

The Journal of Parliamentary Information

VOLUME LVI

NO. 3

SEPTEMBER 2010

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT

NEW DELHI

CBS Publishers & Distributors Pvt. Ltd.

24, Ansari Road, Darya Ganj, New Delhi-2

EDITORIAL BOARD

Editor

*P.D.T. Achary
Secretary-General
Lok Sabha*

Associate Editor

*P.K. Misra
Joint Secretary
Lok Sabha Secretariat*

Assistant Editors

*Kalpana Sharma
Director
Lok Sabha Secretariat*

*Pulin B. Bhutia
Joint Director
Lok Sabha Secretariat*

*Sanjeev Sachdeva
Joint Director
Lok Sabha Secretariat*

© *Lok Sabha Secretariat, New Delhi*

THE JOURNAL OF PARLIAMENTARY INFORMATION

VOLUME LVI

NO. 3

SEPTEMBER 2010

CONTENTS

	PAGE
EDITORIAL NOTE	263
ADDRESS	
Inaugural Address by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar at the 75 th Conference of Presiding Officers of the Legislative Bodies in India, Srinagar, 20 June 2010	265
SHORT NOTE	
Unveiling of Portraits in Parliament House	271
PARLIAMENTARY EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES	
Conferences and Symposia	273
Birth Anniversaries of National Leaders	275
Exchange of Parliamentary Delegations	276
Bureau of Parliamentary Studies and Training	279
PROCEDURAL MATTERS	281
PARLIAMENTARY AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS	284
DOCUMENTS OF CONSTITUTIONAL AND PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST	291
SESSIONAL REVIEW	
Lok Sabha	294
Rajya Sabha	311
State Legislatures	336
RECENT LITERATURE OF PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST	338
APPENDICES	
I. Statement showing the work transacted during the Fourth Session of the Fifteenth Lok Sabha	343

II. Statement showing the work transacted during the Two Hundred and Nineteenth Session of the Rajya Sabha	349
III. Statement showing the activities of the Legislatures of the States and Union territories during the period 1 April to 30 June 2010	354
IV. List of Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament and assented to by the President during the period 1 April to 30 June 2010	361
V. List of Bills passed by the Legislatures of the States and the Union territories during the period 1 April to 30 June 2010	362
VI. Ordinances promulgated by the Union and State Governments during the period 1 April to 30 June 2010	364
VII. Party Position in the Lok Sabha, the Rajya Sabha and the Legislatures of the States and the Union territories	367

EDITORIAL NOTE

The Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India is a significant parliamentary event. The 75th Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India was held at Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir on 20 and 21 June 2010. The Conference deliberated on two important topics, viz. '*Growing Tendency to Disrupt the Question Hour and the Need to Check It*' and '*Significance of the Committee System in Parliament and the Need to Strengthen It*'. In her Inaugural Address, the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar highlighted the recent initiatives taken with regard to Parliamentary Questions and hoped that the procedural changes will meet the long felt need to regulate the Question Hour more effectively. Describing the Committee System as the best suited device for enforcing executive accountability to the Legislature, she said that this Conference provides another opportunity to identify and discuss measures for increasing the efficiency of the Committee System. We include the text of the Inaugural Address of the Speaker, Lok Sabha, at the Conference, in this issue of the *Journal*.

It has been a practice to honour national leaders who have contributed immensely to the national cause, by adorning their portraits in the Central Hall of the Parliament. On 4 May 2010, the Vice-President of India and Chairman, Rajya Sabha, Shri Mohammad Hamid Ansari, unveiled the portrait of Shri Chandra Shekhar, former Prime Minister of India, in the Central Hall of Parliament House, in recognition to his contribution towards strengthening our parliamentary system and promotion of progressive values. A booklet containing the profile of Shri Chandra Shekhar, brought out by the Lok Sabha Secretariat, both in Hindi and English, was presented to the dignitaries at the function. We include in this issue of the *Journal* a Short Note on this event.

We also carry in this issue the 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.

In our constant pursuit of making the *Journal* more enriching and useful, we always invite and 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 all others interested in the field of parliamentary political science.

—*P.D.T. Achary*
Editor

**INAUGURAL ADDRESS BY THE SPEAKER, LOK SABHA,
SMT. MEIRA KUMAR AT THE 75TH CONFERENCE OF
PRESIDING OFFICERS OF LEGISLATIVE BODIES IN
INDIA, SRINAGAR, 20 JUNE 2010**

The Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar delivered the Inaugural Address at the 75th Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India held at Srinagar on 20 June 2010.

We reproduce below the text of the Inaugural Address delivered by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar.

—Editor

Honourable Chief Minister Shri Omar Abdullah; Honourable Speaker Shri Mohammad Akbar Lone; Honourable Acting Chairman Sardar Arvinder Singh Micky; Honourable Deputy Speaker Shri Mohd. Sartaj Madni

It is a matter of great pleasure for me to be with you here at the 75th Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India. I am indeed delighted that the Jammu & Kashmir Legislative Assembly has organized the Conference in this historical city of Srinagar. This picturesque valley has been the venue of three of our previous Conferences—the first in 1954, the second in 1970 and the third in 1987. I am elated that the august forum has once again returned to this sublimely beautiful and invigorating state which has been aptly described as the 'Paradise on the Earth' by the eminent poet Firdaus.

Jammu & Kashmir with its majestic Himalayan ranges, shimmering lakes and warm, sincere and charming people has fascinated everyone over centuries. Its pristine valleys, snowcapped mountains, meandering rivers, magnificent gardens and serene lakes have the magic to win the hearts of people from all over the world. Attending the present Conference of Presiding Officers in this breathtakingly beautiful place will indeed remain etched in the memory of all the participants. My complements to the Honourable Speaker of the Jammu & Kashmir Legislative Assembly and the Honourable Acting Chairman of the Jammu & Kashmir Legislative Council for organizing the Conference in this magnificent valley.

Since the previous Presiding Officers's Conference held in Bhopal in February this year, Shri Akram Khan, Honourable Deputy Speaker of the Haryana Vidhan Sabha has joined the family of Presiding Officers. I extend a hearty welcome to him. We have also had the Budget Session of our Parliament which commenced on 22nd February and concluded on 7th May. In the course of the Session, the Lok Sabha held 32 sittings spread over nearly 138 hours. During this period, the House transacted important financial, legislative and other business, including the adoption of the Motion of Thanks on the Address by the President.

Several matters of immense public importance like the problem of rising prices and growing menace of Maoist violence in various parts of the country, particularly in the States of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Jharkhand, Orissa and West Bengal were extensively debated during the Fourth Session of the Fifteenth Lok Sabha. As many as 21 Bills were passed during the Session, including the National Commission for Minority Educational Institutions (Amendment) Bill, the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Sites and Remains (Amendment and Validation) Bill, the National Green Tribunal Bill, the Energy Conservation (Amendment) Bill and the Prevention of Torture Bill.

We have always shown considerable flexibility regarding procedural issues in the Lok Sabha while conducting the business of the House. In this context, I would like to share with you a path breaking development that took place during the last session of the House. On 27th April, before the submission of the outstanding Demands for Grants relating to the Ministries and Departments to the vote of the House, one of the Honourable members of Lok Sabha raised a critical issue pertaining to the right of members of the House in moving cut motions on the Demands for Grants which are guillotined.

The practice followed so far in this regard in the House had been that the cut motions in respect of the Demands for Grants which were to be guillotined were not circulated and thus not allowed to be moved. However, the right of a member to move a cut motion flows from the power vested in the Lok Sabha under Article 113 of the Constitution to assent to any demand, subject to a reduction of the amount specified in that demand. Evidently, this Article of the Constitution or any of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Lok Sabha does not make any distinction between the demands which are discussed in the House and those which are guillotined. Therefore, while considering the issue of cut motions in respect of the Demands for Grants which are guillotined, after carefully examining the rules as well as the practices that have been followed all these years and the constitutional provision which vests the power in the House of the

Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India Srinagar, 20 to 21 June, 2010



Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar delivering the Inaugural Address at the 75th Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India at Srinagar on 20th June 2010

People to reduce any demand submitted to it, I was of the opinion that the right to move cut motions is certainly a crucial right of the members of the Lok Sabha which cannot be denied. I, therefore, allowed the cut motions to be moved on the Demands for Grants which were to be guillotined for the first time in the Lok Sabha.

Another prominent initiative taken in the recent past relates to Parliamentary Questions. As you are aware, the Question Hour has a special significance in the proceedings of the House, particularly in ventilating the grievances of the public in the matters concerning the administration and working of the Ministries and their allied Departments and organizations. To further streamline this parliamentary device, an exercise was undertaken to amend certain Rules and Directions in the light of experience gained in the past. The key decisions which we have recently taken to increase the efficacy of the Question Hour and which will be operative from the Fifth Session of the Fifteenth Lok Sabha are:

First, the *hitherto* minimum and maximum period of 10 and 21 days, respectively, for giving notices by the Honourable members for Questions has been done away with and a uniform period of fifteen days has been prescribed for giving such notices.

Secondly, the Speaker has now been vested with powers to direct answer to a Starred Question of a member who is absent in the House when his or her name is called.

Thirdly, a Minister is now required to make a Statement in the House correcting the reply given by him or her earlier, irrespective of the fact whether the reply given pertained to a Starred or Unstarred or a Short Notice Question.

Fourthly, the number of notices of Questions which a member is entitled to give, both for oral and written answers in a day, has been limited to ten.

I am sure these procedural changes will meet the long felt need to regulate the Question Hour in the Lok Sabha more effectively.

To provide an in-depth understanding of critical issues of national importance, all the five reconstituted Parliamentary Forums—one each on Water Conservation and Management; Youth; Children; Population and Public Health; and Global Warming and Climate Change have invited experts in related fields to give their presentations for subject-specific enlightenment of the Honourable members of Parliament which include contemporary topics such as 'Right to Education', 'The Road Map for Reduction in Carbon Emission Intensity' and 'Youth Policies in Democratic Process'. The Parliamentary Forum on Global

Warming and Climate Change has also interacted with the visiting Delegation of the European Parliament on issues of mutual interest. I am sharing these achievements with you to enable all of us to learn from each others' experiences with an aim to further strengthen our democratic institutions.

Coming to the topics of deliberation at this Conference, we will be discussing two subjects of enormous parliamentary importance, namely, 'Growing Tendency to Disrupt the Question Hour and the Need to Check it', and 'Significance of the Committee System in Parliament and the Need to Strengthen it'.

Asking questions is an inherent right of members in our parliamentary democracy and 20 starred questions are listed on each working day of the Lok Sabha. The allotted time leaves less than three minutes for each question to be answered taking into consideration the supplementary questions. It is, therefore, not possible to take up all the listed starred questions on any given day.

