-allocation of existing resources. The advantages of proposed system are:

a) The addict does not undergo the humiliating and demoralising experience of being arrested and kept in jail custody;

b) The system saves the addict or his relatives from being fleeced by the legal practitioners;

c) The treatment, rehabilitation and after-care take place in a disciplined and controlled atmosphere under the constant supervision of experts;

d) Even after complete treatment and release from the institution, the ex-addict remains under supervision for a period of two years. This ensures that the relapses are monitored and checked considerably;

e) The system gives an impression to the addict that he is being helped, instead of being punished or harassed by the official machinery. This makes his treatment and rehabilitation much easier;
f) The enforcement agencies and the courts will have more time to deal with the drug traffickers instead of wasting time and resources on the addicts.

**Enforcement agencies**

This study reveals that the enforcement agencies have failed to deal effectively with the drug menace. Except the Narcotics Control Bureau, all the enforcement agencies viz., Customs, Central Excise, Police, State Excise, and Revenue Intelligence etc. have drug law enforcement only as an additional responsibility.

The Narcotics Control Bureau cannot function effectively due to an acute shortage of staff. Its dual role of acting as a co-ordinating agency as well as a strike force adversely affects its performance, as pointed out in Chapter VIII. Therefore, there is a need for augmenting its staff strength, and restricting its role to co-ordination and collection of intelligence only.

The Narcotics Control Bureau is presently staffed by the officers from various other departments on deputation basis. For effective functioning, it should have its own regular cadre of officers.

The study has revealed that a large number of drug offenders are acquitted by the courts on account of procedural irregularities committed by the enforcement officials due to ignorance of the provisions of the NDPS Act, 1985. It has also been observed that vast majority of enforcement officials have not participated in any training programme on drug laws.
It is suggested that adequate facilities and infrastructure for extensive training, on various aspects of drug abuse and illicit trafficking, be made available to all the enforcement agencies.

As explained in Chapter VIII, the police officers are in a disadvantageous position when compared to the enforcement officials from other departments in the matter of investigation of cases under the NDPS Act, 1985 due to the provisions of Section 25 of the Indian Evidence Act 1872. Therefore, Section 53A of the NDPS Act, 1985 needs to be amended so as to give it overriding effect over Section 25 of the said Evidence Act.

The enforcement officials have also been assigned, under the provisions of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Act, 1985, the task of tracing and identification of illegally acquired property held either by the trafficker himself or by his relatives or associates. As such property is held, transferred or earned through intricate banking or commercial transactions, and a common enforcement official may not be conversant with such intricacies, it is suggested that the officials having relevant educational qualifications and experience may be specially trained for discharging such functions. A special task force, to be manned by these trained personnel, may be constituted for effective implementation of the provisions relating to forfeiture of drug-related property.

There is need for taking appropriate action against the enforcement officials indulging in corrupt practices or adopting casual approach in investigation of drug offences. The existing system of payment of cash rewards to the enforcement officials
is faulty as the reward is linked only to the seizure of a contraband drug. The enforcement officials have little interest in proper post-seizure investigations or the conviction of the accused. It is, therefore, suggested that reward should be paid after the completion of the investigations, and only if the quality of investigation in a case warrants such a payment. Frequent transfer of officials dealing with drug offences should be avoided to the extent possible as this causes tremendous set back to the drug control efforts, as pointed out in Chapter VIII.

As explained further in Chapter VIII, there is no system of associating legal advisors with the investigation of drug offences by the enforcement agencies. The enforcement officials, having no formal or informal training in law, fail to appreciate the relative importance of various legal provisions, and also tend to build up prosecution cases on evidence which may not be admissible under the Indian Evidence Act, 1872. It is, therefore, suggested that legal advisors should be associated at all stages of the investigation. In the courts also, the enforcement agencies should have their regular cadre of public prosecutors as the present practice of engagement of private advocates as public prosecutors has not been conducive to effective enforcement of drug laws.

There is also a need for equipping the enforcement agencies with latest modes of communication, fastest modes of transport and the sophisticated weaponry.

In the end, it is stressed that efforts made merely for the enforcement of drug laws will not yield any long-term result, unless appropriate demand-reduction strategies are
also formulated and implemented simultaneously. Such strategies must strive at creating public awareness about drug abuse through authentic and credible information, at providing adequate facilities for treatment, rehabilitation and after-care of the existing addicts and at providing necessary facilities for imparting drug education and creating avenues for youth recreation to keep the young and adolescents away from drugs. As pointed out in Chapter IX, the efforts made so far in this direction are far from adequate, and the matter deserves to be given top priority by the Central Government as well as the State Governments.

To conclude, drug menace is likely to endanger the social, economic and political systems in the country in the near future, unless we start making all-out efforts immediately to control it with a firm political resolve, community involvement, and immediate legislative and executive interventions.