

# **The Journal of Parliamentary Information**

---

**VOLUME XLVII**

**NO. 4**

**DECEMBER 2001**

---

**, LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT  
NEW DELHI**

---

**CBS Publishers & Distributors**

11, Darya Ganj, New Delhi-2

## ***EDITORIAL BOARD***

### ***Editor***

***G.C. Malhotra  
Secretary-General  
Lok Sabha***

### ***Associate Editors***

***M. Rajagopalan Nair  
Joint Secretary  
Lok Sabha Secretariat***

***R.C. Ahuja  
Director  
Lok Sabha Secretariat***

### ***Assistant Editors***

***K. Vijaykrishnan  
Joint Director  
Lok Sabha Secretariat***

***Smt. Kalpana Sharma  
Deputy Director  
Lok Sabha Secretariat***

---

***© Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi***

## **OUR CONTRIBUTOR**

**Shri C. Venkatesan  
is Former Special Secretary,  
Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly**

# THE JOURNAL OF PARLIAMENTARY INFORMATION

---

**VOL. XLVII**

**NO. 4**

**DECEMBER 2001**

---

## CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>EDITORIAL NOTE</b>	<b>377</b>
<b>ADDRESSES</b>	
Addresses at the All India Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies, Chief Ministers, Ministers of Parliamentary Affairs, and Leaders and Whips of Parties	<b>379</b>
<b>ARTICLE</b>	
Is Parliamentary Democracy in Peril? —C. Venkatesan	<b>395</b>
<b>PARLIAMENTARY EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES</b>	
Conferences and Symposia	<b>400</b>
Birth Anniversaries of National Leaders	<b>404</b>
Parliamentary Delegation visiting India	<b>405</b>
Indian Parliamentary Delegation going Abroad	<b>405</b>
Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training	<b>406</b>
<b>PROCEDURAL MATTERS</b>	<b>408</b>
<b>PARLIAMENTARY AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS</b>	<b>416</b>
<b>DOCUMENTS OF CONSTITUTIONAL AND PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST</b>	<b>422</b>
<b>SESSIONAL REVIEW</b>	
Lok Sabha	<b>431</b>
Rajya Sabha	<b>443</b>
State Legislatures	<b>461</b>
<b>RECENT LITERATURE OF PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST</b>	<b>467</b>



**APPENDICES**

I. Statement showing the work transacted during the Seventh Session of the Thirteenth Lok Sabha	472
II. Statement showing the work transacted during the One Hundred and Ninety-third Session of the Rajya Sabha	476
III. Statement showing the activities of the Legislatures of the States and Union territories during the period 1 July to 30 September 2001	481
IV. List of Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament and assented to by the President during the period 1 July to 30 September 2001	487
V. List of Bills passed by the Legislatures of the States and the Union territories during the period 1 July to 30 September 2001	489
VI. Ordinances promulgated by the Union and State Governments during the period 1 July to 30 September 2001	495
VII. Party Position in the Lok Sabha, the Rajya Sabha and the Legislatures of the States and the Union territories	501
INDEX TO VOL. XLVII	509

## EDITORIAL NOTE

---

Legislatures are the temples of democracy. Being the supreme representative institutions of the people, they are expected to function as role models for other institutions and organisations in the country and maintain high standards of work, discipline and decorum. Keeping in mind the imperative of smooth and orderly conduct of the proceedings of our legislative bodies, an All-India Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies, Chief Ministers, Ministers of Parliamentary Affairs and Leaders and Whips of Parties was convened in the Central Hall of Parliament House on 25 November 2001 to discuss 'Discipline and Decorum in Parliament and Legislatures of States and Union Territories in India'. The Conference was inaugurated by the Vice-President of India and Chairman, Rajya Sabha, Shri Krishan Kant. The Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi also addressed the Conference. The Leaders of Opposition in the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha, Presiding Officers of State Legislatures and Chief Ministers were among the dignitaries who attended the Conference and shared their views on this issue of vital concern to our polity. On this occasion, the Hindi version of the Fifth revised English edition of Kaul and Shakhder's *"Practice and Procedure of Parliament"*, brought out by the Lok Sabha Secretariat, was released by the Vice-President of India and Chairman, Rajya Sabha, Shri Krishan Kant. At the end, the Conference adopted a Resolution encompassing a Code of Conduct for members of all our legislative bodies. We include the texts of the addresses delivered by the dignitaries at the inaugural function of the Conference in this issue of the *Journal*.

As mentioned earlier, it is essential that our Parliament and State Legislatures function in a smooth and orderly manner. However, on several occasions, our legislative bodies could not transact the listed business because of continued interruptions resulting in frequent adjournments. This has been a matter of concern for all right thinking people. In his article titled, 'Is Parliamentary Democracy in Peril?', Shri C. Venkatesan, former Special Secretary, Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly, discusses the unfortunate consequences of disorderliness in the Legislatures. The author observes that such unparliamentary atmosphere casts doubts in some minds about the efficacy and suitability of the parliamentary system for our country. The author emphasizes that the Indian polity should take concrete

measures to contain this type of indecorous behaviour and to improve the functioning of legislative institutions through effective procedural methods that could be helpful in utilizing the valuable time of the House in a better way.

Besides, we carry in this issue our other regular features, viz., Parliamentary Events and Activities, Procedural Matters, Parliamentary and Constitutional Developments, Documents of Constitutional and Parliamentary Interest, Sessional Review, Recent Literature of Parliamentary Interest and Appendices. A Comprehensive Index to Vol. XLVII of 2001 also finds place in this issue.

It has been our constant endeavour to make the *Journal* more useful and informative. We would greatly welcome suggestions for its further improvement. We also welcome practice and problem-oriented non-partisan articles in the field of parliamentary procedures and institutions from members of Parliament and State Legislatures, scholars and others interested in the field of parliamentary political science.

—G.C. Malhotra  
*Editor*

# ADDRESSES AT THE INAUGURAL FUNCTION OF THE ALL-INDIA CONFERENCE OF PRESIDING OFFICERS, CHIEF MINISTERS, MINISTERS OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS, LEADERS AND WHIPS OF PARTIES ON “DISCIPLINE AND DECORUM IN PARLIAMENT AND LEGISLATURES OF STATE AND UNION TERRITORIES”

---

The All-India Conference of Presiding Officers, Chief Ministers, Ministers of Parliamentary Affairs, Leaders and Whips of Parties on “Discipline and Decorum in Parliament and Legislatures of States and Union Territories” was held in the Central Hall of Parliament House on 25 November 2001. The Conference was inaugurated by the Vice-President of India and Chairman, Rajya Sabha, Shri Krishan Kant. The Inaugural function was also addressed by the Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee, and the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi.

On this occasion the Hindi version of the Fifth revised edition of the book titled “Practice and Procedure of Parliament” by M.N. Kaul and S.L. Shukla was released by the Vice-President of India and Chairman, Rajya Sabha, Shri Krishan Kant.

The texts of the Addresses delivered by the dignitaries at the function are reproduced below.

—Editor

---

## ADDRESS BY THE SPEAKER, LOK SABHA, SHRI G.M.C. BALAYOGI

*Respected Upa-Rashtrapatiiji, Respected Pradhan Mantriji, Respected Leader of the Opposition in the Lok Sabha, Respected Leader of the Opposition in the Rajya Sabha, Respected Presiding Officers, Respected Chief Ministers, Respected Ministers, Respected Leaders of various Parties, Respected Whips, Respected Chairmen of the Committees of Privileges and Ethics, Respected Members of Parliament, Friends from Print and Electronic Media, Distinguished Guest, Ladies and Gentlemen :*

It is indeed a matter of great pleasure and honour for me to extend a hearty welcome to you all to this Conference. I am grateful to Respected Upa-Rashtrapatiiji for accepting our invitation to inaugurate and address this Conference. I am also thankful to Respected Pradhan

Mantriji for keenly associating with this important event. My thanks are also due to the Leaders of the Opposition in Parliament, my fellow Presiding Officers, Chief Ministers, Union Ministers, Ministers of Parliamentary Affairs, Leaders of various Parties and Groups, Whips, Chairmen of the Committees of Privileges and Ethics and Members of Parliament, who have, out of their concern over the issues, made it convenient to attend this day-long Conference to deliberate on a subject which has been agitating the minds of all those who want parliamentary democracy to thrive and flourish in our country.

Legislatures are the temples of democracy, through which we seek to serve the public weal. Being the supreme representative institutions of the people, they are expected to function as role models for other institutions and organisations in the country and maintain high standards of work, discipline and decorum. The credibility of a Legislature is intimately related to the role and conduct of its members. As people's representatives, they are expected to observe a very high standard of decorum, both inside and outside the Legislature, and help to maintain its sanctity. Unfortunately, in recent times, we have witnessed increasing incidents of indecorous behaviour by legislators, which tarnish the image of the institution.

The problem of indiscipline in our Legislatures has been a matter of concern for a long time. Over the years, though several guidelines and conventions have been developed to regulate the conduct of legislators, the situation has only worsened with each passing year.

Almost a decade back in September 1992, we had a similar Conference in this very Hall to deliberate on the subject of discipline and decorum in Legislatures. Some of those who attended that Conference are present amongst us today also. The Conference had unanimously adopted a Resolution which, among other things, stressed that with a view to preserving the democratic fabric and strengthening parliamentary institutions, it was necessary for the members to faithfully observe the rules of procedure.

We reiterated our commitment to preserve and enhance the prestige of Parliament at the Special Session held from 26 August to 1 September in 1997 to mark the Golden Jubilee of our country's Independence. We also called for continuous and proactive efforts for enhancing the freedom, authority and dignity of our representative institutions. The issue of discipline and decorum has also been discussed threadbare, time and again, at various Presiding Officers' Conferences. However, in spite of our concerns and commitments on this matter, we have not been able to achieve the desired results.

At the 64<sup>th</sup> Conference of Presiding Officers held at Chandigarh, June 2001, we had in-depth deliberations on the "Need to evolve a Code of Conduct for Legislators and Steps to contain frequent Adjournments of the Legislatures on account of Interruptions". It was unanimously decided there to convene a high-level Conference of Presiding Officers, Chief Ministers, Leaders of Opposition, other Leaders and Whips of Parties, Ministers of Parliamentary Affairs and others to discuss measures to effectively ensure discipline and decorum in Legislatures. We have assembled here today to give a sincere and honest thought to this matter and to find ways and means to create a conducive atmosphere for the healthy growth of parliamentary institutions in our country.

It is unfortunate that incidents of unruly behaviour are on the increase. May be, sometimes some members may nurse a feeling that they do not have sufficient opportunities to bring to light the grievances of the people at large. To some extent, I can see their viewpoint. But on the whole, there are several procedural devices available to them within the Rules of Procedure to raise matters agitating their minds. The Rules of Procedures are also modified, updated and revised from time to time, to provide maximum opportunities to members to participate in the proceedings. Yet, some members often flout the rules and resort to improper conduct like rushing to the Well of the House, tearing and throwing parliamentary papers, shouting slogans and using other unparliamentary means. We have to find out inadequacies, if any, in our system, in our endeavours of what has gone wrong with our values.

As you are all aware, a substantial part of the time of Parliament as well as that of State Legislatures is being wasted due to frequent adjournments on account of interruptions and disorderly scenes. I have certain facts and figures about the Lok Sabha, which I would like to share with you all. During the Twelfth Lok Sabha, out of 575 hours of the total time of the House, nearly 68 hours were frittered away by interruptions and adjournments. The situation has further worsened in the Thirteenth Lok Sabha. In the Monsoon Session of 2001, we lost nearly 29 hours of the total time of 174 hours and 30 minutes of the House. Earlier, in the Budget Session of 2001, we lost nearly 74 hours of the business time and for the first time in our parliamentary history, the Railway Budget was passed without any discussion due to continued disruptions. I am not blaming any particular section of the House for this. But, is it proper for us to conduct the business of the House in such a fashion? It is high time that we pondered over the way we practise, or rather fail to practise, parliamentary democracy.

I feel deeply concerned not only about the wastage of time of the House but also about the decrease in the number of sittings of Legislatures. Again, if we go by the statistics about the Lok Sabha, it is indeed disappointing. While the year 1956 recorded the highest number of sittings of 151, regrettably, it slumped to 77 in 1994; and the year 1999 recorded the lowest number of 51 sittings. Even if we leave aside the number considering that in 1999, the Thirteenth General Elections were held, the trend is disturbing. The position in many State Legislatures is even more lamentable. During the period 1993 to 1997, out of the 32 Legislatures, only 3 Legislatures had over 50 sittings on an annual average. Only 13 of them averaged between 30 and 50 sittings. Some of the Legislatures had even less than 10 sittings. These figures are indeed alarming.

It is not that we are not aware of this sorry state of affairs. The Presiding Officers have been deeply concerned with this disturbing situation. In 1998, a Committee of Presiding Officers was constituted to look into various aspects relating to procedural uniformity and better management of the time of the House. The Committee in its Report submitted at the 64<sup>th</sup> Conference of Presiding Officers held at Chandigarh in June 2001, had recommended that Legislatures having 100 or more than 100 members should have atleast 100 sittings in a year, while the Legislatures having less than 100 members should have a minimum of 60 sittings. The Committee has also recommended that more time should be made available for non-government business, as, with the changing political scenario, legislators have a very important and constructive role to play in the House.

The challenges of House management posed by the increase in the number of parties in the Legislatures constitute another aspect which needs to be pondered over. Earlier we used to have upto 5 or 6 parties in the Legislatures with one or two leading political parties. Today, there are as many as 41 political parties and groups in the Thirteenth Lok Sabha representing different ideologies and varying shades of opinion. The position is no different in the State Legislatures. While the larger parties demand that their share of time should be proportionate to their strength in the House, the smaller and even single-member parties also insist that they should be given adequate opportunities to place on record their views. We agree that the merit of the argument cannot be denied. At times, the ground reality is that larger parties consume most of the time of the House allocated for a specific issue and smaller and single-member parties, frustrated at being unable to speak, tend to create disturbances in the House to have, somehow, their say.

Undoubtedly, social and economic development is our prime concern. Even after more than fifty years of Independence, we still have a long way to go to ameliorate the conditions of the poor and the downtrodden. How much of our debate in legislatures is development-oriented? We need to ponder over. Time spent on transacting legislative business is showing a declining trend. With legislation becoming more and more technical, complicated and demanding, legislators need to work much harder to appreciate the issues involved and harmonise legislative proposals with the larger public good.

While on the one hand, there is a section of opinion that with the increase in the number of sittings of legislatures, there may not be sufficient business before the House, on the other hand, there is another point of view that members do not get sufficient opportunities and time to discuss social and economic subjects, Five Year Plans, etc. due to paucity of time. I am sure, increasing the number of sittings will substantially benefit the members by giving them more time to discuss issues which have taken a back seat in recent years and thereby ensure greater Executive accountability.

As an elected representative of the people, a member's status is an exalted one. While privileges are extended to members to enable them to perform their parliamentary duties unfettered, these privileges also entail certain obligations. Transparency in political and public life is a vital aspect of an effective democracy. Ethics has come to hold the attention of people more than ever before. The Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha have constituted Ethics Committees to evolve a code of conduct and other ethical norms for their members. The State Assemblies of Andhra Pradesh, Orissa, Himachal Pradesh and Jammu and Kashmir have also set up Ethics Committees. I understand many more State Legislatures are also in the process of constituting these Committees. The setting up of the Ethics Committee would undoubtedly enhance the levels of transparency and accountability in the functioning of our democratic institutions.

The orderly conduct of Legislature is conducive to the growth of democracy. To serve and survive legislatures must function effectively so as to instil faith and confidence among the people. This is possible only if they function smoothly and meaningfully in the larger interests of the people. The growing incidents of indiscipline being witnessed in recent times in our legislatures do not augur well for democracy. It is high time that we spent some time introspecting, individually as well as collectively, on the standards of our behaviour as legislators. The orderly conduct of proceedings requires a concerted and coor-



minated effort from the Presiding Officers and Leaders and Whips of all the Parties and Groups in the House. I call upon political parties to take the initiative in inculcating discipline among their members to conduct themselves in a dignified and decorous manner.

There is also an urgent need for imparting proper training to members, either by political parties themselves or through some other mechanism, to refresh their understanding *inter alia* of rules and procedures.

Friends, we have discussed the matter relating to the maintenance of discipline and decorum in our Legislatures earlier also at various fora and passed Resolutions to bring about a change in the state of affairs in our legislative bodies. I feel these endeavours have helped us considerably in understanding the problem. This Conference has been convened to deliberate on the matter further and take some concrete measures towards ensuring orderly conduct in the Legislatures. Let this high-level Conference send a message to the people of India, who are the real sovereign authority, that we all are seriously concerned about the falling standards of decorum and discipline in our Legislatures and that we are determined in our resolve and efforts to address the problem. Let us agree to define a Code of Conduct and to abide by it. This august assembly of all cross-sections of all Legislatures is the most appropriate forum to do so.

It is important to bear in mind that the strength of our democratic system depends on the smooth functioning of the three institutions of Government, namely the Parliament, the Executive and the Judiciary. If any one of these organs becomes slack with regard to its constitutionally designated functions, there is likely to be a vacuum. In order that the stability of the system is not jeopardised, attempts may sometimes be made by another organ to fill that vacuum. That may be adversely commented upon. We have, therefore, to function in a manner that the strength and vitality of our institutions is maintained and each one of them is able to perform its function as envisaged in our constitutional scheme.

Our endeavour should be to adopt a new perspective and a new orientation in conducting ourselves in the Legislatures. I am sure the deliberations of this Conference will be very fruitful and meaningful, and the ideas emerging out of this Conference would help in restoring the dignity and prestige of our representative institutions.

Friends, there is no alternative to parliamentary democracy in our country. Effectiveness of this mechanism of governance is directly

related to the effective functioning of Parliamentary institutions. It is our duty to strengthen these institutions.

I sincerely hope that this Conference will make a concrete and meaningful contribution in that direction.

Thank you.

**ADDRESS BY THE PRIME MINISTER OF INDIA,  
SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE**

*Honourable Vice-President, Speaker, Lok Sabha, Ladies and Gentlemen :*

I am grateful to both Honourable Speaker, Lok Sabha and Honourable Chairman, Rajya Sabha for convening this Conference and I congratulate them for the same. India is the largest democratic country in the world, both population-wise and traditions-wise. We have had the tradition of solving various issues through debates and discussions. The Republic had its origin here and the *Samitis* were constituted here and it was, therefore, but natural for us to opt for a parliamentary system of democracy during the struggle for independence and after achieving independence.

For a period of twenty years, our Parliament and the State Legislatures functioned smoothly as per rules and within the parameters of decorum. But later on, violation of rules and *dharnas* started taking place. When *dharnas* became a routine, a course of action was decided upon; however, the situation worsened further. Indecorous scenes of slogan shouting and rushing to the Well of the House became quite frequent. And after each of such incidents, we used to sit together and ponder over as to what steps should be taken in this regard. In the meanwhile, there was another development. The President addresses Parliament and Governors address the State Legislatures before the commencement of the First Session of the year. The solemnity and dignity of such occasions were not observed, and a trend of interruptions during the Address of the President and the Governors started. Such acts virtually lowered the dignity of Parliament and the State Legislatures and were not in consonance with the dignity of the President and the Governors. But this practice continued. After every such incident, meetings were held, views were exchanged and decisions were taken, but those decisions were not implemented. It was only for a few days that we followed those decisions and after sometime we were back to square one.

I have been associated with the Parliament since 1957. I never

felt the need of shouting slogans. Similarly, there has never been an occasion, when I had to raise an issue in an indisciplined manner. Parliament is a forum for exchanging views. It is the supreme democratic institution. Therefore, all the political parties should evolve a Code of Conduct and ensure the strict compliance of the same for the smooth and proper functioning of Parliament in accordance with the rules.

Of late, there has been a slight change in the situation in Parliament. In the State Legislatures, there have been such incidents which do not strengthen parliamentary democracy. There is no question of blaming any particular party for that. It is the responsibility of the majority party to govern and take all others into confidence. The Opposition should play a constructive role. The Opposition should be given opportunity to put forth its views. Parliament reflects the wishes and aspirations of the masses. One of the important task of Parliament is to enact legislations. However, keeping in view the specific scenario prevailing in the country, it is imperative that members of the Opposition and also those from the ruling party, if required, should have full opportunity to express their views. However, members should express their views within the parameters of dignity and decorum of the House. Is it necessary to resort to unseemly conduct and frequent interruptions during the Addresses of Honourable President and Governors to Parliament and State Legislatures? Is it necessary to seek the suspension of the 'Question Hour' time and again? The 'Question Hour' could be suspended if there are any grave issues and circumstances and there is full consensus to suspend the 'Question Hour'. The Opposition has to do it, but can't they raise such issues after the 'Question Hour'? Is it necessary to seek suspension of the 'Question Hour' repeatedly and to interrupt the proceedings during the 'Question Hour' and if it is not suspended then to rush to the Well of the House and to see that ultimately the House is adjourned? I would not like to go into the details as to how much precious time was wasted and to what extent the dignity of the House was lowered. However, all the political parties have to decide and ensure that the Parliament and the State Legislatures function uninterruptedly and the Presiding Officers have to be extended full support to ensure the smooth functioning of the Parliament and the State Legislatures. As I have already stated, adequate time should be given for debate, but the debate should take place in a disciplined manner. No ugly scenes should be created during the debates as it does not strengthen our democracy, and it creates a sense of disrespect among the people about our representative institutions.



विधानमंडली में अनुशासन तथा शान्ति" विषय पर  
अखिल भारतीय सम्मेलन  
नई दिल्ली, 25 नवम्बर 2001

ALL INDIA CONFERENCE ON  
"DISCIPLINE AND DECORUM IN PARLIAMENT AND  
LEGISLATURES OF STATES AND UNION TERRITORIES"  
NEW DELHI, 25 NOVEMBER 2001



The Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee addressing the conference

“संसद तथा राज्यों एवं संघ राज्य क्षेत्रों के  
विधानमंडलों में अनुशासन तथा शालीनता” विषय पर  
अखिल भारतीय सम्मेलन  
नई दिल्ली, 25 नवम्बर 2001

ALL INDIA CONFERENCE ON  
“DISCIPLINE AND DECORUM IN PARLIAMENT AND  
LEGISLATURES OF STATES AND UNION TERRITORIES”  
NEW DELHI, 25 NOVEMBER 2001

श्री कृष्ण कान्त, भारत के  
विधायक, राज्यासभा के  
उप-सभापति, 25 नवंबर 2001

ALL INDIA CONFERENCE OF  
LEGISLATURES AND DELEGATES OF  
LEGISLATURES OF STATES AND UNION TERRITORIES  
NEW DELHI, 25 NOVEMBER 2001



Shri Krishan Kant, Vice-President of India and Chairman, Rajya Sabha releasing the book "Practice and Procedure of Parliament" in Hindi in the Central Hall, Parliament House on 25 November 2001

As far as the masses are concerned, they have reposed their faith in the democracy. The parliamentary system of democracy is the very basis of our Constitution. Since ours is a multi-party democracy, governments will change, coalition governments will be formed and, as such, it becomes all the more necessary that all the political parties make a constant review of their roles and responsibilities and strive together to add to the dignity of our democracy, people's faith in the representative institutions and conduct themselves as a role model for our people.

As I have already mentioned, no untoward incidents occurred during the first twenty years. Was it because there was one party rule or was it because we had faith in democracy and firmly believed in the fundamental principle that in a parliamentary democracy the majority party will rule and the Opposition will have the full opportunity to put forth their views? The problem begins when propriety is breached. People lose their faith in the democratic institutions. If Parliament and the State Legislatures are not conducted in a disciplined and dignified manner, it sets a bad example before the country. A sense of disregard is created for parliamentary democracy. This must be stopped. The erosion of democratic values should be stopped. This requires the cooperation of all, including members of the Treasury Benches and the Opposition. Some political party may be in power in one place and at the same time it may be in the Opposition in another place. This sort of a situation has increased the responsibility of parties. It also calls for even more restraint. What is required is to create such condition as would enable the parliamentary democracy to function successfully, so that the faith of the people in the system remains steadfast, rather grows further. Since we have ushered in the age of coalition governments, I would say that the coalition governments have this added responsibility. It is a good thing if a single party gains majority in elections in the entire country. All the political parties are striving for it. However, the ground reality is an indicator calling upon us that we should learn to work together. A coalition government has a duty of its own which must not be lost sight. Of course, there is a political race now-a-days; however, every care should be taken not to allow any violation of the dignity and the rules amidst the rush. Several political parties are making all-out efforts to gain popularity and implement their programmes on the basis of their ideologies within the framework of parliamentary democracy. This is but natural and essential. Nevertheless, care must be taken that the cardinal values of parliamentary democracy are not damaged. If all political parties extend their cooperation and support in this direction, I believe,



then the task, though difficult, is not impossible to be accomplished. Such conferences and important decisions taken therein are definitely talked about later, but they are hardly implemented in the State Legislatures and the Parliament in a proper way. This, at times, gives an impression that we are just doing a formality. What is required is to come forward and implement them in reality.

Mr. Speaker, Sir, you have taken an initiative in this direction and there has been an improvement in the functioning and conduct of business in the House in the last few days. We hope that the same will happen in the State Legislatures too. Political parties are being put to test today. The world considers us to be the largest democracy on earth. But at the same time, they are not ready to accept that we have been successful in solving our problems through that system of democracy. There will be political differences; it is but natural, but how should it be manifested—herein comes the question of propriety in a parliamentary democracy. During the elections, a large number of people cast their votes. Now, when democracy has percolated to the Panchayat level, even a person living in a village watches as to how the proceedings of Parliament are being conducted and how members of the State Legislatures are behaving. Therefore, we have to act as a role model for them. We have to set an example for them and the responsibility in this regard lies on every political party and all the more so on the ruling party as it has to be more tolerant. But, it is also the responsibility of the Opposition not to take recourse to such steps which could harm the democratic values. I believe we shall be able to take a decision during the course of this Conference and whatever decisions we take here will be implemented in letter and spirit. I hope that all parties will cooperate in this endeavour. The ruling party should live upto its responsibilities and the Opposition also should shoulder its responsibilities. There is a need to build such an environment and I am confident that this Conference will help us in achieving this goal.

Thank you very much.

**ADDRESS BY THE VICE-PRESIDENT OF INDIA AND  
CHAIRMAN, RAJYA SABHA, SHRI KRISHAN KANT**

*Honourable Prime Minister, Shri Vajpayee, Honourable Speaker, Shri Balayogi, Leader of the Opposition, Lok Sabha, Smt. Sonia Gandhi, Leader of the Opposition, Rajya Sabha, Dr. Manmohan Singh, Presiding Officers, Chief Ministers, Ministers, Leaders and Whips of different parties in Parliament and State Legislatures, Honourable Members of Parliament :*        -

I feel honoured to inaugurate this Conference on Discipline and Decorum in Parliament and State Legislatures. A similar Conference was held in 1992 with the same theme. That after nine years, it has been found necessary to convene another Conference with the participation of all those who are involved in managing parliamentary and legislative institutions, is in itself a statement of purpose. It is an acknowledgment that our parliamentary system is under stress. It needs to be urgently resuscitated and revitalised. The urge for action, however, must come from within—from our better sense, our ethical judgments, our genuine concern for the system we have so painstakingly built over the last half century, and which has placed us in the forefront of modern democracies. A time has come, for all of us, to ask the question: have we proved worthy of the system we have given to ourselves? Some parts of the answer to this question may make us uneasy. Wittingly or unwittingly, we have dealt hefty blows to the system, rudely tried to bend it to our partisan will, polluted the wellsprings of its life energy and, offended its sanctity; and yet, the system has tenaciously stood its ground—because of us, or in spite of us, is another matter. Great philosophers and commentators on the functioning of democratic institutions cautioned against threats to democracy from myriad sources such as democratic despotism, majority tyranny, judicial despotism, etc. But even they could hardly imagine a new category of threat to democratic institutions—the subversion of these institutions by the very people who are its parts and, by implication, its protagonists.

In India, both before and after the promulgation of our Constitution, there were raging debates on whether parliamentary system was suited to India, and, also whether India was suited to the parliamentary system. Some wondered that the objective conditions for success of Westminster form of parliamentary government were conspicuously absent in India. But India was determined to prove all the sceptics wrong.

For a major part of the life of our Parliament and State Legislatures in independent India, we set high standards of managing these sophisticated institutions. The Indian Parliament and great parliamentarians like Pandit Nehru, Sardar Patel, Maulana Azad, Dr. B.R. Ambedkar, Acharya Kripalani, Prof. Hiren Mukherjee, Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee, Feroze Gandhi, Govind Ballabh Pant, Nath Pai, H. V. Kamath, to name a few, were applauded by visiting parliamentary delegations and observers for sheer excellence.

So, what has happened in the last few years that our parliamen-

tary institutions have slipped from the commanding heights over which they once stood? Why are these hallowed institutions the subject of scathing attack from diverse quarters? Why is there an impression gaining ground that the Parliament and the Legislatures are letting down the Indian people? Why our actions in the Parliament and the State Legislatures are frequently at variance with the expectations of the Indian people?

In the last over four years that I have had the privilege of presiding over the Rajya Sabha, there have been several occasions when members of both Houses of Parliament agreed on certain norms of behaviour and conduct. There were resolutions that the Question Hour would remain inviolate except under the rarest of circumstances. Members readily agreed to a variety of norms to regulate the working of the Parliament in order to improve efficiency and increase legislative business. Political parties and individual members of Parliament readily subject themselves to appropriating the time and the word-limit on the speeches to be made. A very high level of tolerance and accommodation is shown to the leaders, both of the Treasury Benches as well as the Opposition. Discussions on important public issues take place under specific rules of business and, with modest variations, adhere to the time allotted. I must also say that political parties and members of Parliament show an exceptional level of respect and deference to the Chair. The fact that the cases of expulsion of members for indecorous behaviour are few and far between, reflects the bond between the members and the Chair. Yet, the instances of disruption of proceedings of the House, invasion of the Well, indecorous behaviour and even physical violence keep multiplying. Precious legislative time is lost and the output keeps steadily declining. Time allotted for important debates and discussions is often truncated by frequent disruptions. Legislative hours lost in the Rajya Sabha in the decade 1981-1991, was 3.59 per cent of the total time, which jumped to 10.31 per cent in the decade 1991-2001. The percentage of time lost due to disruption in the Tenth Lok Sabha was only 9.95 per cent, while the percentage for only a part of the Thirteenth Lok Sabha is 28.10 per cent. More important than the story these statistics tell are the impressions they convey, an unedifying picture of a Legislature plunged in frequent turmoil.

Two aspects, which are of relatively recent development, must receive our collective attention. One is the tendency to rush to the Well and the other is to drown the House in noise to stall its proceedings.

Parliaments are essentially political institutions and it would be

naive to believe that they could be insulated from politics. Political parties have every right to use the Parliament or the Legislatures as national transmission towers from where to let the people know what the parties are doing for the people and how are these parties promoting the mandate they receive. Problem arises when the Parliament and the Legislatures become part of the tactics and strategies of political parties to gain specific advantages. It is this attitude which promotes the tendency to look upon the Parliament and the Legislatures as some sort of theatres and, as we all know, unregulated theatres, soon descend to become the theatres of the absurd.

There were times in our country when the national politics, the Parliament and the Legislatures created their own heroes. These were men and women of great substance, stature, probity and character. Today, Parliament and Legislatures create a new breed of heroes—the Well-rushing heroes, who hope to be elevated to instant national fame, straight from the Well of the House. The Well is the functional area reserved for the Presiding Officer, invading which is an insult and an affront to him and, by implication, to the whole House. Every member of the Parliament or the Legislature knows this fact very well.

Then, why do members feel so helpless against their own better judgments? Why do they indulge in acts, which they will disapprove in their own children? Are these the symptoms of a declining sense of values in Indian politics only or are we witnessing a new brand of public morality?

Alex de Tocqueville had warned, and I am quoting: "In the heat of the struggle, each partisan driver beyond the natural limits of his own views by the views and the excesses of his adversaries, loses sight of the very aim he was pursuing and uses influences which ill-correspond to his real feelings and his secret instincts. Here arises the strange confusion we are forced to witness". A time has come to assess how far this 'strange confusion' contributes to the decline of the Parliament.

It was believed that telecasting and broadcasting of parliamentary and legislative proceedings could lead to an improvement in the behaviour of the members. It would now appear that far from improving good conduct, telecasting seems to have promoted a tendency towards dramatic acts, which frequently results in the disruption of proceedings. There is a tendency to extravagance of language and action. Ivor Jennings noted in his commentary on the British Parliament, "Extravagances are of course better news than plain common sense, just as death is not important unless it is a tragedy."

A budding politician was advised by his senior that in the information age every one must learn to live by the rules set by the media, and the first rule was, "always be on the look out to break the rules": In the context of the Parliament, the media loves nothing more than a good disturbance. Five minutes of disturbance in the House may earn you immortality on the next morning's newspapers, while an hour-long learned peroration may not merit even a single line.

Is the anti-hero our new role-model? It shall be a sad day for our country if the Parliament and the Legislatures fail to set the standards for the behaviour, the conduct and the values of our society. The anti-hero can never be a model for any society. Ours is the country which gave the axiom of 'restraint in power and decorum in the assembly'. (सभा में सभ्यता और सत्ता में संयम) We seem to violate this dictum with impunity. The values have a cascading effect and influence the minds and the behaviour of the people. Each time the Parliament and the Legislatures are plunged in anarchic chaos, the edifice of democracy is a little weakened.