I am fully aware that the Honourable Members have to voice the grievances, hopes and aspirations of more than 15-20 lacs people they are representing. They act under constant pressure. Hence, in their effort to project the concerns of their constituencies and other national issues they sometimes insist on postponing the scheduled business of the House which may disrupt the proceedings. Nevertheless, I would like to emphasize that the interests of the people can be better served by ensuring that the House runs in order. Question Hour being the very first hour, sets the mood of the House for the day. Its disruption adversely affects the proceedings of the entire day. In addition, whenever, the Question Hour is disrupted, people are deprived of a great deal of information on various aspects of the functioning of the government. It blocks the flow of information from the Executive to the Legislature and from the legislature to the people, thus, causing a serious blow to the principle of accountability which is so fundamental to Parliamentary democracy. Besides, disruption of the Question Hour, at best, can only momentarily draw attention to a particular issue. More lasting solutions can be found only when the issue is properly debated on the floor of the House for which many devices like the Calling Attention Motion, Short Duration Discussion, Half-an-Hour Discussion etc. are available. I believe State Legislatures are also faced by similar problems. As Presiding Officers we need to develop alternate mechanisms that give Honourable members adequate opportunities to highlight issues that are agitating them.

The Question Hour has sanctity of its own as the primary device available to Honourable Members to demand the Government to explain its acts of omission and commission and also its stand on a variety of subjects of public importance. It is, therefore, the duty of

every Presiding Officer to maintain the inviolability of the Question Hour. I have already referred to some of the measures we have taken in the Lok Sabha to streamline the Question Hour and we are constantly striving to improve the system. I hope this Conference will discuss the relevant issues in their proper perspectives for evolving an effective solution to prevent frequent disruption of the Question Hour.

'Significance of the Committee System in Parliament and the Need to strengthen it' is the next subject chosen for discussion during this Conference. With the increasing business and expanding functions of modern Legislatures, there has been a corresponding increase in the use of Committees in almost all our Legislative Bodies. In fact, the committee system has been widely acclaimed as the best suited device for detailed scrutiny of the administrative actions for enforcing executive accountability to the Legislature and, through it, to the people at large.

The Committees of the Legislature, particularly those specifically constituted to scrutinize Executive actions, are vested with adequate powers to conduct detailed examination of the working and the plans and programmes of various Ministries and Departments. These Committees remain instrumental in inspiring respect for parliamentary control among all sections of the administration to ensure that misuse of public money and administrative powers are prevented. They no doubt operate as sentinels of accountability and help promote good governance and transparency. But the effectiveness of the committee system depends on a variety of factors such as the composition and the organization of the Committees, the individual attributes and expertise of their members, research support provided to the Committees in their examination of the subjects and the seriousness on the part of the Ministries and Departments concerned in implementing the recommendations of the Committees.

We have in our Parliament three Financial Committees and 24 Departmentally Related Standing Committees, apart from several other Committees. Needless to say, the Financial Committees and the Departmentally Related Standing Committees are pivotal in ensuring executive accountability. Almost all the Legislatures in India have evolved their own system of Committees for detailed scrutiny of the administrative actions. In this context, I would like to refer to the Conferences of analogous Committees of Parliament and of our State Legislatures which are held from time to time for sharing of experiences and learning from best practices. This Conference of Presiding Officers provides us yet another opportunity to identify and discuss measures for increasing the efficiency of the working of committee system that we have in place in our Parliament and the State Legislatures.

As Presiding Officers, we are at the helm of affairs of our respective Houses and are entrusted with the onerous task of their proficient management. We are vested with considerable inherent as well as statutory powers in our interface with the members of the Houses we preside over. Our responsibilities as Presiding Officers of modern Legislatures have increased and diversified manifold. This Conference of Presiding Officers is a platform where we can learn from one another's experiences in managing the affairs of our Houses more professionally. I earnestly hope that this Conference will go a long way in further streamlining the working of our parliamentary institutions.

Before I conclude, I would like to convey our deep appreciation to our hosts Honourable Chief Minister Shri Omar Abdullah; Honourable Speaker Shri Mohammad Akbar Lone; Honourable Acting Chairman Sardar Arvinder Singh Micky; Honourable Deputy Speaker Shri Mohd. Sartaj Madni; Secretary and the Staff of the Jammu & Kashmir Legislature Secretariat and all those associated with the meticulous planning and organization of this Conference for the warm and generous hospitality extended to us. It has added an altogether new dimension to the age old tradition of *Atithi Devo Bhav*.

With these words, I have great pleasure in inaugurating the 75th Conference of Presiding Officers and Secretaries of Legislative Bodies in India. I am sure the deliberations of this Conference will prove significant in fortifying our democratic institutions.

Thank you.

UNVEILING OF THE PORTRAIT OF SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR IN PARLIAMENT HOUSE

On 4 May 2010, the Vice-President of India and Chairman, Rajya Sabha, Shri Mohammad Hamid Ansari, unveiled the portrait of Shri Chandra Shekhar in the Central Hall of Parliament House.

Shri Chandra Shekhar was an outstanding leader on the Indian political firmament for five decades who contributed a great deal towards strengthening our parliamentary system and the evolution of progressive thought in the post-Independence era. An ardent patriot, a distinguished parliamentarian, a spell-binding orator and a committed socialist, Chandra Shekharji was a multifaceted personality who rose to become the Prime Minister of the largest working democracy in the world. Endowed with exceptional social and intellectual sensitivity, he forcefully espoused the cause of the masses and the nation with great conviction.

The distinguished legislative career of Shri Chandra Shekhar began in 1962 when he was elected as a Member of the Rajya Sabha from Uttar Pradesh. He was re-elected to the Rajya Sabha in 1968 and again in 1974. He was also elected as a Member of the Lok Sabha eight times and served the Sixth, Seventh, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh, Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Lok Sabhas. His long association with the Congress Party starting from 1964 came to an end in 1975 when he decided to quit the party during the Emergency. He spent 19 months in prison during the Emergency. Later, he became the President of the Janata Party in 1979. In 1983, he undertook a *padayatra* of 4260 kms from Kanyakumari to Rajghat in Delhi. In 1988, Shri Chandra Shekhar played a key role in the formation of the Janata Dal and the National Front which formed the government at the Centre in 1989.

Shri Chandra Shekhar assumed office as the Prime Minister of India on 10 November 1990 when the Government led by Shri V.P. Singh resigned. He remained in office as the Prime Minister till 21 June 1991. Though his stint as the Prime Minister was brief, he earned approbation of the entire nation as an astute administrator. He was a forceful, fluent and persuasive speaker in Parliament and was always heard with rapt attention by all sections of the House. Apart from all this, he was a profound thinker and was the Founder

Editor of the *Young Indian*. His books, *Meri Jail Diary* and *Dynamics of Social Change* have been acknowledged for their literary skills and original thinking.

The function to unveil the portrait of Shri Chandra Shekhar was attended by the Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh; Lok Sabha Speaker, Smt. Meira Kumar; Leader of Opposition (Lok Sabha), Smt. Sushma Swaraj; Leader of Opposition (Rajya Sabha), Shri Arun Jaitley; Union Ministers; Members of Parliament; former Members of Parliament and other distinguished guests. The dignitaries also offered floral tributes at the portrait.

The portrait of Shri Chandra Shekhar, painted by Shri R.D. Pareek was donated by Shri Kamal M. Morarka, former member of Rajya Sabha. A booklet containing the Profile of Shri Chandra Shekhar, brought out both in Hindi and English by the Lok Sabha Secretariat, was distributed among the dignitaries on the occasion.



The Vice-President of India, Shri Mohammad Hamid Ansari; the Prime Minister of India, Dr. Manmohan Singh; the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar; the Leader of Opposition (Lok Sabha), Smt. Sushma Swaraj; and other dignitaries at the unveiling of the portrait of Shri Chandra Shekhar

PARLIAMENTARY EVENTS AND ACTIVITIES

CONFERENCES AND SYMPOSIA

The 75th Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India: The 75th Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India was held at Srinagar, Jammu and Kashmir on 20 and 21 June 2010. Smt. Meira Kumar, Speaker, Lok Sabha and the Chairperson of the Conference, presided over the Conference. Shri Mohammad Akbar Lone, Speaker, Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Assembly was elected as the Co-chairman of the Conference. The Conference deliberated the following topics:

- Significance of the Committee System in Parliament and the need to strengthen it.
- Growing tendency to disrupt the Question Hour and the need to check it.

Symposium on Performance of the Legislators in the House – Ensuring Accountability to the People: The Conference of Presiding Officers was followed by a Symposium which was inaugurated by the Chief Minister of Jammu and Kashmir, Shri Omar Abdullah. The Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar, presided over the Symposium and delivered the Opening Address and the Deputy Chairman, Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Council, Shri Arvinder Singh Micky, delivered the Welcome Address. The Presiding Officers of the Legislative Bodies in India, members of Parliament from Jammu and Kashmir and members of Jammu and Kashmir Legislature participated in the Symposium.

Conference of Secretaries: Prior to the Conference of Presiding Officers, the Fifty-third Conference of the Secretaries of Legislative Bodies in India was held on 19 June 2010. Shri Mohammad Ramzan, Secretary, Jammu and Kashmir Legislative Assembly delivered the Welcome Address and the Inaugural Address was delivered by the Secretary-General, Lok Sabha and the Chairman of the Conference, Shri P.D.T. Achary. The Secretary-General, Rajya Sabha, Dr. V.K. Agnihotri also addressed the Conference. The Conference discussed the following Agenda items:

.

- Resignation of Member from State Assembly on election to Parliament-Implication of non-acceptance of resignation by the Speaker;
- What is the impact of expulsion of a Member from his party, on his membership of the House? Can he continue to hold various official positions, including Chairmanship of a Parliament/Legislative Committee even after his expulsion?;
- Conflict of interests of Members of Committee need to have a fair and reasonable approach;
- Can a Citizen access the report of Committee of Inquiry under RTI before it is laid on the Table of the House of the Legislature?'
- Legislative Bodies *vis-à-vis* the RTI;
- Violation of Members' Protocol – Need to evolve a procedure; and
- Authority of the House to expel a Member for breach of privilege and the extent of its Judicial Review in view of the Amrinder Singh's Case.

Mid-Year CPA Executive Committee Meeting: The Mid-Year Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) Executive Meeting was held in Ezulwini, Swaziland from 8 to 13 May 2010. Smt. Meira Kumar, Speaker, Lok Sabha attended the meeting. Shri Uday Narayan Choudhary, Speaker, Bihar Vidhan Sabha and Shri Tanka Bahadur Rai, Speaker, Assam Legislative Assembly also attended the meeting as Regional Representatives from the CPA India Region. Shri P.D.T. Achary, Secretary-General, Lok Sabha, and the Regional Secretary of CPA India Region also participated in the meeting.

The 122nd Assembly of Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), Bangkok: The Meeting of the 122nd Assembly of Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) was held in Bangkok, Thailand from 27 March to 1 April 2010. An Indian Parliamentary Delegation led by Smt. Meira Kumar, Speaker, Lok Sabha attended the Assembly*.

Meeting of the (i) Standing Committee on 'Political Affairs' and (ii) Ad-hoc Working Group on ICT in Tehran: The Meeting of the Standing Committee on Political Affairs and the *Ad hoc* Working

* Details of the above assembly have been included in the June 2010 Issue of the JPI.

Group on ICT of the Asian Parliamentary Assembly (APA) were held in Tehran from 12 to 14 May 2010. An Indian Parliamentary Delegation constituting of Shri Jai Prakash Agarwal, MP, (Lok Sabha), and Shri Tariq Anwar, MP (Rajya Sabha) attended the Meeting. The Standing Committee on Political Affairs discussed the subjects related to Sub-Committees of the APA on (i) on Major issues of Peace and Security in Asia (ii) Declaration on Principles of Friendship and Co-operation in Asia and (iii) Enhancing Cooperation between the APA member Parliaments and their Governments.

21st Session of the Standing Committee of the Parliamentary Conference on the WTO in Geneva: The Twenty First Session of the Steering Committee of the Parliamentary Conference on the WTO was held in Geneva, Switzerland on 24 and 25 June 2010. Shri P.C. Chacko, MP, Lok Sabha, participated in the Session. The following agenda items were discussed:

- ❖ Parliaments and the WTO Aid-for-Trade Campaign;
- ❖ The successful settlement of the banana dispute: a sign of things to come?;
- ❖ Parliaments for the WTO Public Forum 2010;
- ❖ Long-term prospects for the Parliamentary Conference on the WTO.

BIRTH ANNIVERSARIES OF NATIONAL LEADERS

On the birth anniversaries of national leaders whose portraits adorn the Central Hall of Parliament House, functions are organized under the auspices of the Indian Parliamentary Group 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 brought out on the occasion.

The birth anniversaries of the following leaders were celebrated during the period 1 April to 30 June 2010.

Dr. B.R. Ambedkar: On the occasion of the birth anniversary of Dr. B.R. Ambedkar a function was held on 14 April 2010 in the Central Hall, Parliament House. The Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar, the Leader of the House (Lok Sabha), Shri Pranab Mukherjee; the Leader of Opposition (Lok Sabha), Smt. Sushma Swaraj; the Deputy Chairman of Rajya Sabha, Shri K. Rahman Khan; the Leader of Opposition

(Rajya Sabha), Shri Arun Jaitley; Union Ministers; members of Parliament; former members of Parliament, the Secretaries-General of Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha paid floral tributes to Dr. B.R. Ambedkar.

Pandit Motilal Nehru: On the occasion of the birth anniversary of Pandit Motilal Nehru a function was held on 6 May 2009. The Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh; the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar; the Leader of the House (Lok Sabha) Shri Pranab Mukherjee; the Leader of Opposition (Lok Sabha) Smt. Sushma Swaraj; the UPA Chairperson, Smt. Sonia Gandhi; the Chairman of the BJP Parliamentary Party, Shri L.K. Advani; members of Parliament; former members of Parliament, and the Secretary-General, Lok Sabha, paid floral tributes to Pandit Motilal Nehru.

Gurudev Rabindranath Tagore: On the occasion of the birth anniversary of Gurudev Rabindranath Tagore, a function was held on 9 May 2009 in the Central Hall, Parliament House. The Prime Minister, Dr. Man Mohan Singh; the Leader of Opposition (Lok Sabha), Smt. Sushma Swaraj; the UPA Chairperson, Smt. Sonia Gandhi; the Chairman of the BJP Parliamentary Party, Shri L.K. Advani; members of Parliament; former members of Parliament and other dignitaries paid floral tributes to Gurudev Rabindranath Tagore.

Swatantryaveer Vinayak Damodar Savarkar: On the occasion of the birth anniversary of Swatantryaveer Vinayak Damodar Savarkar, a function was held on 28 May 2009 in the Central Hall of Parliament. The Leader of Opposition (Rajya Sabha), Shri Arun Jaitley; the Chairman of the BJP Parliamentary Party, Shri L.K. Advani; members of Parliament; former members of Parliament and other dignitaries paid floral tributes to Swatantryaveer Vinayak Damodar Savarkar.

EXCHANGE OF PARLIAMENTARY DELEGATIONS

Indian Parliamentary Delegations going Abroad

Bhutan: A six member Indian Parliamentary Delegation led by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar visited Bhutan from 26 to 29 May 2010. The other members of the delegation were Smt. Sushma Swaraj, Leader of Opposition, Lok Sabha, Dr. (Km.) Girija Vyas, Shri Vishwa Mohan Kumar, all members of Parliament and Shri P.D.T. Achary, Secretary-General, Lok Sabha. Shri S. Bal Shekar, Joint Secretary, Lok Sabha Secretariat was Secretary to the delegation.

Hungary and Luxembourg: A nine member Indian Parliamentary

Delegation led by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar visited Hungary from 7 to 10 June 2010 and visited Luxembourg from 10 to 13 June 2010. The other members of the delegation were Sarvashri Naresh Gujaral, Ganesh Singh, Mohammad Shafi, N. Gowda Cheluvuraya Swamy, Smt. Davidson J. Helen and Dr. P.L. Punia, all members of Parliament and Shri P.D.T. Achary, Secretary-General, Lok Sabha. Shri U.S. Saxena, Joint Secretary, Lok Sabha Secretariat was Secretary to the delegation.

Mongolia: A nine member Indian Parliamentary Delegation led by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar visited Mongolia from 26 to 30 June 2010. The other members of the Delegation were Shri Manikrao Hodlya Gavit, Dr. Virendra Kumar, Shri Raashid Alvi, Shri Bharatkumar Raut, Shri Raju Shetti and Shri Pulin Bihari Baske, all members of Parliament and Shri P.D.T. Achary, Secretary-General, Lok Sabha. Shri Devender Singh, Joint Secretary, Lok Sabha Secretariat was Secretary to the delegation.

Foreign Parliamentary Delegation visited India

Estonia: A ten member Parliamentary Delegation led by H.E. Dr. (Mrs.) Ene Ergma, President of the Riigikogu (Parliament of Estonia) visited India from 3 to 10 April 2010.

On 5 April 2010 the Delegation called on the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar who also hosted a Banquet in honour of the Delegation, later in the evening. On 6 April 2010, the Delegation had meeting with the Minister of State for External Affairs, Smt. Preneet Kaur and the Leader of Opposition, Lok Sabha, Smt. Sushma Swaraj. Besides, the Delegation visited Agra, Jaipur and Mumbai.

Paraguay: An eight-member Paraguayan Parliamentary Delegation led by H.E. (Mr.) Senator Miguel Carrizosa Galiano, President of the Parliament Paraguay visited India from 10 to 14 April 2010.

On 12 April 2010, the delegation met the Leader of Opposition, Lok Sabha, Smt. Sushma Swaraj. Later in the evening, the delegation called on the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar, who hosted a Banquet in honour of the delegation. On 13 April 2010, the delegation called on the Vice-President of India and Chairman, Rajya Sabha, Shri Mohammed Hamid Ansari. The same day, the delegation had meetings with the Chairman and members of the Standing Committee on External Affairs and with the Minister of Parliamentary Affairs and Water Resources, Shri P.K. Bansal. Later, in the evening, the delegation

also met the then Minister of State for External Affairs, Dr. Shashi Tharoor. Besides, the delegation also visited Agra.

India delegation of the European Parliament: A twenty two member India Delegation of the European Parliament led by Mr. Graham Watson, member of the European Parliament, and Chairman of the India Delegation in the European Parliament visited India from 25 to 30 April 2010.

On 26 April 2010, the delegation had meetings with the Leader of Opposition, Lok Sabha, Smt. Sushma Swaraj; and the Minister of Agriculture, Shri Sharad Pawar. The delegation also called on the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar on the same day. On 27 April 2010, the delegation had meetings with the Minister of State for External Affairs, Smt. Preneet Kaur and the Member-Convener and other members of the Parliamentary Forum on Global Warming and Climate Change. Besides, the delegation also visited Hyderabad.

Visit of Foreign Dignitaries to Parliament House Estate

Israel: H.E. Ms. Rachel Adatto, Member of the Knesset (Parliament of Israel) and Chairperson of Israel-India Parliamentary Friendship Association called on the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar on 16 April 2010.

Pakistan: Dr. (Ms.) Firdous Ashiq Awan, the Minister for Population Welfare of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan called on the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar on 20 April 2010.

Germany: H.E. Mr. Thomas Matussek, Ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany called on the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar on 22 April 2010.

Uzbekistan: H.E. Dr. Salikh Inagamov, Ambassador of the Republic of Uzbekistan called on the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar on 23 April 2010.

Egypt: An eight-member Delegation of Women Political leaders from Egypt called on the Honourable Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar on 28 April 2010.

Cuba: H.E. Mr. Miguel Angel Ramirez Ramos, Ambassador of the Republic of Cuba called on the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar on 4 May 2010.

United Kingdom: H.E. Sir Richard Stagg, British High Commissioner called on the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar on 19 May 2010.

Mongolia: H.E. Mr. Voroshilov Enkbold, Ambassador of Mongolia called on the Speaker, Lok Sabha, Smt. Meira Kumar on 2 June 2010.

PARLIAMENT MUSEUM

During the period from 1 April to 30 June 2010, a total of 5,580 visitors visited the Museum. Apart from the general visitors, there were 1,478 students from 31 schools from all over the country. Besides, a number of present and former Members of Parliament, Members of State Legislatures, and Foreign dignitaries/delegations also visited the Museum. Among the Foreign dignitaries, Mr. Graham Watson, Chairman of the Indian Delegation in Europe from the European Parliament, H.E. Dr. Ene Ergma, President of the Estonian Parliament and H.E. Senator Miguel Carrizosa Galiano, President of the Paraguayan Senate visited the Museum. Delegations from the Parliament of Kenya, Nepal, Tanzania, Zambia, China and Bangladesh also visited the Museum during the quarter.