The Presiding Officers are frequently criticised for not using their powers to check and discipline errant members and recalcitrant parties and groups. Parliament works best when there is cooperation between the treasury benches and the Opposition with the Presiding Officers. If the Presiding Officer is required to frequently take punitive action against members and groups, he or she will weaken his or her arbitral authority and expose himself or herself to debilitating criticism. He, therefore, has to perform a delicate balancing act. The overriding purpose for him or her should be the efficient and the harmonious functioning of the House rather than an ambition to be the dispenser of King Solomon's justice. His or her choices are never optimal and his or her tasks never easy. There is a convention still extant in the British Parliament, that the member of Parliament, who is elected Speaker is ritually pulled to his or her chair, signifying that he or she is reluctant to occupy it. In the medieval times, Speakers often found themselves on the wrong side of the sovereign and ended up experiencing the sharp blade of the executioner on their necks. Modern Speakers are mercifully spared the sword, but they are often seared with other forms of agony, one of which is to helplessly watch the House dissolve in chaos.

The answer to the problem of offence to the proceedings of the Parliament cannot be found in the increased powers of the Presiding Officers. It has to come from the collective resolve of the members of Parliament and the legislators.

It shall be too utopian to surmise that the improved functioning of the Parliament can only be a sequel to the improvement in the quality of the political culture in this country, and this is a legitimate expectation. The battle for restoring decorum in the Parliament and the Legislatures is to be fought at two levels – one level is putting in place cast-iron rules about what a member or a party can or cannot do in the Parliament. The second level is voluntary action on the part of the members of the Parliament and the Legislatures. In my understanding, voluntary action by the members is a superior form of norm-compliance than enforcement of strict rules. It is voluntary action which lends meaning and strength to the rules. We may formulate a thousand great rules, but they will never become effective if there remains a hiatus between the individual inclinations and the conduct of the members on the one hand and, the rules, on the other.

Several efforts have already been made, some of which were sequel to deliberations in the Presiding Officers' Conferences and voluntary action by leaders in Parliament and Legislatures. But the wide gulf between professed goals and actual conduct never seems to be bridged.

Several recipes for preventing interruptions to parliamentary proceedings and loss of legislative time have been suggested and even tried. These include setting up of Department-Related Committees, strengthening the Ethics Committee, evolving a Code of Conduct for all political parties, training and education of the members and the like. I have no doubt that when sincerely applied and used, these instrumentalities will, at least partly, eliminate the factors which cause disruption of the House. But, to expect these to improve the level of decorum in the Houses may not be wholly realistic. Most disruptions of the House occur in spite of the rules to the contrary. If I may say so, sometimes presence of these rules provokes the urge to break them.

I am not advocating that our Legislatures should exhibit the peace of the grave. These institutions are not meant to be 'quiet places'. How can a forum where great issues of the nation and the world are discussed and, where alternative visions of national reconstruction are articulated, be a 'quiet place'? But, these should not also become places where anarchy rules. Great institutions of the state are established for preventing anarchy. They cannot allow themselves to become its victims.

I am all for members expressing themselves forcefully and even passionately, but they must stop short of becoming, boisterous, libellous

and personal. They should remain mindful about keeping inviolate the institutions of the House, which are germane to its smooth and efficient functioning. I readily agree that "obstruction is an ordinary part of parliamentary procedure". It should be remembered, however, that such obstruction cannot be construed to mean physical obstruction. It can only be confined to the realm of intelligent use of rules and procedures and 'points of order', discomfiting the government with hard but well argued criticism; but it should not and, cannot be, construed to sanction ruckus behaviour, anarchy, invasion of the Well of the House and violence.

Improvement in the functional efficiency of the Parliament is an on-going process to which every generation makes its own contribution. I have been personal witness to how the Government and the Opposition cooperate to make the House function efficiently and productively. Our effort should be directed at enlarging the common space for this cooperation and understanding.

We must remember that the spectacle of anarchy which we create in Parliament and in the Legislatures, profoundly influences the people in general, especially our young men, and women in particular. The parliamentary institutions act as the wellsprings of national and societal values. What you enact in Parliament, today, shall be enacted and replayed over and over again, in towns and villages, factories and farms, schools and colleges and in every home and family. The life conditions in our times prompt men and women to seek examples, not leaders. If we wish to become leaders – and as the people's representatives that is a very legitimate expectation, we must speak to the people through our personal example: an example of character, decorum, order, dignity, tolerance and accommodation.

John Stuart Mill, that great votary of representative government, believed that democratic government promoted a higher form of national character. But, he cautioned that there must be active effort to promote that character. "The test of real vigorous thinking", Mill wrote, "the thinking to ascertain truth, instead of dreaming dreams, is a successful application to practice".

In this assembly today, it should be our effort to ensure that all our collective, constructive perceptions are translated into visible and enduring practices. That is our challenge.

You have my good wishes for your endeavours.

## IS PARLIAMENTARY DEMOCRACY IN PERIL?

C. VENKATESAN

---

Is parliamentary democracy, acclaimed as the best available system in the world for resolving disputes through debates and arriving at decisions through discussions, in peril in India? The disorderliness witnessed during the 2001 Budget Session of Parliament, passing the Railway Budget without any debate and passing the General Budget with minimum discussion lasting a few hours, cast doubts in some minds about the efficacy and suitability of the system for our country.

Parliament, the supreme deliberative organ in the country and the sole representative of public will and sovereignty of one billion people, had been stalled continuously for days together. It could not perform any of its important duties and constitutionally assigned work due to the continuous hurdles created by some of its own members. The extent of disorderly behaviour of some members forced the Speaker of Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi to express his anger and anguish over the events, openly. The situation in several State Legislatures is also a matter of serious concern. For example, in the Gujarat Legislative Assembly, the Speaker, Shri Dhirubhai Swaroopchand Shah, sat on a day-long fast on 30 March 2001 to restore parliamentary values and to express his displeasure over the failure of the Legislature to focus attention on the earthquake that devastated Gujarat and the drought conditions in the State.

In recent years, it has become increasingly difficult for Presiding Officers to conduct the business of the House in a dignified manner, as discipline, decency and decorum have been persistently violated by some members. Occupying the well of the House even before the Presiding Officer takes his seat has become a common practice among some members. No doubt, dissent and protest are an integral part of democracy. But those members who disrupt the proceedings should realize that by doing so, they are defeating the very purpose of the Legislature for which it has been constituted. Every member has the fullest liberty and every right to express his viewpoint and



his disagreement on any matter or the policy being pursued by the Government. But what is to be borne in mind is the fact that when one intends to exercise his right to the fullest extent, he must accept the right of others too to do the same. The success of parliamentary democracy depends on this principle of tolerance and acceptance of dignified dissent. As has been rightly remarked by Dadasaheb Mavalankar, the first Speaker of Lok Sabha, "To the extent to which persons holding different points of view or ideologies exhibit the qualities of tolerance, 'give and take', and make an effort to understand the differing points of view, to that extent only, the parliamentary government stands the chance of being successful".

The very essence of parliamentary democracy is that the arguments must be heard first and then they have to be answered. But, unfortunately some of our elected representatives tend to overlook this cardinal principle of democracy, and in the process bring Parliament and the Legislatures to a grinding halt frequently, thus paralyzing the functioning of the Houses.

However serious the issue may be, it is unfair on the part of any member to persistently defy the Chair and create disorder in the House. Shouting of slogans, rushing into the well of the House, tearing and throwing out papers, disrupting the proceedings on one pretext or the other, etc. have happened at one time or other in most Legislatures. The disruption of parliamentary work by a few members indicates that indiscipline continues to plague our representative bodies. Needless to say, there must be an end to it. One must ascertain the reasons and find long lasting solutions to this problem, which is slowly, but gradually, eating into the very foundations of our parliamentary democracy.

*Loss of valuable time and money:* Due to the disruptions and interruptions caused by some members, the House is losing its most valuable time. Recent experience shows that the unparliamentary atmosphere, surcharged with political emotions, is engulfing even the most important function of Parliament, *i.e.* passing of the Budget after proper discussion and debate. In 1997, the Budget of the Deve Gowda Government could not go through the natural process as there was a sudden change of political equations. Again, in 1999, the Budget Session was hurriedly concluded under similar circumstances. Once again, in 2001, no full-fledged discussion on the Budget could be held in the wake of the 'Tehelka' episode. Reasons may vary from time to time, but the result is the same, which is that our Parliament could not devote enough time to pass the Budget. It is the most worrying factor for any

person who considers the concept of parliamentary democracy dear to his heart.

*Golden past:* If one goes into the annals of the history of Indian Parliament, one finds many golden chapters. stalwarts like Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee, A.K. Gopalan, Acharya J.B. Kripalani, Dr. Rammanohar Lohia, Acharya N.G. Ranga, S.A. Dange, Feroze Gandhi, Bhupesh Gupta and Prof. Madhu Dandavate enriched parliamentary debates by their exemplary behaviour. They kept the Government and the Treasury Benches on their toes all the time by their power of argument and reasoning. On the Government side, the then Prime Minister Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru was always eager to hear the suggestions made by Opposition members. During those days there were hardly any incidents when the Treasury Benches were reluctant to take note of the points raised by the other side. In 1951, when the 'Mudgal Case' was brought to the notice of Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, he himself took the initiative to refer the matter for an enquiry and later to move the resolution for the expulsion of Shri Mudgal from Parliament, though the latter belonged to his own Congress Party. In 1957, when Feroze Gandhi brought the LIC Scandal to light, the Government took necessary steps immediately.

The spirit of the freedom movement, the members' educational background with many of them having been abroad for higher studies, the then socio-political ethos and values, etc. might have been the major factors that contributed for such exemplary standards of parliamentary behaviour. Now, we are all in a different world, with fast changing values and ethos. Even the responsibilities and duties of legislators have undergone enormous changes. Legislative bodies cannot anymore afford to simply stick to the duty of enacting laws. They are necessarily performing so many other functions, which were hitherto unknown to law-making institutions. The ever-expanding field of information technology has also brought tremendous changes in eliciting information on any subject from any corner of the world in no time. Naturally, all these developments will have their own share in putting pressure on peoples' representatives. In a bid to prove themselves as more responsive and champions of the public cause, members may resort to new methods just to catch the eye of the House or the media, so that they could claim before their constituents that they had tried hard to focus the attention of the House on issues of concern to them.

The unfortunate part of this scenario is that it is all being done at the cost of public money. The ever rising cost of conducting a Parliament Session or a Session of a State Legislature clearly indi-

cates as to how much of public money is being lost due to continuous disruptions in Parliament and other Legislative Bodies. Parliamentary democracy, which is supposed to ensure accountability in spending the public money, stands to suffer in the process. The hopes and aspirations of millions of people for ventilating their grievances through their representatives in the Legislative Bodies get belied. The redressal of public issues may go beyond their reach if the Legislative Bodies are not able to perform their functions in the desired manner. It is high time that the Indian polity took concrete measures to contain this type of indecorous behaviour and to improve the functioning of legislative institutions through more effective procedural methods that could be helpful in utilizing the valuable time of the House in a better way.

Acknowledging the gravity of the situation and the seriousness of the problem, the then Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi took various steps to confront this challenge. The Ethics Committee of the Lok Sabha, constituted in May 2000, looks into the moral and ethical conduct of the members; it also examines the cases referred to it with reference to ethical and other misconduct of the members. Under Shri Balayogi's initiative, the 64<sup>th</sup> Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India, held in Chandigarh in June 2001, also discussed the subject 'Need to Evolve a Code of Conduct for legislators and steps to contain frequent adjournment of the Legislatures on account of interruptions/disturbances'.

As per the consensus at this Conference, it was decided to convene an All India Conference of Presiding Officers, Chief Ministers, Ministers of Parliamentary Affairs, Leaders and Whips of Parties to deliberate on all these matters. Subsequently, a high-level Committee was constituted to consider and evolve a Code of Conduct for members. The 34-member Committee, headed by the Deputy Speaker of Lok Sabha, Shri P.M. Sayeed, had several veteran parliamentarians and Presiding Officers of several State Legislatures on its membership. The 'All India Conference of Presiding Officers, Chief Ministers, Ministers of Parliamentary Affairs, Leaders and Whips of Parties' on 'Discipline and Decorum in Parliament and Legislatures of States and Union territories' which was held in the Central Hall of Parliament House on 25 November 2001, adopted a Resolution encompassing a Code of Conduct as recommended by the high level Committee headed by Shri P.M. Sayeed.

Needless to say, parliamentarians and legislators are the best judges and doctors to diagnose the root cause and to suggest the remedial measures against the menace of parliamentary indiscipline. A broad

consciousness should be brought in among all the legislators about the necessity for such a code of conduct for members. It may also be wise to conduct a nation wide debate over the contents of the Code of Conduct. With the help of the electronic and print media, strong public opinion must be built up in favour of the Code of Conduct. Eventually, in a democracy, it is the public opinion that shall prevail.

We must also realize that absolute discipline cannot be brought in a single day. It requires a lot of patience and continuous effort and co-operation from all the people concerned. As pointed out once in the Lok Sabha by our first Prime Minister, Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru, "Parliamentary democracy demands many virtues. It demands, of course, ability. It demands a certain devotion to work as every work does. But it demands also a large measure of co-operation, of self-discipline, of restraint. It is obvious that a House like this cannot perform any functions without the spirit of co-operation, without a large measure of restraint and self-discipline in each member and in each group."

Our experience in parliamentary democracy in its modern sense is only of fifty years. There are bound to be some hindrances and in our long journey to the goal of an ideal democracy. Wise people will introspect and rectify the mistakes on their way to the goal without any deviation from the right path. Let us hope that our learned Speakers and wise parliamentarians will scrupulously follow the Code of Conduct as adopted by the All India Conference of Presiding Officers, Chief Ministers, Ministers of Parliamentary Affairs, Leaders and Whips of Parties. Such an endeavour on the part of our elected representatives will indeed pave the way for the smooth functioning of our Legislative Bodies which, in turn, will help to further strengthen our parliamentary polity.

## PARLIAMENTARY EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES

---

### CONFERENCES AND SYMPOSIA

*Parliamentary Meeting on the occasion of the 3<sup>rd</sup> UN Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance:* A Parliamentary Meeting was organized by the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) with the support of the National Assembly of South Africa alongside the 3<sup>rd</sup> UN Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance held in Durban, South Africa on 2 September 2001. An Indian Parliamentary Delegation led by Shri P.K. Bansal, MP, attended the Meeting. The other members of the Delegation were: Sarvashri Thawar Chand Gehlot, Ram Sajivan, Kunwar Akhilesh Singh and Dr. M. Jagannath, all members of Parliament. Shri Ram Autar Ram, Joint Secretary, Lok Sabha Secretariat, was the Secretary to the Delegation.

The one-day Meeting titled "Action of Parliaments and their Members in the fight against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance" mainly held Panel discussions on the following three subjects:

- (i) The Tension between Freedom of Speech and Incitement to Hatred;
- (ii) Providing Adequate Protection to Migrants; and
- (iii) Special Measures to Ensure Equality, including Affirmative Action.

*106<sup>th</sup> Inter-Parliamentary Conference:* The 106<sup>th</sup> Inter-Parliamentary Conference was held in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso from 9 to 14 September 2001. The Indian Delegation to the Conference was led by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi. The other members of the Delegation were: Sarvashri Ratilal Kalidas Varma, Ramesh Chennithala, Anantray Devshanker Dave, V. Vetriselvan, Capt. Jai Narain Prasad Nishad, Smt. D.M. Vijaya Kumari, all members of Parliament, and the Secretaries-General, respectively, of the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha, Shri G.C. Malhotra and Shri R.C. Tripathi. Shri Harnam Singh, Joint Secretary, Lok Sabha Secretariat, was the Secretary to the Delegation.

The Conference mainly discussed and adopted Resolutions on the following subjects:

- (i) Protecting and Caring for Children, the Driving Force for Future Society;
- (ii) Urgent Action to Combat HIV/AIDS and other Pandemics which Seriously Endanger Public Health, and Economic, Social and Political Development and Threaten the very Survival of many Nations;
- (iii) Contribution of Parliamentarians to Dealing with Continuing Tragic Situation in the Occupied Arab Territories, to the Provision of International Observers, and to the Protection of the Arab Palestinian People, specially Unarmed Civilians; (adapted as Supplementary Item); and
- (iv) Condemnation of the Terrorist Attacks of 11 September 2001, on USA.

Shri Ramesh Chennithala, member, represented India on the Drafting Committee for the Supplementary Item.

Besides, the Conference held the General Debate on the political, economic and social situation in the world.

*Fifth North-East Region Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference:* The Fifth North-East Region Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference was organised by the Sikkim CPA Branch at Gangtok from 21 to 25 May 2001. The Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi inaugurated the Conference on 22 May 2001 in the Chamber of the Sikkim Legislative Assembly. The Chief Minister of Sikkim, Shri Pawan Kumar Chamling; the Speaker, Nagaland Legislative Assembly and Chairman of the North East Region CPA, Shri Z. Lohe; and the Speaker, Sikkim Legislative Assembly, Smt. Kalawati Subba, addressed the delegates on the occasion. In all, twenty-six delegates from six Branches of the Region attended the Conference. During the Conference, the Delegates discussed the topic "Parliamentary Democracy-in Retrospect and Prospect."

*Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Asia Region of the CPA:* The Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Asia Region of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association was held in New Delhi on 22 August 2001 to select the theme and the subjects for the Second Regional Conference of the CPA Branches in Asia Region which was scheduled to be held in Colombo, Sri Lanka from 13 to 19 October 2001. The Speaker, Lok Sabha, and the Chairman of the

Executive Committee of the Asia Region of the CPA, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi presided over the Meeting.

The Speaker, Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly, Shri Keshari Nath Tripathi and the Deputy Speaker, Parliament of Sri Lanka, Maj. Gen. Sarath Munasinghe, both members of the CPA Asia Region Executive Committee, attended the Meeting. The Secretary-General Lok Sabha and Regional Secretary Asia Region, Shri G.C. Malhotra, also attended the Meeting.

The Committee considered and selected the following Theme and subjects for the Plenary and Panel Sessions of the Second Regional Conference which was scheduled to be held in Colombo: *Theme:* Strengthening Parliamentary Democracy in the Asia Region; *Subjects for the Panel Sessions:* Strengthening the Committee System in Asian Parliaments for Greater Executive Accountability to the Legislature; Parliamentary Sovereignty and Judicial Independence; Women's Participation in Politics and their Contribution to Human Development; Population Explosion and its Control; and the CPA and the Commonwealth.

*47<sup>th</sup> Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference:* The 47<sup>th</sup> Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference was held in Melbourne and Canberra, Australia from 4 to 14 September 2001. The Indian Parliamentary Delegation to the Conference was led by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi. Besides, the Delegation consisted of the Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri P.M. Sayeed, Shri Satish Pradhan, Smt. Margaret Alva, Smt. Renuka Chowdhury, Smt. Ambika Soni, and Dr.(Smt.) Beatrix D'Souza, all members of Parliament. The Secretary-General, Lok Sabha, Shri G.C. Malhotra, was the Secretary to the Delegation. Sarvashri G. Ganga Reddy, Surendra Singh Barwala, Sunil Khan, P.N. Siva and Dr. (Smt.) Sudha Yadav, all members of Parliament, also attended the Conference as Observers.

The Delegation included the following delegates from the State CPA Branches in India; the Minister for Finance and Legislative Affairs, Government of Andhra Pradesh (Regional Representative for the Asia Region in the CPA Executive Committee), Shri Y. Ramakrishnudu; the Speaker, Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly, Smt. K. Prathibha Bharati; the Speaker, Arunachal Pradesh Legislative Assembly, Shri Tamiyo Taga; the Speaker, Assam Legislative Assembly, Shri Prithibi Majhi; the Speaker, Bihar Legislative Assembly, Shri Sadanand Singh; the Speaker, Goa Legislative Assembly, Shri Pratapsingh Raoji Rane; the Speaker, Gujarat Legislative Assembly, Shri Dhirubhai S. Shah; the Speaker, Haryana Legislative Assembly, Shri Satbir Singh Kadian; the Speaker, Himachal Pradesh Legislative

Assembly, Shri Gulab Singh Thakur; the Chairman, Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Council, Shri Abdul Rashid Dar; the Speaker, Jharkhand Legislative Assembly, Shri Indar Singh Namdhari; the Leader of Legislative Council and Minister of Water Resources, Government of Karnataka, Shri H.K Patil; the Speaker, Kerala Legislative Assembly, Shri Vakkom Purushothaman; the Chairman, Maharashtra Legislative Council, Prof. N.S. Pharande; the Speaker, Manipur Legislative Assembly, Dr. Sapam Dhananjoy; the Speaker, Meghalaya Legislative Assembly, Shri Elstone D. Marak; the Speaker, Mizoram Legislative Assembly, Shri R. Lalawia; the Speaker, Nagaland Legislative Assembly, Shri Z. Lohe; the Speaker, Orissa Legislative Assembly, Shri Sarat Kumar Kar; the Speaker, Punjab Legislative Assembly (Regional Representative of Asia Region on CPA Executive Committee), Sardar Charanjit Singh Atwal; the Deputy Speaker, Punjab Legislative Assembly, Shri Sat Pal Gosain; the Deputy Speaker, Rajasthan Legislative Assembly, Shri Devendra Singh; the Speaker, Sikkim Legislative Assembly, Smt. Kalawati Subba; the Speaker, Tripura Legislative Assembly, Shri Jitendra Sarkar; the Speaker, Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly, Shri Keshari Nath Tripathi; the Speaker, Uttaranchal Legislative Assembly, Shri Prakash Pant; the Speaker, West Bengal Legislative Assembly, Shri Hashim Abdul Halim; and the Speaker, Delhi Legislative Assembly, Chaudhury Prem Singh.

The Secretary, Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly, Shri K. Tuljanand Singh; the Secretary, Delhi Vidhan Sabha, Shri S.K. Sharma; the Secretary, Himachal Pradesh Vidhan Sabha, Shri Ajay Bhandari; and the Secretary, Bihar Legislative Assembly, Shri J.P. Paul were the four Secretaries from the State Branches who attended the Conference.

The Theme of the Conference was "Reassessing the Profession of Politics to Raise the Public Perception of Parliaments and Parliamentarians". The Conference discussed the following subjects on the Agenda:

- A. Strengthening Parliament's Oversight Role in the Battle Against Corruption;
- B. Poverty Alleviation;
  - (i) Literacy
  - (ii) The role of volunteers and voluntary organizations
  - (iii) Direct economic action through international debt relief and micro credit, technology and business resources;
  - (iv) Globalisation and the feminisation of poverty;
- C. Gender sensitising Parliaments in Commonwealth;



- D. Towards being a professional, knowledge based Parliamentarian;
  - (i) Awareness and appreciation of information and communications technology;
  - (ii) Application in education, business and daily life;
  - (iii) The role of a Parliamentarian and how the electorate can understand that role.
- E. Combating international trafficking of people;
- F. Should scientific advances be subject to legislative and regulatory measures?

The Speaker, West Bengal Legislative Assembly, Shri Hashim Abdul Halim and the Speaker, Gujarat Legislative Assembly, Shri Dhirubhai S. Shah were elected the Regional Representatives for the Asia Region on the CPA Executive Committee for a period of three years.

The Speaker, Punjab Legislative Assembly, Sardar Charanjit Singh Atwal was elected the Vice-Chairman of the CPA Executive Committee for a period of one year at a meeting of the Executive Committee of the CPA held in Canberra on 13 September 2001.

### **BIRTH ANNIVERSARIES OF NATIONAL LEADERS**

On the birth anniversaries of those national leaders whose portraits adorn the Central Hall of Parliament House, functions are organised under the auspices of the Indian Parliamentary Group (IPG) to pay tributes to the leaders. Booklets containing profiles of these leaders, prepared by the Library and Reference, Research, Documentation and Information Service (LARRDIS) of the Lok Sabha Secretariat are also brought out on the occasion.

The birth anniversaries of the following leaders were celebrated during the period 1 July to 30 September 2001.

*Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee:* On the occasion of the birth anniversary of Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee, a function was held on 6 July 2001. The Minister of Home Affairs, Shri L.K. Advani; the Minister of External Affairs, Shri Jaswant Singh; the Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri P.M. Sayeed; members of Parliament, and former members of Parliament and others paid floral tributes to Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee.

*Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak:* On the occasion of the birth anniversary of Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak, a function was held on 23 July 2001. The Minister of Home Affairs, Shri L.K. Advani; the Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri P.M. Sayeed; members of Parlia-

ment, and former members of Parliament and others paid floral tributes to Lokmanya Tilak.

*Shri Rajiv Gandhi:* On the occasion of the birth anniversary of Shri Rajiv Gandhi, a function was held on 20 August 2001. The Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri L.K. Advani; the Leader of the Opposition in the Lok Sabha, Smt. Sonia Gandhi; the Deputy Chairman, Rajya Sabha, Dr. (Smt.) Najma Heptulla; the Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri P.M. Sayeed; members of Parliament; and former members of Parliament and others paid floral tributes to Shri Rajiv Gandhi.

*Dadabhai Naoroji:* On the occasion of the birth anniversary of Dadabhai Naoroji, a function was held on 4 September 2001. The Minister of Home Affairs, Shri L.K. Advani; the Minister of Social Justice and Empowerment, Dr. Satyanarayan Jatiya; members of Parliament; and former members of Parliament and others paid floral tributes to Dadabhai Naoroji.

## **EXCHANGE OF PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS**

### **PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION VISITING INDIA**

*Nigeria:* On our invitation, a 15-member Parliamentary Delegation from Nigeria, led by the Deputy President of the Senate, Mr. Ibrahim Mantu and the Deputy Speaker of the House of Representatives of the National Assembly of Nigeria, Mr. Nwuche Chibudom visited India from 14 to 20 August 2001. The visiting Delegation called on the Vice-President of India and Chairman, Rajya Sabha, Shri Krishan Kant, the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi, and the Deputy Chairman, Rajya Sabha and President of the Inter Parliamentary Council, Dr. (Smt.) Najma Heptulla on 16 August 2001.

The Delegation called on the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Information Technology, Shri Pramod Mahajan, the Leader of Opposition in the Lok Sabha, Smt. Sonia Gandhi and the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, Shri Omar Abdullah on 17 August 2001. The Delegation also had a meeting with the members of the Standing Committee on External Affairs. The Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha hosted a dinner in their honour the same day.

Besides Delhi, the Delegation visited Agra and Bangalore.

### **INDIAN PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATION GOING ABROAD**

*Mongolia:* An Indian Parliamentary Delegation led by the Speaker,

Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi visited Mongolia from 8 to 12 July 2001. The other members of the Delegation were: the Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha Shri P.M. Sayeed; Sarvashri Devendra Prasad Yadav, Braj Mohan Ram, Raj Kumar Wangcha, Samik Lahiri, Sukhbir Singh, P.D. Elangovan and Smt. Basanti Sarma, all members of Parliament and Shri G.C. Malhotra, Secretary-General, Lok Sabha, Shri V.K. Sharma, Director, Lok Sabha Secretariat, was the Secretary to the Delegation.

*Parliamentary Friendship Group:* During the visit, the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi formally announced the formation of a Parliamentary Friendship Group with Mongolia under the Presidentship of Shri P.A. Sangma, MP. Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav, MP and Shri Hiphei, MP, are the Vice-Presidents of the Group. The aims and objectives of the Group are to maintain political, social and cultural contacts between the two countries and to assist in having exchanges of information and experiences on issues relating to parliamentary activities.

### **BUREAU OF PARLIAMENTARY STUDIES AND TRAINING**

During the period 1 July to 30 September 2001, the Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training (BPST) organised the following Courses/Programmes:

*Seventeenth Parliamentary Internship Programme for Foreign Parliamentary Officials:* The Seventeenth Parliamentary Internship Programme for foreign parliamentary officials was organized from 23 September to 9 November 2001. The former Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri Rabi Ray, inaugurated the Programme on 25 September 2001. Twenty-seven participants from sixteen Afro-Asian countries, viz. one each from Botswana, Brazil, Guyana, Mozambique, Nepal, Panama, Philippines, Tanzania and Nigeria; two each from Bangladesh, Kenya, Maldives, Papua New Guinea and South Africa; three from Indonesia; and five from Sri Lanka participated in the Programme, which aimed to provide the foreign parliamentary officials an opportunity to exchange experiences in their Legislatures and to acquaint themselves with the environment, culture, tradition and working of parliamentary institutions in India.

*Appreciation Courses:* Appreciation Courses in Parliamentary Processes and Procedures were organised for the following:

- (i) Probationers of Indian Statistical Service (25 to 29 June 2001);
- (ii) Senior Audit/Accounts Officers from the Office of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India (9 to 13 July 2001);
- (iii) Probationers of

Indian Forest Service (23 to 27 July 2001); (iv) Probationers of Indian Railway Personnel Service, Indian Information Service, and Indian Postal Service (6 to 10 August 2001).

*Training Courses for Officials of the Lok Sabha and the State Legislature Secretariats:* (i) Two Training Programmes were organised on Noting, Drafting and Office Procedure for officers and staff of the Lok Sabha Secretariat from 9 to 12 July 2001 and 10 to 19 July 2001; (ii) A Training Course was also organised for the Hindi Editors/ Assistant Editors/Translators/Hindi Assistants of the Lok Sabha and the State Legislature Secretariats from 10 to 14 September 2001. Twenty-three officers from eleven State Legislature Secretariats, viz. Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Delhi, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Karnataka, Punjab, Rajasthan and Tripura and twenty-three officers from the Lok Sabha Secretariat attended the Programme; and (iii) A similar Training Course was also organized for officers working in the Financial Committees of the Lok Sabha and the State Legislature Secretariats from 24 to 28 September 2001. Forty-five participants from twenty-one State Legislature Secretariats, viz. Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chattisgarh, Delhi, Gujarat, Himachal Pradesh, Jammu and Kashmir, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland, Orissa, Punjab, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh and West Bengal and four officers from the Lok Sabha Secretariat attended the Programme.

*Nominations for Training/Conferences Abroad:* The 67<sup>th</sup> General Annual Conference of the International Federation of Library Association (IFLA) was held in Boston, USA from 16 to 25 August 2001. The 17<sup>th</sup> Annual International Conference of Parliamentary Librarians was also held alongside the IFLA Conference. Prior to this, participants to the Conference of Parliamentary Librarians met in Ottawa, Canada from 14 to 15 August 2001 and deliberated on topics of mutual interest. Shri M.K. Dubey and Shri G. Rangarao, Joint Director and Research Officer, respectively, in the Lok Sabha Secretariat, were nominated to attend the Conference.

*Study Visits:* Twelve Study Visits were organised for participants from various training and educational institutions.

## PROCEDURAL MATTERS

---

*Instance when members were allowed to seek clarifications on a Statement made by the Minister:* On 1 August 2001, on a Statement made by the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri L.K. Advani on 31 July 2001 regarding the brutal murder of Smt. Phoolan Devi, MP, eighteen members were allowed to seek clarifications and the Minister replied thereto.

*Instance when the Speaker gave his consent to move the Adjournment Motion to a member who also had given notice, at the request of another member who had secured first position in the ballot and no objection was taken in the House:* On 2 August 2001, at about 12.05 hrs., the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi informed the House that he had given his consent to moving of the Adjournment Motion regarding the mismanagement of the US-64 funds by the Unit Trust of India (UTI) adversely affecting the small investors and the failure of the Government to take timely action to prevent it, given notices of by Shri M.K. Subba and Forty-one others. Shri M.K. Subba, who had secured first position in the ballot, meanwhile, requested that Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi who had also given notice of the Adjournment Motion on the same subject might be permitted to seek the leave of the House to move the Adjournment Motion in his place. The Speaker acceded to Shri Subba's request. Accordingly, Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi sought the leave of the House to move the Motion. As no objection was taken, the Speaker then informed that leave was granted and directed that the discussion be taken up at 1400 hrs.

*Minister cannot be compelled to make a Statement on an issue raised during the 'Zero Hour':* On 2 August 2001, after the Question Hour, Shri Suresh Kurup, member, raised the issue regarding the demolition of a mosque in South Rajasthan by a mob and demanded a Statement from the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri L.K. Advani. Thereupon, the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi observed:

"During the 'Zero-Hour,' you cannot compel the Minister to make a Statement. He has noted the issue raised."

*Matters referred to the Joint Parliamentary Committee cannot be*

*raised in the House:* On 29 August 2001, after the Question Hour, when members were raising matters of urgent public importance, a member, Shri Saiduzzama, sought permission to raise a matter regarding the UTI scam, which had already been referred to the Joint Parliamentary Committee (JPC) on the Stock Scam and Matters Relating Thereto. Thereupon, the Deputy Speaker, Shri P.M. Sayeed who, was in the Chair observed:

“The matter which has already been referred to the JPC cannot be raised in the House. If there is any other matter, that will be allowed.”

*Instance when a member was asked not to display photographs:* On 30 August 2001, after the Question Hour, when Shri Nawal Kishore Rai, member, was raising a matter regarding the police firing in Muzaffarpur, Shri Raghunath Jha, another member, displayed some photographs. Thereupon, the Deputy Speaker, Shri P.M. Sayeed who was in the Chair observed:

“Please, do not show it. You are not permitted to show this kind of things.”

*Reference by the Speaker, Lok Sabha to the Chairman, Rajya Sabha of question of breach of privilege given notice of by a member, Lok Sabha against a Minister (who happens to be a member of the Rajya Sabha) for appropriate action:* On 30 August 2001, after the Question Hour, Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal, member, raised the matter regarding his notice of privilege against the Minister of State of the Department of Disinvestment, Shri Arun Shourie, who is a member of the Rajya Sabha. Thereupon, the Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri P.M. Sayeed, who was in the Chair, observed Shri Bansal's notice was under the consideration of the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi. Later, on the same day, the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi observed:

“Honourable members, today I have received a notice of question of privilege from Shri Pawan Kumar Bansal against Shri Arun Shourie, the Minister of State of the Department of Disinvestment for having allegedly sought verification of the authenticity of a letter purported to have been written by the Cabinet Secretary which was quoted by Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi during the discussion on the Disinvestment of Public Sector Undertakings on 23 August 2001. The member has also stated that the Minister of State of the Department of Disinvestment has since sought investigation by the CBI in the matter.

Shri Bansal has contended that since the said letter was quoted

by Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi in the House, the same formed part of the proceedings of the House and the matter regarding investigation with regard to the authenticity of the same should have been referred to the Speaker, Lok Sabha instead of referring the same for investigation to the CBI. Shri Bansal has contended that the Minister has committed a breach of privilege by seeking verification of the said letter and also referring the matter to the CBI for investigation.

It may be recalled that on 27 August 2001, when Shri Dasmunsi sought to raise this matter in the House, several members, expressing their views in the matter, demanded that this matter may be referred to the Committee of Privileges.

I may like to inform the House that Shri Arun Shourie is a member of the Rajya Sabha.

The Committees of Privileges of the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha in the Report of their joint sitting in 1954, laid down the procedure to be followed in case where a member of one House is alleged to have committed a breach of privilege of the other House. In terms of that procedure, when a question of breach of privilege is raised in any House in which a member of the other House is involved, the Presiding Officer of the House in which question of privilege is raised, has to refer the case to the Presiding Officer of the other House for appropriate action.

Since Shri Arun Shourie is a member of the Rajya Sabha, I am referring this matter to the Hon'ble Chairman, Rajya Sabha, Shri Krishan Kant for appropriate action in accordance with the above procedure."

*Instance when permission was not granted to a member to make personal explanation regarding certain remarks made against him by another member on the ground that the remarks taken objection to did not form part of the proceedings:* On 13 August 2001, a member, Shri Rajesh Ranjan sought permission of the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi, to make a personal explanation in regard to certain remarks made against him by another member, Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh in the Lok Sabha on 8 August 2001. The member was requested to supply the text of the personal explanation. On 28 August 2001, Shri Ranjan submitted the text of the statement for making the personal explanation. Permission was not granted to him on the ground that the remarks taken objection to by the member did not form part of the proceedings of the House.

*Bills seeking to replace Ordinances are not normally referred to the Departmentally-Related Standing Committees:* On 20 August 2001, when the Statutory Resolution seeking disapproval of the Indian Council of World Affairs (Second) Ordinance and the Indian Council of World Affairs Bill, 2001 were taken up for consideration and passing, Shri Shivraj V. Patil rising on a Point of Order, submitted that the Ordinance-making power was undemocratic. He pointed out that the Lok Sabha had already passed a similar Bill which was later withdrawn in the Rajya Sabha and again the same Bill could not be re-introduced in the Lok Sabha. He added that under Rule 331 E(1)(b) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, the Indian Council of World Affairs Bill, 2001 should have been referred to the Departmentally-Related Standing Committee for examination and report.

The Minister of Urban Development and Poverty Alleviation, Shri Jagmohan submitted that three Ordinances had to be promulgated in the present case as a similar Bill, earlier passed by the Lok Sabha, could not be taken up for consideration in the Rajya Sabha and that necessitated the re-issue. Thereafter, the permission of the Rajya Sabha had been sought and on the acceptance of its recommendation, the Bill was taken up for consideration in the Lok Sabha at present. The Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs, Shri Arun Jaitley contended that due to the urgency of the situation, the Bill could not be referred to the Standing Committee. Thereupon, the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi observed that he would give his ruling later and till such time, other items of business would be taken up. Later on the same day, the Speaker, Lok Sabha observed:

“Shri Shivraj V. Patil had raised three points xxx.

1. He had said that the Ordinance-making power was undemocratic. While I agree that the Government should resort to the Ordinance-making power as sparingly as possible, situations cannot be ruled out where the Government may need to promulgate Ordinances.
2. Shri Patil had said, ‘Can a Bill, which has been withdrawn, be re-introduced?’ The withdrawal was necessitated in the present case. There have been three Ordinances on the subject. The first Ordinance-replacing Bill, as we are all aware, was passed in the Lok Sabha but could not be passed in the Rajya Sabha. Consequently, the first Ordinance lapsed. In order to give continuous effect to the provisions of the first Ordinance, the second and the third



Ordinances were promulgated. When the Bill to replace the third Ordinance was introduced, the introduction of the Bill necessitated the withdrawal of the earlier Bill with the same title to avoid confusion.

3. He said that under Rule 331 E (1) (b), almost all Bills were to be referred by the Presiding Officer to the Standing Committees. I agree that almost all Bills need to be referred to the Standing Committees after introduction. There are however two exceptions. First, Bills of technical nature, to which Shri Patil himself made a reference, need not be referred to the Standing Committees. Secondly, Bills seeking to replace Ordinances are not normally referred to the Departmentally-Related Standing Committees since these Bills have to be enacted before the expiration of six weeks from the re-assembling of Parliament in terms of article 123 of the Constitution. As the present Bill before the House is almost similar to a Bill already passed by this House and since this Bill needs to be enacted by 3 September 2001, I am not inclined to refer it to the Standing Committee."

Accordingly, the Statutory Resolution seeking disapproval of the Indian Council of World Affairs (Second) Ordinance and the Indian Council of World Affairs Bill, 2001 was taken up on 23 August 2001 and the Bill was passed the same day.

*Instances when papers sought to be laid on the Table of the House were not treated as papers laid and the documents were returned to members:* During the Seventh Session of the Thirteenth Lok Sabha, the following papers sought to be laid on the Table of the House were not treated as papers laid on the Table of the House and were either returned to members or filed:

1. Photostat copies of the document consisting of (i) cover page of "The Guilty Men of 1962" by Shri D.R. Mankekar with Foreword by Shri George Fernandes datelined New Delhi, 17 December 1998, and (ii) Publication information sought to be laid by Shri Mani Shankar Aiyar, member, on 1 August 2001, while taking part in the discussion regarding summit-level talks held between India and Pakistan in Agra. (The document was not in original but was merely a copy and was available in the Library).
2. Photostat copies of letters written by (i) the Chief Minister of Bihar, Smt. Rabri Devi to the Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee regarding the flood situation in Bihar and (ii) letter written by the Resident Commissioner, Bihar to the Secretary

- to the Government of India, Department of Expenditure regarding the amount of calamity relief fund for the State of Bihar sought to be laid on the Table by Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh, member, on 8 August 2001, while participating in the discussion on the loss of lives and property due to floods, drought and other natural calamities in various parts of the country. (There was no demand for laying of the documents and the member had not quoted from the document).
3. The document titled "Special Area Development Project—KBK, Koraput—Orissa", sought to be laid on the Table by Shri Bikram Keshari Deo, member, on 28 August 2001, while speaking during the Demands for Supplementary Grants – General.
  4. On 29 August 2001, Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi, member, while initiating the discussion under Rule 193 regarding the New Telecom Policy, 1999, quoted from the Seventeenth Report of the Standing Committee on Communications and also from the official note recorded by Shri V. Rajendran, ADG of Finance Section on 11 July 2000. Since the member did not supply any document for being laid on the Table, the Paper Under Consideration (PUC) was filed.

*Instance when the House adjourned immediately on receipt of information about demise in New Delhi/ of sitting/member and obituary references were made at the next sitting:* On 25 July 2001, at 1420 hrs. interrupting Shri Somnath Chatterjee who was speaking on the discussion under Rule 193 regarding the summit level talks held between India and Pakistan in Agra, Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi, member, intimated that Smt. Phoolan Devi, a sitting member of the Lok Sabha had been shot dead. The Minister of Parliamentary Affairs, Shri Pramod Mahajan also said that there was a news on the *Doordarshan* in that regard and requested that the House be adjourned for half-an-hour. Thereupon, at 1423 hrs. the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi adjourned the House till 1500 hrs. At 1502 hrs., when the House reassembled, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri L.K. Advani informed the House about the assassination of Smt. Phoolan Devi, at her residence in New Delhi on that day. The Speaker, Lok Sabha, observed that the obituary reference would be made the next day, i.e. on 26 July 2001 and, thereafter, members stood in silence for a short while as a mark of respect to the memory of the departed soul. At 1506 hrs. the House was adjourned for the day.

On 26 July 2001, at the commencement of the sitting, the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi made obituary reference on the passing away of Smt. Phoolan Devi, a sitting member. Members stood in silence for a short while as a mark of respect to the memory of the departed soul. Thereafter, the House was adjourned for the day without transacting any business.

*Instance when the Chair allowed members, whose names were not there in the List of Business, to ask clarificatory questions:* On 9 August 2001, the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi permitted three members Sarvashri Somnath Chatterjee, Vaidya Vishnu Datt Sharma and P.H. Pandian whose names were not included in the List of Business to ask clarificatory questions on the Calling Attention regarding the situation arising out of the killings of members of the minority community in Doda, Jammu and Kashmir and steps taken by the Government in regard thereto.

*Removal of shirt and exhibiting it in the Well of the House is reprehensible:* On 13 August 2001, as soon as the House met, members of the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (DMK) party came to the Well of the House raising the issue of the police attack on the DMK party rally in Chennai on 12 August 2001. Amidst interruptions, Shri V. Vetriselvan, member came to the Well of the House and removed his shirt exhibiting injuries caused to him by the police attack in Chennai. Due to continued interruptions, at 1107 hrs., the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi, adjourned the House till 1400 hrs. When the House re-assembled at 1400 hrs., members of the DMK party again came to the Well of the House raising the same issue. Amidst interruptions, the Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri P.M. Sayeed, who was in the Chair, observed:

“xxx the way in which you have been treated is condemnable. At the same time, in the morning, the removal of shirt and the exhibition in the Well of the House is equally reprehensible. Never in the history of the House, we had such an exhibition. Not only that you have to raise matters according to rules and from your seats xxx”

Due to continued interruptions, at 1407 hrs. the Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha, adjourned the House for the day.

On 14 August 2001, after the obituary references on the passing away of a former member, members of the DMK party came to the Well of the House raising the same issue and demanded a central commission to enquire into the incident. They were also wearing

placards. The Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi then observed that members should not wear placards in the House.

*Issue which comes within the jurisdiction of the Speaker cannot be raised in the House:* On 16 August 2001, after the Question Hour, Shri Mohan Rawale, member, wanted to raise a matter regarding the installation of portraits of great freedom fighters in the corridor of Parliament House. Thereupon, the Deputy Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri P.M. Sayeed, who was in the Chair, observed:

“xxx the issue which you want to raise now comes within the purview of the Speaker, so it is not to be taken up here.”

## PARLIAMENTARY AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

(1 JULY TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2001)

---

Events covered in this Feature are based primarily on reports appearing in the daily newspapers and, as such, the Lok Sabha Secretariat does not accept any responsibility for their accuracy, authenticity or veracity.

—Editor

---

### INDIA

#### DEVELOPMENTS AT THE UNION

*Elections to the Rajya Sabha:* On 25 July 2001, the following persons were declared elected to the Rajya Sabha from Tamil Nadu in the biennial elections: Sarvashri P.G. Narayanan, R. Kamaraj, S.S. Chandran and Smt. S. Gokula Indira (all belonging to the All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam); Shri R. Sarath Kumar (Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam); and Shri B.S. Gnanadesikan (Tamil Maanila Congress (M)).

*By-elections to the Lok Sabha:* In the by-elections held on 20 September 2001, Shri Kailash Meghwal of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) won the Tonk (Rajasthan) Lok Sabha seat defeating Shri Banwari Lal Bairwa of the Indian National Congress (INC); and Shri Madhusudan Derram Mistry of the INC won the Sabarkantha (Gujarat) Lok Sabha seat defeating Shri Upendra Trivedi of the BJP.

*Reshuffle of Portfolios:* On 22 July 2001, Shri Ajit Singh was inducted into the Union Cabinet as the Cabinet Minister for Agriculture. In a reshuffle of some of the portfolios, the Minister of State for Commerce and Industry, Shri Omar Abdullah was given the charge of Ministry of External Affairs; the Minister of State for Railways, Shri Digvijay Singh was given the charge of Ministry of Commerce and Industry; and the Minister of State for External Affairs, Shri U.V. Krishnam Raju was given the charge of Ministry of Defence, on the same day.

On 1 August 2001, the Minister of State for Commerce and Industry, Shri Digvijay Singh was given the additional charge as the Minister of State for Railways.

*Expansion of the Union Cabinet:* On 1 September 2001, the Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee expanded the Union Council of Ministers, elevated two Ministers of State to Cabinet rank, and dropped four Ministers of State from his Council of Ministers. The new Ministers and their portfolios are:

*Cabinet Ministers:* Shri Ved Prakash Goel: *Shipping*; and Shri Kariya Munda: *Agro and Rural Industries*.

*Ministers of State:* Sarvashri Rajiv Pratap Rudy: *Commerce and Industry*; Ravi Shankar Prasad: *Coal and Mines*; Vijay Goel: *Prime Minister's Office and Planning*; and Shri Annasaheb Patil: *Rural Development*.

The Ministers of State, Sarvashri Arun Shourie and Syed Shahanawaz Hussain were elevated as Cabinet Ministers for *Dis-investment and Department of Development of North-Eastern Region*; and *Civil Aviation*, respectively.

The Prime Minister also dropped the following Ministers of state, Sarvashri Debendra Pradhan, Th. Chaoba Singh, Shriram Chauhan and Jai Singh Gaekwad, from the Union Cabinet.

The Union Minister for Mines, Shri Sunder Lal Patwa, resigned from Cabinet the same day.

*RJD faction recognised:* On 21 September 2001, the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi recognised the Rashtriya Janata Dal (Democratic) faction of Sarvashri Nagmani, Sukdeo Paswan and Mohammad Anwar-ul-Haque in the Lok Sabha for functional purposes.

*Death of Members:* On 25 July 2001, Smt. Phoolan Devi, a sitting member of the Samajwadi Party from the Mirzapur constituency of Uttar Pradesh, was shot dead.

On 10 September 2001, Shri Samar Choudhuary, another sitting member of the Lok Sabha belonging to the CPI (M) representing (Tripura West), passed away.

## AROUND THE STATES

### ANDHRA PRADESH

*By-election results:* Ms. Vijay Lakshmi of the Telugu Desam Party and Shri K. Chandra Sekhar Rao of the Telangana Rashtriya

Samithi won by-elections to the State Legislative Assembly on 20 September 2001 from the Vuyyuru and Siddipetta constituencies, respectively.

### **ARUNACHAL PRADESH**

*By-election result:* The Minister of State for Social Welfare, Shri Nyani Natung of the Indian National Congress was elected to the State Legislative Assembly from the Pakke-Kesang constituency in the by-election held on 20 September 2001.

### **ASSAM**

*By-election results:* The Chief Minister, Shri Tarun Gogoi and Shri Kalyan Gogoi, both belonging to the Indian National Congress, were elected to the State Legislative Assembly from the Titabor and Dibrugarh constituencies, respectively, for which by-elections were held on 20 September 2001.

### **GUJARAT**

*By-election result:* Shri Narhari Amin of the Indian National Congress was elected to the State Legislative Assembly from the Sabarmati constituency for which by-election was held on 20 September 2001.

### **JAMMU AND KASHMIR**

*Expansion of Cabinet:* On 14 August 2001, the Chief Minister, Shri Farooq Abdullah expanded the Council of Ministers by inducting three Cabinet Ministers. They are: Shri Khalid Najeed Suhrawardi, Shri Mushtaq Bukhari and Choudhary Mohammad Hussain.

### **MAHARASHTRA**

*By-election results:* Smt. Ranjana Kul and Shri Manohar Raju Singh Naik, both from the Nationalist Congress Party (NCP), were elected to the State Legislative Assembly from the Daund and Pusad constituencies, respectively, in the by-elections held on 20 September 2001.

### **MANIPUR**

*Dissolution of Assembly:* After receipt of the Presidential Proclamation of 7 September 2001, the Legislative Assembly of Manipur was dissolved on the recommendation of the Union Cabinet.

## ORISSA

*By-election result:* Shri Sanatan Bisi of the Biju Janata Dal (BJD) was elected to the State Legislative Assembly by defeating Shri Ashok Kumar of the Indian National Congress from the Raikhol (SC) constituency in the by-election held on 20 September 2001.

## TAMIL NADU

*Resignation of Governor:* The Governor, Smt. Fathima Beevi resigned from office on 1 July 2001, following the Union Cabinet's decision recommending her recall by the President after she failed to "discharge her constitutional obligations" and also inform the President on the happenings in the State, including the arrest of former Chief Minister Dr. M. Karunanidhi and two Union Ministers Shri Murasoli Maran and Shri T.R. Baalu. Later, the Governor of Andhra Pradesh, Shri C. Rangarajan was given the additional charge of Tamil Nadu.

*Resignation of MLA:* On 19 September 2001, Shri Thanga Tamizhselvan, an MLA belonging to the AIADMK party, resigned from the Assembly.

## UTTAR PRADESH

*MLAs expelled from party:* On 21 July 2001, the Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP) expelled two MLAs, Shri Barkhu Ram Verma and Shri R.K. Choudhury from the Party, for indulging in anti-party activities.

*Political developments:* On 11 September 2001, all the MLAs belonging to the Samajwadi Party resigned from the State Legislative Assembly.

On 13 September 2001, four MLAs belonging to the CPI (M) and one MLA of the CPI resigned from the Assembly.

On 18 September 2001, the Chief Minister, Shri Rajnath Singh dropped the Minister of State for Tourism, Shri Ashok Yadav from the State Cabinet for his public statements against the reservation policy of the Government. The same day, the BJP expelled Shri Yadav from the Party for indulging in anti-Party activities.

## WEST BENGAL

*No-confidence Motion against Speaker rejected:* On 19 July 2001, the State Legislative Assembly rejected an Opposition-sponsored



No-confidence Motion against the Speaker of the West Bengal Legislative Assembly, Shri Hashim Abdul Halim, with 70 members voting in favour and 166 against.

## **DEVELOPMENTS ABROAD**

### **BANGLADESH**

*Death of Speaker:* On 11 July 2001, the Speaker of the Bangladesh Parliament, Mr. Humayun Rasheed Chowdhury passed away. Later, Barrister Jamaruddin Sircar became the Speaker.

### **BELARUS**

*President re-elected:* On 10 September 2001, Mr. Alexander Lukashenko was re-elected as the President.

### **BOLIVIA**

*New President:* On 8 August 2001, Mr. Jorge Quiroga was sworn-in as the President of Bolivia, succeeding Mr. Hugo Banzer who resigned due to his failing health.

### **BULGARIA**

*New Prime Minister:* On 12 July 2001, Mr. Simeon Saxe-coburg-Gotha was appointed as the new Prime Minister.

### **FIJI**

*New Prime Minister:* On 10 September 2001, Mr. Laisenia Qarase of the Fijian United Party was sworn-in as the Prime Minister.

### **INDONESIA**

*Political developments:* On 22 July 2001, the President Mr. Abdurrahman Wahid imposed a state of emergency in the country.

On 23 July 2001, Parliament impeached the President, Mr. Abdurrahman Wahid for violating the Constitution. Subsequently Parliament elected Mrs. Megawati Sukarnoputri as the new President. Mr. Hamzah Haz, Chief of the United Development Party, was elected as the Vice-President on 26 July 2001.

*Election results in East Timor:* On 6 September 2001, the Fretilin Party won 55 seats to the 88 seat Assembly in the elections held on 30 August 2001.

## **IRAN**

*Resignation of Vice-President:* On 9 July 2001, the Vice-President, Mr. Hassan Habibi resigned from Office.

*President sworn-in:* On 8 August 2001, Mr. Mohammad Khatami was sworn-in for a second term as the President.

## **NEPAL**

*Political developments:* On 13 July 2001, the Deputy Prime Minister and Home Minister, Mr. Ram Chandra Poudyal resigned from Office.

On 19 July 2001, the Prime Minister, Mr. G.P. Koirala resigned from Office. Sher Bahadur Deuba was elected as the new Prime Minister on 22 July 2001. A 13-member Cabinet headed by Mr. Deuba was sworn-in on 26 July 2001.

## **PERU**

*New President:* On 29 July 2001, Mr. Alejandro Toledo was sworn-in as the new President of Peru.

## **SRI LANKA**

*Political developments:* On 5 July 2001, the President, Smt. Chandrika Kumaratunga reimposed a state of emergency in the country.

On 11 July 2001, Smt. Chandrika Kumaratunga suspended the Parliament.

On 17 August 2001, 38 Deputy Ministers resigned from the Government.

## **USA**

*Emergency declared:* On 14 September 2001, the President Mr. George Bush imposed a National Emergency in the country "by reason of the terrorist attacks at the World Trade Centre, New York and the Pentagon" (on September) and the continuing and immediate threat of further attacks on the United States."

## DOCUMENTS OF CONSTITUTIONAL AND PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST

---

The two Union territories of the National Capital Territory of Delhi and Pondicherry with their Legislative Assemblies had their own Consolidated Funds, but they did not have the power to borrow from the market. It was proposed that the said Union territories may be given the authority to borrow upon the security of the Consolidated Fund of the Union territory concerned as also to allow the Administrator or Lieutenant Governor to exercise the powers of the Government of India in this regard, subject to such conditions as the Government of India may think fit to impose. It was also proposed to make provisions for their separate Public Accounts as well as their own cash balance with the Reserve Bank of India, separate from the cash balance of the Government of India.

On the lines of articles 292 and 293(4) of the Constitution, it was proposed to insert a new section 47A in the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Act, 1991 to provide that the executive power of the Union extended to borrowing upon the security of the Consolidated Fund of the Capital, within such limits, if any, as may from time to time be fixed by Parliament by law and to the giving of guarantees within such limits, if any, as may be so fixed. The power would also be exercisable by the Lieutenant Governor of the Capital subject to such conditions, if any, as the Government of India may think fit to impose. Similar provision was proposed to be made by inserting a new section 48A in the Government of Union Territories Act, 1963 insofar as the Union territory of Pondicherry was concerned. Further, it was proposed to insert, on the pattern of the provisions contained in clause (2) of article 266 and clause (2) of article 283, a new section 46A in the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Act, 1991 to provide for a separate Public Account of the Capital and to regulate its custody by rules made by the Lieutenant Governor with the approval of the President. It was, similarly, proposed to insert a new section 47A in the Government of Union Territories Act, 1963 to provide for a separate Public Account in respect of Pondicherry. Incidental and consequential amendments were also proposed to be made in sections 23 and 47 of the Government of Union Territories Act, 1963 on the lines of articles 110(1)(f) and 199(1)(f) of the Constitution. Similarly, amendments were also proposed to be made in sections 22 and 46 of the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Act, 1991, insofar as the Capital was concerned. This revised arrangement was envisaged to enable the Reserve Bank of India to monitor the ways and means position of these two Union territories on a day to day basis and bring them within the normal discipline relating to limitations and regulations of overdrafts already applicable in respect of the State Governments. This would also enable the two Union territories to operate their finances on their own in real terms and encourage them to observe strict financial discipline. The Government of Union Territories and the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi (Amendment) Bill, 2001, which sought to achieve the above objects was passed by the Lok Sabha on 16 August 2001 and

the Rajya Sabha on 27 August 2001. It received the President's assent on 6 September 2001.

The Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1952 provides for the salaries and allowances of Ministers. Section 5 of the said Act provided for sumptuary allowance payable every month to the members of the Union Council of Ministers. The rates of sumptuary allowance were prescribed in the year 1985 and had not been enhanced since then. With a view to increasing the amount payable to Ministers by way of sumptuary allowance, section 5 of the said Act was proposed to be substituted. Section 6 of the aforesaid Act deals with travelling and daily allowances to Ministers. Sub-section (1A) in section 6 was inserted by the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers (Amendment) Act, 1985 with a view to providing for the facility of six return journeys to a Minister for non-official purposes along with one member of his family in a year. The Salaries, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament Act, 1954 as amended in 1998 entitled a member of Parliament to the facility of thirty-two single air journeys in a year. The existing facility available to the members of the Union Council of Ministers, however, it was felt was inadequate keeping in view the number of air journeys allowed to a member of Parliament. It would be just and proper that these facilities were enhanced on a suitable scale so that a Minister becomes entitled to travelling allowances in respect of not more than twelve return journeys performed during each year within India for himself and a member of his family, whether travelling together or separately, subject to overall entitlement of forty-eight single journeys in each year. The Salaries and Allowances of Ministers (Amendment) Bill, 2001, which sought to achieve the above objects, was passed by the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha on 30 and 31 August 2001, respectively. It received the President's assent on 11 September 2001.

The Joint Committee on Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament, in its report of 16 November 2000, had made certain recommendations regarding increase in the salary, daily allowances and other facilities to the members of Parliament. After considering the said report and other recommendations, it was proposed to enhance the salary, daily allowance and rate of road mileage facilities available to the members of Parliament as under: (a) the salary of the members be enhanced from Rs. 4,000/- per mensem to Rs. 12,000/- per mensem for a period of five years from the date of commencement of the proposed legislation; (b) the allowance to the members during any period of residence payable be enhanced from Rs. 400/- for each day on duty to Rs. 500/- for each day for a period of five years from the date of commencement of the proposed legislation; and (c) the rate of road mileage in respect of every journey performed in India for the purpose of attending session of a House of Parliament or meeting of a Committee or for the purpose of attending to any other business connected with the duties as a member be enhanced from Rs. 6/- per kilometer to Rs. 8/- per kilometer.

In addition to the above, it was also proposed to enhance the ceiling of the following allowances and facilities available to the members by making amendments in the relevant rules made under the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, namely: (a) to enhance the constituency allowance from Rs. 8,000/- per mensem to Rs. 10,000/- per mensem; (b) to enhance the office expense allowance from Rs. 9,500/- per mensem to Rs. 14,000/- per mensem; (c) to enhance 25,000 free units of electricity to 50,000 units in a year; and (d) to enhance free 2,000 kiloliters of water to 4,000 kiloliters in a year. It was

also proposed to provide 20,000 additional free local telephone calls to members whose constituencies were more than 1,000 kilometers away from Delhi. It was also proposed that the members may be provided mobile phones with adjustment of the calls made from such phones against one lakh free local calls available to them. In respect of ex-members, it was proposed that with effect from 14 September 2001, the pension of Rs. 2,500/- per month may be enhanced to Rs. 3,000/- per month for service for a period of four years (whether continuous or not); also, the amount of Rs. 500/- being paid for every additional year of service in excess of five years may be enhanced to Rs. 600/- per month. The Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 2001, which sought to achieve the above objects was passed by the Lok Sabha on 27 August 2001 and the Rajya Sabha on 29 August 2001. It received the President's assent on 14 September 2001.

The Central Government constituted a Commission headed by Shri P.C. Jain, *inter alia*, to undertake an overview of the steps taken by the various Ministries and Departments for the review of Administrative Laws, regulations and procedures administered by them and the follow-up steps thereafter, for repeal and amendment of certain Acts. The said Commission recommended repeal of a large number of Central enactments of different categories, including thirty-five Reorganisation Acts. The recommendations were examined and it was considered that the seven Acts mentioned in the Bill could be repealed for the reasons stated below: The Two-Member Constituencies (Abolition) Act, 1961 was enacted for abolition of two-member Parliamentary and Assembly constituencies and for the creation of single-member constituencies in their place. The Andhra Pradesh Legislative Council (Abolition) Act, 1985, the Tamil Nadu Legislative Council (Abolition) Act, 1986 and the West Bengal Legislative Council (Abolition) Act, 1969 were enacted for the abolition of the Legislative Councils in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal, respectively. The then States of Madras and Mysore and the Union territory of Laccdiv, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands were re-christened as Tamil Nadu, Karnataka and Lakshadweep, respectively by enacting the Madras State (Alteration of Name) Act, 1968, the Mysore State (Alteration of Name) Act, 1973 and the Laccdiv, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands (Alteration of Name) Act, 1973, respectively. The seven Acts mentioned above were proposed to be repealed since they had served their purpose and were no longer required to be retained on the statute book. The Two-Member Constituencies (Abolition) and other Laws Repeal Bill, 2001 which sought to achieve the above objects was passed by the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha on 28 August and 31 August 2001, respectively. It received the President's assent on 14 September 2001.

We reproduce below the texts of the above Acts.

—Editor

---

### THE GOVERNMENT OF UNION TERRITORIES AND THE GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI (AMENDMENT) ACT, 2001

*An Act further to amend the Government of Union Territories Act, 1963 and the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Act, 1991.*

BE it enacted by Parliament in the Fifty-second Year of the Republic of India as follows:-

## **CHAPTER I**

### **PRELIMINARY**

**1. Short title and commencement :** (1) This Act may be called the Government of Union Territories and the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi (Amendment) Act, 2001.

(2) It shall come into force on such date as the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, appoint.

## **CHAPTER II**

### **AMENDMENTS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF UNION TERRITORIES ACT, 1963**

**2. Amendment of section 23 :** In section 23 of the Government of Union Territories Act, 1963 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), in sub-section (1), for clause (e), the following clause shall be substituted, namely:

*“(e) the receipt of money on account of the Consolidated Fund of the Union territory or the public account of the Union territory or the custody or issue of such money or the audit of the accounts of the Union territory:”.*

**3. Amendment of section 47 :** In section 47 of the principal Act, for the words “all loans advanced to the Union territory from the Consolidated Fund of India”, the words “all loans advanced to the Union territory from the Consolidated Fund of India and all loans raised by the Government of India or the Administrator of the Union territory upon the security of the Consolidated Fund of the Union territory” shall be substituted.

**4. Insertion of new section 47A :** After section 47 of the principal Act, the following section shall be inserted, namely:-

*“47A. Public Account of the Union territory and moneys credited to it; (1) As from such date as the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, appoint in this behalf, all other public moneys received by or on behalf of the Administrator shall be credited to a Public Account entitled “the Public Account of the Union territory”.*

(2) The custody of public moneys, other than those credited to the Consolidated Fund of the Union territory or the Contingency Fund of the Union territory, received by or on behalf of

the Administrator, their payment into the Public Account of the Union territory and the withdrawal of moneys from such account and all other matters connected with or ancillary to the aforesaid matters shall be regulated by rules made by the Administrator with the approval of the President.'

**5. Insertion of new sections 48A and 48B :** After section 48 of the principal Act, the following sections shall be inserted, namely:-

*"48A. Borrowing upon the security of the Consolidated Fund of the Union territory (1) The executive power of the Union extends to borrowing upon the security of the Consolidated Fund of the Union territory within such limits, if any, as may, from time to time, be fixed by Parliament by law and to the giving of guarantees within such limits, if any, as may be so fixed:*

*Provided that the powers exercisable by the Government of India under this sub-section shall also be exercisable by the Administrator subject to such conditions, if any, as the Government of India may think fit to impose.*

*(2) Any sums required for the purpose of invoking a guarantee shall be charged on the Consolidated Fund of the Union territory.*

*48B. Form of accounts of the Union territory; The accounts of the Union territory shall be kept in such form as the Administrator may, after obtaining advice of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India and with the approval of the President, prescribe by rules."*

### CHAPTER III

#### AMENDMENTS TO THE GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI ACT, 1991

**6. Amendment of section 22 :** In section 22 of the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Act, 1991 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), in sub-section (1), for clause (e), the following clause shall be substituted, namely:-

*"(e) the receipt of money on account of the Consolidated Fund of the Capital or the Public Account of the Capital or the custody or issue of such money or the audit of the accounts of the Capital:"*

**7. Amendment of section 46 :** In section 46 of the principal Act, for the words "all loans advanced to the Capital from the Consolidated

Fund of India", the words "all loans advanced to the Capital from the Consolidated Fund of India and all loans raised by the Government of India or by the Lieutenant Governor upon the security of the Consolidated Fund of the Capital" shall be substituted.

**8. Insertion of new section 46A :** After section 46 of the principal Act, the following section shall be inserted, namely:-

"46 A. Public Account of the Capital and moneys credited to it ; (1) As from such date as the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, appoint in this behalf, all other public moneys received by or on behalf of the Lieutenant Governor shall be credited to a public account entitled "the Public Account of the Capital".

(2) The custody of public moneys, other than those credited to the Consolidated Fund of the Capital or the Contingency Fund of the National Capital Territory of Delhi, received by or on behalf of the Lieutenant Governor, their payment into the Public Account of the Capital and the withdrawal of moneys from such account and all other matters connected with or ancillary to matters aforesaid shall be regulated by rules made by the Lieutenant Governor with the approval of the President.'.

**9. Insertion of new sections 47A and 47B :** After section 47 of the principal Act, the following sections shall be inserted, namely:-

"47A. *Borrowing upon the security of the Consolidated Fund of the Capital;* (1) The executive power of the Union extends to borrowing upon the security of the Consolidated Fund of the Capital, within such limits, if any, as may from time to time be fixed by Parliament by law and to the giving of guarantee within such limits, if any, as may be so fixed:

Provided that the powers exercisable by the Government of India under this sub-section shall also be exercisable by the Lieutenant Governor subject to such conditions, if any, as the Government of India may think fit to impose.