BUREAU OF PARLIAMENTARY STUDIES AND TRAINING

Study Visits: The Study Visits were organized between April and June for: (i) 7 delegates of the Parliamentary Committee on Implementation of the National Assembly of Kenya from 5 to 7 April 2010; (ii) 4 Members from the Ugandan Parliamentary Service Commission from 19 to 23 April 2010; (iii) 18 Officers from the Government of Nepal on 20 April 2010; (iv) 11 Women political leaders from Egypt on 28 April 2010; (v) 12 Foreign diplomats attending a Special Course at the Foreign Service Institute, New Delhi, on 30 April 2010; (vi) 8 Delegates from the Parliament of Tanzania on 30 April 2010; (vii) 17 Students from the Tilburg University, Netherlands, on 4 May 2010; (viii) 10 Women parliamentarians from the National Assembly of Nigeria on 26 May 2010; (ix) 15 Members of the Public Accounts Committee of the Parliament of Zambia on 28 May 2010; (x) 34 Officials from Bangladesh Visiting India on a Study Tour on Good Governance, Transparency and Accountability through CAN Institute of Higher Education, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, on 7 June 2010; and (xi) 29 Officers from the Government of Bangladesh on 23 June 2010. Besides, six other Study Visits were conducted for the students, teachers and officials of various schools, and organizations in India. A total of 499 persons participated in these 18 Study Visits.

Appreciation Courses: Appreciation Courses in Parliamentary Processes and Procedures were organized for the following officers: (i) 20 Probationers of the Indian Railways Institute of Traffic Management from 5 to 7 April 2010; (ii) 121 Probationers of the Indian Administrative Service and Royal Bhutan Civil Service from 12 to 16 April 2010; (iii) 22 Probationers of the Indian Statistical Service and Indian Postal Service.

Training Programmes: (i) Training Programme for 26 Officers/ Assistants of Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha and State Legislature Secretariats dealing with Questions and Legislative and Budgetary Processes was organised from 29 March to 1 April; (ii) Training Programme in Parliamentary Processes and Procedures for 25 ONGC Executive was organized from 19 to 20 April 2010; (iii) Training Programme in Parliamentary Processes and Procedures for 15 Executive of the Gas Authority of India Ltd. and Pawan Hans Helicopters Ltd. was organized from 29 to 30 April 2010; (iv) Training Programme for 53 Officers/Assistants of Lok Sabha, Rajya Sabha and State Legislature Secretariats working in Committees was organized from 3 to 7 May 2010; and (v) Training Programme in Parliamentary Processes and Procedures for 25 Officers of the Indian Economic Service was also organized from 4 to 7 May 2010.

PROCEDURAL MATTERS

LOK SABHA

Observation from the Chair regarding moving of Cut Motions in respect of the Demands for Grants, whether discussed in House or guillotined, is a constitutional right of members and the same can not be curtailed: On 27 April 2010, before the submission of the Outstanding Demands for Grants relating to the Ministries/Departments to the vote of the House, the Speaker, Lok Sabha made the following observation:—

“Shri Gurudas Dasgupta, honourable member, in a letter addressed to me raised an important point relating to the right of the members of the House in moving cut motions on the Demands for Grants which are guillotined. He quoted article 113 of the Constitution and stated that since the Constitution vests in the House of the People the power to assent to the demand subject to reduction of the amount specified in that demand, the members have the right to move cut motions on any demand submitted to the House for its approval.

This point was also raised in the Business Advisory Committee meeting held on 15 April 2010, by Smt. Sushma Swaraj, the Leader of Opposition, and other honourable members. I had promised to examine this issue in terms of the constitutional provisions and Rules and Practices followed in the House.

The practice followed so far in the House has been that the cut motions in respect of Demands for Grants which are to be guillotined are not circulated and thus not allowed to be moved. But, I did not find any rule which bars the moving of cut motions on demands which are not discussed in the House.

The right to move a cut motion follows from the power vests in the House in the article 113 of the Constitution to assent to any demand subject to a reduction of the amount specified in that demand. This article or any of the Rules does not make any distinction between the Demands which are discussed in the House and those which are guillotined. Article 113 uses the word ‘any demand’. It is thus clear that cut motions can

be moved on all Demands submitted to the House under article 113(2).

I have given careful consideration to the rules as well as the practice that has been followed all these years in respect of cut motions. I have also examined the constitutional provision which vests the power in the House of the People to reduce any demand submitted to the House. Constitutional right is a superior right and it overrides practices. Right to move cut motions is an important right of the members of the House provided in the Constitution which cannot be curtailed. I am, therefore, allowing the cut motions to be moved on demands which are to be guillotined.

Lists of Cut Motions to the Outstanding Demands of various Ministries/Departments have already been circulated. In the normal course, members are given 15 minutes time to send slip at the Table indicating the serial number of the cut motions which they intend to move. However, in the present case, since it is not possible to give time to the members to send slip to the Table indicating the serial number of the cut motions they would like to move, all the cut motions to the Outstanding Demands of various Ministries/Departments, for which notices have been given and which have been circulated, will be treated as moved. And, these cut motions will be disposed of before the Outstanding Demands are put to the vote of the House”.

Instances when the Chair allowed members to lay their written speeches on the Table of the House: On 19 April 2010, during discussion on the Demands for Grants in respect of Budget (Railways) for the year 2010-2011, the Chair permitted twenty eight members to lay their written speeches on the Table of the House.

On 20 April 2010, during discussion on the Demands for Grants relating to Ministry of External Affairs for the year 2010-2011, the Chair permitted four members [Dr. (Prof.) Prasanna Kumar Patasani, Sarvashri Nama Nageswara Rao, J. M. Rasheed Aaroon and Jagdambika Pal] to lay their written speeches on the Table of the House.

On 22 April 2010, during discussion on the Demands for Grants relating to Ministry of Rural Development for the year 2010-2011, the Chair permitted fourteen members (Dr. Tarun Mandal, Sarvashri Prabodh Panda, Sameer Magan Bhujbal, Virender Kashyap, Ganesh Singh, Bhartruhari Mahtab, Ramashankar Rajbhar, A.K.S. Vijayan, Dr. M. Jagannath, Sarvashri Ram Singh Kaswan, Satpal Maharaj, Prem Das Rai, Dr. (Smt.) Jhansi Botcha Lakshmi and Shri Jagdambika Pal) to lay their written speeches on the Table of the House.

On 23 April 2010, during discussion on the Demands for Grants relating to the Ministry of Tribal Affairs for the year 2010-2011, the Chair permitted fifteen members (Sarvashri J.M. Rasheed Aaroon, Mansukhbhai D. Vasava, Ramsinh Patalyabhai Rathwa, Dr. Mahendrasinh Pruthvisinh Chauhan, Sarvashri Yashbant Narayan Singh Laguri, Laxman Tudu, Satpal Maharaj, Paban Singh Ghatowar, Dr. (Prof.) Prasanna Kumar Patasani, Shri S.S. Ramasubbu, Dr. Vinay Kumar "Vinnu" Pandey, Sarvashri Kamal Kishore, Prem Das Rai, Suresh Kodikunnil and Jagdambika Pal) to lay their written speeches on the Table of the House.

PARLIAMENTARY AND CONSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENTS

(1 APRIL TO 30 JUNE 2010)

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

Budget Session of Parliament: The Second Part of the Fourth Session of the Fifteenth Lok Sabha and the Two Hundred and Nineteenth Session of the Rajya Sabha commenced on 15 April 2010. The two Houses were adjourned *sine die* on 7 May 2010. The President prorogued both the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha on 11 May 2010.

Resignation of Union Minister: On 18 April 2010, Union Minister of State for External Affairs Shri Shashi Tharoor resigned.

Rajya Sabha Elections: On 19 March 2010, elections were held to 5 Rajya Sabha seats from Punjab, 3 from Kerala, and one each from Himachal Pradesh and Tripura.

Smt. Bimla Kashyap Sood of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) was elected from Himachal Pradesh.

Smt. Jhama Das Baidya of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) [CPI(M)] was elected from Tripura.

Shri A.K. Antony of the Indian National Congress (INC), and Shri K.N. Balagopal and Dr. T.N. Seema of the CPI(M) were elected from Kerala.

The term of all the above members commenced on 3 April 2010 and they took oath/affirmation on 15 April 2010.

Shri Ashwani Kumar and Dr. M.S. Gill (both of INC); Sardar Sukhdev Singh Dhindsa and Shri Naresh Gujral (both of Shiromani Akali Dal); and Shri Avinash Rai Khanna (BJP) were elected from Punjab. The term of all the members commenced on 10 April 2010 and they took oath/affirmation on 15 April 2010.

On 26 March 2010, Smt. Naznin Faruque and Shri Silvius Condpan, both of the INC and Shri Khekiho Zhimomi of the Nagaland Peoples Front (NPF) were declared elected from Assam and Nagaland, respectively. The term of all the three members commenced on 3 April 2010. While Smt. Naznin Faruque and Shri Silvius Condpan took oath/affirmation on 15 April 2010, Shri Khekiho Zhimomi took oath/affirmation on 19 April 2010.

On 7 June 2010, following six—Sarvashri Jesudasu Seelam, Jairam Ramesh, V. Hanumantha Rao and Dr. N. Janardhana Reddy (all from INC); and Sushri Gundu Sudha Rani and Shri Y.S. Chowdary (both from TDP)—were elected from Andhra Pradesh. The term of all the members commenced on 22 June 2010 and except for Shri Jairam Ramesh, who took oath/affirmation on 29 July 2010, the rest took oath/affirmation on 26 July 2010.

On 10 June 2010, elections were held to 6 Rajya Sabha seats from Tamil Nadu, 3 from Madhya Pradesh, 2 from Chhattisgarh and 1 from Rajasthan.

Sarvashri K.V. Ramalingam, Paul Manoj Pandian, (both of All India Anna Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam); S. Thangavelu, T.M. Selvaganapathi, Dr. K.P. Ramalingam (all from Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam) and Dr. E.M. Sudarsana Natchiappan (INC) were elected from Tamil Nadu. The term of all the members commenced on 30 June 2010. While Dr. Natchiappan, Sarvashri Thangavelu, T.M. Selvaganapathi and Dr. K.P. Ramalingam took oath/affirmation on 26 July 2010; Sarvashri Ramalingam and Paul Manoj Pandian took oath/affirmation on 27 July 2010.

Dr. Chandan Mitra and Shri Anil Madhav Dave (both from BJP); and Dr. Vijaylaxmi Sadho of the INC were elected from Madhya Pradesh. The term of all the three members commenced on 30 June 2010 and they took oath/affirmation on 26 July 2010.

Shri Nand Kumar Sai of the BJP and Smt. Mohsina Kidwai of the INC were declared elected from Chhattisgarh. The term of both the members commenced on 30 June 2010. Smt. Mohsina Kidwai took oath/affirmation on 26 July 2010 while Shri Nand Kumar Sai took oath/affirmation on 28 July 2010.