(2) Any sums required for the purpose of invoking a guarantee shall be charged, on the Consolidated Fund of the Capital.

47B. *Form of accounts of the capital;* The accounts of the Capital shall be kept in such form as the Lieutenant Governor may, after obtaining advice of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India and with the approval of the President, prescribe by rules."



## **THE SALARIES AND ALLOWANCES OF MINISTERS (AMENDMENT) ACT, 2001**

*An Act further to amend the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1952.*

BE it enacted by Parliament in the Fifty-second Year of the Republic of India as follows:-

1. *Short title and commencement* : (1) This Act may be called the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers (Amendment) Act, 2001.

(2) It shall come into force on such date as the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, appoint.

2. *Substitution of new section for section 5* : For section 5 of the Salaries and Allowances of Ministers Act, 1952 (hereinafter referred as the principal Act), the following section shall be substituted, namely:-

"5. *Sumptuary allowance to Ministers*; There shall be paid a sumptuary allowance to each Minister at the following rates, namely:-

- |   |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| (a) the Prime Minister                                  | Rupees three thousand per mensem; |
| (b) every other Minister who is a member of the Cabinet | Rupees two thousand per mensem;   |
| (c) a Minister of State                                 | Rupees one thousand per mensem;   |
| (d) a Deputy Minister                                   | Rupees six hundred per mensem."   |

3. *Amendment of section 6* : In section 6 of the principal Act, for sub-section (1A), the following sub-section shall be substituted, namely:-

"(1A) A Minister shall be entitled to travelling allowance in respect of not more than twelve return journeys performed, during each year, within India, for himself and his family, whether travelling together or separately at the same rates at which travelling allowance is payable to such Minister under clause (b) of sub-section (1) in respect of tours referred to in that clause, subject to the overall 'entitlement of forty-eight single journeys in each year'".

## **THE SALARY, ALLOWANCES AND PENSION OF MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT (AMENDMENT) ACT, 2001**

*An Act further to amend the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament Act, 1954.*

BE it enacted by Parliament in the Fifty-second Year of the Republic of India as follows:-

1. *Short title* : This Act may be called the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Act, 2001.

2. *Amendment of section 3* : In section 3 of the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament Act, 1954 (hereinafter referred to as the principal Act), after the proviso, the following provisos shall be inserted, namely:-

Provided further that in the case of salary, the provisions of this section shall have effect as if for the words "four thousand rupees" the words "twelve thousand rupees" had been substituted for a period of five years beginning from the date of commencement of the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Act, 2001.

Provided also that in the case of the allowance, the provisions of this section shall have effect as if for the words "four hundred rupees", the words "five hundred rupees" had been substituted for a period of five years beginning from the date of commencement of the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Act, 2001.'

3. *Amendment of section 4* : In section 4 of the principal Act, in sub-section (1), in clause (c), in sub-clause (ii) *for the words* "six rupees per kilometre", the words "eight rupees per kilometre" shall be substituted.

4. *Amendment of section 8A* : In section 8A of the principal Act, in sub-section (1),—

(a) for the words "two thousand and five hundred rupees", the words "three thousand rupees" shall be substituted;

(b) in the first proviso, *for the words* "five hundred rupees", the words "six hundred rupees" shall be substituted.

### **THE TWO-MEMBER CONSTITUENCIES (ABOLITION) AND OTHER LAWS REPEAL ACT, 2001**

*An Act to repeal the Two-Member Constituencies (Abolition) Act, 1961 and certain other enactments.*

BE it enacted by Parliament in the Fifty-second Year of the Republic of India as follows:—

1. *Short title* : This Act may be called the Two-Member Constituencies (Abolition) and other Laws Repeal Act, 2001.

**2. *Repeal of enactments*** : The enactment specified in the Schedule are hereby repealed.

# THE SCHEDULE

(See section 2)

## REPEAL OF ENACTMENTS

Sl. No.	Name of the Act	Year	Act No.
1.	The Two-Member Constituencies (Abolition) Act	1961	1
2.	The Madras State (Alteration of Name) Act	1968	53
3.	The West Bengal Legislative Council (Abolition) Act	1969	20
4.	The Mysore State (Alteration of Name) Act	1973	31
5.	The Laccadive, Minicoy and Amindivi Islands (Alteration of Name) Act	1973	34
6.	The Andhra Pradesh Legislative Council (Abolition) Act	1985	34
7.	The Tamil Nadu Legislative Council (Abolition) Act	1986	40

## SESSIONAL REVIEW

---

### THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA

#### SEVENTH SESSION

The Seventh Session of the Thirteenth Lok Sabha, which commenced on 23 July 2001, was adjourned *sine die* on 31 August 2001. The House was later prorogued on 3 September 2001. In all, there were 29 sittings. A resume of some of the important discussions held and other business transacted during the period 23 July to 31 August 2001 is given below.

#### A. DISCUSSIONS / STATEMENTS

*Statement by the Minister of Railways regarding the setting up of the Non-Lapsable Special Railway Safety Fund for the Indian Railways:* Making a Statement in the House on 29 August 2001, the Minister of Railways, Shri Nitish Kumar said that the safety of the travelling public on the Railways had been a growing concern. Many high level inquiry committees had been engaged in the past to go into the issue of Railway Safety, namely, the Shah Nawaaz Committee (1954), the Kunzru Committee (1962), the Wanchoo Committee (1968) and the Sikri Committee (1978). More recently, the Railway Safety Review Committee (1998) under the Chairmanship of Justice H.R. Khanna had also examined this issue and given its interim report in August 1999 and the final report in February 2001. In its Report, the committee had *inter alia* recommended that in the interest of safety of the passengers, the Central Government should provide a one-time Rs. 15,000 crore grant to the Railways so that arrears in the renewal of vital safety equipment were wiped out within a fixed time frame of 5 to 7 years. The cost of replacement of over-aged assets had been re-assessed at current price level as Rs. 17,000 crore. He said that the Government had been seized of this issue. On 27 August 2001, the Cabinet had decided to set up a Non-Lapsable Special Railway Safety Fund to wipe out the arrears of replacement on the Railways in a fixed time schedule, as recommended by the Justice Khanna Committee. This Special Railway Safety Fund would be funded through two sources, viz. (i) Railways' contribution through the levy of the

Safety Surcharge on passenger traffic; and (ii) through additional financial assistance which would be given by the Ministry of Finance.

It was expected that with the levy of the Safety Surcharge, the Railways would be able to raise Rs. 5000 crore over a period of 6 years, including the current financial years, which would be credited to the newly-created Non-Lapsable Special Railways Safety Fund. The remaining Rs. 12,000 crore would be provided by the Ministry of Finance. In the current financial year, the Ministry of Finance had agreed to provide Rs. 1000 crore towards the Fund. The balance amount would be provided over the next five years.

The minister said that the Safety Surcharge would be levied as a flat amount depending on the class of travel with a certain surcharge for travelling distances upto 500 kms. and a higher surcharge beyond 500 kms. The Second Class (Ordinary) and Second Class (Mail/Express) passengers would have to pay Re. 1 and Rs. 2, respectively, irrespective of the distance of journey performed. In the Sleeper Class, the levy would be Rs. 10 for distances upto 500 kms. and Rs. 20 for beyond 500 kms. For passengers travelling by the AC Chair Car and First Class, the surcharge would be Rs. 20 upto 500 kms and Rs. 40 beyond 500 kms. In AC 3 Tier, it would be Rs. 30 upto 500 kms and Rs. 60 beyond 500 kms; in AC 2 Tier Rs. 40 upto 500 kms. and Rs. 80 beyond 500 kms; and in AC-1 Class, it would be Rs. 50 upto 500 kms. and Rs. 100 beyond 500 kms. As far as the monthly season tickets were concerned, it would be Rs. 20 for First Class and Rs. 10 for Second Class travel. The surcharge would be levied with effect from 1 October 2001.

With the creation of the Non-Lapsable Special Railway Safety Fund, the Railways were expected to be able to wipe out its arrears of replacement of assets in a time bound manner and thereby considerably improve the safety of the travelling public, the minister added.

*Statement by the Minister regarding the Remote Sensing Data Policy:* Making a Statement in the House on 8 August 2001, the Minister of State in the Departments of Atomic Energy and Space, Smt. Vasundhara Raje said that Remote Sensing Data was an important source of information for managing the nation's natural resources, supporting and monitoring developmental activities at the local level, supporting disaster management activities, ocean state and weather forecasting and environmental monitoring. The Indian Remote Sensing (IRS) satellite series would provide an immense imaging capability to

the national and global user community. As per defined guidelines, IRS data was acquired and distributed to government, private organizations and academia for a variety of operational applications and the data was also marketed all over the world.

With the availability of high resolution images from commercial US satellites, images of any part of the world, including Indian regions, were available and these had immense potential to support local level development and cadastral applications. India also had plans for having such high resolution imaging satellites in near future. These high resolution images also had strategic value and thus a regulated distribution of such high resolution images would not only take care of the user community requirements but also the national security interests.

The Minister stated that with this in mind, the Government had approved and adopted a comprehensive Remote Sensing Data Policy (RSDP) for the acquisition and distribution of satellite remote sensing data from Indian and foreign satellites for civilian users in India. The policy had comprehensively covered guidelines for satellite data acquisition and distribution in the country and also for licensing the IRS capacities to other countries. The Department of Space (DoS) would be the nodal agency for implementing the policy.

As per the policy, Government's permission was required for operating a remote sensing satellite from India and also for distribution of satellite images in India. The National Remote Sensing Agency (NRSA) had been identified as the national acquisition/distribution agency for all satellite data within India and had been allowed to enter into agreements for any foreign satellite data distribution in India. The Antrix Corporation (of DoS) was identified to license IRS capacities outside India.

The policy had safeguards for ensuring that images of sensitive areas were screened out, so that national security interests were protected. In particular, the policy would streamline the distribution of high-resolution data to government users and private users involved in developmental activities with government and other private/academic/foreign users.

The Minister said that the RSDP was a step towards making transparent the procedures of satellite data distribution, including those from high resolution imaging systems. Without being restrictive, the RSDP would help regulate the process of image distribution so that Indian users are not denied access to this valuable tool which

had become a mainstay in the developmental and natural resources management activities of the country.

*Discussion under Rule 193 on the New Telecom Policy, 1999:* On 29 August 2001, initiating a discussion under Rule 193, Shri M.V. V. S. Murthi of the Telugu Desam Party said that in this knowledge-based society, telecommunication plays a very important role. In cities, telephones were provided on demand which was a welcome sign. This approach had to spread to remote places so as to enable them to derive the fruits of development. He said that the tax had to be reduced in respect of the Information, Communication and Technology Sector. The Government should play the role of a facilitator, rather than that of a regulator in these fields.

Participating in the discussion\*, Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh of the Rashtriya Janata Dal said that the Government had claimed that all the villages would be connected with telephone by 2002. However, people had been facing difficulty in getting telephone connections in rural areas.

Shri Haribhau Shankar Mahale of the Janata Dal (Secular) said that not much work had been done in rural areas of the country; though 30 per cent of the Telecom sector had been privatized, this was in respect of urban areas only.

Replying to the discussion, the Minister of Communications, Shri Ram Vilas Paswan said that the revolution or reform process in the Telecom Sector could be divided into three phases. The first phase was during 1980-1990, the second phase during 1990-99 and the third phase started after 1999. The C-DoT was established in 1984 and the Mahanagar Telephone Nigam Limited (MTNL) and the Videsh Sanchar Nigam Limited (VSNL) came into being in 1986. The Telecom Commission was constituted in 1989. The first National Telecom Policy was evolved in 1994 and under this policy, basic telephone service was opened for the private sector. Accordingly, one operator each was allotted for every circle. A decision was also taken to appoint two operators each in all circles for cellular services. Thereafter, the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India (TRAI) was established in 1997 and in 1998, internet was also opened for the private sector.

---

\* Others who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Ramji Lal Suman, Mani Shankar Aiyar, Bikram Keshari Deo, Prabodh Panda, Rajesh Ranjan, Shrinivas Patil, Tapan Sikdar, Adv. Suresh Ramrao Jadhav (Patil), Dr. Baliram and Dr.(Smt.) V. Saroja

A New Telecom Policy was framed in 1999 and a formula of revenue sharing for new operators was provided for therein. This was also called the 'Migration Policy'. The national long distance communication was also opened for private sector. Earlier, there used to be two private operators in cellular services, but soon 17 more operators also joined. All these operators had been issued the Letter of Indent (LOI) and out of them, 16 operators had been granted licence. The prevailing system of international long distance would be done away with effect from 1 April 2002. The Minister added that the strengthened and restructured TRAI had been functioning in an innovative way.

*Discussion under Rule 193 on acute problems being faced by the poor in rural and urban areas in various parts of the country due to non-availability of foodgrains:* On 30 August 2001, initiating a discussion, Shri Bikram Keshari Deo said that the issue was one concerning poverty alleviation and non-availability of foodgrains in various parts of the country. Since independence, significant achievements had been made in confronting the challenge of poverty. The food grains production had grown three-fold. There had been enough stock of foodgrains in the country but unfortunately States had not been lifting them. As a result, the foodgrains had not been reaching the people. Though we had the Antyodaya Yojana and the Food-for-Work Programme, the off-take of foodgrains was not there. The Public Distribution System (PDS) had also not been revamped properly. India had the largest number of malnourished children in the world and nothing concrete had been done to improve the situation. He hoped that the Government would sanction long-term revised action plans and would see that the poor people in the far-flung areas and backward areas of the country would be looked after properly.

Participating in the discussion\*, Shri P.H. Pandian of the All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam said that taking note of starvation deaths despite the overflowing godowns of the Food Corporation of India, the Supreme Court had asked six drought-prone States to take immediate steps to make the closed PDS shops functional within a week.

Shri Devendra Prasad Yadav of the Janata Dal (United) said that hunger and starvation were very sensitive issues. Food was a basic need and it should be given top priority.

---

\* Others who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Shivraj V. Patil, Rupchand Pal, M.V.V.S. Murthi, C.N. Singh, Kharabela Swain, K.P. Singh Deo, A.K.S. Vijayan, Prabhunath Singh, Prasanna Acharya, Ram Prasad Singh, Ramanand Singh, Joachim Baxla, Bhan Singh Bhaura, K.H. Muniyappa, Rajesh Ranjan, Bishnu Pada Ray, Punnu Lal Mohale, Dr. (Smt.) V. Saroja and Smt. Hema Gamang



Replying to the discussion, the Minister of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution, Shri Shanta Kumar said that the godowns had been full with foodgrains. About 160 tonnes foodgrains for the People Living Below Poverty line (BPL), and 24 lakh tonnes for the mid-day meal had been allocated. Again, 303 lakh tonnes foodgrains were allocated for distribution; however, of this, only 130 lakh tonnes were lifted. Nearly 173 lakh tonnes of foodgrains were not lifted. He said that the foodgrains could be made available to each village of the country and starvation could be eradicated from the country if the Central and the State Governments worked together in a determined way.

*Discussion under Rule 193 on the Disinvestment of Public Sector Undertakings:* On 23 August 2001, initiating a discussion in the House, Shri Basu Deb Acharia pointed out that the Minister of Disinvestment had repeatedly said that a huge amount was locked up in public sector units which had to be released for social activities, basic education, health and rural development. However, none of those assurances had been implemented. He said that a White Paper on Disinvestment should be prepared; a separate Standing Committee on Disinvestment should be constituted and the Committee should scrutinise each and every disinvestment proposal of the Government.

Intervening in the discussion\*, the Minister of Rural Development, Shri M. Venkaiah Naidu said that privatisation had been implemented in China and erstwhile East Germany also. He said that the interests of the workers in the unorganised sector in the rural areas should be taken care of.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee of the Communist Party of India (M) stated that the Government should inform the House about the utilisation of money recovered from disinvestment for the social sector, for meeting the budgetary deficit and for the benefit of the workers.

Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh of the Rashtriya Janata Dal said that the Government was privatising industries in the name of disinvestments, and had formulated such guidelines which favoured the capitalists and industrialists.

---

\* Others who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi, M.V.V.S. Murthi, Kirit Somaiya, Akhilesh Yadav, Prabhat Samantray, T.M. Selvaganapathi, Pawan Kumar Bansal, Anadicharan Sahu, Ravi Prakash Verma, Dr. Nitish Sengupta and Dr. (Smt.) Suguna Kumari Chellamella

Shri Ajoy Chakraborty of the Communist Party of India said that his party had strongly opposed the policy of the Government because disinvestment was another name for dismantling and demolishing the whole structure of PSUs.

Shri Haribhau Shankar Mahale of Janata Dal (Secular) said that the Government should go for privatisation only after studying its pros and cons.

Replying to the discussion, the Minister of State in the Department of Disinvestment and the Minister of State in the Ministry of Planning, Minister of State in the Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Minister of State in the Department of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievances in the Ministry of Personnel, Public Grievances and Pensions, Shri Arun Shourie said that the issue of restructuring and reviving the Public Sector had been discussed several times. In the case of 77 Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs) units, Rs. 10,600 crore had been invested. The dividend paid was Rs. 0.71 crore. Fifty companies were in arrears for different periods. Of the 12 corporations, only one corporation had finalized its accounts. The accumulated losses of 46 PSUs were Rs. 2,078 crore. About Rs. 40,000 crore were sunk on 23 revival packages and not even a single one turned around. Eighteen units continued to be sick. The Hindustan Teleprinters was one of the firms referred to the Disinvestment Commission by the United Front Government. The situation was so serious that actually by every week's delay on this matter, the death of these companies were almost ensured. The Ministry of Heavy Industries referred 18 companies to the Department of Disinvestment. Two of them were just returned because they did not come in the purview of disinvestment at the moment. Of the remaining 16 cases, after one and a half years' work, six companies were returned because there was not a single bidder who wanted to take them.

The Minister added that the Government continued to believe that disinvestment was one way to make companies vibrant and revive their health so that they could flourish in a competitive environment; this was also the only way to safeguard the jobs of the workers.

*Adjournment Motion re. mismanagement of the US-64 Funds by the Unit Trust of India adversely affecting the small investors and failure of the Government to take timely action to prevent it:* On 2 August 2001, initiating a discussion in the House, Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi said that after the 2 July story came in regard to the US-64 Funds, the Finance Minister in his first and instant reaction totally denied his

responsibility into the entire matter as if he was totally unaware of the developments. The Joint Secretary in the Ministry of Finance gave a public interview that the Finance Minister was trying to seek reports of the ongoing developments, but the reports which came to him were evasive. He said that it gave a clear message that the Finance Minister could not control the situation; also, the queries of the Finance Minister had not been responded to by the UTI.

The whole nation was looking at the US-64 Scheme, which had now become a dead scheme. In regard to other schemes, like the Master Gain, Master Plus, etc., money to the tune of Rs. 8,000 crore had been taken out and pumped out, risking the fate of the investors.

Opposing the Adjournment Motion\*, the Minister of Law and Justice and Company Affairs and Minister of Shipping, Shri Arun Jaitley said that the US-64 was the first scheme which was envisaged under the Unit Trust of India Act, 1963. The Scheme intended to have an assured return to millions of investors. The US-64 Scheme was made in different bonds, securities, and interest-bearing securities. A small part of its investment went into the equity market. Seventy-two per cent of its investment was such that the stock market really could not directly influence the US-64. This character was changed during the period 1992-93 to 1995-96 and it became an equity-linked scheme. From a debt fund, it had become substantially an equity fund. The Deepak Parekh Committee had said that it should be restored, but restored in such a manner that it did not disturb the markets so that the share market did not collapse any further. It added to the problems of the US-64. In 1991-92, the total equity exposure of the US-64 was Rs. 2,905 crore and, therefore, if the stock market fluctuations took place, it was only this investment of Rs. 2,905 crore that could be affected. A large part of it was outside the equities. In 1997-98, the equity exposure had increased from Rs. 2,905 crore to Rs. 13,647 crore; therefore, it became far more vulnerable to the fluctuations of the stock market.

The second important question, which was raised was with whom this additional equity of Rs. 10,472 crore was invested. Of the Rs. 10,472 crore, Rs. 4,572 crore – the single largest component – was when the US-64 was asked to pick up shares in the name of disinvestment of

---

\* Others who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Rupchand Pal, M.V.V.S. Murthi, Kirit Somaiya, Chandra Bhushan Singh, Mani Shankar Aiyar, George Fernandes, Rashid Alvi, T.M. Selvaganapathi, Ramjivan Singh, Joachim Baxia, Bhan Singh Bhaura, Pawan Kumar Bansal, and Dr. Bikram Sarkar

minority shareholdings which were being disinvested during the period 1992 to 1996. The present Government had started a process of strategic sales. In a process of strategic sale, the private sector must be invited by a bidding process and the best bidder got a sizeable section of the shares. The private sector took over the management of the company. There was some governmental representation because Government also had equity. That would bring in fresh capital and fresh technology. The process which was started in 1991, picked up 2 per cent, 5 per cent, 7 per cent of PSUs shares, off-loaded them in drips and drabs into the market and compelled the market to pick them up. The market picked up those investments which were likely to share lucrative interest or results. The market did not perceive some shares to be very attractive. Therefore, an ingenious scheme was brought about in 1992. The Scheme was that all shares were divided into three categories, that is, the good PSUs, the market PSUs and the loss-making PSUs, bundled them into one of each and sold the bundles. The US-64 of Rs. 10,742 crore of equity exposure was asked to pick up those bundles and shares to the tune of Rs. 4,572 crore. That was in addition to disinvestment. The public sector shares to the extent of Rs. 4,572 crore became the largest single component of the US-64 investment which converted a debt-related fund into an equity-related fund. The Minister said that there were several issues that had arisen as a result of all these.

Shri Vaiko of the Marumalarchi Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam pointed out that the whole world economy was in a recession and we should desist from trying to create panic in the minds of people as was being done by some opposition parties.

Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh of the Rashtriya Janata Dal said that the scam in the US-64 of the UTI was a set back to the faith and trust of two crore investors of the Scheme.

Dr. Sushil Kumar Indora of the Indian National Lok Dal said that the Government should find out as to what responsibility had to be shared by the management and the Ministry in the UTI scam.

Shri Somnath Chatterjee of the Communist Party of India (M) said that the UTI was under the overall control of the Ministry of Finance and demanded that the matter should be examined by a Joint Parliamentary Committee.

The Minister of Finance, Shri Yashwant Sinha assured the House that he would do his duty in the same manner in which the members of Parliament had done their duty by casting aside personal feelings.

Concluding the debate, Shri Priya Ranjan Dasmunsi said that the Prime Minister had assured the Rajya Sabha that if need be, an inquiry could be made into the functioning of the Prime Minister's Office. The Prime Minister, in his own magnanimity, had accepted the demand for appointing a Joint Parliamentary Committee (JPC) to investigate into the affairs of the UTI, including the involvement of the Prime Minister's office.

Later, the Motion was negatived.

## B. LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

*Constitution (Ninety-first Amendment) Bill\*, 2000:* Moving the Motion for consideration of the Bill on 21 August 2001, the Minister of Law, Justice and Company Affairs and Minister of Shipping, Shri Arun Jaitley said as part of the 42<sup>nd</sup> amendment to the Constitution, certain provisions of the Constitution were amended, as a result of which the number of seats on the basis of population was frozen on the basis of the 1971 census. All elections, both for the Lok Sabha as also the State Assemblies were, thereafter, held on the basis of the 1971 census. The number of seats had remained the same and the delimitation of constituencies had also been on the basis of the 1971 census. The said delimitation processes and the population figures would be construed until the relevant figures of the first census taken after the year 2000 had been published as a reference to the 1971 figures. Till the year 2001, the figure of the 1971 census was to be taken into consideration. Now, the year 2001 had ended. Therefore, both Houses of Parliament had a constitutional obligation to make a further provision in this regard.

The rationale for which the number of constituencies would be frozen and the subsequent increase in population would not be taken into consideration while determining the seats for election to the Lok Sabha and to the State Assemblies. The National Population Policy envisaged the year 2026 as the year in which the population of the country would stabilise. Accordingly, it was proposed that the existing freeze will continue till the year 2026. It had been noticed that on account of population growth which had taken place disproportionately in some areas, the constituencies had become odd-sized within the given States. There would be delimitation conducted and each one of these constituencies, as far as practicable, be brought to even size.

---

\* The Bill was introduced in the Lok Sabha on 27 November 2000

The last limb of the amendment related to article 330 providing for the seats which were going to be reserved for the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes; that reservation would also have to be updated on the basis of the 1991 census.

Participating in the discussion\*, Shri Somnath Chatterjee of the Communist Party of India (M) said that the functioning of Parliament would not depend on the number, but in the quality of participation.

Shri K. Yerrannaidu of the Telugu Desam Party said that according to the 1991 Census, the SC and the ST constituencies should be increased.

Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh of the Rashtriya Janata Dal said that the Government should bring forth a Bill which unites the country and which would be based on principle and which could lead the country to prosperity.

Shri Haribhau Shankar Mahale of the Janata Dal (Secular) requested the Government to pay proper attention on Scheduled Tribes also.

Replying to the discussion Shri Arun Jaitley said that the delimitation process decided by the 42<sup>nd</sup> amendment lapsed in the year 2000. Therefore, this House had to make a constitutional arrangement for the future. This constitutional arrangement for the future could only be on the basis of a complete consensus, which was arrived at before the Standing Committee where it was decided to freeze the number of seats till the year 2026. On various issues such as the population policy, very constructive suggestions had been made. While continuing the freeze till the year 2026, it was a known fact that particularly between 1971 and 1991 due to the rapid growth and urbanisation that had taken place, distortions had come into play with regard to the size of individual constituencies. Therefore, to remove those distortions, a Delimitation Commission was constituted. While delimiting the constituencies, the Commission would make sure that the constituencies of similar sizes were there within a State. Of course, one problem would remain. Between two States, the constituencies might be of

---

\* Others who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Shivraj V. Patil, Anadicharan Sahu, Anandrao Vithoba Adsul, A. Krishnaswamy, T.M. Selvaganapathi, Sontosh Mohan Dev, Thawar Chand Gehlot, Prabhunath Singh, Rashid Alvi, Chhattarpal Singh, K.H. Muniyappa, Ram Nagina Mishra, K.A. Sangtam, Bhartruhari Mahtab, Ananda Mohan Biswas, Avtar Singh Bhadana, S. Jaipal Reddy and Ramdas Athawale

different sizes. There could be areas, which, because of geographical factors, could be smaller. As a result of the freezing that was taking place with regard to the number of seats, the figure could be different.

The Bill as amended, was passed.

### C. QUESTION HOUR

During the Seventh Session of the Thirteenth Lok Sabha, in all, 26,042 notices of questions (19,458 Starred, 6,567 Unstarred and 17 Short Notice Questions) were received.

Out of these, 580 notices were admitted as Starred and 6,081 as Unstarred. None was admitted as a Short Notice Question.

On 23, 26, 27 and 31 July 2001 and 13 and 14 August 2001, Starred Questions were not called for oral answer and, as such, their replies were treated as Unstarred and their answers, together with the answers to Unstarred Questions, were printed in the official report of those days.

*Daily average of Questions in the List of Questions orally answered:* The average number of Starred Questions answered orally in the House during the Session was three. The maximum number of Starred Questions answered was five on 25 July and 3, 8, 10, 16, and 17 August 2001.

The average number of Questions in the Unstarred List came to 210 as against the prescribed limit of 230, the minimum being 135 questions on 21 August 2001.

*Half-an-Hour-Discussion:* In all, 41 notices of Half-an-Hour Discussion were received during the Session. Out of these, seven notices were admitted, but only four were discussed.

### D. OBITUARY REFERENCES

During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing away of His Majesty, King Birendra Bir Bikram Shah Dev of Nepal; Shri Shyam Lal Bansiwala and Smt. Phoolan Devi, sitting members of the Lok Sabha; Shri G.K. Moopanar, a sitting member of the Rajya Sabha; Begum Aizaz Rasul, a member of the Constituent Assembly; and Sarvashri Z.M. Kahandole, Amrit Nahata, N. Tombi Singh, Sudhakar Rao Naik, G.Y. Krishnan, Ram Dhan, P. Ramachandran, Jagan Nath Kaushal, C.R. Pattabhi Raman, Kanhu Charan Jena, Rampal Upadhyay, Niren Ghosh and Thota Subba Rao, all former members.

**RAJYA SABHA****ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-THIRD SESSION\***

The Rajya Sabha, which met for its One Hundred and Ninety-third Session on 23 July 2001, was adjourned *sine die* on 31 August 2001, and was then prorogued on 3 September 2001.

A resume of some of the important discussions held and other business transacted during the Session is given below :

**STATEMENTS/DISCUSSIONS**

*Statement by the Prime Minister regarding Summit level talks held between India and Pakistan in Agra (14-16 July 2001) :* Making a Statement in the House on 24 July 2001, the Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee said that by inviting the President of Pakistan, Gen. Pervez Musharraf to visit India, the Government had sought to strengthen the broad-based framework of dialogue between the two countries, so that progress could be made on all outstanding bilateral issues, including Jammu and Kashmir. Prior to the visit, the Government of India had announced significant decisions relating to peace and security, nuclear and non-nuclear Confidence Building Measures (CBMs), people-to-people contacts, humanitarian issues, education, youth exchanges and trade to promote a congenial environment. India remained committed to implementing them.

The Prime Minister said that on 15 and 16 July 2001, he held extensive one-to-one talks with President Musharraf. There were also talks at the Delegation level. During these talks, he had taken up specific issues, including the issue of fifty-four Prisoners of War (POWs) believed to be in Pakistani jails; the extradition of known terrorists and criminals who had been given sanctuary in Pakistan; the upkeep of Sikh Gurudwaras and Hindu temples in Pakistan, the treatment of Indian pilgrims visiting shrines in Pakistan, and the enhancement of mutually beneficial trade. He had conveyed in clear terms that India had to resolve, strength and stamina to counter terrorism and violence. Despite differences in perspectives, progress had been made towards bridging the approaches of the two countries in a draft joint document which incorporated the structure of a future dialogue process on all issues, including meetings at official, ministerial and summit levels. The quest

---

\* Contributed by the Research and Library Section, Rajya Sabha Secretariat



for a joint document had to be abandoned because of Pakistan's insistence on the 'settlement' of the Jammu and Kashmir issue as a precondition for the normalization of relations. Islamabad had also been reluctant to acknowledge and address cross-border terrorism. The export of terrorism to Jammu and Kashmir from across the borders resulting in the killing of innocent people was a fact that could not be ignored, Shri Vajpayee stressed.

The Prime Minister said that the primary wish of every single Kashmiri was to live in peace, security and freedom, so that economic progress could be made. As long as violence was abjured, the Government would listen to all streams of Kashmiri opinion, however small a minority they represented. He had accepted President Musharraf's invitation to visit Pakistan and the External Affairs Minister had similarly accepted an invitation from his Pakistani counterpart. The Government would persist with its efforts to convince Pakistan that bilateral cooperation need not be held hostage to the resolution of any one issue. Though a joint document could not be concluded in Agra, a degree of understanding between the two countries had been achieved. India's concerns in vital areas such as cross-border terrorism would have to find a place in any document that future negotiations endeavoured to conclude. India would engage in quiet, serious diplomacy and pursue a relationship based on peace, friendship and cooperation, he concluded.

*Discussion on the Statement of the Prime Minister regarding the Summit-level talks between India and Pakistan in Agra:* A discussion on the Statement made by the Prime Minister in the House on 24 July 2001 took place on 8, 9, 10 and 16 August 2001.

Initiating the discussion on 8 August 2001, the Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Manmohan Singh said that the Agra Summit had reflected the Government's inadequate preparation and lack of a consistent policy on Pakistan and Jammu and Kashmir. The Summit called for better preparation and clarity in national objectives. The Summit did not have a structured agenda and the media management had been poor. India had to work in close cooperation with the Central Asian Republics, China and Russia for peace and prosperity in the region. It had to convince the Arab countries that its fight against Pakistan-sponsored terrorism was a fight for decency and the Rule of Law. The administration in Jammu and Kashmir had to be toned up and the people provided with minimum security and safety. A long term development plan was needed for the State and revitalizing grass-root institutions was a necessary step in this regard.

Participating in the discussion\*, the Minister of Information and Broadcasting, Smt. Sushma Swaraj responded to the points raised by the Leader of the Opposition and said that the Government had identified all issues for a composite dialogue during the Summit. A joint declaration could not be signed because Pakistan had been adamant on its stand on Kashmir. As the Information and Broadcasting Minister of the Government of India, she had given the details of points raised by the Prime Minister in one-to-one talks with General Pervez Musharraf as well as in Delegation level meetings. So far as the outcome of the Summit was concerned, the Government had firmly held the stand that Kashmir was an integral part of India. By inviting General Musharraf for talks, India had come to be in a win-win situation. The Government had proved that it would not compromise with the national interests at any cost.

Taking part in the discussion, the leader of the Communist Party of India, Shri J. Chitharanjan urged the Government to continue the dialogue with Pakistan and also win over the confidence of the people in Kashmir.

Intervening in the debate, the Minister of External Affairs, Shri Jaswant Singh said that Pakistan had to come to terms with India and decide the kind of long-term relationship it wanted to have with India. If Pakistan challenged India militarily, it would be defeated; India, however, bore no enmity to the people of Pakistan. There had been no final document at the end of the Agra Summit because both the Governments had been unable to bridge the gaps on Jammu and Kashmir and cross-border terrorism.

Replying to the discussion on 16 August 2001, the Prime Minister, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee said that the Agra Summit was in continuation of the process of negotiation which started with the Lahore Summit. In between, the Kargil War had deepened the differences between India and Pakistan. The Prime Minister said that the Government had not fixed any condition for the talks. In fact, it had declared a cease-fire in Kashmir and invited General Musharraf just before the deadline ended. He said that General Musharraf described the Kashmir issue as a core issue and acted against the decorum of the Summit. On

---

\* Others who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri S. Ramachandran Pillai, K.M. Saifullah, Dina Nath Mishra, P.N. Siva, Kapil Sibal, Janeshwar Mishra, Ravi Shankar Prasad, Gandhi Azad, B.S. Gnanadesikan, Kuldip Nayyar, Abani Roy, Bratin Sengupta, Maulana Obaidullah Khan Azmi, Mirza Abdul Rashid, Dr. Karan Singh, Dr. M.N. Das, Smt. Saroj Dubey and Smt. S.G. Indira

the other hand, the Government of India wanted to discuss other aspects of Indo-Pak relations and had announced confidence building measures also. Pakistan had been prepared to talk about terrorism but not cross-border terrorism. The stalemate at the Agra Summit had put a big question mark on Pakistan in the international arena. Justifying India's stand on Kashmir, the Prime Minister said that Kashmir had been merged with India constitutionally and it was not possible to divide India again on the basis of religion. Despite differences on certain issues, the whole country was one on the issue of Jammu and Kashmir, he added.

*Statement by the Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas on the CNG supplies in Delhi :* On 30 July 2001, the Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas, Shri Ram Naik made a Statement in the House on the conversion of diesel driven transport system to the Compressed Natural Gas (CNG) driven transport system in Delhi which had become a subject of public concern.

The Minister said that the Supreme Court, in its order dated 28 July 1998, had directed the Gas Authority of India Limited (GAIL) to expedite and expand the number of the CNG outlets from nine to eighty by 31 March 2000 and the Government of National Capital Territory (NCT) of Delhi to convert the entire city bus fleet to a single fuel mode on the CNG by 31 March 2001. The CNG requirements of Delhi were being met by the Indraprastha Gas Limited (IGL), a joint venture of the GAIL, the Bharat Petroleum Corporation Limited (BPCL) and the Government of the NCT of Delhi. The demand of the CNG in the NCT of Delhi had swelled from 1.00 lakh Kgs. per day as on 1 April 2001 to 1.85 lakh Kgs. per day as on 1 July 2001. Seventy-two CNG stations installed so far had included 9 mother stations, 16 online stations, 8 daughter booster stations and 39 daughter stations. The installed compressor capacity of these stations was 2.07 lakh kgs. per day.

The Transport Department of the Government of the NCT of Delhi had reported in all 23,000 CNG fuelled vehicles by the end of April 2001. It had also been indicated that the CNG fuelled three-wheeler autos were likely to get registered at the rate of 1,500-1,800 per month and that 28,605 special permits had been issued to commercial vehicles for conversion by 30 September 2001. Efforts were being made by the IGL to make arrangements for the supply of the CNG for the city bus fleet. As per the Supreme Court's order, only the pre-1990 autos/taxis had to be replaced and that too by vehicles run on "clean fuels" and not necessarily converted to the CNG. The

CNG demand generated by the light motor vehicles, including three-wheeler autos and taxis had swelled because of its pricing advantage at Rs. 12.21 per kg. as against the price of Rs. 28.75 per litre of petrol. The cost per km came to Rs. 0.49 in the case of CNG as against Rs. 1.60 in the case of petrol. The unleaded and low benzene petrol and diesel with 0.05% maximum sulphur content also satisfied the criteria of 'clean fuel', as they met the requirement of the vehicular emission norms from the Bharat Stage-II vehicles – the latest engine technology available in the country. In order to meet the Bharat Stage-I vehicular emission norms throughout the country and the Bharat Stage- II emission norms in the National Capital Territory/ National Capital Region as per the directions of the Supreme Court, expenditure of approximately Rs. 10,000 crore had been incurred by the refineries.

The Minister said that dependency on a single fuel mode of the CNG for the public transport system in Delhi was not desirable and sustainable due to the initial higher and the subsequent maintenance cost of the CNG vehicles; the substantially higher price of the CNG compared to diesel when the requirement would need to be met from the imported Liquefied Natural Gas (LNG); the extra burden on the commuting public on account of increase in the bus fares due to the increased costs of public transport; the risks associated with the disruption in the city public transportation system in situations of break-down in the supply chain of natural gas to Delhi due to unforeseen problems in the 2000 km long Hazira-Bijapur-Jagdishpur (HBJ) pipeline passing through the States of Gujarat, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan and Haryana or the gas processing plant; and the higher safety requirements in using the CNG as auto fuel. The IGL had informed that it had taken several steps to further enhance the supply of CNG in Delhi such as placing orders for higher capacity compressors; increasing the total number of CNG stations to eighty- seven by September 2001; upgrading thirty-nine daughter stations to daughter booster stations progressively by December 2001; initiating action to lay a 23 kms. long gas pipeline connecting Dhaula Kuan with the GT Karnal Road and identifying fifty retail outlets for co-locating the CNG dispensing facility. It would be expedient for the city public transport system to have a dual fuel mode so that if the CNG supply chains failed, the entire city public transport system would not get paralysed. In this regard, on 26 April 2001, the Government had also moved an application in the Supreme Court, he concluded.

*Statement by the Minister of Home Affairs on the brutal murder of Shrimati Phoolan Devi, Member of Parliament:* Making a Statement in the House on 2 August 2001, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri L.K. Advani, said that members had been shocked to hear about the ghastly murder of Smt. Phoolan Devi, member of Parliament, outside her residence on 25 July 2001.

The Minister said that preliminary inquiries revealed that on that day she had gone to the Parliament House Annexe Dispensary for a physiotherapy session after which she and her Personal Security Officer (PSO), Shri Balinder Singh, were driven to her residence at 44, Ashoka Road, New Delhi by Shri Raghuraj Singh Shakya, her party colleague and a member of Parliament, in his car. The assailants wearing masks fired at Smt. Phoolan Devi and her PSO at around 1.20 p.m. as they alighted from the car outside her residence and were walking towards the entrance gate. She was hit by six bullets from close range and was declared brought dead at Dr. Rammanohar Lohia Hospital. Her PSO, who was operated upon, made a statement recorded by the police on 28 and 29 July 2001. Inquiries on the day of the murder itself pointed to one Sher Singh Rana as the prime suspect who reportedly claimed before the Uttaranchal Police that he had killed Smt. Phoolan Devi to avenge the *Behmai* massacre. In the course of Sher Singh's interrogation later by the Delhi Police, he disclosed the names of three other persons allegedly involved in the crime, namely Shekhar Thakur, Rajender and Rajbir Gujjar who were all arrested in Saharanpur on 30 July 2001. The Minister denied the allegation that the personal security provided to Smt. Phoolan Devi had been downgraded by the Government. In July 1994, she had been provided with three plain clothes PSOs functioning round-the-clock in three shifts. In addition, the Government of Uttar Pradesh had provided one armed police personnel for her security. The arrangement had continued till the very end. Smt. Phoolan Devi's life had reflected the social realities of contemporary India. It had shown the inner struggles of a woman who wanted to transcend her past. The incident had once again highlighted the menace of criminalisation of politics afflicting Indian democracy. He pleaded to every political party neither to encourage any kind of association with criminal elements nor to succumb to the temptation of trying to derive political mileage when unfortunate incidents took place.

*Statement by the Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Defence on goodwill visit to Nepal :* Making a Statement in the House on 21 August 2001, the Minister of External Affairs and Minister of

Defence, Shri Jaswant Singh said that he had made a goodwill visit to Nepal from 17 to 19 August 2001 with the purpose of personally conveying to His Majesty King Gyanendra Bir Bikram Shah Dev, the deepest condolences of the President, the Prime Minister, the Government, and the people of India at the grievous tragedy that had struck Nepal in June 2001 and also to convey to the newly-elected Prime Minister of Nepal, His Excellency, Shri Sher Bahadur Deuba, reaffirmation of India's commitment to build further on the existing friendship and cooperation between India and Nepal. Regarding issues of interest between the two countries and apprehensions about the renewal of the existing trade treaty, he had conveyed that India remained fully committed to the growth of industry and employment in Nepal and enhancing trade between the two countries. Regarding concerns expressed in Nepal about the possibility of adverse consequences of a minor flood control embankment being constructed in Siddhartha Nagar district of Uttar Pradesh, he conveyed that though technical provision had been made in the embankment for water to flow through 12 regulators, and that any adverse impact would be unlikely, the construction of the embankment had been promptly halted after receiving their concerns. The apprehensions about the embankment causing damage to *Lumbini* were totally unfounded. He had reiterated India's willingness to develop jointly the water resources of Nepal so that it could become an energy exporting country. He had also conveyed India's appreciation of the movement towards dialogue on the Maoist question and the concerns with regard to the clandestine use of Nepal's territory for anti-India activities by Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI). Nepal had given a firm assurance that any such activity against India would not be tolerated. The relationship between the two countries continued to be that of mutual trust and friendship.

Replying to the points raised by members, the Minister said that the trade treaty with Nepal had an automatic and in-built renewal mechanism and it was due for consideration currently. Trade between the two countries had to be enhanced but India could not be made a dumping ground for any country. The aspect of free trade was being examined by experts and officials of the Ministry of Commerce. Certain modifications had to be carried out for addressing imbalances in the trade. Stability was required in the Indo-Nepal relations and in the interest of strengthening ties, India had to refrain from commenting on the internal matters of Nepal, he concluded.

*Flood situation in the country caused by heavy rains, resulting in loss of lives, property and crops:* On 3 August 2001, Shri Suresh Pachouri of the Indian National Congress called the attention of the

Minister of Agriculture in this regard. Replying to the Calling Attention, the Minister of Agriculture, Shri Ajit Singh said that in June and July 2001, Tripura, Kerala, Chhattisgarh and Orissa had received more than their normal share of rains from the South-West monsoon. The floods in Orissa had occurred in three phases. The first was in the beginning of July 2001, caused by heavy rains in the catchment area of Mahanadi and release of water from some reservoirs in Chhattisgarh into the Mahanadi system which had resulted in inundation in many districts including Puri, Jagatsinghpur, Bhadrak, Khurda, Kendrapara and Kalahandi. The outflow of the overflowing Hirakud reservoir with other run offs caused by the next round of extensive rains had caused serious floods again in twenty-four districts. The situation had aggravated due to the high tide which slowed down drainage in the Bay of Bengal. In all, 96 human lives had been lost with more than 16,000 villages, 87 lakh persons, 8.91 lakh hectares of cropped area and 2.34 lakh houses being affected. The situation had been reviewed by the National Crisis Management Committee under the Chairmanship of the Cabinet Secretary on 18 July 2001 and necessary directions had been issued to various agencies of the Central Government to extend the required assistance to the State Government for restoration of the damaged infrastructure. The Indian Railways which suffered extensive damage in the State had not only managed to restore most of the damage caused by the floods but also had been transporting relief materials and supplies free of cost. The Prime Minister had also visited the State on 29 July and announced a number of relief measures which included release of Rs.100 crore as *ad hoc* assistance from the National Calamity Contingency Fund, release of three lakh tonnes of rice for the Food-for-Work Programme and construction of one lakh housing units for people living below poverty line under the *Indira Aawas Yojana*. The floods in Kerala had taken a heavy toll of more than hundred human lives and a total damage amounting to worth Rs. 551.75 crore. The first and second instalments of 50 per cent of Rs. 26.48 crore of central share of the Calamity Relief Fund (CRF) had already been released. Floods in Chhattisgarh affected Dhamtari district and other catchment areas of the Mahanadi system, affecting twenty-three tehsils and resulting in the loss of 12 human lives and Rs.102 crore. Flash floods in Tripura and the adjoining districts of Assam and Meghalaya had mainly caused damage to the National Highway connecting the State to the rest of the country.

The Border Roads Organisation, the Army, the Navy and the Coast Guards all rendered useful assistance to the State Governments in relief and rescue operations and restoration works. The

Central Government was committed to supplement efforts of the State Governments by making available all possible logistic and financial support. The Department of Agriculture and Cooperation had been closely monitoring the situation in the affected States. Situation reports were being issued regularly from a central control room which would also be available on the website of the Natural Disaster Management Division of the Department. Developments requiring prompt attention were being constantly reviewed at the levels of the Department and the Cabinet Secretary in the National Crisis Management Committee.

Replying to the points raised by members, the Minister said that the Government had responded promptly to natural calamities. There was a permanent flood and drought relief fund and also a contingency fund from which assistance was provided to every State in two instalments. The Planning Commission had given funds to many States for flood control in the past. The Central Water Commission had established a nation-wide flood forecasting and warning system, due to which six lakh people in Orissa could be evacuated on time. The Government had also decided that the Food-for-Work would be provided to the States, irrespective of whether there was flood or drought.

*Recent circulars of the UGC and the NCERT curriculum framework in the context of the National Policy on Education:* On 29 August 2001, Shri Eduardo Faleiro of the Indian National Congress called the attention of the Minister of Human Resource Development in this regard. Replying to the Calling Attention, the Minister of Human Resource Development, Dr. Murli Manohar Joshi said that the National Policy on Education, 1986, as modified in 1992, had been based on an in-depth review of the entire gamut of the educational process. The actions and initiatives taken by the National Council for Educational Research and Training (NCERT) and the University Grants Commission (UGC) in the fields of school and higher education had been in pursuance of, and within the parameters of the National Policy on Education with a view to bringing about quality upgradation and meeting emerging challenges.

The Minister said that the NCERT had implemented important programmes, including setting up of the National Centre for Computer Education, the National Centre for Value Education, the National Resource Centre for Inclusive Education, for which the assistance of the UNESCO was being sought, the Centre for International Relations for organising training programmes for teachers and teacher-trainees



for the SAARC countries and reviving the Programme of Community Singing initiated by late Smt. Indira Gandhi but discontinued in the early 1990s. A Discussion Document on the Curriculum Framework had been published in January 2000, based on extensive deliberations of experts in seven constituent units, including the Central Institute of Vocational Studies, Bhopal and the Central Institute of Education and Technology, New Delhi and consultations with teachers, educators and parents. Seminars and conferences had also been organised to discuss the Document. Based upon the inputs received, the NCERT had finalised the National Curriculum Framework in November 2000. It had been considered in December 2000 in the General Body of the NCERT, wherein the Education Ministers of all States and Union territories were members. Copies of the final/revised document of the National Curriculum Framework for School Education were subsequently distributed to various organisations, Central/State Governments and newspaper editors. The NCERT was currently engaged in the task of developing new curricular materials including textbooks.

Regarding the UGC, the Minister said that during the years 1999-2001, the UGC had issued thirty-one circulars on excellence and quality, covering a comprehensive plan of action for improving the quality and standards of teaching and research, compulsory minimum attendance of 75 per cent by students, adjunct professorship, national lecturership, career advancement scheme from Reader to Professor, fellowships, compulsory accreditation through the National Assessment and Accreditation Council (NAAC), UGC regulations on minimum qualifications, autonomous colleges, work ethics and self discipline in universities, audit of educational institutions, recognition of degrees specified by the UGC, award of degrees by private franchisees of universities, minimum standards of instructions for grant of first degree, appointment of observers in selection committees, revised guidelines for deemed universities, listing of fake universities, Cell for Prevention of Malpractices, performance linked funding, etc. The UGC had also issued six circulars on access and equity concerning coaching classes for minority communities, Reader's allowance to blind teachers, etc.; eleven circulars on relevance of education including establishment of the Department of Human Consciousness and Yogic Science, setting up of simple Sanskrit Speaking Centres, etc.; fifteen circulars on general development and other aspects of university education including prevention of ragging in universities and colleges, emergency powers of the Vice-Chancellors, etc.; and one circular on creation of 15 per cent supernumerary seats for foreign students with preference to persons of Indian origin.

Replying to the points raised by members, the Minister said that the inclusion of Sanskrit in teaching syllabus would not be against secularism and tantamount to imposing religious education. The study of Sanskrit would be optional and not compulsory. The Government had taken a number of steps for the promotion of Persian and Arabic also. The Textbooks Board had taken note of the observations and suggestions made by members and suitable revisions would be made in the future edition. References in history books which were against the Indian spirit and liable to cause disintegration of the society would be looked into and deleted wherever necessary. Education could not be left to the market forces. The Government wanted to present a balanced picture of historical facts. It had a firm and definite Education Policy, the Minister added.

*Short Duration Discussion on the working of the UTI with special reference to freeze on sale and repurchase of the US-64 and failure of the Government to take timely action:* A Short Duration Discussion took place in the House in this regard on 24, 25, 30 and 31 July 2001 and 1 and 2 August 2001. Initiating the discussion on 24 July 2001, Shri V.V. Raghavan of the Communist Party of India said that twenty million common people who had subscribed to the US-64 Scheme of the Unit Trust of India (UTI) had been cheated. He wanted to know the reason for the UTI's intervention when the shares of the big corporate houses went down. He also enquired from the Government as to why the small unit holders had been given under asset value while the corporate houses had got their entire units redeemed at higher value.

Participating in the discussion\*, the Leader of the Opposition, Dr. Manmohan Singh said that the UTI was not an ordinary institution as it accounted for nearly 65 to 70 per cent of the total business in the mutual fund industry and was also an investor in a number of enterprises. While the wrong-doing had to be punished, the system reforms had to be given priority attention.

Shri S. Viduthalai Virumbi of the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam said that if the UTI had adhered to the recommendations of the Deepak Parekh Committee, investors would have been saved. There was a

---

Others who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Ramdas Agarwal, Santosh Bagrodia, Nilotpal Basu, C. Ramachandraiah, Amar Singh, Kapil Sibal, Fali S. Nariman, T.N. Chaturvedi, Prem Chand Gupta, P. G. Narayanan, Sanjay Nirupam, Kuldip Nayyar, N.K. Premachandran, S. Peter Alphonse, Shankar Roy Chowdhury, Praful Patel, Gandhi Azad and Cho. S. Ramaswamy

need to set up a Serious Fraud Office as existing in the United Kingdom (UK) which would investigate people involved in economic crimes.

Replying to the debate on 31 July 2001, the Minister of Finance, Shri Yashwant Sinha said that the value of the stocks held under the US-64 Scheme had declined, thereby causing a further decline in the overall value of the fund. The UTI had come out with a redemption scheme and the Government stood fully behind the UTI as far as the redemption in future was concerned. The value of the corpus had declined because it was subjected to the fluctuations of the stock market. The US-64 was not an assured income scheme but a regular income scheme. There were three features which distinguished the Scheme. Firstly, the people who invested in units of the Scheme made capital gains. Secondly, they received annual dividends from the UTI. Thirdly, it provided liquidity. When the UTI announced the freeze on 2 July 2001, the liquidity of the Scheme had to be restricted for a period of six months which the investors did not like and a situation arose which the Government was trying to correct.

Regarding the use of tax-payers' money, the Minister said that it had been invested in the Public Sector Undertakings' (PSU) stocks held by the UTI. The US-64 Scheme had suffered loss of revenue because of the PSU shares. The Government had repurchased the PSU shares from the US-64 Scheme so that the unit-holders did not suffer the loss of value. Regarding how the equity structure of the Scheme changed, he said that during three years, *i.e.* 1994-95, 1995-96 and 1996-97, the UTI and the US-64 drew heavily upon the reserves in order to declare high dividends. That was the reason the reserves turned negative.

Continuing his reply to the debate on 1 August 2001, the Minister said that while it was of utmost importance that confidence in the financial markets was fully restored, a situation was also to be created whereby that confidence was not tested and endangered again. Regarding redemptions which took place in April-May of the current year from the US-64, he said that the re-purchase price of the units was the highest in the months of April and May 2001 and that was the time when people made re-purchases. The redemptions were Rs. 473 crore in April 2001. In May 2001, it had suddenly increased to Rs. 3,682 crore out of which Rs. 1,557 crore were redemptions by individuals. The balance amount of Rs. 2,125 crore were redemptions by non-individuals which included public and private sector banks and other corporates.

Regarding the investment of the UTI in a Mumbai based company, he said that the investment decision had been taken by the UTI Board and the Ministry of Finance did not have anything to do with it. As the Minister-in-charge of the UTI, he said that he would not accuse the UTI of deliberately making wrong investments. The Minister said that on 3 July 2001, the Chairman of the UTI had been removed and a new Chairman had been appointed on 4 July 2001. A Committee to inquire into the transactions of the UTI during the last ten years had also been set up.

Continuing his reply to the debate on 2 August 2001, the Minister said that the Deepak Parekh Committee appointed by the UTI to go into its affairs had made a total of nineteen recommendations, out of which ten had been fully implemented and seven had come under various stages of implementation while two had not been implemented as it involved amendment to the UTI Act. The UTI was repurchasing only 3000 units per account holder. The total amount of money involved was a little over Rs.5 crore. It had become the Government's responsibility to live up to the perception that it was backing the UTI and its schemes. A Joint Parliamentary Committee set up to look into the market scam was already working, the Minister added.

*Short Duration Discussion on the economic slowdown, fall in the GDP rate and deteriorating financial condition of the country in the context of mid-term appraisal of the Ninth Five Year Plan:* A discussion in this regard took place in the House on 16, 17 and 20 August 2001. Initiating the discussion on 16 August 2001, Shri J. Chitharanjan of the Communist Party of India said that the current economic slowdown was taking place at the time when a determined effort had been made by the Government to implement the second phase of economic reforms programme. The critical sectors of the economy such as manufacturing, construction, electricity, agriculture, services, etc. were facing deceleration. In so far as the financial situation was concerned the gross fiscal deficit had also risen. Increase in market borrowings in the last two years would lead to further increase in debt and interest liability. Tax collection had not been effective Exports had come down; exports of cashew, coffee, spices and tea had declined creating a serious crisis in those sectors. In the field of foreign investment, there had been a mild improvement of 2 to 2.5 billion dollars per year, whereas the target had been 10 billion dollars per year. Lakhs of people were being thrown out of employment in the Public Sector in the name of the Voluntary Retirement Scheme (VRS). Increase in private investments by Indian industrialists had not happened even though concessions had been given to them

year after year when Budgets were presented. He regretted that the Government had reduced the interest rate on various savings like the Employees Provident Fund, the Public Provident Fund and savings in Post Office which would not increase the national savings consequently. He called for a thorough review of the current economic policies and adoption of a democratic and progressive policy.

Participating in the discussion\*, Shri S. Viduthalai Virumbi of the Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam said that there was a need to satisfy the aspirations of the educated youth. He expressed concern on the tax evasions, fall of savings rate which would affect investments, shortfall of revenue receipts and the increase in revenue expenditure.

Shri Satish Pradhan of the Shiv Sena expressed concern at the lack of proper storage facility with the Food Corporation of India resulting in the diversion of surplus paddy for other use. No arrangements had been made to provide sufficient paddy to the States suffering from famine. The State Governments did not have sufficient funds to give monthly salary. An atmosphere had to be built in which our industries could compete with those of other countries, he added.

Replying to the discussion on 20 August 2001, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Planning, Shri Arun Shourie agreed that there had been a comprehensive slowdown in the economy in spite of higher rate of growth in mining and quarrying. He said that the fundamentals of India's economy were strong but performance had to be improved. The range of production in India had been growing during the structural changes within the economy. Tariff level had come down from 125 per cent to 35 per cent but the Indian industry had stood up to the competition.

Regarding the fall in public investments, the Minister said that the Government wanted investments to be higher but it would not allow any change in the strength of Government servants. The Pay Commission had cost the public exchequer Rs. 35,000 to Rs. 40,000 crore. The pension figure today had reached Rs. 20,000 crore, two hundred times more than it was in 1974-75. More than 70 per cent of the total tax revenue had been spent for payment of interest on past loans.

---

\* Others who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Pranab Mukherjee, Narendra Mohan, Krishna Kumar Birla, C. Ramachandraiah, Ravi Shankar Prasad, Manoj Bhattacharya, Dipankar Mukherjee, C.M. Ibrahim, Eduardo Faleiro, Prem Chand Gupta, Balbir K. Punj, R. Kamaraj, Suresh A. Keswani, Gandhi Azad, Praful Patel, Fall S. Nariman, Rajeev Shukla, R.P. Goenka, Lalitbhai Mehta, P. Prabhakar Reddy and Dr. Biplob Dasgupta

Moreover, the States had made a negative contribution to the Plan outlay. There was a need to reverse the policies of giving free power to agriculture, subsidy to passenger traffic on Indian Railways, etc.

The Minister said that a Committee had been appointed to review labour problems comprehensively. Any change in the Public Distribution System would be to benefit the poor. Reforms required legislation and there was a need to focus on implementation of laws and improving the quality of public expenditure, he concluded.

### LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

*The Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill, 2001\**: Moving the motion for consideration of the Bill on 2 August 2001, the Minister of State (Independent charge) in the Ministry of Road Transport and Highways, Maj. Gen. (Retd.) B.C. Khanduri said that the Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 had been amended in 1994 to encourage the use of non-conventional energy for the purpose of road transport. As per amendments in sections 66(1) and 67 of the Act, motor transport vehicles were permitted to select their own routes and fix their own fares and freight. In recent years, the technology had been refined and the vehicles using eco-friendly fuels such as the CNG had increased, particularly in Delhi and Bombay. The Bill sought to withdraw the incentives which had been given to the CNG, electricity and solar power driven vehicles and to allow the State Governments to control issue of permits and fares relating to them.

Intervening in the debate on 6 August 2001, the Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas, Shri Ram Naik said that with regard to the CNG problems, the Government had filed an application in the Supreme Court on 26 April 2001 indicating all difficulties. The Government was making all efforts to explore and get more gas and also to see that clean fuel was being supplied to Delhi. But the CNG alone could not solve the mass transport requirement of a city like Delhi where railways was practically non-existent.

Replying to the debate\*\* the Minister said that the Bill involved the withdrawal of certain concessions that were being given to the CNG, electricity and solar power driven vehicles. Apart from Delhi

---

\* The Bill was introduced in the Rajya Sabha on 24 April 2001.

\*\* Others who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri K.Rahman Khan, Anantray Devshanker Dave, A. Vijaya Raghavan, Khan Ghufuran Zahidi, C.P.Thirunavukkarasu, Balwant Singh Ramoowalia, N.K.Premachandran, H.K.Javare Gowda, Fali S. Nariman and Smt. Saroj Dubey

and Mumbai, the CNG was not likely to be available at other places in the near future. On the licensing system, the Central Government had set up a committee which had suggested a computerised system and a smart card for licencing. It was also trying to develop an all-India system whereby a person having a driving licence could be identified and located at any place, in any of the transport offices in the country.

The motion for consideration of the Bill and Clauses, etc. were adopted and the Bill was passed.

*The Indian Medical Council (Amendment) Bill, 2001\**: Moving the motion for consideration of the Bill on 6 August 2001, the Minister of Health and Family Welfare, Dr. C.P. Thakur said that the Bill sought to enable the Medical Council of India to conduct a screening test for the holders of foreign medical qualifications in order to satisfy itself with regard to the adequacy of their knowledge and skills, before they were granted registration to practice medicine in India. This related to those Indian students who had qualified for MBBS from various foreign universities without fulfilling the minimum eligibility requirements for admission to medical courses in India.

Replying to the debate\*\* the Minister said that the Bill had been brought forward to solve the problem of those students who returned to the country after having their education abroad and were having difficulties in getting themselves registered. The proper legislation would bring parity among the students returning from various countries.

The motion for consideration of the Bill and Clauses, etc. were adopted and the Bill was passed.

*The Electricity Regulatory Commissions (Amendment) Bill, 2001\*\*\**: Moving the motion for consideration of the Bill on 7 August 2001, the Minister of Power, Shri Suresh Prabhu said that the Bill would enable smaller States and the Union territories to come together and form a Joint Electricity Regulatory Commission which would reduce the cost of administration. It would also help the smaller States to pool their resources together and make the Joint Regulatory Commission operative in their respective States. He said that the Government had

---

\* The Bill was introduced in the Rajya Sabha on 12 March 2001.

\*\* Those who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri Manmohan Samal, S.Viduthalai Virumbi, Rajiv Ranjan Singh 'Lalan', Khan Ghufuran Zahidi, Sangh Priya Gautam, Mirza Abdul Rashid, Dr. Y. Radhakrishna Murty, Dr. Raja Ramanna and Smt. Jamana Devi Barupal

\*\*\* The Bill, as passed by the Lok Sabha, was laid on the Table on 7 March 2001.

received requests from several States and Union territories, particularly from the North-East to get the Bill passed so that they could set up Joint Regulatory Commissions.

Replying to the debate\*, the Minister said that since the Parliament had already enacted a law for creating the Electricity Regulatory Commissions, there could be no objection to the creation of Joint Electricity Regulatory Commissions which could facilitate the implementation of the will of the Parliament in a more effective manner. There was a need to reorient the power policy and make the power sector more commercially viable so that it could take care of itself and cater to the needs of the vulnerable sections of the society. Bringing about commercial viability would require reduction in the cost of power and increase in the average cost of tariff. The Government would introduce a concept of accountability for the transmission and distribution losses at every distribution level.

The motion for consideration of the Bill and Clauses, etc. were adopted and the Bill was passed.

*The Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 2001\*\**: On 29 August 2001, the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Minister of Information Technology, Shri Pramod Mahajan moved the motion for consideration of the Bill to further amend the Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament Act, 1954, as passed by the Lok Sabha. [The Bill proposed to enhance the Salary of the members from Rs. 4000 per mensem to Rs. 12,000 per mensem for a period of five years; the daily allowance from Rs. 400 to Rs. 500; and the rate of road mileage from Rs. 6 per km to Rs. 8 per km. In addition, it also proposed to enhance the constituency allowance from Rs. 8,000 per mensem to Rs. 10,000 per mensem; the office expense allowance from Rs. 9500 p.m. to Rs. 14,000 p.m.; 25,000 free units of electricity to 50,000 units in a year; and free 2000 kilolitres of water to 4000 kilolitres in a year. It also proposed to provide 20,000 additional free local telephone calls to members whose constituencies are more than 1000 kms away from Delhi; as also mobile phones to members with the adjustment of the calls to be made from such phones against one lakh free local calls available to them.]

---

\* Those who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Santosh Bagrodia, Ramdas Agarwal, Dipankar Mukherjee, P. Prabhakar Reddy, S. Viduthalai Virumbi, Prem Chand Gupta, Ramachandra Khuntia, V.V. Raghavan, S.S. Chandran, B.J. Panda and N.K. Premachandran

\*\* The Bill, as passed by the Lok Sabha, was laid on the Table on 27 August 2001 [Extracts from the 'Objects and Reasons' of the Bill]



Replying to the debate\* the Minister said that the salaries and allowances of members of Parliament were being determined by Parliament as per the provision made under article 106 of the Constitution. For the first time, members would pay income tax at the rate of 30 per cent.

The motion for consideration of the Bill and Clauses, etc. were adopted and the Bill was passed.

### C. QUESTION HOUR

During the One Hundred and Ninety-third Session of the Rajya Sabha, 10,346 notices of questions (9,565 Starred and 781 Unstarred) were received. Out of these, 580 questions were admitted as Starred and 4,430 as Unstarred. The total number of notices of questions received in Hindi was 1,838.

*Daily average of Questions:* For all days, the list of Starred Questions contained 20 questions. The average number of questions orally answered was 3.25 per sitting. The maximum number of questions orally answered on a particular day was six on 24 July 2001 and 24 August 2001 and the minimum number of questions orally answered was two on 2, 3, 9, 16 and 20 August 2001. The list of Unstarred Questions contained 124, 130 and 146 questions on 1, 8 and 31 August 2001 respectively, and on the rest of the days it contained 155 questions each.

*Half-an-Hour Discussions:* Ten notices of Half-an-Hour Discussion were received, out of which three notices were admitted jointly, but none could be discussed due to the adjournment of the House.

*Short Notice Questions:* Out of the five Short Notice Questions received, only one notice was admitted but could not be discussed.

### D. OBITUARY REFERENCES

During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing away of King Birendra Bir Bikram Shah Dev and other members of the royal family of Nepal; Smt. Phoolan Devi, sitting member, Lok Sabha; Shri G.K. Moopnar, sitting member, Rajya Sabha and Sarvashri R.K. Narayan, G.Y. Krishnan, Jagan Nath Kaushal, Mohammad Yunus, Niren Ghosh, V.C. Ganesan, Banka Behary Das and Begum Aizaz Rasul, all former members; and Shri S.S. Bhalerao, former Secretary-General, Rajya Sabha. Members stood in silence as a mark of respect to the deceased.

---

\* Those who took part in the discussion were : Sarvashri S.Ramachandran Pillai, Rama Shanker Kaushik, Gaya Singh, Shankar Roy Chowdhury, Manoj Bhattacharya, Képil Sibal, Dipankar Mukherjee, Khan Ghufan Zahidi, Dr. M.N.Das and Dr. Alladi P. Rajkumar

## STATE LEGISLATURES

### ASSAM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY\*

The Eleventh Assam Legislative Assembly, which commenced its Second Session on 27 September 2001, was prorogued on 6 October 2001. There were five sittings in all.