Shri Narendra Budania of the INC was elected from Rajasthan. His term commenced on 15 June 2010 and he took oath/affirmation on 26 July 2010.

Death of Rajya Sabha Members: Shri Krishan Lal Balmiki, a BJP member from Rajasthan and Shri Virendra Bhatia, a Samajwadi Party member from Uttar Pradesh, in the Rajya Sabha, passed away on 21 April 2010 and 24 May 2010, respectively.

Resignation of Rajya Sabha Member: On 22 June 2010, Shri Narendra Budania an INC member from Rajasthan in the Rajya Sabha resigned from his seat.

Death of Lok Sabha Member: On 24 June 2010, Shri Digvijay Singh, an Independent Lok Sabha member from the Banka Lok Sabha Constituency (Bihar) passed away.

Death of former Vice-President: On 15 May 2010, former Vice-President of India, Chairman of Rajya Sabha and three-time Chief Minister of Rajasthan, Shri Bhairon Singh Shekhawat passed away.

AROUND THE STATES

BIHAR

Suspension of Party MLA: On 18 June 2010, the BJP suspended its party MLA Shri Banwari Lal for violating party discipline and cross-voting in the recent Rajya Sabha elections.

Death of Minister: On 24 June 2010, the Minister for Planning and Development, Smt. Sudha Srivastava passed away.

GOA

Resignation of Minister: On 5 June 2010, the Tourism Minister, Shri Mickky Pacheco of the NCP resigned for his being allegedly involved in the controversy over the death of a woman.

JHARKHAND

Withdrawal of Support to the Government: On 24 May 2010, the BJP withdrew support to the Shibu Soren Government in which it was a coalition partner.

Resignation of Chief Minister: On 30 May 2010, the three-time Chief Minister, Shri Shibu Soren resigned after failing to get the support of the INC and its ally JVM (P).

President's Rule Imposed: On 1 June 2010, accepting the Union Cabinet's recommendation, President Smt. Pratibha Devisingh Patil imposed President's Rule and the Legislative Assembly was placed under suspended animation.

Suspension of Party MLA: On 18 June 2010, the BJP suspended its party MLA, Shri Ram Chandra for violating party discipline and cross-voting in the recent Rajya Sabha elections.

KARNATAKA

Resignation of the Minister: On 2 May 2010, the Food, Civil Supplies and Consumer Affairs Minister, Shri H. Halappa resigned from the Cabinet.

KERALA

Resignation of Minister: On 30 April 2010, the Public Works Minister Shri P.J. Joseph resigned from the Cabinet.

MEGHALAYA

New Chief Minister: On 19 April 2010, the Chief Minister, Shri D.D. Lapang resigned. On 20 April 2010, Dr. Mukul Sangma was sworn-in as the Chief Minister. Along with him, Shri Bindo M. Lanong, Leader of the United Democratic Party (UDP) took oath as the Deputy Chief Minister while Shri J. Antonius Lyngdoh and Shri Abu Taher Mondal took oath as Cabinet Ministers.

ORISSA

Suspension of Party MLA: On 18 June 2010, the BJP suspended its party MLA Shri Bhimsen Chowdhary for violating party discipline and cross-voting in the recent Rajya Sabha elections.

PUNJAB

Assembly Expulsion of Amarinder Quashed: On 26 April 2010, the Supreme Court quashed Punjab Assembly resolution dated 10 September 2008, expelling the former Chief Minister and Congress leader, Capt. Amarinder Singh, from the House for his purported executive action during the term of the previous House, holding it as constitutionally invalid. The Court allowed his appeal and restored his membership.

RAJASTHAN

Death of Governor: On 26 April 2010, Smt. Prabha Rau died. Subsequently, Punjab Governor, Shri Shivraj Vishwanath Patil, was given additional charge of Rajasthan.

UTTAR PRADESH

Expulsion of Party MLA: On 16 April 2010, the Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP) expelled its party MLA Shri Mukhtar Ansari for anti-party activities.

Mayawati Re-elected to Legislative Council: On 3 June 2010, the Chief Minister and the BSP leader, Kumari Mayawati and 12 others were elected to the State Legislative Council.

EVENTS ABROAD**COSTA RICA**

New President: On 8 May 2010, Ms. Laura Chinchilla of the National Liberation Party was elected as the first woman President of Costa Rica.

CZECH REPUBLIC

Legislative Elections: The elections to the 200-seat Chamber of Deputies (the Lower House of the bicameral legislature) were held on 28 and 29 May 2010. The party position following the elections is as follows: Czech Social Democratic Party: 56; Civil Democratic Party: 53; Tradition Responsibility Prosperity: 41; Communist Party of Bohemia Moravia: 26; and Public Affairs: 24.

ETHIOPIA

Legislative Elections: The elections to the 547-seat Council of People's Representatives (the Lower Chamber of the bicameral legislature) were held on 23 May 2010. The party position following the elections is as follows: Ethiopian People's Revolutionary Democratic Front: 499; Somali People's Democratic Party: 24; Benishangul-Gumuz People's Democratic Unity Front: 9; Afar National Democratic Party: 8; Gambela People's Democratic Movement: 3; Amhara National Democratic Movement: 1; Harari National League: 1; Ethiopia Federal Democratic Unity Forum: 1; and Independents: 1.

GERMANY

Resignation of President: On 31 May 2010, President Mr. Horst

Köhler of the Christian Democratic Union resigned. The President of the *Bundesrat* (the Upper House) Bremen Mayor, Mr. Jens Bohmsen became acting federal President.

HAITI

Extension of Presidential Term: On 6 May 2010, the Chamber of Deputies (the Lower Chamber of the bicameral legislature) by 56 votes to three, extended President Mr. René Préval term until 14 May 2011, if presidential elections could not be held by 7 February 2011.

MAURITIUS

Legislative Elections: The elections to the 69-seat National Assembly (the unicameral legislature) were held on 5 May 2010. The party position following the elections is as follows: Alliance of the Future: 41 (45); Alliance of the Heart: 18 (20); Mauritian Solidarity Front: 1 (1); Rodrigues Movement: 2 (2); and Rodrigues People's Organisation: 0 (1). [62 deputies were elected, and seven were appointed from the list of unsuccessful candidates under the "best loser" system. Figures in parentheses reflect the distribution of seats after the "best loser" appointees was added].

NIGERIA

Death of President: On 5 May 2010, President Mr. Umaru Yar'Adua died in the capital Abuja.

New President: On 6 May 2010, Mr. Goodluck Jonathan was sworn in as the new President.

PHILIPPINES

New President: On 10 May 2010, Mr. Benigno "Noynoy" Aquino III of the Liberal Party was elected as the President of the Philippines.

POLAND

Death of President: On 10 April 2010, President Mr. Lech Kaczynski died. Mr. Bronislaw Komorowski was appointed as the acting President.

SUDAN

President Re-elected: On 27 May 2010, Mr. Omar Hassan Ahmed al-Bashir, the incumbent President of Sudan, was sworn in for a further five-year term.

SURINAM

Legislative Elections: The elections to the 51-seat National Assembly (the unicameral legislature) were held on 25 May 2010. The party position following the elections is as follows: Mega Combination: 23; New Front for Democracy: 14; A-Combination: 7; People's Alliance for Progress: 6; and Party for Democracy and Development through Unity: 1.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

Legislative Elections: The elections to the 41-seat House of Representatives (the Lower House of the bicameral legislature) were held on 24 May 2010. The People's Partnership Coalition secured 29 seats while the People's National Movement won 12 seats.

UNITED KINGDOM

Legislative Elections: The elections to the 650-seat House of Commons (the Lower Chamber of Parliament, the bicameral legislature) were held on 6 May 2010. The party position following the elections is as follows: Conservative Party: 306; Labour Party: 258; Liberal Democrats: 57; Scottish National Party: 6; Plaid Cymru: 3; Democratic Unionist Party: 8; Sinn Féin: 5; Social Democratic and Labour Party: 3; Alliance Party: 1; Greens: 1; Speaker: 1; and Others: 1.

DOCUMENTS OF CONSTITUTIONAL AND PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST

The Tamil Nadu Legislative Council Act, 2010: Article 168 of the Constitution, *inter alia*, provides for constitution of two Houses in six States and one House in other States. Where there are two Houses of the Legislature of a State, one is known as the Legislative Council and other as the Legislative Assembly. At the commencement of article 168 of the Constitution, a Legislative Council for the erstwhile State of Madras was envisaged. The State was renamed as the State of Tamil Nadu *vide* the Madras State (Alteration of Name) Act, 1968. However, the Tamil Nadu Legislative Council was abolished with effect from 1 November 1986 *vide* the Tamil Nadu Legislative Council (Abolition) Act, 1986.

Clause (1) of article 169 of the Constitution provides that the Parliament may, by law, provide for the abolition of the Legislative Council of a State having such a Council or for the creation of such a Council in a State having no such Council if the Legislative Assembly of the State passes a resolution to that effect by a majority of the total membership of the Assembly and by a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members of the Assembly present and voting.

On 26 July 1996, the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly passed a resolution for creation of a Legislative Council in the State and a Bill, namely, the Legislative Council Bill, 1997 which provided for creation of a Legislative Council in the States of Punjab and Tamil Nadu was introduced in the Lok Sabha on 14 August 1997 but the Bill lapsed on the dissolution of the Eleventh Lok Sabha. However, the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly passed another resolution on 12 September 2001 rescinding its earlier resolution dated 26 July 1996 and hence no further action for revival of the proposal could be taken.

On 12 April 2010, the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly passed a resolution in terms of clause (1) of article 169 of the Constitution for the creation of Legislative Council in that State. It was, accordingly, proposed to enact a law providing for the creation of the Legislative Council for the State of Tamil Nadu with seventy-eight members paving way for giving better opportunity to people's participation in governance and decision-making. The expenditure in respect of the Legislative Council would be borne by the Government of Tamil Nadu.

The Tamil Nadu Legislative Council Bill, 2010 sought to achieve the above objects and also provided for matters supplemental, incidental and consequential to the creation of the proposed Legislative Council. The Bill was passed by the Rajya Sabha and the Lok Sabha on 5 May 2010 and

6 May 2010, respectively. The President of India assented to it on 18 May 2010.

We reproduce here the text of the above Act.

—Editor

THE TAMIL NADU LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ACT, 2010

An Act to provide for the creation of Legislative Council for the State of Tamil Nadu and for matters supplemental, incidental and consequential thereto.

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

1. *Short title.* This Act may be called the Tamil Nadu Legislative Council Act, 2010.

2. *Definition.* In this Act, unless the context otherwise requires, each of the words and expressions used herein and not defined but defined in the Representation of the People Act, 1950, shall have the same meaning as in that Act.