*Legislative business:* During the Session, seven Bills were passed by the House. These included: (i) The Assam General Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 2001; (ii) The Assam Taxation (on Luxuries) (Amendment) Bill, 2001; (iii) The Assam Entry Tax (Amendment) Bill, 2001; (iv) The Assam Profession, Trades, Callings and Employment Taxation (Amendment) Bill, 2001; (v) The Assam Panchayat (Amendment) Bill, 2001; and (vi) The Assam Appropriation (No. IV) Bill, 2001.

*Financial business:* During the Session, Supplementary Demands for Grants and Supplementary Appropriations for the year 2001-2002 were presented to the House and later passed. The House also passed the Assam Appropriation (No. IV) Bill, 2001.

*Obituary references:* During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing away of eighteen eminent personalities and also on those who lost their lives in the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Centre and the Pentagon in the United States of America and in the bomb explosion in the complex of the Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Assembly in Srinagar.

### JHARKHAND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY\*\*

The First Jharkhand Legislative Assembly, which commenced its Third Session on 17 August 2001, was adjourned *sine die* on 24 August 2001. There were six sittings in all.

*Legislative business:* During the Session, the House passed the Jharkhand Appropriation (No.3) Bill, 2001. In addition to this, nine Bills, after the approval of the Governor, were laid on the Table of the House by the Secretary-in-Charge. They were: (i) The Jharkhand Appropriation Bill, 2001; (ii) The Jharkhand Contingency Fund Bill, 2001; (iii) The Jharkhand Area Autonomous Council (Abolition) Bill, 2001; (iv) The Jharkhand Panchayat Raj Bill, 2001; (v) The Jharkhand

---

\* Material contributed by the Assam Legislative Assembly Secretariat

\*\* Material contributed by the Jharkhand Legislative Assembly Secretariat

Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 2001; (vi) The Jharkhand Legislature (Members Salary, Allowances and Pension) Bill, 2001; (vii) The Jharkhand Legislature (Officers' Salary, Allowances) Bill, 2001; (viii) The Jharkhand Legislature (Leader of Opposition) (Salary, Allowances) Bill, 2001; and (ix) The Jharkhand Ministers' Salary and Allowances Bill, 2001.

*Financial business:* On 20 August 2001, the Minister of Finance, Shri Mrigendra Pratap Singh introduced the Demands for Grants of the Cabinet Secretariat and Co-ordination Department which were discussed and passed by the House along with the Supplementary Budget. The Demands for Grants in respect of the other Departments were later guillotined. The Jharkhand Appropriation Bill (No. 3), 2001 was also passed.

*Rules of Procedure:* On 21 August 2001, the House discussed and adopted its Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business.

*Obituary references:* During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing away of Choudhary Devi Lal, former Deputy Prime Minister; Shri Ram Dhan, former member of Parliament; and Sarvashri Puranchand, Mahangu Lal Das Manjhi, Ras Raj Tudu and Shyam Charan Murmu, all former members of the undivided Bihar Legislative Assembly.

### **KARNATAKA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY\***

The Eleventh Karnataka Legislative Assembly, which commenced its Third Session on 16 July 2001, was adjourned *sine die* on 4 August 2001. There were sixteen sittings in all.

*Legislative business:* During the Session, fifteen Bills (including two Appropriation Bills) were passed by the House.

*Financial business:* During the Session, the General Discussion on the Demands for Grants for the year 2001-2002 took place in which twenty-seven members participated. The Chief Minister, Shri S.M. Krishna replied to the debate on 30 July 2001. The relevant Appropriation Bill was passed on 1 August 2001. The Supplementary Estimates for the year 2001-2002 (First Instalment) was presented on 1 August 2001 and later passed by the House on 3 August 2001. The relevant Appropriation Bill was passed the same day.

*Obituary references:* During the Session, obituary references were

---

\* Material contributed by the Karnataka Legislative Assembly Secretariat

made on the passing away of former State Ministers, Shri Gopinath Sandra and Shri Annarao Balappa Jaknoor; Shri C. Narayana Reddy, a sitting member of the Legislative Council; and some former members of the Legislative Assembly.

### **MADHYA PRADESH VIDHAN SABHA\***

The Eleventh Madhya Pradesh Vidhan Sabha, which commenced its Eighth Session on 20 August 2001, was adjourned *sine die* on 21 September 2001. There were twenty-three sittings in all.

**Legislative business:** During the Session, fourteen Bills were passed by the House. The following are some of the important Bills passed by the House: (i) The Madhya Pradesh Vrukshon Kaa Parirakshan (Nagriya Kshetra) Vidheyak, 2001; (ii) The Madhya Pradesh Lok Ayukta Evam Up-lok Ayukta (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001; (iii) The Madhya Pradesh Sarvajanik Sthan (Dharmik Bhawan Evam Gatividhiyon Kaa Viniyaman) Vidheyak, 2001; (iv) The Madhya Pradesh Adhyaksha Tatha Upadhyaksha, Neta Pratipaksha Tatha Vidhan Sabha Sadasya Vetan, Bhatta Tatha Pension Vidhi Sanshodhan Vidheyak, 2001; and (v) The Madhya Pradesh Mantri (Vetan Tatha Bhatta) Sanshodhan Vidheyak, 2001.

**Financial business:** On 7 September 2001, the Minister of Finance, Shri Ajai Mushran introduced the First Supplementary Demands for the year 2001-2002, which were granted by the House on 10 September 2001 after a brief discussion.

**Obituary references:** During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing away of Choudhary Devi Lal, former Deputy Prime Minister of India; Kunwar Mehmood Ali Khan, former Governor of Madhya Pradesh; Sarvashri Narsingh Rao Dixit, Prabhudayal Chaubey, Vishweshwar Prasad, Raghuvir Singh, Ramesh Dubey, Anoopsingh Bhagwan Singh, Kunwar Singh Mandloi, Suryadeo Sharma, Sawai Singh Mandloi, Kishore Singh, and Smt. Chamelibai Sagar, all former members of the Assembly; Pandit Ramnarayan Upadhyay, a well known literary personality; and Shri Shailendra Shaily, the State Secretary of the Communist Party (Marxist). Obituary references were also made in the memory of those who lost their lives in the terrorist attacks at various places in the United States of America on 11 September 2001.

**MAHARASHTRA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY\***

The Maharashtra Legislative Assembly, which commenced its Second Session of the year on 16 July 2001, was prorogued on 3 August 2001. There were fifteen sittings in all.

*Legislative business:* During the Session, the following Bills were passed by the House: (i) The Maharashtra Pre-School Centres (Regulation of Admission) Bill, 2001; (ii) The Maharashtra State Enterprises (Restructuring and other Special Provisions) Bill, 2001; (iii) The Bombay Motor Vehicles (Third Amendment) Bill, 2001; (iv) The Maharashtra University of Health Sciences (Amendment) Bill, 2001; (v) The Maharashtra Municipal Councils, Nagar Panchayats and Industrial Townships (Amendment) Bill, 2001; (vi) The Maharashtra Gunthewari Development (Regulation, Upgradation and Control) Bill, 2001; (vii) The Maharashtra Universities (Amendment) Bill, 2001; (viii) The Maharashtra Forest Development (Tax on Sale of Forest Produce by Government or Forest Development Corporation (Continuance) (Amendment) Appropriation Bill, 2001; (ix) The Maharashtra (Second Supplementary) Appropriation Bill, 2001; (x) The Bombay Civil Courts (Amendment) Bill, 2001; (xi) The Prince of Wales Museum (Amendment) Bill, 2001; (xii) The Maharashtra Co-operative Societies (Third Amendment) Bill, 2001; and (xiii) The Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) (Amendment) Bill, 2001.

*Financial business:* During the Session, the Minister of Finance presented the Supplementary Demands for the year 2001-2002. The discussion and voting on the Supplementary Demands of five Departments were held on 24 and 25 July 2001.

*Obituary references:* During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing away of the former Chief Minister of Maharashtra, Shri Sudhakar Rao Rajusing Naik; a sitting member, Shri Subhash Bapurao Kul; Sarvashri Jayantrao Shridhar Tilak and Sakham Gopalrao Nakhate, both former Ministers; Sarvashri Chaturbhai Mangaldas Amin, Govindrao Narsingrao More-Telkikar, Kisanrao Pandharinath Bhise, Santoshrao Narayan Patil, Chandrabhan Bhausaheb Ghogare-Patil, Ravindra Ramchandra Sabnis, Sahebrao Sakojirao Deshmukh-Baradkar and Mangaldas Bholaram Yadav, all former members of the Assembly.

**MIZORAM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY\***

The Fourth Mizoram Legislative Assembly commenced its Tenth Session on 17 October 2001. The House was later prorogued by the Governor on 23 October 2001. There were five sittings in all.

*Legislative business:* During the Session, the following Bills were passed by the House: (i) The Mizoram (Sales of Petroleum and Petroleum Products, including motor spirit and lubricants) Taxation (5<sup>th</sup> Amendment) Bill, 2001; (ii) The Mizoram Public Demands Recovery Bill, 2001; (iii) The Mizoram (Prevention of Government Land Encroachment) Bill, 2001; (iv) The Mizoram (Pension of Members of the Defunct Mizo District Council and of the Defunct Pawi-lakher Regional Council) (Amendment) Bill, 2001; and (v) The Mizoram Cooperative Societies (Amendment) Bill, 2001.

*Obituary references:* During the Session, obituary reference was made on the passing away of Shri Vanlalnghaka, a former member of the Assembly.

**NAGALAND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY\*\***

The Ninth Nagaland Legislative Assembly, held its Tenth Session with two sittings on 24 and 25 September 2001.

*Legislative business:* During the Session, the following three Bills were passed by the House: (i) The Nagaland Legislative Assembly Member's Salaries, Allowances and Pension (Amendment) Bill, 2001; (ii) The Nagaland Appropriation (No.4) Bill, 2001; and (iii) The Nagaland Municipal Bill, 2001.

*Financial business:* During the Session, the Chief Minister presented the Supplementary Demands for Grants for regularisation of Excess Expenditure for the year 1991-92. These were subsequently passed by the House.

*Obituary references:* During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing away of Shri N.L. Odyuo, a former Minister, Shri Imsumeren, a former member, and also on those who lost their lives in the terrorist attacks in U.S.A.

---

\* Material contributed by the Mizoram Legislative Assembly Secretariat

\*\* Material contributed by the Nagaland Legislative Assembly Secretariat

**ORISSA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY\***

The Twelfth Orissa Legislative Assembly, which commenced its Fifth Session on 30 July 2001, was adjourned *sine die* on 9 August 2001. The House was later prorogued on 28 August 2001. There were eight sittings in all.

*Legislative business:* During the Session, five Bills, including an Appropriation Bill, were passed by the House.

*Financial business:* On 1 August 2001, the Minister of Finance, Shri Ram Krushna Patniak presented the First Supplementary Statement of Expenditure to the House. Only one Demand for Grants pertaining to the Water Resources Department was discussed in the House and the rest of the Demands were guillotined. The relevant Appropriation Bill was passed by the House on 9 August 2001.

*Obituary references:* During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing away of the former Governor of Orissa, Shri Gopala Ramanujam; a sitting member of the Assembly, Shri Duryodhan Sohela; and Shri Banka Behari Das, a former member of the Assembly.

**TRIPURA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY\*\***

The Eighth Tripura Legislative Assembly, which commenced its Tenth Session on 24 August 2001, was adjourned *sine die* on 29 August 2001. There were four sittings in all.

*Legislative business:* During the Session, the following three Bills were passed by the House: (i) The Tripura Tea Companies (Taking over of Management of Certain Tea Units) (Third Amendment) Bill, 2001; (ii) The Tripura Sales Tax (Tenth Amendment) Bill, 2001; and (iii) The Salary, Allowances and other Amenities of the Leader of the Opposition in the Tripura Legislative Assembly, Bill, 2001.

*Obituary references:* During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing away of Choudhary Devi Lal, former Deputy Prime Minister; Smt. Phoolan Devi, a sitting member of Parliament; Shri Nripen Choudhury, a sitting member of the Tripura Tribal Areas Autonomous District Council and a member of the Forward Bloc State Committee; Shri Sarbajoy Reang, a former member of the Tripura Tribal Areas Autonomous District Council; and Sarvashri Sailen Dasgupta and Niren Ghosh, both eminent freedom fighters.

---

\* Material contributed by the Orissa Legislative Assembly Secretariat

\*\* Material contributed by the Tripura Legislative Assembly Secretariat

## RECENT LITERATURE OF PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST

---

### I. BOOKS

Abernethy, David B., *Dynamics of Global Dominance: European Overseas Empires 1415-1980* (London: Yale University Press), 2000

Abrahamsen, Rita, *Disciplining Democracy: Development Discourse and Good Governance in Africa* (London: Zed Books), 2000

Adiraju, V.R., *Netaji Subhas Bose: The Great Revolutionary* (Hyderabad: Om See Satya Publications), 2001

Akhtar, Rai Shakil, *Media, Religion, and Politics in Pakistan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 2000

Antlov, Hans, ed. *The Cultural Construction of Politics in Asia* (Surrey: Curzon), 2000

Aruna, Aladi, *Unfederal Features of Indian Constitution* (Chennai: Mathivanan Publications), 2001

Barry, John, ed. *Sustaining Liberal Democracy: Ecological Challenges and Opportunities* (Houndmills: Palgrave), 2001

Bhattacharjea, Mira Sinha, *China, the World and India* (New Delhi: Samskriti), 2001

Bimal Prasad, *Pathway to India's Partition* (New Delhi: Manohar Publishers and Distributors), 2000

Blang, Ricardo, ed. *Democracy: A Reader* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), 2000

Burnell, Peter, ed. *Democracy Assistance: International Co-operation for Democratization* (London: Frank Cass), 2000

Cabrita, Joao M., *Mozambique: The Tortuous Road to Democracy* (Houndmills: Palgrave), 2000

Chaube, Shibanikinkar, *Constituent Assembly of India: Spring-board of Revolution (2<sup>nd</sup> edn.)* (New Delhi: Manohar Publishers and Distributors), 2000



Chavan, Sheshrao, *Makers of Indian Constitution: Myths and Reality* (Mumbai: Bharatiya Vidya Bhawan), 2000

Chishti, M. Anees, *Committees and Commissions in Pre-Independence India 1836-1947* (New Delhi: Mittal Publications), 2001

Cohen-Almagor, Raphael, ed. *Liberal Democracy and the Limits of Tolerance: Essays in Honour and Memory of Yitzhak Robin* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press), 2000

Cornwell, Grant H., ed. *Global Multiculturalism: Comparative Perspectives on Ethnicity, Race and Nation* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers), 2001

Ericson, Richard V., ed. *Governing Modern Societies* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 2000

Fadia, B.L., ed. *Reviewing the Constitution?* (Udaipur: Himanshu Publications), 2001

Fierke, Karin M., *Constructing International Relations: The Next Generation* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe), 2001

Gopal, S., ed. *Selected Works of Jawaharlal Nehru* Vol. 27 (New Delhi: Jawaharlal Nehru Memorial Fund), 2000

Gray, Chris Hables, *Cyborg Citizen: Politics in the Post-human Age* (New York: Routledge), 2001

Greven, Michael Th., ed. *Democracy Beyond the State? The European Dilemma and the Emerging Global Order* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 2001

Herzog, Todd and Gilman, Sander L., ed. *New Germany in a New Europe* (New York: Routledge), 2001

International IDEA: *Democracy in the Making* (Stockholm: International IDEA), 2000

Inter-Parliamentary Union, *Conference of Presiding Officers of National Parliaments: UN Headquarters, New York, 30 August–1 September 2000* (Geneva: Inter Parliamentary Union), 2001

Irigaray, Luce, *Democracy Begins Between Two* (London: The Athlone Press), 2000

Jain, Subhash C., *Constitution of India: Select Issues and Perceptions* (New Delhi: Taxmann Publications), 2000

Johannen, Uwe, ed. *The Political Dimensions of the Asian Crisis* (Singapore: Select Books), 2000

Joshi, Akshay, *Information Age and India* (New Delhi: Knowledge World), 2001

Kagzi, M.C. Jain, *Constitution of India: As Amended upto 83<sup>rd</sup> Amendment with Complete Text and Statement of Objects and Reasons Along with Chapter on Efforts for Review of Constitution of India* (6 edn.) (New Delhi: India Law House), 2001

Kashyap, Subhash C., *Speaker's Office. (Rev. edn.)* (Delhi: Shipra Publications), 2001

Khanna, S.K., *Encyclopaedia of Contemporary Indian Politics* (New Delhi: Commonwealth Publishers), 2001

Mason, David S., *Marketing Democracy : Changing Opinion About Inequality and Politics in East Central Europe* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers), 2000

Misra, D.P., *India's March to Freedom* (New Delhi: Har-Anand Publications), 2001

Misra, D.P., *The Nehru Epoch: From Democracy to Monocracy* (New Delhi: Har-Anand Publications), 2001

Nanda, B.R., ed. *Selected Works of Govind Ballabh Pant* Vol. 14 (New Delhi: Oxford University Press), 2001

Nathan, Richard P., *Social Science in Government: The Role of Policy Researchers* (Albany: The Rockefeller Institute Press), 2000

Noorani, A.G., *The RSS and the BJP: A Division of Labour* (New Delhi: Left Word Books), 2000

Nye, Joseph S., ed. *Governance in a Globalizing World* (Cambridge: Visions of Governance for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century), 2000

Pai Panandiker, V.A. and Kashyap, Subhash C., ed. *Political Reforms: Asserting Civic Sovereignty* (Delhi: Konark Publishers), 2001

Pierson, Christopher, *Hard Choices: Social Democracy in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge: Polity Press), 2001

Raju, A. Subramanyam, *Democracies at Loggerheads: Security Aspects of US - India Relations* (New Delhi: South Asian Publishers), 2001

Rosner, Lisa, *A Short History of Europe 1600-1815: Search for a Reasonable World* (Armonk: M.E. Sharpe), 2000

*Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Punjab Vidhan Sabha* (Chandigarh: Punjab Legislative Assembly Secretariat), 2000

Russell, Peter H., ed. *The Future of Social Democracy: Views of Leaders from around the World* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 1999

Santhanam, M.K., ed. *50 Years of Indian Republic* (New Delhi: Publications Division), 2000

*Seminar on Commonwealth National Human Rights Institutions: Promoting Good Practices: Seminar Report* (London: Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative (CHRI)), 1997

Siddiqui, Tasneem Ahmad, *Towards Good Governance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), 2001

Sidjanski, Dusan, *The Federal Future of Europe: From the European Community to the European Union* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press), 2000

Smith, Martin A., *NATO in the First Decade after the Cold War* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers), 2000

Sondhi, M.L., ed. *Towards a New Era: Economic, Social and Political Reforms* (New Delhi: Har-Anand Publications), 2001

Street, John, *Mass Media, Politics and Democracy* (Houndmills: Palgrave), 2001

Subramanian Swami, *India's China Perspective* (Delhi: Konark Publishers), 2001

Thomas, Clive S., ed. *Political Parties and Interest Groups: Shaping Democratic Governance* (London: Routledge), 2001

Vohra, Sahdev, *Twentieth Century India* (Delhi: Indian Publishers Distributors), 2001

Warren, Mark E., *Democracy and Association* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), 2001

*Who's Who: Tenth Kerala Legislative Assembly* (Thiruvananthapuram: Kerala Legislature Secretariat), 2000

## II. ARTICLES

Bradbury, Jonathan and Mitchell James, "Devolution: New Politics for Old?", *Parliamentary Affairs*, Vol. 54, No. 2, April 2001, pp. 257-75

Clague, Christopher and Others, "Determinants of Lasting Democracy in Poor Countries: Culture, Development and Institutions", *Annals*

*of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, Vol. 573, January 2001, pp. 16-41

Cowley, Philip and Stuart, Mark, "Parliament: Few Headaches and a Dose of Modernisation", *Parliamentary Affairs*, Vol. 54, No. 2, April 2001, pp. 238-56

Gordon, Pamela E., "Constitutional Reform: Democracy Under Siege in Bermuda", *The Parliamentarian*, Vol. 82, No. 2, 2001, pp.151-53

Hazell, Robert and Others, "Constitution: Rolling Out the New Settlement", *Parliamentary Affairs*, Vol. 54, No. 2, April 2001, pp. 190-205

Mackay, David and Others, "Reviewing the Oxford History of the British Empire", *Political Science*, Vol. 53, No. 1, June 2001, pp. 67-73

Malhotra, G.C., "Election of Speaker in UK and India", *Journal of Parliamentary Information*, Vol. 46, No. 4, December 2000, pp. 551-74

Malhotra, G.C., "Parliament Estate", *Journal of Parliamentary Information*, Vol. 46, No. 3, September 2000, pp. 400-11

Muthamma, C.B., "Representational Legitimacy of the Present System", *Man and Development*, Vol. 23, No. 2, June 2001, pp. 36-44

Puri, Balraj, "First Step towards Solution of Kashmir Problem", *Man and Development*, Vol. 23, No. 2, June 2001, pp. 1-6

Ram, N., "Political India", *Indian Horizons*, Vol. 45, Nos. 3 & 4, July-December 1998, pp. 59-72

Shaw, Eric, "New Labour: New Pathways to Parliament", *Parliamentary Affairs*, Vol. 54, No. 1, January 2001, pp. 35-52

Singhvi, L.M., "Law and the Constitution", *Indian Horizons*, Vol. 45, Nos. 3 & 4, July-December 1998, pp. 47-57

**APPENDIX I**

**STATEMENT SHOWING THE WORK  
TRANSACTIONED DURING THE SEVENTH SESSION  
OF THE THIRTEENTH LOK SABHA**

1. PERIOD OF THE SESSION	23 July 2001 to 31 August 2001	
2. NUMBER OF SITTINGS HELD		29
3. TOTAL NUMBER OF SITTING HOURS	174 hours 30 minutes	
4. NUMBER OF DIVISIONS HELD		3
5. GOVERNMENT BILLS		
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session		28
(ii) Introduced		24
(iii) Laid on the Table as passed by the Rajya Sabha		14
(iv) Returned by the Rajya Sabha with any Amendment/ recommendation and Laid on the Table		1
(v) Reported by Standing Committees		8
(vi) Referred to concerned Departmentally-related Standing Committees by Speaker, Lok Sabha/ Chairman Rajya Sabha		6
(vii) Discussed		35
(viii) Passed		35
(ix) Withdrawn		1*
(x) Pending at the end of the Session		31
6. PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS		
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session		169
(ii) Introduced		60
(iii) Discussed		2
(iv) Passed		Nil
(v) Withdrawn	3 (including 2 Bills withdrawn without discussion)	
(vi) Part-discussed		1
(vii) Pending at the end of the Session		226
7. NUMBER OF MATTERS RAISED UNDER RULE 377		277
8. NUMBER OF SUBMISSIONS MADE DURING ZERO HOUR		304
9. NUMBER OF DISCUSSIONS HELD UNDER RULE 193 (Matters of Urgent Public Importance)		
(i) Notices received		363

\* As passed by the Lok Sabha and pending in the Rajya Sabha was withdrawn by leave of the House in the Rajya Sabha

(ii) Admitted	7
(iii) Discussions held	6
10. NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MADE UNDER RULE 197 (Calling Attention to Matters of Urgent Public Importance)	2
11. STATEMENTS MADE BY MINISTERS UNDER RULE 372	19
12. STATUTORY RESOLUTIONS	
(i) Notices received	18
(ii) Admitted	18
(iii) Moved	4
(iv) Adopted	1
(v) Negatived	3
13. GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS	
(i) Notices received	4
(ii) Admitted	4
(iii) Moved	1
(iv) Adopted	1
14. PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS	
(i) Notices received	8
(ii) Admitted	8
(iii) Discussed	2
(iv) Withdrawn	1
(vii) Part-discussed	1
15. PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS	
(i) Notices received	653
(ii) Admitted	78
(iii) Moved	Nil
16. NUMBER OF ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS	
(i) Total No. of Notices received	142
(ii) Brought before the House	42
(iii) Admitted	1
(iv) Discussed and negatived	1
(v) Barred in view of the Adjournment Motion admitted on the subject	41
(iv) Consent withheld by Speaker outside the House	100
17. TOTAL NUMBER OF VISITORS' PASSES ISSUED DURING THE SESSION	17,688
18. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF VISITORS' PASSES ISSUED ON ANY SINGLE DAY AND THE DATE ON WHICH ISSUED	1,092 on 30 August 2001
19. TOTAL NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ADMITTED	
(i) Starred	580 (87 answered orally)

(ii) Unstarred	6,081
(iii) Short Notice Questions	NH
(iv) Half-an-Hour Discussions	4
20. NUMBER OF MEMBERS GRANTED LEAVE OF ABSENCE	10
21. PETITIONS PRESENTED	2
22. NUMBER OF NEW MEMBERS SWORN IN, WITH DATE	3 sworn in on 23 July 2001
23. NUMBER OF PRIVILEGE MOTIONS	
(i) Notices received	15
(ii) Brought before the House	1
(iii) Consent withheld by Speaker	4
(iv) Observation made by Speaker	1

## 24. WORKING OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

Sl. No.	Name of the Committee	No. of sittings held during the period 1 July to 30 September 2001	No. of Reports presented
1	2	3	4
i)	Business Advisory Committee	6	6
ii)	Committee on Absence of Members	1	1
iii)	Committee on Public Undertakings	4	2 (1) Action Taken Report
iv)	Committee on Papers Laid on the Table	—	—
v)	Committee on Petitions	5	3
vi)	Committee on Private Members Bills and Resolutions	4	4
vii)	Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes	7	3
viii)	Committee on Privileges	—	—
ix)	Committee on Government Assurances	—	—
x)	Committee on Subordinate Legislation	2	—
xi)	Estimates Committee	3	—
xii)	General Purposes Committee	—	—
xiii)	House Committee		
	a) Accommodation Sub-Committee	—	—
	b) Sub-Committee on Amenities	—	—
xiv)	Public Accounts Committee	—	—
xv)	Railway Convention Committee	1	—
xvi)	Rules Committee	—	—

## JOINT/SELECT COMMITTEES

i)	Joint Committee on Offices of Profit	—	—
ii)	Joint Committee on Stock Market Scam and Matters Relating Thereto	10	—

**STANDING COMMITTEES**

i)	Committee on Agriculture	5	2
ii)	Committee on Information Technology	—	—
iii)	Committee on Defence	3	1
iv)	Committee on Energy Sub Committee	11	1
v)	Committee on External Affairs	6	2
vi)	Committee on Finance	7	—
vii)	Committee on Food, Civil Supplies and Public Distribution	—	—
viii)	Committee on Labour and Welfare	—	—
ix)	Committee on Petroleum and Chemicals	14	5
x)	Committee on Railways	2	7
xi)	Committee on Urban and Rural Development	8	—
xii)	Committee on the Empowerment of Women	4	2

---



**APPENDIX II**

**STATEMENT SHOWING THE WORK TRANSACTED  
DURING THE ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-THIRD  
SESSION OF THE RAJYA SABHA**

---

1. PERIOD OF THE SESSION	23 July to 31 August 2001
2. NUMBER OF SITTINGS HELD	29
3. TOTAL NUMBER OF SITTINGS HOURS	140 Hours and 01 minute
4. NUMBER OF DIVISIONS HELD	4
5. GOVERNMENT BILLS	
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session	50
(ii) Introduced	8
(iii) Laid on the Table as passed by the Lok Sabha	17
(iv) Returned by the Lok Sabha with any amendment	Nil
(v) Referred to Select Committee by the Rajya Sabha	Nil
(vi) Referred to Joint Committee by the Rajya Sabha	Nil
(vii) Referred to the Departmentally- related Standing Committees	2
(viii) Reported by Select Committee	Nil
(ix) Reported by Joint Committee	Nil
(x) Reported by the Departmentally- related Standing Committees	8
(xi) Discussed	36
(xii) Passed	35
(xiii) Withdrawn	1
(xiv) Negatived	Nil
(xv) Part-discussed	Nil
(xvi) Returned by the Rajya Sabha without any recommendation	3
(xvii) Discussion postponed	Nil
(xviii) Pending at the end of the Session	39
6. PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS	
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session	128
(ii) Introduced	35

(iii) Laid on the Table as passed by the Lok Sabha	Nil
(iv) Returned by the Lok Sabha with any amendment and laid on the Table	Nil
(v) Reported by Joint Committee	Nil
(vi) Discussed	3
(vii) Withdrawn	2
(viii) Passed	Nil
(ix) Negatived	Nil
(x) Circulated for eliciting opinion	Nil
(xi) Part-discussed	1
(xii) Discussion postponed	Nil
(xiii) Motion for circulation of Bill negatived	Nil
(xiv) Referred to Select Committee	Nil
(xv) Lapsed due to retirement/death of Member-in-charge of the Bill	8
(xvi) Pending at the end of the Session	153
<b>7. NUMBER OF DISCUSSIONS HELD UNDER RULE 176 (Matters of Urgent Public Importance)</b>	
(i) Notices received	139
(ii) Admitted	30 (on four subjects)
(iii) Discussions held	4
<b>NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MADE UNDER RULE 180 (Calling Attention to Matters of Urgent Public Importance)</b>	
<b>8. STATEMENTS MADE BY MINISTERS</b>	4
<b>9. HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSIONS HELD</b>	Nil
<b>10. STATUTORY RESOLUTIONS</b>	
(i) Notices received	1 (on President's Rule in Manipur)
(ii) Admitted	1
(iii) Moved	1
(iv) Adopted	1
(v) Negatived	Nil
(vi) Withdrawn	Nil
<b>11. GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS</b>	
(i) Notices received	4
(ii) Admitted	4
(iii) Moved	Nil
(iv) Adopted	Nil
<b>12. PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTION</b>	
(i) Received	12
(ii) Admitted	12

(iii) Discussed	1
(iv) Withdrawn	1
(v) Negatived	Nil
(vi) Adopted	Nil
(vii) Part-discussed	1
(viii) Discussion postponed	Nil
<b>13. GOVERNMENT MOTIONS</b>	
(i) Notices received	Nil
(ii) Admitted	Nil
(iii) Moved	Nil
(iv) Adopted	Nil
(v) Part-discussed	Nil
<b>14. PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS</b>	
(i) Notices received	128*
(ii) Motions admitted	217
(iii) Moved	Nil
(iv) Adopted	Nil
(v) Part-discussed	Nil
(vi) Negatived	Nil
(vii) Withdrawn	Nil
<b>15. MOTIONS REGARDING MODIFICATION OF STATUTORY RULE</b>	
(i) Received	Nil
(ii) Admitted	Nil
(iii) Moved	Nil
(iv) Adopted	Nil
(v) Negatived	Nil
(vi) Withdrawn	Nil
(vii) Part-discussed	Nil
(viii) Lapsed	Nil
<b>16. NUMBER, NAME AND DATE OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE CREATED, IF ANY</b>	Nil
<b>17. TOTAL NUMBER OF VISITORS' PASSES ISSUED</b>	1,369
<b>18. TOTAL NUMBER OF VISITORS</b>	2,618
<b>19. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF VISITORS' PASSES ISSUED ON ANY SINGLE DAY, AND DATE ON WHICH ISSUED</b>	79 (on 23.8.2001)
<b>20. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF VISITORS ON ANY SINGLE DAY AND DATE</b>	238 (on 23.8.2001)
<b>21. TOTAL NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ADMITTED</b>	
(i) Starred	580

---

\* Some Notices contained more than one Motion.

(ii) Unstarred	4,430
(iii) Short-Notice Questions	1
<b>22. DISCUSSIONS ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRIES</b>	<b>Nil</b>
<b>23. NUMBER OF MEMBERS GRANTED LEAVE OF ABSENCE</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>24. PETITIONS PRESENTED</b>	<b>Nil</b>

**25. WORKING OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES**

Sl No.	Name of the Committee	No. of meetings held during the period 1 July – 30 September 2001	No. of Reports presented
--------	-----------------------	---	--------------------------

1	2	3	4
i)	Business Advisory Committee	4	Nil
ii)	Committee on Subordinate Legislation	4	2
iii)	Committee on Petitions	3	1
iv)	Committee on Privileges	Nil	Nil
v)	Committee on Rules	1	Nil
vi)	Committee on Government Assurances	1	1
vii)	Committee on Papers Laid on the Table	2	2
viii)	General Purposes Committee	Nil	Nil
ix)	House Committee	2	1

**DEPARTMENTALLY–RELATED STANDING COMMITTEES**

x)	Commerce	4	Nil
xi)	Home Affairs	9	5
xii)	Human Resource Development	10	4
xiii)	Industry	11	8
xiv)	Science and Technology, Environment and Forests	8	Nil
xv)	Transport and Tourism	3	Nil

**OTHER COMMITTEES**

xvi)	Ethics Committee	2	Nil
xvii)	Committee on Provision of Computers to the Members of Rajya Sabha	Nil	Nil
xviii)	Committee on Members of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme	1	Nil
xix)	Joint Parliamentary Committee on the functioning of Wakf Boards	1	Nil
xx)	Joint Parliamentary Committee to look into the question of jurisdictional overlap between Parliamentary Committees	2	Nil
xxi)	Joint Parliamentary on Patents (Second Amendment) Bill, 1999	6	Nil

## 26. NAME OF NEW MEMBERS SWORN IN WITH DATES

S.No.	Name of members sworn in	Party affiliation	Date on which sworn in
1	2	3	4
1.	Dr. Manmohan Singh	INC	23.7.2001
2.	Shri Indramoni Bora	BJP	-do-
3.	Shri Kalraj Mishra	-do-	-do-
4.	Smt. Gurcharan Kaur	-do-	-do-
5.	Shri Rao Man Singh	INLD	-do-
6.	Shri S.S. Chandran	AIADMK	25.7.2001
7.	Smt. S.G. Indira	-do-	-do-
8.	Shri R. Kamaraj	-do-	-do-
9.	Shri P.G. Narayanan	-do-	-do-
10.	Shri R. Sarath Kumar	DMK	-do-
11.	Shri B.S. Gnanadesikan	TMC(M)	-do-
12.	Shri Dayanand Sahay	Independent	27.7.2001

## 27. OBITUARY REFERENCES

S.No.	Name	Sitting member/ Ex-member/Dignitary
1	2	3
1.	King Birendra Bir Bikram Shah Dev and other members of the royal family of Nepal	
2.	Shri R.K. Narayan	Ex-member
3.	Shri G.Y. Krishanan	-do-
4.	Shri Jagan Nath Kaushal	-do-
5.	Shri Mohammad Yunus	-do-
6.	Shri Niren Ghosh	-do-
7.	Shri V.C. Ganesan	-do-
8.	Shri Banka Behary Das	-do-
9.	Begum Aizaz Rasul	-do-
10.	Shri G.K. Moopanar	Sitting member
11.	Smt. Phoolan Devi	Sitting member, Lok Sabha
12.	Shri S.S. Bhalerao	Former Secretary-General, Rajya Sabha

# APPENDIX III

## STATEMENT SHOWING THE ACTIVITIES OF THE LEGISLATURES OF THE STATES AND UNION TERRITORIES DURING THE PERIOD 1 JULY TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2001

Legislature	Duration	Sittings	Govt. Bills	Private Bills	Starred Questions	Unstarred Questions	Short Notice Questions
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
<b>STATES</b>							
Andhra Pradesh L.A.	13.9.2001 to 22.9.2001	9	12(10)	12(0)	252(97)	(32)	79(11)
Arunachal Pradesh L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Assam L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bihar L.A.	24.9.2001 to 27.9.2001	4	—	—	—	—	—
Bihar L.C.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chhattisgarh L.A.	27.2.2001 to 20.4.2001	28	13(6)	—	1,31(715)	802(669)	—
Delhi L.A.	24.9.2001 to 1.10.2001	6	2(3)	3	120	356	3
Goa L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gujarat L.A.	26.7.2001 to 31.8.2001	22	16(16)	8	4,093(2,268)	243(85)	46(8)
Haryana L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Himachal Pradesh L.A.	21.8.2001 to 24.8.2001	4	6(6)	—	215(135)	55(43)	—
Jammu & Kashmir L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jammu & Kashmir L.C.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jharkhand L.A.	17.8.2001 to 24.8.2001	6	1(1)	—	268(168)	92(62)	9
Karnataka L.A.	16.7.2001 to 4.8.2001	16	11(15)	—	2,027(180)	1,679	—
Karnataka L.C.	16.7.2001 to 14.8.2001	19	3	—	1,189(180)	764	—
Kerala L.A.	5.6.2001 to 23.7.2001	12	—	—	—	—	—

Madhya Pradesh L.A.	20.8.2001 to 21.9.2001	23	14(14)	—	4,469(2,785)	2,699(2,717)	4(1)
Maharashtra L.A.	16.7.2001 to 3.8.2001	15	16(13)	14	7,291(1,832)	24(11)*	54(5)
Maharashtra L.C.	16.7.2001 to 3.8.2001	15	5(2)	7	2,911(1,490)	24(82) <sup>b</sup>	18(9)
Manipur L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Meghalaya L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mizoram L.A.*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nagaland L.A.	24.9.2001 to 25.9.2001	2	3(3)	—	8	6	—
Orissa L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Punjab L.A.	21.8.2001 to 22.8.2001	2	4(4)	—	60(43)	32(25)	3(1)
Rajasthan L.A.*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sikkim L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tamil Nadu L.A.	22.5.2001 to 1.6.2001	7	—	—	—	—	—
Tripura L.A.	24.8.2001 to 29.8.2001	4	3(3)	—	511(399)	106(146) <sup>c</sup>	1(1)
Uttar Pradesh L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uttar Pradesh L.C.	26.9.2001 to 28.9.2001	3	7(9)	—	661(498)	92(85)	35
West Bengal L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
UNION TERRITORIES							
Pondicherry L.A.**	5.7.2001 to 5.9.2001	19 <sup>d</sup>	4(4)	—	1,111	—	—
Two sessions	5.9.2001 to 26.9.2001						

\* Information received from the State/Union territory Legislatures contained NIL report

\*\*Information not received from the State/Union territory Legislatures

Notes: a) This also includes questions which have been originally submitted as starred questions but afterwards converted as unstarred question

b) This column also includes questions which have been originally submitted as starred questions but afterwards converted as unstarred questions

c) 40 nos. of starred questions admitted as un-starred questions

d) Two Sessions were held, one sitting in the first Session and eighteen sittings in the Second Session

# APPENDIX III (Contd.)

## COMMITTEES AT WORK/NUMBER OF SITTINGS HELD AND NUMBER OF REPORTS PRESENTED DURING THE PERIOD 1 JULY TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2001

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Business Advisory Committee																
Committee on Govt. Assurances																
Committee on Petitions																
Committee on Private Members Bills and Resolutions																
Committee on Privileges																
Committee on Public Undertakings																
Committee on Subordinate Legislation																
Committee on the Welfare of SC and ST																
Estimates Committee																
General Purposes Committee																
House/Accommodation Committee																
Library Committee																
Public Accounts Committee																
Rules Committee																
Joint Select Committee																
Other Committees																

### STATES

Andhra Pradesh L.A.	—	1	—	—	—	3	1	5	—	—	—	2	6	1	—	(a)
Arunachal Pradesh L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	4	—	—	—



	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Assam L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bihar L.A.	1(1)	10	—	—	1	—	9	—	39	1	—	9	98	1(1)	—	116 <sup>(a)</sup>
Bihar L.C.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chhattisgarh L.A.	1(1)	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	—
Delhi L.A.	1(1)	1	—	1	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	2(2)	—	—	7(1) <sup>(a)</sup>
Goa L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gujarat L.A.	5(5)	4	—	6(6)	4(2)	3(4)	1	6(4)	10(5)	—	1	—	8(2)	—	—	13(4) <sup>(a)</sup>
Haryana L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Himachal Pradesh L.A.	—	—	—	—	2	12(9)	7	12(5)	11	—	—	1	12(21)	—	—	21(8) <sup>(a)</sup>
Jammu & Kashmir L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jammu & Kashmir L.C.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jharkhand L.A.	1(1)	13	20	—	2(3)	44	22	19	22	—	—	—	25	—	—	7 <sup>(a)</sup>
Karnataka L.A.	2	7	6(1)	1(1)	7	6	7	6	10	—	6	5	6	—	—	18 <sup>(a)</sup>
Karnataka L.C.	3	7	6(1)	1(1)	10	—	—	—	—	—	11	—	—	—	—	—
Kerala L.A.	2(2)	2	1	4	1	3	3	3	6	—	3	2	4	—	—	15 <sup>(a)</sup>
Madhya Pradesh L.A.	4(A)	1	6	—	4	5	2	2(5)	2	—	1	1	—	1	—	3(2) <sup>(a)</sup>
Maharashtra L.A.	3(2)	5	12(2)	3(3)	6	11(1)	10	21(3)	14(2)	—	—	—	16(2)	1	6	47(3) <sup>(a)</sup>
Maharashtra L.C.	2(1)	11	1	3(3)	4	11(1)	10	21(3)	14(2)	—	—	—	16(2)	1	—	47(4) <sup>(a)</sup>
Manipur L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Meghalaya L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mizoram L.A.	—	4	3	—	3	—	—	—	7	1	3	—	6	—	—	1
Nagaland L.A.	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1(1)	—	—	—	2	—	—	—
Orissa L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Punjab L.A.	1(1)	11	15	—	7(1)	17	5	13	28	1	4	8	10	—	—	27 <sup>(a)</sup>

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Rajasthan L.A.	—	25	29	—	—	27	26	50	59	—	21	26	29	24	—	98 <sup>(m)</sup>
Sikkim L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tamil Nadu L.A.	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tripura L.A.	2(2)	4	3(2)	—	2	3	2	2	3	—	1	2	5	—	—	—
Uttar Pradesh L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uttar Pradesh L.C.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
West Bengal L.A.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>UNION TERRITORY</b>																
Pondicherry L.A.	2	8	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	16 <sup>(m)</sup>

\* Information received from the State/Union territory Legislatures contained NIL report

\*\* Information not received from the State/Union territory Legislatures

- (a) Sub-Committee on Rules-6; Select Committee on Water, Land and Trees Bill, 2001-3; Select Committee on Societies Registration Bill, 2001(1); Committee on Welfare of Women and Children-8; Committee on Welfare of Minorities-2; and House Committee on Factional Violence-2
- (b) Committee on Scheduled Castes/Tribes-9; Zila Panchayat Raj Zila Parishad Committee-51; Nivedan Committee-25; Internal Resources Committee-22; and Women and Child Welfare Committee-9
- (c) Select Committee on 'The Delhi Fire Service Bill, 2000 [1(1)]; and House Committee to look into the recommendation of the Virender Prakash Committee's Report to review working of MCD-6
- (d) Panchayati Raj Committee-9(1); Papers Laid on the Table Committee-1; and Absence of Members Committee-3(3)
- (e) Public Administration Committee-7(3); Human Development Committee-3; General Development Committee-5(3) ; Rural Planning Committee-6(2)
- (f) Nivedan Committee-20; Committee on Culture, Youth and Sports Development-9; Committee on Development of Women and Children-9; Zila Parishad and Panchayati Raj Committee-9; Committee on Environment and Pollution Control-9; Committee on Interim Resources and Central Aid-9; Special Committee (Nelarhat School)-1; and Special Committee (Private School)-8; Special Committee (Polytechnic-4; Question and Call Attention Committee-7)
- (g) Women and Children Welfare Committee-5; Backward Classes and Minorities Welfare Committee-7; and Papers Laid on the Table Committee-6
- (h) Subject Committee I to X -3 Meeting each; Subject Committee III-5; Subject Committee IV-2; Committee on the Welfare of Women, Children and

## Laid on the Table-2

- (i) Committee on Papers Laid on the Table-1(1); and Committee on Welfare of Women and Children-2(1)
- (j) Committee on Welfare of Vimukta Jatis and Nomadic Tribes-8; Committee on Employment Guarantee Scheme-9(1); Committee on Leave of Absence of Members from Sittings of the House-1(1); Panchayati Raj-13(2); Catering Committee-7; and Committee on Rights and Welfare of Women-9(1)
- (k) Committee on Welfare of Vimukta Jatis and Nomadic Tribes-8; Committee on Employment Guarantee Scheme-9(1); Committee on Leave of Absence of Members from Sittings of the House-1(1); Panchayati Raj-13(2); Catering Committee-7; and Committee on Rights and Welfare of Women-9;
- (l) Committee on Papers Laid/ to be Laid on the Table-15; Committee of the House to Enquire into Recruitment of Teachers by the Previous Government-3; and Committee of the House on Starred Question No.2154 constituted on 30-10-2000-9
- (m) Women and Child Welfare Committee-28; Question and Reference Committee-26; Backward Class Welfare Committee-29; Select Committee on Rajasthan Cooperative Society Bill, 2001-8; and Select Committee on Rajasthan Rent Control Bill, 2001-7
- (n) Papers Laid on the Table of the House-8; and Committee on Delegated Legislation-8

**APPENDIX IV**  
**LIST OF BILLS PASSED BY THE HOUSES OF**  
**PARLIAMENT AND ASSENTED TO BY THE**  
**PRESIDENT DURING THE PERIOD**

**1 JULY TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2001**

Sl. No.	Title of the Bill	Date of assent by the President
1	2	3
1.	The Vaccination (Repeal) Bill, 2001	3.8.2001
2.	The U.P. Sugarcane Cess (Validation) Repeal Bill, 2001	3.8.2001
3.	The Post-Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh Amendment Bill, 2001	3.8.2001
4.	The Industrial Disputes (Banking Companies) Decision (Repeal) Bill, 2001	3.8.2001
5.	The Banking Companies (Legal Practitioners' Clients Accounts) Repeal Bill, 2001	26.8.2001
6.	The Electricity Regulatory Commissions (Amendment) Bill, 2001	29.8.2001
7.	The Judicial Administration Laws (Repeal) Bill, 2001	29.8.2001
8.	The Warehousing Corporations (Amendment) Bill, 2001	29.8.2001
9.	The Indian Railway Companies (Repeal) Bill, 2001	29.8.2001
10.	The Railway Companies (Substitution of Parties in Civil Proceedings) Repeal Bill, 2001	29.8.2001
11.	The Hyderabad Export Duties (Validation) Repeal Bill, 2001	29.8.2001
12.	The Food Corporations (Amendment) Bill, 2001	29.8.2001
13.	The Live-Stock Importation (Amendment) Bill, 2001	29.8.2001
14.	The Indian Council of World Affairs Bill, 2001	3.9.2001
15.	The Repealing and Amending Bill, 2001	3.9.2001
16.	The Trade Unions (Amendment) Bill, 2001	3.9.2001
17.	The Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques (Regulation and Prevention of Misuse) Amendment Bill, 2001	3.9.2001
18.	The Influx from Pakistan (Control) Repealing (Repeal) Bill, 2001	3.9.2001
* 19.	The Indian Medical Council (Amendment) Bill, 2001	3.9.2001
20.	The Sugarcane Cess (Validation) Repeal Bill, 2001	3.9.2001

21. The Indian Universities (Repeal) Bill, 2001	4.9.2001
22. The Auroville (Emergency Provisions) Repeal Bill, 2001	4.9.2001
23. The Government of Union Territories and the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi (Amendment) Bill, 2001	6.9.2001
24. The Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill, 2001	11.9.2001
25. The Inland Waterways Authority of India (Amendment) Bill, 2001	11.9.2001
26. The Central Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 2001	11.9.2001
27. The Appropriation (No.3) Bill, 2001	11.9.2001
28. The Manipur Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 2001	11.9.2001
29. The Salaries and Allowances of Ministers (Amendment) Bill, 2001	11.9.2001
30. The Advocates' Welfare Fund Bill, 2001	14.9.2001
31. The Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 2001	14.9.2001
32. The Two-Member Constituencies (Abolition) and other Laws Repeal Bill, 2001	14.9.2001
33. The Registration and other Related Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2001	24.9.2001
34. The Marriage Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2001	24.9.2001
35. The Code of Criminal Procedure (Amendment) Bill, 2001	24.9.2001
36. The Indian Divorce (Amendment) Bill, 2001	24.9.2001
37. The Energy Conservation Bill, 2001	29.9.2001

**APPENDIX V**  
**LIST OF BILLS PASSED BY THE**  
**LEGISLATURES OF THE STATES AND THE**  
**UNION TERRITORIES DURING THE PERIOD**

**1 JULY TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2001**

---

**ANDHRA PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

1. The A.P. Societies Registration Bill, 2001
2. The A.P. Infrastructure Development Enabling Bill, 2001
3. The A.P. District Boards (Amendment) Laws Bill, 2001
4. The Hyderabad Municipal Corporations (Second Amendment) Bill, 2001
5. The A.P. Municipal Laws (Third Amendment) Bill, 2001
6. The A.P. Municipal Laws (Fourth Amendment) Bill, 2001
7. The A.P. Tax on Entry of Goods into Local Areas Bill, 2001
8. The A.P. Tax on Luxuries (Amendment) Bill, 2001
9. The A.P. Sales Tax (Settlement of Disputes) Bill, 2001
10. The A.P. Panchayat Raj (Amendment) Bill, 2001

**CHHATTISGARH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

1. The Chhattisgarh Aakastmikta Nidhi Vidheyak, 2001
2. The Chhattisgarh Viniyog (Kramank 1) Vidheyak, 2001
3. The Chhattisgarh Viniyog (Kramank 2) Vidheyak, 2001
4. The Chhattisgarh Vanijyk Ker (Visesh Upbandh) Vidheyak, 2001
5. The Chhattisgarh Aabkari (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
6. The Chhattisgarh Viniyog (Lekhanudan) (Kramank 3) Vidheyak, 2001
7. The Chhattisgarh Chikitsa Mandal Vidheyak, 2001
8. The Chhattisgarh Zila Yojna Samiti (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
9. The Chhattisgarh Viniyog (Kramank 4) Vidheyak, 2001
10. The Chhattisgarh Pravasi Shramik Hit Sanrakshan Vidheyak, 2001
11. The Chhattisgarh Vidhan Sabha Sadasya Vetan Bhatta Thatha Pension (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
12. The Chhattisgarh Adhyaksha Thatha Upa-adhyaksha (Vetan Thatha Bhatta) (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
13. The Chhattisgarh Vidhan Mandal Neta Pratipaksha (Vetan Thatha Bhatta) (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
14. The Chhattisgarh Mantri (Vetan Thatha Bhatta) (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001

15. The Chhattisgarh Viniyog (Kramank-5) Vidheyak, 2001
16. The Chhattisgarh Sehkari Society (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
17. The Chhattisgarh Vidhan Sabha Sadasya Vetan, Bhatta Thatha Pension (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
18. The Chhattisgarh Manoranjan Ker Evam Vigyapan Shulka (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
19. The Chhattisgarh Hotel Thatha Vas Grahoin Me Vilas Vastuoin Per Ker (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
20. The Chhattisgarh Sthaniya Kshetra Me Mal Ke Pravesh Per Ker (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
21. The Chhattisgarh Vanijyik Ker (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
22. The Chhattisgarh Vriti Ker (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
23. The Chhattisgarh Chikitsa Mandal (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
24. The Chhattisgarh Mantri (Vetan Thatha Bhatta) (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
25. The Chhattisgarh Motoryan Karadhan (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001

#### **DELHI LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

1. The Indian Stamp (Delhi Second Amendment) Bill, 2001
2. The Delhi Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill, 2001
3. The Delhi Fire Service Bill, 2001

#### **GUJARAT LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

1. The Gujarat Motor Spirit Cess Bill, 2001
2. The Gujarat Panchayats (Second Amendment) Bill, 2001
3. The Gujarat Town Planning and Urban Development Bill, 2001
4. The Gujarat Regularisation of Unauthorised Development Bill, 2001
5. The Gujarat Municipalities (Amendment) Bill, 2001
6. The Bombay Provincial Municipal Corporations (Gujarat Amendment) Bill, 2001
7. The Gujarat Legislative Assembly Members Pension (Repeal) Bill, 2001
8. The Gujarat Tax on Luxury Commodities (Amendment) Bill, 2001
9. The Bombay Rents, Hotel and Lodging House Rates Control (Gujarat Amendment) Bill, 2001
10. The Bombay Motor Vehicles Tax (Gujarat Second Amendment) Bill, 2001
11. The Bombay Stamp (Gujarat Amendment) Bill, 2001
12. The Gujarat Sales Tax (Second Amendment) Bill, 2001
13. The Bombay Rents, Hotel and Lodging House Rates Control (Gujarat Second Amendment) Bill, 2001
14. The Gujarat Appropriation Bill, 2001
15. The Gujarat Tax on Entry of Specified Goods into Local Areas Bill, 2001
16. The Gujarat Public Libraries Bill, 2001

**HIMACHAL PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

1. The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 2001
2. The Himachal Pradesh Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 2001
3. The Himachal Pradesh Panchayati Raj (Amendment) Bill, 2001
4. The Himachal Pradesh Village Common Lands Vesting and Utilization (Amendment) Bill, 2001
5. The Himachal Pradesh Courts (Amendments) Bill, 2001
6. The Himachal Pradesh Motor Vehicles Taxation (Amendments) Bill, 2001

**JHARKHAND LEGISLATIVE SASSEMBLY**

1. The Jharkhand Appropriations (No.3) Bill, 2001

**KARNATAKA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

1. The Karnataka Municipal Corporations (Amendment) Bill, 2000
2. The Karnataka Municipalities (Amendment) Bill, 2000
3. The Karnataka Co-operative Societies (Second Amendment) Bill, 2000
4. The Karnataka Panchayat Raj (Third Amendment) Bill, 2000
- \*5. The Karnataka State Universities Bill, 2000
- \*6. The Karnataka Land Reforms (Amendment) Bill, 2001
7. The Karnataka Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes (Reservation of Appointment etc.) (Amendment) Bill, 2001
- \*8. The Karnataka Motor Vehicles Taxation Bill, 2001
9. The Karnataka Electricity Reform (Amendment) Bill, 2001
10. The Karnataka Electricity Board (Recovery of Dues) and other Law (Amendment) Bill, 2001
11. The Karnataka Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 2001
12. The Tungabhadra Sagar (Devi Sagar) Limited (Acquisition and Transfer of undertaking) (Repeal) Bill, 2001
13. The Electricity (Karnataka Amendment) Bill, 2001
- \*14. The Karnataka Transparency in Public Procurements (Amendment) Bill, 2001
- \*15. The Karnataka Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 2001

**KARNATAKA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

1. The Karnataka Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 2001
2. The Karnataka Land Reforms (Amendment) Bill, 2001
3. The Karnataka Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes (Appointment and other Reservation) (Amendment) Bill, 2001
4. The Karnataka Electricity Reforms (Amendment) Bill, 2001
5. The Karnataka Electricity Board (Dues Collection) and Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2001



6. The Tungabhadra Sagar (Devi Sagar) Limited (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) (Repeal) Bill, 2001
7. The Electricity (Karnataka Amendment) Bill, 2001
8. The Karnataka Transparency in Public Procurement Bill, 2001
9. The Karnataka Appropriation (No.3) Bill, 2000
10. The Karnataka Motor Vehicle Taxation (2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment) Bill, 2001
11. The Karnataka Municipalities (Amendment) Bill, 2000
12. The Karnataka Municipal Corporations (Amendment) Bill, 2000
13. The Karnataka State Universities Bill, 2000
14. The Karnataka Panchayat Raj (Amendment) Bill, 2000
15. The Karnataka Co-operative Societies (2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment) Bill, 2000
16. The Rorich and Devika Rani Rorich Estate (Acquisition and Transfer) (Amendment) Bill, 2001
17. The Karnataka Prohibition of Smoking and Protection of Health Bill, 2001
18. The Karnataka Forest (Amendment) Bill, 2001

#### **MADHYA PRADESH VIDHAN SABHA**

- \*1. The Madhya Pradesh Lok Ayukta Evam Up Lok Ayukta (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
2. The Madhya Pradesh Sinchai Prabandhan Mein Krishakon ki Bhagidari (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
3. The Madhya Pradesh Panchayat Raj Evam Gram Swaraj (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
4. The Madhya Pradesh Vrakshon ka Prarirakshan (Nagriya Kshetra) Vidheyak, 2001
5. The Madhya Pradesh Upkar (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
6. The Madhya Pradesh Bhu-Rajswa Sanhita (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
7. The Madhya Pradesh Viniyoga (Kramank 3) Vidheyak, 2001
8. The Madhya Pradesh Krishi Upaj Mandi (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
9. The Madhya Pradesh Swayatta Sahkarita (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
10. The Madhya Pradesh Audhyogik Sambandh (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
11. The Madhya Pradesh Sarvjanik Sthan (Dharmik Bhawan Evam Gatividhiyon ka Viniyaman) Vidheyak, 2001
12. The Madhya Pradesh Adhyaksha Tatha Upadhyaksha, Neta Pratipaksh Tatha Vidhan Sabha Sadasya Vetan, Bhatta Tatha Pension Vidhi (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
13. The Madhya Pradesh Mantri (Vetan Tatha Bhatta) (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
14. The Madhya Pradesh Upkar (Dwitiya Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001

#### **MAHARASHTRA LEGISLATIVE SASSEMBLY**

1. The Maharashtra Pre-School Centres (Regulation of Admission) Bill, 2000

2. The Maharashtra State Enterprises (Restructuring and other Special Provisions) Bill, 2001
3. The Bombay Motor Vehicles (Third Amendment) Bill, 2001
4. The Maharashtra University of Health Sciences (Amendment) Bill, 2001
5. The Maharashtra Municipal Councils, Nagar Panchayats and Industrial Townships (Amendment) Bill, 2001
6. The Maharashtra Gunthewari Development (Regularisation, Upgradation and Control) Bill, 2001
7. The Maharashtra Universities (Amendment) Bill, 2001
8. The Maharashtra Forest Development (Tax on Sale of Forest Produce by Government or Forest Development Corporation) (Continuance) (Amendment) Bill, 2001
9. The Maharashtra (Second Supplementary) Appropriation Bill, 2001
- \*10. The Bombay Civil Courts (Amendment) Bill, 2001
11. The Prince of Wales Museum (Amendment) Bill, 2001
12. The Maharashtra Co-operative Societies (Third Amendment) Bill, 2001
- \*13. The Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) (Amendment) Bill, 2001

#### **MAHARASHTRA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

1. The Maharashtra Co-operative Societies (Second Amendment) Bill, 2001
2. The Maharashtra Agricultural Lands (Ceiling on Holdings) (Amendment) Bill, 2001
3. The Maharashtra Pre-School Centres (Regulation of Admission) (Repeal) Bill, 2000
4. The Maharashtra State Enterprises (Restructuring and other Special Provision) Bill, 2000
5. The Maharashtra University of Health Sciences (Amendment) Bill, 2001
6. The Maharashtra Municipal Councils, Nagar Panchayats and Industrial Townships (Amendment) Bill, 2001
7. The Maharashtra Gunthewari Development (Regulations, Upgradation and Control) Bill, 2001
8. The Maharashtra Universities (Amendment) Bill, 2001
9. The Maharashtra Forest Development (Tax on Sale of Forest Produce by Government or Forest Development Corporation) (Continuance) (Amendment) Bill, 2001
10. The Bombay Motor Vehicles Tax (Third Amendment) Bill, 2001
11. The Maharashtra (Second Supplementary) Appropriation Bill, 2001

#### **NAGALAND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

1. The Nagaland Appropriation (No. 4) Bill, 2001
2. The Nagaland Municipal Bill, 2001
3. The Nagaland Legislative Assembly Member's Salaries, Allowances and Pension (Amendment) Bill, 2001

#### **PONDICHERRY LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

1. The Appropriation Bill, 2001

2. The Pondicherry Women's Commission Bill, 2001
3. The Pondicherry Municipalities (Amendment) Bill, 2001
4. The Pondicherry Village and Commune Panchayat (Amendment) Bill, 2001

#### **PUNJAB LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

1. The Punjab New Mandi Townships (Development and Regulation) (Amendment) Bill, 2001
2. The Punjab Agricultural Produce Markets (Amendment) Bill, 2001
3. The Punjab Town Improvement (Amendment) Bill, 2001
4. The Punjab Recruitment of Multipurpose Health Workers (Female) Bill, 2001

#### **TRIPURA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

1. The Tripura Tea Companies (Taking over of Management of Certain Tea Units) (Third Amendment) Bill, 2001
2. The Tripura Sales Tax (Tenth Amendment) Bill, 2001
3. The Salary, Allowances and other Amenities of the Leader of the Opposition in the Tripura Legislative Assembly Bill, 2001

#### **UTTAR PRADESH LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**

1. The Uttar Pradesh Alpasankhyak Aayog (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
2. The Uttar Pradesh Jagadguru Ramabhadracharya Viklang Vishwavidyalaya Vidheyak, 2001
3. The Uttar Pradesh Maharshi Suchana Praodhyogiki Vishwavidyalaya Vidheyak, 2001
4. The Uttar Pradesh Pichhada Varg Rajya Aayog (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
5. The Uttar Pradesh Anusuchit Jati Aur Anusuchit Janjati Aayog 2001
6. The Uttar Pradesh Panchayat Vidhi (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
7. The Uttar Pradesh Nagar Swayatatt Shasan Vidhi (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
8. The Uttar Pradesh Mal Ke Pravesh Per Ker (Dwitliya Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
9. The Uttar Pradesh Lok Sewa (Anusuchit Jatiyon, Anusuchit Jan Jatiyon Aur Anya Pichhade Vargo Ke liye Aarakshan) (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
10. The Uttar Pradesh Viniyog (2001-2002) ka Anupurak Vidheyak, 2001
11. The Uttar Pradesh Motoryan Karadhan (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
12. The Uttar Pradesh Zamindari Vinash Aur Bhumi Vyavastha (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
13. The Uttar Pradesh Nagar Palika (Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
14. The Uttar Pradesh Rajya Mahila Aayog Vidheyak, 2001
15. The Police (Uttar Pradesh Sanshodhan) Vidheyak, 2001
16. The Uttar Pradesh Pandit Din Dyal Upadhyaya Pashu Chikitsa Vigyan Vishwavidyalaya Evam Go Anusandhan Sansthan Vidheyak, 2001

**APPENDIX VI**  
**ORDINANCES PROMULGATED BY THE UNION AND STATE GOVERNMENTS DURING THE PERIOD**  
**1 JULY TO 30 SEPTEMBER 2001**

Sl. No.	Subject	Date of Promulgation	Date on which laid before the House	Date of Cessation	Remarks
<b>UNION GOVERNMENT</b>					
1.	The Live-Stock Importation (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	5.7.2001	24.7.2001	3.9.2001	Replaced by an Act of Parliament, Act No. 28 of 2001
2.	The Institute of Technology (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	21.9.2001	—	—	—
<b>STATE GOVERNMENTS</b>					
<b>ANDHRA PRADESH</b>					
1.	The Andhra Pradesh Sales Tax (Settlement of Disputes) Ordinance, 2001	16.7.2001	14.9.2001	—	Replaced by Legislation
2.	The Andhra Pradesh Infrastructure Development Enabling Ordinance, 2001	20.8.2001	14.9.2001	—	-do-
3.	The Andhra Pradesh Panchayat Raj (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	20.8.2001	14.9.2001	—	-do-

Replaced by  
Legislation

4.	The Andhra Pradesh Water, Land and Trees Ordinance, 2001	20.8.2001	14.9.2001	—	—
CHHATTISGARH					
1.	The Chhattisgarh Zila Yojna Samiti Adhiniyam (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 2001	16.5.2001	—	—	—
2.	The Chhattisgarh Manoranjan Kar Evam Vigyapan (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 2001	5.6.2001	—	—	—
3.	The Chhattisgarh Hotel Tatha Vas Grihon Me Vilas Vastuon Par Kar (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 2001	5.6.2001	—	—	—
4.	The Chhattisgarh Sthaniya Kshetra Me Mal ke Praves Par Kar (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 2001	5.6.2001	—	—	—
5.	The Chhattisgarh. Vanijyik Kar (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 2001	5.6.2001	—	—	—
6.	The Chhattisgarh Vritti Kar (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 2001	5.6.2001	—	—	—
DELHI					
1.	The Delhi Sales Tax (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	27.8.2001	24.9.2001	27.9.2001	—

		30.7.2001	24.9.2001	26.9.2001	Replaced by Legislation
2.	The Indian Stamp (Delhi Second Amendment) Ordinance, 2001				
<b>KERALA</b>					
1.	The Kannur University (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	28.8.2001	15.10.2001	—	—
2.	The Kerala Stay of Eviction Proceedings (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	28.8.2001	15.10.2001	—	—
3.	The Kerala Advocates Welfare Fund (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	30.8.2001	15.10.2001	—	—
4.	The Kerala Road Fund Ordinance, 2001	7.9.2001	15.10.2001	—	—
5.	The University Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	13.9.2001	15.10.2001	—	—
6.	The Kerala Panchayat Raj (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	13.9.2001	16.10.2001	—	—
<b>MADHYA PRADESH</b>					
1.	The Madhya Pradesh Bhu- Rajswa Sanhita (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 2001	25.6.2001	21.8.2001	—	—
2.	The Madhya Pradesh Upkar (Sanshodhan) Adhyadesh, 2001	29.6.2001	21.8.2001	—	—

		21.8.2001	28.7.2001	MAHARASHTRA	27.8.2001	Replaced by Legislation
3.	The Madhya Pradesh Prashasnik Adhikaran (Lambit Marlon ka Aantaran) Adhyadesh, 2001					
1.	The Maharashtra Universities (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	17.7.2001	12.7.2001			—
2.	The Bombay Entertainments Duty (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	—	17.8.2001			-do-
3.	The Maharashtra Krishna Valley, Vidarbha Irrigation, Konkan Irrigation, Tapi Irrigation and Godavari Marathwada Irrigation Development Corporations (Amendment and Continuance) Ordinance, 2001	—	23.8.2001			-do-
4.	The Maharashtra Co-operative Societies (Fourth Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	—	23.8.2001			-do-
5.	The Maharashtra Slum Areas (Improvement, Clearance and Redevelopment) (Amendment and Continuance) Ordinance, 2001	—	24.8.2001			-do-
6.	The Maharashtra Municipal Corporations and Municipal Councils (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	—	7.9.2001			-do-

7.	The Maharashtra Land Revenue Code (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	14.9.2001	—	—	Replaced by Legislation
8.	The Bombay Court-Fees (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	28.9.2001	—	—	-do-
1	The Punjab New Mandi Townships (Development and Regulation) Amendment Ordinance, 2001	2.8.2001	22.8.2001	—	Replaced by Legislation on 22.8.2001
2.	The Punjab Agricultural Produce Markets (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	2.8.2001	22.8.2001	—	-do-
3.	The Punjab Town Improvement (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	9.7.2001	22.8.2001	—	-do-
4.	The Punjab Recruitment of Multipurpose Health Workers (Female) Ordinance, 2001	6.7.2001	2.8.2001	—	-do-
<b>TAMIL NADU</b>					
1.	The Tamil Nadu Co-operative Societies (Amendments) Ordinance, 2001	12.6.2001	—	—	—
<b>UTTAR PRADESH</b>					
1.	The U.P. Maharishi University of Information Technology Ordinance, 2001	7.8.2001	—	—	—