3. *Creation of Legislative Council for Tamil Nadu.* (1) As from such date as the President may, by order appoint, there shall be a Legislative Council for the State of Tamil Nadu; and as from that date, in sub-clause (a) of clause (1) of article 168, after the word “Karnataka,” the words “Tamil Nadu”, shall be inserted.

(2) In the said Council, there shall be 78 seats of which—

- (a) the numbers to be filled by persons elected by the electorates referred to in sub-clauses (a), (b) and (c) of clause (3) of article 171 shall be 26, 7 and 7 respectively;
- (b) the number to be filled by persons elected by the members of the Legislative Assembly of Tamil Nadu in accordance with the provisions of sub-clause (d) of the said clause shall be 26; and
- (c) the number to be filled by persons nominated by the Governor of Tamil Nadu in accordance with the provisions of sub-clause (e) of that clause shall be 12.

(3) As soon as may be after the commencement of this Act, the President, after consultation with the Election Commission, shall, by order, determine,—

- (a) the constituencies into which the State of Tamil Nadu shall

SESSIONAL REVIEW

FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA

FOURTH SESSION

The Fourth Session (part one and part two) of the Fifteenth Lok Sabha commenced on 22 February 2010 and was adjourned *sine die* on 7 May 2010. In all, there were 32 sittings during the Session. The House was prorogued on 11 May 2010.

A resume of some of the important discussions held and other business transacted during the period from 15 April to 7 May 2010 (Second part of the Fourth Session) is given below:

A. DISCUSSIONS / STATEMENTS

Regarding Prime Minister's visit to Bhutan for the 16th SAARC Summit: Making a Statement in the House on 3 May 2010, the Minister of External Affairs, Shri S.M. Krishna said that Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh's participation in the 16th South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) Summit in Bhutan in April 2010 was a historic summit marking the 25th anniversary of SAARC. The Prime Minister had very fruitful discussions with Prime Minister of Bhutan Mr. Jigmi Thinley and an audience with His Majesty, Druk Gyalpo Jigme Khesar Namgyel Wangchuck the King of Bhutan. These discussions have reinforced the conviction that India-Bhutan relations remain strong, deep-rooted and steeped in mutual trust and understanding. The Prime Ministers of India and Bhutan launched two new large hydropower projects as part of the commitment to jointly develop 10,000 MWs of hydro-power capacity in Bhutan by the year 2020. They also laid the foundation stone of the Bhutan Institute of Medical Sciences and initiated an e-governance and IT project in Bhutan.

The Prime Minister of India stressed that regional cooperation should enable freer movement of people, of ideas, and of goods and services. It is not sufficient to merely conclude agreements and conventions. The challenge before both the countries is to translate these agreements into practical activities and programmes, which

touch the lives of people. The Prime Minister emphasized the need for greater regional cooperation in areas such as agriculture, forestry, education, healthcare, women's empowerment, skill development and technological innovations. The Summit concluded an Agreement on Trade in Services.

The Prime Minister shared our vision of a prosperous and vibrant South Asia playing its rightful role in shaping the global discourse on issues facing the world. There was a convergence of views on the need to transform SAARC into a truly action-oriented, people-centric and dynamic regional organization. There was unanimous condemnation of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations.

The theme of the Summit was "Climate Change". The leaders of the SAARC countries exchanged views on deepening regional cooperation for tackling the effects of global warming in our region, and how we can benefit from each other's experiences and strengths. A Summit Declaration on Climate Change as well as a Convention on Cooperation on Environment was concluded.

There was widespread appreciation for India's initiatives and role in contributing to the region's stability and prosperity. We would continue to persevere in our efforts to create a climate of constructive cooperation in South Asia based on mutual respect and mutual benefit.

The Prime Minister had the opportunity of having bilateral meetings with the Presidents of Maldives and Sri Lanka, and the Prime Ministers of Bangladesh, Nepal and Pakistan. There was a common desire among all our neighbours to further strengthen their relations with India. During the Prime Minister's meeting with the President of Maldives, the two sides reviewed our close and friendly relations, based on mutual trust and understanding and shared interests. The Prime Minister reiterated India's commitment to deepen our partnership with Maldives across all areas. The President of Sri Lanka, Mr. Mahinda Rajapaksha informed our Prime Minister of their efforts for political reconciliation and for bringing lasting peace in the country. The Prime Minister reiterated India's commitment to assist Sri Lanka in its relief and rehabilitation efforts, and to strengthen our bilateral relations in diverse areas. During his meeting with Ms. Sheikh Hasina heading the Bangladesh Government, the Prime Minister reaffirmed our commitment to expeditiously implement the various decisions taken during her landmark visit to India in January 2010. Our Prime Minister also conveyed to Prime Minister of Nepal, Mr. Madhav Kumar Nepal, India's support for the

ongoing efforts of the people of Nepal for the consolidation of multi-party democracy in Nepal. Both sides expressed satisfaction at the progress made in our cooperation since the visits of Prime Minister of Nepal to India in August 2009 and the President of Nepal in February 2010. Similarly, our Prime Minister had also a cordial and frank discussion with the Prime Minister Syed Yousaf Raza Gilani of Pakistan. He told him that if the trust deficit between India and Pakistan can be eliminated, all issues can be resolved through dialogue. Good neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan were in the interest of both our countries as well as in the interest of the peace, stability and development in the region. He reiterated our serious concerns on terrorism emanating from Pakistan, and urged the Prime Minister of Pakistan to expedite action against the perpetrators of the Mumbai terrorist attack. He was assured that Pakistan was serious about bringing these perpetrators to book. Likewise, during President Hamid Karzai's visit to India on April 26-27, 2010, India and Afghanistan had discussed a broad range of bilateral and regional issues of mutual interest, and they reaffirmed their commitment to the strategic partnership between the two countries. Our Prime Minister reiterated our commitment to assist the Government and people of Afghanistan in their efforts towards the reconstruction and development of their country, the Minister informed.

Regarding situation arising out of deplorable condition of working women particularly the poor women workers in unorganized sector and steps taken by the Government in this regard: Shri Gurudas Dasgupta called the attention on this issue on 6 May 2010, of the Minister of Labour and Employment.

Replying to this, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Labour and Employment, Shri Harish Rawat said that out of total workforce in the country, 31.6 per cent are women workers which are mostly employed in the unorganized sector. In rural areas, women are mostly employed in agriculture. Under-employment in the agricultural sector, seasonal nature of employment and other socio-economic factors, result in particularly poor conditions and workers of this category have little to fall back upon in later years of life when they are unable to earn their livelihood. Though Agriculture is a State subject and Labour is in the concurrent list, the Central Government is alive to the situation and is taking appropriate action to provide for their better working and living conditions, the Minister opined. Presently, many existing labour laws like the Minimum Wages Act, 1948; the Inter-State Migrant Workmen (Regulation of Employment and Conditions of

Service) Act 1979; the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970, etc. are applicable to unorganized workers. For taking care of the rights of working women, the Government has enacted the Equal Remuneration Act, 1976 to provide for payment of equal remuneration to men and women for the same work or work of similar nature and for the prevention of discrimination on ground of sex against women in the matter of employment. Under the Maternity Benefit Act, women employees are entitled to maternity benefit at the rate of average daily wage for the period of their actual absence up to 12 weeks due to the delivery.

There are also some schemes for the working women being implemented by various Ministries/Departments—the *Swarnjayanti Gram Swarojgar Yojana*; *Indira Awas Yojana*; *Janani Suraksha Yojana* (JSY), etc. The Ministry of Labour and Employment has constituted the Welfare Funds for some categories of workers like *beedi*, cine and non-coal mine workers in the unorganised sector. The Welfare Funds are utilized to provide for financing of measures to promote the welfare of workers, including women workers engaged in these occupations. The Unorganised Workers' Social Security Act, 2008 was enacted on 31 December 2008 which provided for constitution of the National Social Security Board which would recommend formulation of social security schemes for unorganised workers from time to time, including the women workers. Similarly, the National Board was constituted on 18 August 2009 which provided for women representation on the Board. The *Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana* was launched on 1 October 2007 to provide smart card based cashless health insurance cover of Rs.30,000 per annum on family floater basis to BPL families in the unorganized sector.

Responding to the points made by Shri Gurudas Dasgupta, the Minister further stated that the UPA Government is committed to Women empowerment, which is one of the six components of the National Minimum Programme. He said that there are about dozen labour laws for the welfare of women and altogether there are 22 laws in the country to bring about improvement in the conditions of women in the country.

However, the Minister admitted that these are not enforced properly. He informed that after the enactment of the Unorganized Social Security Act in December 2008, a corpus of Rs.1,000 crore as a National Social Security Fund has been constituted. The Minister also stated that workers engaged under Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MNREGA) would also be covered thereunder.

The workers engaged in the building construction sectors, other workers, and the poor women under BPL are also proposed to be covered thereunder. Besides, the women workers engaged in *Janhit Suraksha Yojna*, *Swarna Jayanti Gram Swarozgar Yojna*, *Indira Awas Yojna*, *Swadhar Yojna*, *Swayam Siddha Yojna* and *Beedi Worker Welfare Fund* are amongst the likely beneficiaries, the Minister said. Eversince the implementation of the Sixth Pay Commission, the Government has endeavoured to make women equal partners and in the same manner, workers engaged in the unorganized sector are to be made equal partners, the Minister added.

Regarding Recent Maoist Attack on CRPF Personnel at Dantewada District of Chhattisgarh: Initiating* the discussion on 15 April 2010, Shri Yashwant Sinha (BJP) said that the 6th April, 2010 would go down in our internal security history as a black day. Seventy three policemen were ambushed and killed by the Maoists in the jungles of Dantewada district of Chhattisgarh. Shri Sinha said that this represented the failure of Indian democracy, of the Indian Constitution, of all our development efforts and the style of governance of the present Government.

Shri Sinha emphasized on the fact that we would continue to face defeat at the hands of the Maoists unless a clear policy is framed with a firm resolve to fight with them. He alleged that the Operation Green Hunt was started without proper preparations. The State Governments were not taken into confidence before starting this operation. Shri Sinha urged the Government to provide all the necessary facilities for modernization of the police forces.

Shri Sinha suggested that a panel of retired Central Paramilitary officers could be formed to think and advise on matters of internal security for the nation. Experienced Central Paramilitary forces officers should be placed in the Ministry of Home Affairs to process the various proposals of the Central Paramilitary Forces (CPMF) which has a bearing on the functioning of these forces. A transparent command and control system need to be made functional so that over every five units, there is an officer of DIG rank to supervise and monitor the functioning of the units, and over every 15 units, an

* Others who participated in the discussion were: Sarvashri Subodh Kant Sahay, Sharad Yadav, Tathagata Satpathy, Kirti Azad, Sanjay Singh Chauhan, Adhir Chowdhury, Varun Gandhi, P. Lingam, Manohar Tirkey, Asaduddin Owaisi, Babu Lal Marandi, Aruna Kumar Vundavalli, Dr. Charn Das Mahant, Dr. Baliram and Dr. Tarun Mondal.

officer of IG rank is placed to supervise their functioning so that operational and tactical lapses could be avoided while planning and executing the anti-Naxal operations, Shri Sinha added.