2.	The U.P. Jagadguru Rambhadracharya Handicapped University Ordinance, 2001	7.8.2001	—	—	—
3.	The Police (U.P. Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	10.8.2001	—	—	—
4.	The U.P. State Commission for Women Ordinance, 2001	16.8.2001	—	—	—
5.	The U.P. Public Service (Reservation for Scheduled Castes Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes) (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	15.9.2001	—	—	—
6.	The U.P. Zamindari Abolition and Land Reforms (Amendment) Ordinance, 2001	19.9.2001	—	—	—

APPENDIX VII  
A. PARTY POSITION IN LOK SABHA (AS ON 27 NOVEMBER 2001)

States	Seats BJP	INC	CPI TDP	SJP	SS	BSP	DMK	JD(Sa mata)	AIA	BJD	AITC	NCP	JD (U)	INLD	PMK	J&KNC	LJSP	MDMK	RJD	(De mocratic)	RSP	CPI
Andhra Pradesh	42	7	5	29*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arunachal Pradesh	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Assam	14	2	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bihar	40	12	2	—	—	—	—	10	—	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	3	—	4	2	—	—
Chhattisgarh	11	8	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Goa	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gujarat	26	20	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Haryana	10	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Himachal Pradesh	4	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jammu & Kashmir	6	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jharkhand	14	10	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Karnataka	28	7	17	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—
Kerala	20	8	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Madhya Pradesh	29	21	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Maharashtra	48	13	10	—	—	15	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Manipur	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Meghalaya	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mizoram	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nagaland	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Orissa	21	9	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Punjab	13	1	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rajasthan	25	16	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sikkim	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tamil Nadu	39	3	2	—	—	—	—	12	11	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	—	4	—	—	—	—
Tripura	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uttaranchal	5	4	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uttar Pradesh	80	25	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
West Bengal	42	2	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nominated	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
UNION TERRITORIES																						
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chandigarh	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daman and Diu	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
The NCT of Delhi	7	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lakshadweep	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Pondicherry	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	545	180	110	32	29	26	15	14	12	12	11	10	9	8	6	5	5	4	4	4	3	3

\* Includes one member (Kunwar Sarv Raj Singh) expelled from Samajwadi Party and sitting separately w.e.f. 6.2.2001



**Abbreviations used in respect of parties represented in the Lok Sabha:**

ABLT-C-Akhil Bharatiya Lok Tantrik Congress; AIADMK-All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam; AIFB-All India Forward Bloc; AIMEIM-All India Majlis-e-Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen; AITC-All India Trinamool Congress; BBM-Bharipa Bahujan Mahasangh; BJD-Biju Janata Dal; BJP-Bharatiya Janata Party; BSP-Bahujan Samaj Party; CPI-Community Party of India; CPI(M)-Communist Party of India (Marxist); CPI(ML)-Communist Party of India (Marxist Leninist) Liberation; DMK-Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam; HVC-Himachal Vikas Congress; INC-Indian National Congress; IND-Independents; INLD-Indian National Lok Dal; JD(S)-Janata Dal (Secular); JD(Samata)-Janata Dal (Samata); JD(U)-Janata Dal(United); J&K NC-Jammu and Kashmir National Conference; KC-Kerala Congress; KCM-Kerala Congress(M); LJP-Lok Jan Shakti Party; MDMK-Marumalarchi Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam; MGRADMK-MGR Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam; MSCP-Manipur State Congress Party; MUL-Muslim League Kerala State Committee; NCP-Nationalist Congress Party; PMK-Pattali Makkal Katchi; PWP-Peasants and Workers Party of India; RJD-Rashtriya Janata Dal; RLD-Rashtriya Lok Dal; RSP-Revolutionary Socialist Party; SAD-Shiromani Akali Dal; SAD(M)-Shiromani Akali Dal (SS Mann); SDF-Sikkim Democratic Front; SJP(R)-Samajwadi Janata Party (Rashtriya); SP-Samajwadi Party; SS-Shiv Sena; TDP-Telugu Desam Party

**B. PARTY POSITION IN RAJYA SABHA  
(AS ON 3 OCTOBER 2001)**

Sl. No.	State/Union Territories	Seats	INC	BJP	CPI(M)	TDP	RJD	DMK	SP	JD	CPI	AIA-DMK	Shiv Sena	SAD	*Others	Indep- endents	Total	Vacancies
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
<b>STATES</b>																		
1.	Andhra Pradesh	18	2	1	1	13	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	18	—
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	1	—
3.	Assam	7	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	2(a)	—	7	—
4.	Bihar	16	2	2	—	—	7	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	3(b)	—	16	—
5.	Chattisgarh	5	3	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—
6.	Goa	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
7.	Gujarat	11	3	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	—
8.	Haryana	5	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3(c)	—	5	—
9.	Himachal Pradesh	3	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1(d)	—	3	—
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	4	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3(e)	—	4	—
11.	Jharkhand	6	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	3(f)	—	6	—
12.	Karnataka	12	5	2	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	12	—
13.	Kerala	9	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	4(g)	—	9	—
14.	Madhya Pradesh	11	7	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	—
15.	Maharashtra	19	5	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	2(h)	3	19	—
16.	Manipur	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
17.	Meghalaya	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
18.	Mizoram	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
19.	Nagaland	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
20.	Orissa	10	6	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3(i)	—	10	—

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
21.	Punjab	7	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	—	7	—
22.	Rajasthan	10	6	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	—
23.	Sikkim	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1(l)	—	1	—
24.	Tamil Nadu	18	—	—	—	—	—	8	—	—	—	6	—	—	2(k)	—	16	2
25.	Tripura	1	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
26.	Uttaranchal	3	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—
27.	Uttar Pradesh	31	2	12	—	—	—	—	8	—	—	—	—	—	5(l)	4	31	—
28.	West Bengal	16	1	—	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3(m)	2	15	1
<b>UNION TERRITORIES</b>																		
29.	Delhi	3	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—
30.	Pondicherry	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
31.	Nominated	12	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	12	—
<b>TOTAL</b>		245	57	49	14	13	7	9	9	6	6	6	5	5	36	21	242	3

- (a) Asom Gana Parishad-1; Autonomous State Demand Committee-1  
(b) Samata Party-1; Expelled from Rashtriya Janata Dal-2  
(c) Indian National Lok Dal-2; Haryana Vikas Party-1  
(d) Himachal Vikas Congress-1  
(e) J&K National Conference-3  
(f) Jharkhand Mukti Morcha-2; Expelled from Rashtriya Janata Dal-1  
(g) Muslim League-2; Kerala Congress-1; Revolutionary Socialist Party-1  
(h) Republican Party of India-1; Nationalist Congress Party-1  
(i) Biju Janata Dal-3  
(j) Sikkim Democratic Front-1  
(k) Tamil Maanila Congress (Moopanar)-2  
(l) Bahujan Samaj Party-4; Akhil Bhartiya Loktantrik Congress-1  
(m) All India Forward Bloc-1; Revolutionary Socialist Party-2

## C. PARTY POSITION IN STATE LEGISLATURES

State/Union territories	Seats	Cong.(I)	Janata Dal	BJP	CPI(M)	CPI	Others Parties	Ind.	Total	Vacancies
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Andhra Pradesh L.A. (1.10.2001)	295	91	—	12	2	—	184 <sup>(a)</sup>	5	294 <sup>a</sup>	—
Arunachal Pradesh L.A. (1.7.2001)	—	56	—	—	—	—	1 <sup>(b)</sup>	2	59	1
Assam L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bihar L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bihar L.C.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chhattisgarh L.A.	91	49	—	36	—	—	6 <sup>(b-1)</sup>	—	91	—
Delhi L.A. (1.10.2001)	70	52	1	14	—	—	1 <sup>(c)</sup>	2	69 <sup>a</sup>	—
Goa L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gujarat L.A. (1.10.2001)	182	57	4*	117	—	—	—	4	182	—
Haryana L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Himachal Pradesh L.A. (1.4.2001)	68	28	—	35	—	—	4 <sup>(d)</sup>	1	67 <sup>a</sup>	—
Jammu & Kashmir L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jammu & Kashmir L.C.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jharkhand L.A.	82	11	—	33	1	2	30 <sup>(e)</sup>	4	81 <sup>a</sup>	—
Karnataka L.A. (1.10.2001)	225	135	—	44	—	—	25 <sup>(f)</sup>	19	223 <sup>a</sup>	1
Karnataka L.C. (1.9.2001)	75	31	4	13	—	—	22 <sup>(g)</sup>	4	74 <sup>a</sup>	—





## UNION TERRITORY

Pondicherry L.A.  
(1.10.2001)30 11 — 1 — — 17<sup>(a)</sup> 2 29<sup>a</sup> —

## ⊗ Excluding Speaker

\* Information received from the State/Union territory Legislatures contained NIL Report

\*\* Information not received from the State/Union territory Legislatures

+ Two Members of this Party have intimated to the Speaker of their joining the Congress Party and one Member has intimated about his resignation from the Janata Dal. In this regard, petitions filed under the Tenth Schedule to the Constitution of India, are pending

++ Including Chairman and five nominated members

(a) Telugu Desam Party-178; All India Majlis-e-Ittehad-ul-Muslimeen-4; Telengana Rashtra Samiti-1; and Nominated-1.

(b) Arunachal Congress-1

(c) Unattached-1

(d) Himachal Vikas Congress-2; Unattached-2 (including Speaker)

(e) Jharkhand Mukti Morcha-12; Rashtriya Janata Dal-9; Samata Party-5; Janata Dal (United)-2; Marxist Co-ordination Committee-1 and Nominated-1

(f) Janata Dal (U)-19; Janata Dal (S)-4; AIADMK-1; and Nominated-1

(g) Janata Dal (S)-14; and Janata Dal (U)-8

(h) Muslim League-16; Kerala Congress (Mani)-9; Janathipathya Samrakshana Samithi-4; Janata Dal (S)-3; Kerala Congress-2; Kerala Congress (B)-2; Kerala Congress (Jacob)-2; Nationalist Congress Party-2; Revolutionary Socialist Party-2; Revolutionary Socialist Party (Bolshevik)-2; and Communist Marxist Party-1

(i) Bhartiya Rashtriya Congress-127; Bahujan Samaj Party-4; Samajwadi Party-4; Republican Party of India-1; Janata Party-1; Ajay Bharat Party-1; and Nominated-1.

(j) Shiv Sena-70; Nationalist Congress Party-59; Peasants and Workers Party-5; Bharipa Bahujan Mahasangh -3; Janata Dal (S)-2; Samajwadi Party-1; Gondwana Gantantra Party-1; Native People's Party-1; Republican Party on India-1; Samajwadi Janata Party (Maharashtra)-1; and Nominated-1

(k) Shiv Sena-19; (including six nominated members); Nationalist Congress Party-11 (including Deputy Chairman and one nominated member); and Peasants and Workers Party of India-1

(l) Shiromani Akali Dal-62; Shiromani Akali Dal (Mann)-1; Bahujan Samaj Party-1; and Unattached-13

(m) BSP-2; RJD-1; and Loktantrik Congress Vidhayak Dal Samuah (Independent)-5

(n) All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam-131; Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam-31; Tamil Maanila Congress (Moopananar)-23; Pattali Makkal Katchi-20; MGR Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam-2; All India Forward Bloc-1; and Indian National League-1

(o) RSP-2; and TJUS-4

(p) Bahujan Party-22; Bahujan Samaj Party-9; Bahartiya Loktantrik Congress-2; and Shikshak Dal (Non Political)-9

(q) All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam (including Speaker)-3; Tamil Maanila Congress (Moopananar)-2; Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam-7; and Puduvai-Makkal Congress-4

# THE JOURNAL OF PARLIAMENTARY INFORMATION

## INDEX TO VOL. XLVII (2001)

<b>ADDRESSES</b>	<b>Page</b>	<b>Death of Minister</b>	<b>77</b>
At the Inaugural Function of the All-India Conference of Presiding Officers, Chief Ministers, Ministers of Parliamentary Affairs, Leaders and Whips of Parties on "Discipline and Decorum in Parliament and Legislatures of State and Union Territories"	379	Expansion of Cabinet	76
At the Inaugural Function of the Conference of Chairmen of Committees on Public Undertakings of Parliament and State Legislatures	23	Resignation of Deputy Speaker	319
At the Inaugural Function of the Conference of Chairmen of Committees on Public Accounts of Parliament and State Legislatures	29	<b>APPENDICES</b>	140, 258, 324, 467
By the President to Parliament	4	<b>ARTICLES</b>	
By the President of the Russian Federation, His Excellency, Mr. Vladimir V. Putin to Members of Parliament	54	"Safeguarding Democracy: Role of Opposition in Indian Parliament" by G.C. Malhotra	161
By the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi at the Appreciation Course in Parliamentary Processes and Procedures for the Probationers of Indian Administrative Service	157	"Is Parliamentary Democracy In Peril?" by C. Venkatesan	395
By the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi at the Fifth North-East Region Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference	153	<b>ARUNACHAL PRADESH</b>	
By the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi at the 64 <sup>th</sup> Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India	289	By-election results	418
By the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Shri G.M.C. Balayogi at the Symposium on 'Indian Legislatures-Vision for 21 <sup>st</sup> Century'	299	<b>ASSAM</b>	
<b>ANDAMAN AND NICOBAR ISLANDS</b>		By-election results	418
New Lieutenant-Governor	319	Merger of Parties	320
<b>ANDHRA PRADESH</b>		Political developments	319
By-election results	204, 417	<b>BANGLADESH</b>	
		Death of Speaker	420
		<b>BELARUS</b>	
		President re-elected	420
		<b>BIHAR</b>	
		Break up in Alliance	77
		By-election results	204
		Resignation of Ministers	77, 204
		<b>BIRTH ANNIVERSARIES OF NATIONAL LEADERS</b>	
		Maulana Abul Kalam Azad	55
		Dr. B.R. Ambedkar	312
		Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak	404
		Shri C. Rajagopalchari	56
		Chaudhary Charan Singh	56
		Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das	55
		Shri Dadabhai Naoroji	405

Mahatma Gandhi	54	Conference of the Chairmen of Committees on Public Undertakings of Parliament and State Legislatures	51
Smt. Indira Gandhi	55		
Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru	55	Conference of Secretaries of Legislative Bodies in India	311
Lala Lajpat Rai	187		
Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri	54	8 <sup>th</sup> General Assembly of the Asia-Pacific Parliamentarians Conference on 'Environment and Development'	52
Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya	56		
Shri Morarji Desai	187	European Parliamentary Seminar on 'Trade Development and Democracy'	309
Pandit Motilal Nehru	312		
Gurudev Rabindranath Tagore	312	Fifth North-East Region Commonwealth Parliamentary Association Conference	401
Dr. Rajendra Prasad	56		
Shri Rajiv Gandhi	405	50 <sup>th</sup> Parliamentary Seminar (Westminster)	186
Dr. Rammanohar Lohia	187	47 <sup>th</sup> Commonwealth Parliamentary Conference	402
Smt. Sarojini Naidu	187		
Netaji Subhas Chandra Bose	187	104 <sup>th</sup> Inter-Parliamentary Conference	51
Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee	404	105 <sup>th</sup> Inter-Parliamentary Conference	309
Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel	55	106 <sup>th</sup> Inter-Parliamentary Conference	400
<b>BOLIVIA</b>		India-China Parliamentary Friendship Group	186
New President	420		
<b>BULGARIA</b>		Meeting of the Executive Committee of the Asia Region of the CPA	401
Election results	323		
New Prime Minister	420	Meeting of the Standing Committee of the Commonwealth Speakers and Presiding Officers	186
<b>BUREAU OF PARLIAMENTARY STUDIES AND TRAINING (BPST)</b>		Parliamentary Meeting on 'International Trade for a Free, Just and Equitable and Multi-lateral Trading System: Providing a Parliamentary Dimension'	310
Courses/Programmes	57, 187, 313, 406		
<b>CANADA</b>		Parliamentary Meeting on the occasion of the 3 <sup>rd</sup> UN Conference against Racism, Racial Discrimination, Xenophobia and Related Intolerance	400
Election results	81		
<b>CHHATTISGARH</b>		Regional Conference of Parliamentarians on 'Impact of Tuberculosis and Malaria on Poverty'	53
By-election to the Assembly	204		
Political developments	77		
Resignation of MLA	207		
<b>CHINA (TAIWAN)</b>		64 <sup>th</sup> Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India	310
New Prime Minister	81	Symposium on 'Indian Legislatures-Vision for 21 <sup>st</sup> Century'	311
<b>CONFERENCES AND SYMPOSIA</b>		232 <sup>nd</sup> Session of the IPU Executive Committee and IPU-FICCI Conference on 'Globalisation and Democracy'	54
Conference of Chairmen of Committees on Public Accounts of Parliament and State Legislatures	185		

Video Conference on 'Parliament and the Media'	185	INDONESIA	
CONGO		Election results in East Timor	420
New President	207	Political developments	420
DOCUMENTS OF CONSTITUTIONAL AND PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST		IRAN	
The Government of Union Territories and the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi (Amendment) Act, 2001	424	President re-elected	324
The Salaries and Allowances of Ministers (Amendment) Act, 2001	428	President sworn-in	421
The Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Act, 2001	428	Resignation of Vice-President	421
The Two-Member Constituencies (Abolition) and other Laws Repeal Act, 2001	429	ISRAEL	
EDITORIAL NOTE 1, 151, 287, 377		New Prime Minister	207
EXHIBITION		Resignation of Prime Minister	81
Exhibition on <i>Bharat Mein Sansadiya Loktantra Ka Vikas</i>	305	ITALY	
FIJI		Election results	324
New Prime Minister	420	New Prime Minister	324
Political developments	207	JAMMU AND KASHMIR	
GOA		Death of Minister	205
Change of Party affiliation	78	Expansion of Cabinet	205, 418
New Chief Minister	77	JAPAN	
Political developments	77	New Prime Minister	324
Split in Goa People's Congress	78	No-Confidence Motion defeated	207
GUJARAT		Resignation of Speaker	82
By-election result	418	JHARKHAND	
Minister dropped	78	By-election result	205
Resignation of Minister	78	Election of Speaker	79
GUYANA		Political developments	78
New President	323	Vote of Confidence	79
HARYANA		KARNATAKA	
MLA unseated	78	Death of former Chief Minister	79
HIMACHAL PRADESH		MLA expelled from party	79
New Governor	78	Resignation of Minister	205
		KERALA	
		New Chief Minister	320
		Political developments	320
		LUXEMBOURG	
		New Grand Duke	82
		MAHARASHTRA	
		By-election results	418

Expansion of Cabinet	205	Indian Parliamentary Delegations going abroad	313, 405
Resignation of Minister	205		
MALHOTRA, G.C.		PARLIAMENTARY EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES	
Article, "Safeguarding Democracy: Role of Opposition in Indian Parliament"	161	Feature	51, 185, 309, 400
MANIPUR		PERU	
Confidence Motion	320	New President	324, 421
Dissolution of Assembly	418	Political developments	82
Expansion of Cabinet	79	PHILIPPINES	
Imposition of President's Rule	321	Impeachment of President	82
Merger of parties	320	Resignation of President	207
Ministers dropped	320	PONDICHERRY	
Political developments	205	Election of Speaker	321
Resignation of Deputy Speaker	206	Elections to the State Legislative Assembly	321
Resignation of Minister	206	Expansion of Cabinet	321
Split in MSCP	320	Minister dropped	80
MIZORAM		New Chief Minister	321
New Deputy Speaker	79	PORTUGAL	
New Governor	321	President re-elected	82, 207
Resignation of Governor	80	PRIVILEGE ISSUES	
NEPAL		LOK SABHA	
Death of King	324	Alleged Search in the room of Shri Sis Ram Ola, MP, ordered by the District Collector, Jhunjhunu, Rajasthan in Hotel 'Shekhawati', Jhunjhunu on 21 November 1988, with a view to maligning his reputation	189
Political developments	421		
ORISSA		Reference by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, to the Chairman, Rajya Sabha of a notice of question of privilege given by a member of the Lok Sabha	315
By-election result	419	RAJYA SABHA	
Death of MLA	206	Alleged filing of false FIR against Shri Sakshiji Maharaj, a member, and alleged misbehaviour with him by the District Magistrate and Senior Superintendent of Police, Etah, U.P.	66
PAKISTAN			
New President	324		
PARLIAMENTARY AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS			
Developments abroad	81, 207, 323, 420		
Developments around the States	76, 204, 319, 417		
Developments at the Union	75, 201, 318, 416		
PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS			
Parliamentary Delegations visiting India	56, 312, 405	Alleged ill-treatment meted out to a member by the security personnel posted at Raj Bhawan, Chennai	61

Alleged misleading of a Parliamentary Committee and thereby of the House by the Finance Secretary	63	Instance when the House adjourned immediately on receipt of information about demise in New Delhi of sitting member and obituary references were made at the next sitting	413
<b>PROCEDURAL MATTERS</b>			
<b>LOK SABHA</b>			
A member cannot cross-examine a Minister	72	Instance when the issue regarding the reported resignation of the Union Ministers was allowed to be discussed under Rule 184	68
Bills seeking to replace Ordinances are not normally referred to the Departmentally-Related Standing Committees	411	Instance when the member, in whose name Calling Attention was listed called attention of the Minister, but due to interruptions in the House, the Speaker asked the Minister to lay the Statement	73
Decision relating to increase in the number of matters permitted to be raised under Rule 377 and to reduce the length of the text of the notice	68	Instance when the Speaker acceded to a request from a member who had secured first position in a ballot to move Adjournment Motion to permit another member to move the same Motion	72
Instance when a document was not treated as paper laid on the Table	73	Instance when the Speaker gave his consent to move the Adjournment Motion to a member who also had given notice, at the request of another member who had secured first position in the ballot and no objection was taken in the House	408
Instance when a member other than from the Panel of Chairmen presided over a sitting of the House	201	Instances when members were allowed to seek clarifications on a Statement made by the Minister	408
Instance when a member was asked not to display photographs	409	Instances when papers sought to be laid on the Table of the House were not treated as papers laid and the documents were returned to members	412
Instance when consent was withheld since the subject matter was not appropriate enough to adjourn the entire business of the House	71	Instances when revised notice of the Motion of Thanks received through the Ministry of Parliamentary Affairs was published in Bulletin Part-II superseding the earlier one published in Bulletin Part-II	200
Instance when General Budget was presented at 11 a.m.	200	Issue which comes within the Jurisdiction of the Speaker cannot be raised in the House	415
Instance when in the case of the death of sitting members, only the Speaker made references	202	Lok Sabha Secretariat does not entertain matters pertaining to policy decisions of the Government	317
Instance when permission was not granted to a member to make personal explanations regarding certain remarks made against him by another member on the ground that the remarks taken objection to did not form part of the proceedings	410	Matters referred to the Joint Parliamentary Committee cannot be raised in the House	408
Instance when Rule 331G(a) was suspended to enable Standing Committees to consider the Demands for Grants without general discussion on Railways and General Budgets	201		
Instance when the Chair, as a special case, allowed members, whose names were not included in the List of Business, to ask clarificatory questions	68, 414		

Minister cannot be compelled to make a Statement on an issue raised during the 'Zero Hour'	408	Discussion under Rule 193 regarding loss of lives and property due to floods, drought and other natural calamities in various parts of the country	89
Reference by the Speaker, Lok Sabha to the Chairman, Rajya Sabha of question of breach of Privilege given notice by a member, Lok Sabha against a Minister (who happens to be a member of the Rajya Sabha) for appropriate action	409	Discussion under Rule 184 on the proposed disinvestment of the Bharat Aluminum Company Ltd. (BALCO)	227
Removal of shirt and exhibiting it in the well of the House is reprehensible	414	Motion of Thanks to the President for his Address	224
RAJYA SABHA		Obituary References	93, 231, 442
Instance of vacation of seat by a member for absence without permission of the House for a period of sixty days or more	73	Problems faced by farmers	230
PUNJAB		Question Hour	93, 442
Death of Minister	206	Severe crisis faced by the farming community due to burden of the recent increased cost of production and the crash in agricultural commodity price	88
Expansion of Cabinet	80	Statement by the Minister of External Affairs on the Taliban move to destroy Buddhist relics in Afghanistan	214
MLA joins Congress	321	Statement by the Minister of External Affairs regarding recent incidents on the India-Bangladesh border	327
RECENT LITERATURE OF PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST		Statement by the Minister of Railways regarding the setting up of the Non-lapsable Special Railway Safety Fund for the Indian Railways	431
Feature	111, 251, 338, 467	Statement by the Minister on re-inundation of the Bagadigi Colliery of Bharat Coking Coal Ltd. on 2 February 2001	209
SESSIONAL REVIEW		Statement by the Minister regarding situation caused by severe earthquake of 26 January 2001 in Gujarat	211
LOK SABHA		Statement by the Minister regarding the Remote Sensing Data Policy	432
Adjournment Motion regarding mis-management of the US-64 Funds by the Unit Trust of India adversely affecting the small investors and failure of the Government to take timely action to prevent it	437	Statement by the Prime Minister regarding Jammu and Kashmir	208
Discussion on motion under Rule 184 regarding <i>prima facie</i> changes against three Union Ministers on the issue of demolition of Babri Masjid	85	Statement by the Prime Minister regarding the launch of the Geosynchronous Satellite Launch Vehicle (GSLV)	326
Discussion under Rule 193 on acute problems being faced by the poor in rural and urban areas in various parts of the country due to non-availability of foodgrains	435	The Appropriation (NO.2) Bill, 2001	329
Discussion under Rule 193 on the disinvestment of Public Sector Undertakings	183, 436		
Discussion under Rule 193 on the New Telecom Policy, 1999	434		

The Appropriation (Railways) No. 2, Bill, 2001	329	Motion of Thanks to the President for his Address to Members of Parliament	232
The Budget (General) 2001-2002	218	Obituary References	106, 244, 460
The Budget (Railways) 2001-2002	215	Question Hour	106, 244, 329, 460
The Companies (Second Amendment) Bill, 1999	90	Recent Circulars of the UGC and the NCERT curriculum framework in the context of the National Policy on Education	451
The Constitution (Ninety-first Amendment) Bill	440	Sale of BALCO at an abnormally low price and the questionable method of valuation of its assets	237
The Electricity Regulatory Commission (Amendment) Bill, 1999	230	Short Duration Discussion on the economic slowdown, fall in the GDP rate and deteriorating financial condition of the country in the context of mid-term appraisal of the Ninth Five Year Plan	455
The Finance Bill, 2001	329	Short Duration Discussion on Shifting of Industries from residential areas of Delhi	101
The Immigration (Carriers' Liability) Bill, 2000	92	Short Duration Discussion on the plight of farmers in the country	102
The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Bill, 2000	91	Short Duration Discussion on the working of the UTI with special reference to freeze on sale and repurchase of the US-64 and failure of the Government to take timely action	453
The Narcotics Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (Amendment) Bill, 2000	230	Short Duration Discussion on the situation caused by the grave earthquake in Gujarat on 26 January 2001	236
<b>RAJYA SABHA</b>		Statement by the Minister of External Affairs and Minister of Defence on goodwill visit to Nepal	448
Discussion on the Statement of the Prime Minister regarding the Summit-level talks between India and Pakistan in Agra	444	Statement by the Minister of External Affairs regarding recent incidents at the India-Bangladesh Border	239
Dumping of Chinese goods in Indian market and its adverse effect on the Indian economy	100	Statement by the Minister of Home Affairs on the brutal murder of Shrimati Phoolan Devi, Member of Parliament	448
Extreme volatility in the Stock markets which had led to a climate of uncertainty and instability for investment and remedial measures taken by Government with regard thereto	235	Statement by the Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas on the CNG supplies in Delhi	446
Failure of the Public Distribution System and the remedial measures initiated by the Government in regard thereto	98	Statement by the Minister of Petroleum and Natural Gas regarding the revision in price of petroleum products	94
Flood situation in the country caused by heavy rains, resulting in loss of lives, property and crops	449		
Government motion on international Situation	95		
LTTE activities in the country and action taken by Government in regard thereto	98		
Motion expressing disagreement with the reported Statement of the Prime Minister	96		



Statement by the Prime Minister on the peace initiatives in Jammu and Kashmir	95	Financial business	331, 461
Statement by the Prime Minister regarding Summit level talks held between India and Pakistan in Agra (14-16 July 2001)	443	Legislative business	461
The Central Road Fund Bill, 2000	140	Obituary references	331, 461
The Companies (Amendment) Bill, 2000	103	CHHATTISGARH VIDHAN SABHA	
The Electricity Regulatory Commission (Amendment) Bill, 2001	458	Address by the Governor	107, 331
The Indian Medical Council (Amendment) Bill, 2001	458	Constitution of Committees	332
The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Bill, 2000	105	Election of Deputy Speaker	331
The Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill, 2001	457	Election of Speaker	107
The National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (Amendment) Bill, 2000	104	Financial business	332
The Post-Graduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh (Amendment) Bill, 2000	243	Legislative business	332
The Salaries, Allowances, Leave and Pensions of the Officers and Servants of the Delhi High Court Bill, 2001	241	Obituary references	332
The Salaries, Allowances, Leave and Pension of the Officers and Servants of the Supreme Court Bill, 2001	242	DELHI LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY	
The Salary, Allowances and Pension of Members of Parliament (Amendment) Bill, 2001	459	Legislative business	107
The Vaccination (Repeal) Bill, 2000	242	GOA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY	
STATE LEGISLATURES		Financial business	334
ARUNACHAL PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY		Legislative business	333
Address by the Governor	330	Motion of Thanks to the Governor's Address	333
Financial business	330	Obituary references	334
Obituary references	330	HIMACHAL PRADESH VIDHAN SABHA	
ASSAM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY		Legislative business	108
Address by the Governor	330	Obituary references	108
Election of Speaker	331	JHARKHAND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY	
		Financial business	462
		Legislative business	461
		Obituary references	462
		Rules of procedure	462
		KARNATAKA LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL	
		Address by the Governor	245
		Financial business	246
		Legislative business	246
		Obituary references	246
		KARNATAKA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY	
		Address by the Governor	245
		Financial business	245, 462
		Legislative business	245, 462

Obituary references	245, 462	Financial business	249
<b>MADHYA PRADESH VIDHAN SABHA</b>		Legislative business	249
Address by the Governor	334	Obituary references	249
Financial business	246, 335, 463	<b>WEST BENGAL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY</b>	
Legislative business	246, 335, 463	Address by the Governor	250
Obituary references	246, 335, 463	Legislative business	250
<b>MAHARASHTRA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY</b>		Financial business	250
Address by the Governor	335	Obituary references	250
Financial business	109, 336, 464	<b>SHORT NOTES</b>	
Legislative business	109, 335, 464	Exhibition on <i>Bharat Mein Sansadiya Loktantra Ka Vikas</i>	305
Obituary references	109, 336, 464	The Third Conference of Chairmen of Committees on Public Undertakings of Parliament and State Legislatures	41
<b>MANIPUR LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY</b>		The Ninth Conference of Chairmen of Committees on Public Accounts of Parliament and State Legislatures	46
Address by the Governor	247	<b>SIKKIM</b>	
Election of Deputy Speaker	247	New Governor	321
Financial business	247	<b>SRI LANKA</b>	
Legislative business	247	Death of former Prime Minister	82
Obituary references	109, 247, 248	Death of Minister	83
<b>MEGHALAYA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY</b>		Election of Speaker	83
Address by the Governor	248	New Prime Minister	83
Legislative business	248	Political developments	82, 324, 421
Financial business	109, 248	<b>STATE LEGISLATURES</b>	
Obituary references	109, 248	Bills passed	137, 272, 356, 489
<b>MIZORAM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY</b>		Ordinances issued	140, 275, 360, 495
Legislative business	465	Party position	143, 278, 367, 501
Obituary references	465	Statement showing activities	131, 265, 349, 481
<b>NAGALAND LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY</b>		<b>TAMIL NADU</b>	
Financial business	465	Change of party affiliation	321
Legislative business	465	Elections to the State Legislative Assembly	322
Obituary references	465	Members expelled from party	321
<b>ORISSA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY</b>		New Speaker	322
Address by the Governor	337		
Financial business	110, 337, 466		
Legislative business	110, 337, 466		
Obituary references	110, 337, 466		
<b>TRIPURA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY</b>			
Address by the Governor	249		

Resignation of Governor	419	New Chief Minister	81
Resignation of MLA	419	New Governor	81
TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO		Political developments	419
Election results	83	Split in JBSP	206
TRIPURA		UTTARANCHAL	
Death of MLA	206	Political developments	80
U.K.		VENKATESAN, C.	
New Speaker	83	Article, "Is Parliamentary Democracy in Peril?"	395
Prime Minister re-elected	325		
UKRAINE		WEST BENGAL	
New Prime Minister	325	Elections to the State Legislative Assembly	323
Prime Minister removed	325	Governor appointed	323
U.S.A.		New Chief Minister	81, 323
Emergency declared	421	No-Confidence Motion against Speaker rejected	419
Political developments	83	Political developments	206
UTTAR PRADESH		YUGOSLAVIA	
By-election to the Assembly	206, 322	New Government	84
Death of MLA	81	Resignation of Prime Minister	84, 325
MLA expelled from party	81, 322, 419		