Taking part in the discussion, Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav (SP) said that Dantewada incident was a very serious, shocking and painful one and it is a serious threat to the unity of the country. He took exception to the Maoists declaring that they are going to have a rule over India by the year 2050. Shri Yadav said that we cannot suppress Naxalism with the help of arms only. We have to take both measures, *i.e.*, to adopt a tough stance and to provide the basic amenities to them. He wanted an all party meeting should be called to find out the solution of this problem. Shri Yadav said that there is a need to pay attention as to why some people have become Naxalites. The moment the Government pays its attention towards their problems, the naxalites would be handicapped and people would be with the Government. Shri Yadav also demanded that the Government should provide facilities like drinking water, electricity, education and employment to them.

Taking part in the debate, Shri Basu Deb Acharia (CPI-M) said that the problem of Maoism has spread over seven States and in almost 82 districts. He said that there is displacement and dispossession among the tribals, and his party has been demanding that land acquisition along with rehabilitation and resettlement policy should be brought about. He said that the economic policy which is being pursued by this Government is responsible for the gap between the poor and the rich. Because of the construction of the project, the tribals are adversely affected. But their rehabilitation and resettlement is not done. Shri Acharia emphasized that the real development is needed for the tribal people so that their alienation can be tackled. There is a need for a coordinated approach and the Government should speak in united voice, Shri Acharia demanded.

Participating in the discussion, Dr. M. Thambidurai (AIADMK) supported the Government in its efforts to tackle naxalism in this country. He stressed on modernization of the police forces. He requested the Government to allocate more funds for modernizing the police force and to take some other efforts. Dr. Thambidurai said that even though the Government was giving so many welfare programmes, the naxalites and Maoists still do not have any faith in democracy and democratic system. He emphasized that we have to protect democracy and find a solution to this problem.

Taking part in the discussion, Shri Nama Nageswara Rao (TDP)

said that since the present Government took the charge, the number of victims of naxalism has reached 4,928, a four-fold increase. Shri Rao said that economic disparities prevalent in the society are adding fuel to this menace. He alleged that Government was not trying to develop the backward areas and the tribals have no access to the welfare schemes being implemented by the Government. Shri Rao stressed that the Government should think over it seriously and pay attention to the development of the affected areas to solve this problem.

Taking part in the discussion, Shri Lalu Prasad Yadav (RJD) said that in many states, problem of Naxalism is increasing day by day. Andhra Pradesh, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, Orissa, Bihar and Nepal have become the corridor of extremism. He suggested that this menace has to be tackled in a peaceful manner and urged the Government to convene an all party meeting to resolve the matter.

Joining in the discussion, Shri Dara Singh Chauhan (BSP) said that naxalism is gaining ground because the tribal people are neglected. The reason lies in the lack of economic development in tribal areas. He alleged that despite the Government enacting the Forest Rights Act, this has not been enforced. He urged upon the Home Minister to convene an all-party meeting on this issue.

Replying to the discussion on 15 April 2010, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P. Chidambaram called the Dantewada incident a grave tragedy. He said that in accordance with our policy, and at the request of the Government of Chhattisgarh, 141 companies of Central Paramilitary Forces had been deployed in that State for anti-naxal operations. The decision to undertake an 'area-domination exercise' was taken jointly by the State Police of Chhattisgarh and CRPF. However, the *Jawans* were caught by surprise. The Minister said that he has instituted an inquiry and the report would come the same month. He further said that anti-naxal operations are conducted in accordance with the policy that has evolved over time. As far as Congress Party was concerned, they consider naxalism a grave law and order problem. He said that one has to be mindful of the underlying socio-economic causes but the door for dialogue is also always open. Shri Chidambaram stated that he held a series of 'Chief Ministers' Meetings wherein it was agreed that the development and police action should go hand-in-hand. It was agreed that intra-State operations would be conducted under the direction of the DGP and the Chief Minister; and the inter-State operations, would be conducted under the command of the Special DG of the CRPF. He further stated that there is no other force than CRPF

to take on the naxals. He said that given our resources, these are trained forces and everyone of the three platoons that were inducted in this area, Jagdalpur, had pre-induction training. Despite this, there has been a grave tragedy and he took the moral responsibility as the Union Home Minister for this unfateful incident.

Shri Chidambaram said that the goal of naxalism is the seizure of political power. He said that we are facing a determined enemy, and our *jawans* are putting up a brave fight. Hence, it is our duty to stand by our *jawans*. They fight so that the rest of us can live in freedom, liberty and democracy, he observed.

He felt that we must address the underlying socio-economic causes. He also emphasized that this tragedy would only make us more determined, more resolute and more fearless. It must also make us, at the same time, more compassionate and more concerned about the poor so that development takes place.

The Minister announced that the Central Government, under various heads, would give each family Rs.35 lakh, besides the contribution of the State Governments between Rs.5 lakh and Rs.15 lakh. Secondly, the Last Drawn Pay would be paid to the family until the date the martyrs would have retired. Thirdly, one eligible member of the family would get a job, the Home Minister announced.

The discussion was concluded.

Regarding Need to lay down specific parameters for conducting the Census, 2011: Initiating* the discussion on 5 May 2010, Shri Ananth Kumar (BJP) said that Census is a huge exercise and is being undertaken from the last 140 years. The National Population Register (NPR) was started in 2010. However, no report has been presented so far on this. Similarly, on the National Register of Citizenship, there is also no report. Shri Kumar referred to the then Prime Minister,

* Others who participated in the discussion were: Sarvashi Bhakta Charan Das, Sharad Yadav, Kalyan Banerjee, T.K.S. Elangovan, B. Mahtab, Gopinath Munde, Sandeep Dikshit, Sameer Bhujbal, Anand Prakash Paranjpe, Beni Prasad Verma, O.S. Manian, S.D. Shariq, Prasanta Kumar Majumdar, Mohammed E.T. Basheer, Chaudhary Lal Singh, Asaduddin Owaisi, Hansraj G. Ahir, Hukmadeo Narayan Yadav, Haribhau Jawale, Rajaram Pal, S. Semmalai, Shalendra Kumar, Sansuma Khunggur Bwiswmuthiary, Dilip Kumar Mansukhlal Gandhi, Danve Raosaheb Patil, Gorakh Prasad Jaiswal, P.T. Thomas, P.L. Punia, Avtar Singh Bhadana, Dr. Ram Chandra Dome, Dr. Tarun Mandal, Dr. Raghuvansh Prasad Singh, Dr. Vinay Kumar Pandey, Smt. Peramjit Kaur Gulshan and Smt. Rama Devi.

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayeeji's statement that we want a national register of citizenship, not a national register of population. Anybody residing in India can be enlisted in it, even a foreigner can become part of the national population register whose citizenship is not verified. But, the NDA Government had said that only citizens of this country would be enlisted in it. Through the national population register, anybody who can register himself into that register can get the citizen's rights. Shri Kumar wanted to draw the attention of the House to a very famous case law – *Sarbananda Sonowal versus Union of India* in which the Supreme Court had said that the report of the Governor, the affidavits and other material on record show that millions of Bangladeshi nationals have illegally crossed the international border. It is a matter of external aggression as well as internal disturbance. Shri Kumar said that the Census is only demographic profiling. What requires is a National Register of Citizens, and not a National Register of Population. Shri Kumar said that the form that is being given to the enumerators says 'nationality as declared' which means that anybody coming into the country can declare himself and register himself through the enumerator. He would also get unique identity number and unique identity card. This would result in infiltration into India, Shri Kumar alleged.

Participating in the discussion, Shri Mulayam Singh Yadav (SP) demanded for caste census so as to ensure that these castes are recognized and identified. Shri Yadav referred to both *Kaka Kalekar* and *Mandal Commission* which said that unless figures of caste are available, provision for reservation can not be made. He also quoted the observation of the Supreme Court in the *Indira Sahani case* that until a Caste Census is made, no right judgement can be pronounced. These castes do not have much representation in jobs. Until we have the Caste Census, it is difficult to extend the facilities.

Joining in the discussion, Shri Dara Singh Chauhan (BSP) said that the people who have been oppressed in the name of caste would perhaps get justice if the census is conducted on the basis of caste. So, it is the responsibility of the Government to provide facilities to the people as per the population of their castes, he observed.

Shri Nama Nageswara Rao (TDP) requested the Government to collect the complete details with regard to the OBCs in the Census. Besides, he wanted the illegal immigrants to be identified and deported. With regard to the format of the Census, Shri Rao suggested that there should be a column regarding medical facilities also.

Sharing his views, Shri Gurudas Dasgupta (CPI) wanted to go along with the unanimity of the House that the identification of a person should be on the basis of social status, that is, caste. It is a reality that most of the poor people of this country are Scheduled Castes, the Scheduled Tribes, the Muslims and the Tribals. Shri Dasgupta was of the view that caste would not bring about the division of the country. He wanted the Government to take a broad view on this issue.

Participating in the discussion, Shri H.D. Devegowda [JD(S)] wanted to draw the attention of the House to a resolution which he had moved in 1974 as the Leader of the Opposition in Karnataka which had recommended to the Government of India to conduct caste-wise census of the country. He said that when the 73rd and 74th Constitution amendments were to be passed, the Joint Parliamentary Committee was unable to come to a unanimous decision so far as the backward classes were concerned. He attributed this to the want of Census figures. Shri Devegowda wanted the House might have to take a decision reversing the decision of the Supreme Court limiting the reservation.

Shri Lalu Prasad Yadav (RJD) said that Caste is a reality in the country which cannot be ignored. The people of every caste have to be enumerated mentioning their caste. He raised the question that when the counting of animals, birds and everything else is being done, why cannot we have a caste-based census? As there is a large number of people of backward and most backward people, he demanded for a separate compartment to be provided for them in the Government services.

Replying to the discussion on 7 May 2010, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P. Chidambaram said that the central issue of the debate was whether information on the caste of the respondent should be collected in the on-going Census 2011. He explained a few aspects of Census 2011 and the National Population Register. Census 2011 would be conducted in two phases – first phase is called the House listing and Housing census and the second phase is called the Population Enumeration, the Minister added.

The Citizenship Act is a separate law. The Citizenship Act was amended in 2003 and the Rules were notified on 10 December 2003. These rules mandate the Registrar-General to establish and maintain the National Population Register. The Minister added that two exercises that are underway are Census 2011 and the exercise of preparing the

National Population Register. He wanted to note the distinction between the Census, 2011 and the NPR. The information relating to the caste and each member of the household was last collected and published in detail in 1931. After Independence, as a matter of policy, the question relating to caste, other than the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes, was not included, he informed. As regards the desirability of Census being the vehicle to carry out the enumeration of caste, the Registrar General has pointed out a number of logistic and practical difficulties in canvassing the question of caste while conducting the Census. In this connection, the distinction between 'enumeration' on the one hand and 'compilation, analysis and dissemination' on the other, must be kept, the Minister opined.

Further, assuming that it is desirable to canvass the question of caste, more such issues would arise regarding the methodology, avoiding phonetic and spelling errors, maintaining the integrity of the enumeration, doing an accurate headcount of the population, etc. The main objective of the population census is, the Minister said, to do an accurate *de facto* headcount of the usual residents in India on the deemed date. However, the Minister assured that the enumerator should record whatever answer the respondent gives to the question, 'what is your caste?', in deference to the wishes of members.

Later, the Prime Minister, Dr. Manmohan Singh also assured the House on this issue that the Cabinet would take a decision shortly on this issue.

B. LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

The National Green Tribunal Bill, 2009: Moving the motion for consideration of the Bill on 15 March 2010, the Minister of State of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Shri Jairam Ramesh said that the Bill is of considerable significance. He said a historic step is being taken forward in ensuring that the Directive Principles of the Constitution; decisions of the Supreme Court; and the recommendations of the Law Commission are given effect to. The Minister said that the Bill provides for the establishment of a National Green Tribunal for the effective and expeditious disposal of cases relating to environmental protection and conservation of forests and other natural resources including enforcement of any legal right relating to environment and giving relief and compensation for damages to persons and property and for matters connected therewith or incidental thereto.

Shri Ramesh said that the Law Commission, in its 186th Report, had recommended about the need to have separate environment

courts manned only by persons having judicial or legal experience and assisted by persons having scientific qualification and experience in the field of environment. India would really be the first country in the world to set up such an extensive network of specialized environment courts. He said that the National Green Tribunal would empower the ordinary citizen of India to ensure that the laws relating to environment and forests are implemented for his or her own benefit. The National Green Tribunal would guarantee to every citizen of India the right to a safe and clean environment. There would be one main Bench and four other Benches of the National Green Tribunal. They would have judicial members up to 20 and members of experts relating to environment up to 20. They would function in a circuit mode so that access to justice would be easy and convenient for all citizens of the country. The idea is to put pressure on the Central Government and the State Government to ensure that the laws of the land that relate to environment and forests are implemented in letter and spirit, and if they are not implemented, civil damages can be claimed by citizens, the Minister said. In many parts of the country, environment is beginning to have public health impact. Citizens living in these areas can approach the National Green Tribunal and claim civil damages for hurt that has been caused by them by the non-implementation of laws relating to environment and forests.

The present Bill was brought on 31 July 2009. The Standing Committee gave its Report on 24 November 2009. Out of a total of 12 recommendations of the Standing Committee, the Government had accepted 10 such recommendations. The National Green Tribunal is a specialized environment court which would adjudicate civil matters relating to environment and forests. Today, there are over 5,600 cases in the judiciary which are waiting for disposal. The Government wants to give six months' time for the Tribunal to adjudicate. It is the intention of the Government that this huge backlog of cases that exists in the High Courts and in the lower courts would not be there and ordinary citizens of India would get access to quick justice when it comes to environment and forests, the Minister added.

Initiating* the discussion, Shri Anant Kumar Hegde (BJP) said that

* Others who participated in the discussion were: Sarvashri Sandeep Dikshit, T.K.S. Elangovan, Kalikesh Narayan Singh Deo, Dr. Kakoli Ghosh Dastidar, M.B. Rajesh, Vijay Bahadur Singh, S. Semmalai, Jayant Chaudhary, Shallendra Kumar, Smt. Supriya Sule, Pradeep Tamta, C. Sivasami, Jagdanand Singh, Mangani Lal Mandal, Prasana Kumar Majumdar, S.S. Ramasubbu, Dr. Charles Dias, Dr. Prasanna Kumar Patasani, Bhakta Charan Das and Smt. Botcha Jhansi Lakshmi.

this Bill is toothless. He alleged that no consultation has been done with experts before bringing this Bill in the House and the Ministry itself has accepted that fact in a query under the Right to Information Act. He further said that this Bill has not been brought for the protection of environment but for the protection of the interests of the industries. He suggested that in this matter, haste should have been avoided and it should have been left to the Advisory Committee to decide as to when this Bill has to be presented.

Taking part in the discussion, Smt. Maneka Gandhi (BJP) said that environment crimes are the most serious crimes in the world. There is a feeling that the National Green Tribunal Bill 2009 is brought for the establishment of a National Green Tribunal for the effective and expeditious disposal of cases relating to environmental protection and conservation of forests and other natural resources, but it would have the same powers as a civil court. It would subsume various State level authorities that address environmental issues as well as committees created by the Supreme Court for that purpose. If the Bill had been conceptualized to provide safeguards to the poorest of poor communities in the face of a rapacious attack on their resources, it might have been approached differently. But it seemed to be yet another mechanism to give jobs to bureaucrats. Smt. Gandhi alleged that there is no provision in this Bill for ecologists, environmentalists, hydrologists and anybody from civil society or NGOs who have been active in the field of environment to become a member. This should be changed. There should be a transparent process of appointment of members and Chairman, Smt. Gandhi demanded.

Participating in the discussion, Shri Prem Das Rai (SDF) said that he welcomes the National Green Tribunal Bill. He drew the attention of the House that since the North-East and the Eastern Himalaya is a bio-diversity hot spot, in the implementation of this Bill, a Bench has to be made available in the North-Eastern sector.

Taking part in the discussion, Shri Bibhu Prasad Tarai (CPI) said that the form in which this Bill is being introduced is dangerous and detrimental for the poor and tribal people. He said that for industrial growth, we are transferring the land to the multinational companies. He wanted to know whether this Tribunal would safeguard the interest of the poor people. Shri Tarai suggested that we should look after the livelihood of the poor farmers and tribals. He also suggested that we should have sitting judges in the Tribunal instead of the retired Judges.

Replying to the debate on 30 April 2010, the Minister of State of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, Shri Jairam Ramesh said that broadly, the idea of having a National Green Tribunal has been supported. He stated that the National Green Tribunal Bill was one element of revised approach to environmental governance. The National Green Tribunal Bill was not an answer to the problems of environment and forest, but it provides an opportunity for people to claim civil damages arising out of the non-implementation or the wrong implementation of the laws relating to environment and forest.

The Minister said that this Bill deals only with the judicial dimension. Responding to the criticisms of the members as regards various provisions of the proposed Bill, he said that he wanted to make some amendments to it. First, any person aggrieved can approach the National Green Tribunal. Second, an amendment to Section 19(a) would bring the principles of sustainable development. Third, this Act would come into force simultaneously, not Section by Section. Fourth, the decisions of the National Green Tribunal can be appealed in the Supreme Court. Fifth, territorial jurisdiction of the Tribunal would be specified. Sixth, there would be minimum of 10 judicial members and a minimum of 10 expert members not exceeding 20. Seventh, the Chairperson of the Tribunal would be given the authority to break the deadlock in case there is a deadlock. The Minister also said that the rules of the proposed Tribunal would be framed; they would be put on the website; and they would also be laid on the Table of the House. As far as members are concerned, the Minister wanted to have a transparent Selection Committee. He assured that environmentalists, people with background in environment, would be made members of the National Green Tribunal.

He further said that the scope of this National Green Tribunal is much larger. It is going to provide an opportunity for people, who feel aggrieved by the non-implementation of these laws, to seek civil damages, to go to the National Green Tribunal which would give a decision normally within six months. He appealed to give the National Green Tribunal a try and if, after a couple of months, the need for amending some of the provisions is felt, the Government would come back to Parliament. He also proposed to locate it in Bhopal as a goodwill gesture to the victims of environmental tragedy in 1984, thereby showing some small sensitivity to that great tragedy. Shri Ramesh wished that this Tribunal would go to the people, and not the *vice-versa*.

The Bill, as amended, was passed.

The Tamil Nadu Legislative Council Bill, 2010: On 12 April 2010, the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly passed a resolution in terms of clause (1) of article 169 of the Constitution for the creation of Legislative Council in that State. It was accordingly, proposed to enact a law providing for the creation of Legislative Council for the State of Tamil Nadu with seventy-eight members paving way for giving better opportunity to people's participation in governance and decision making. The expenditure in respect of the Legislative Council would have to be borne by the Government of Tamil Nadu, said Shri M. Veerappa Moily, the Union Minister of Law and Justice. The Bill seeks to achieve the above objects and also provides for matters supplemental, incidental and consequential to the creation of the proposed Legislative Council, the Minister informed. The Bill was moved for consideration on the floor of Lok Sabha on 6 May 2010 by the Minister.

Initiating* the debate on 6 May 2010, Shri T.R. Baalu (DMK) said that as there is the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha here at the Centre, in Tamil Nadu, he wanted to have a two-Chamber system, which existed till 1986. The reason he cited was many illustrious and eminent people could not contest the Assembly elections for various reasons. In order to enable them to share their views and to accommodate their views in policy-making, he wanted to have an Upper House in Tamil Nadu. That is why, the Resolution has been proposed and passed in Tamil Nadu, and sent to Parliament for its approval.

Shri Baalu informed that there would be 78 Members in this House. Out of 78 Members, 12 Members would be nominated by the Governor; 26 Members would be from the local bodies and Graduates and teachers would be representing in seven places each. Teachers will be representing in seven places. Besides, the Legislative Assembly would elect 26 members. He requested the House to support the Bill.

Taking part in the discussion, Dr. M. Thambidurai (AIADMK) said that the hurry with which the Bill was brought forward imputed ulterior motives behind this motion. He said that the Tamil Nadu Legislative Council was abolished in 1986 with a good intention. He referred to Dr. Ambedkarji who had said that the Second Chamber was not necessary and that should be there only on an experimental basis. Even the Inter-State Sub-Committee on *Sarkaria Commission*, in its meeting reiterated that the Upper House should be removed from

* Others who participated in the discussion were: Sarvashri Syed Shahnawaz Hussain, N.S. V. Chitthan, Shailendra Kumar, Mangani Lal Mandal, P.K. Biju, B. Mahtab, Ganeshrao Nagorao Dudhgaonkar, P. Lingam and S.D. Shariq

all the States. He parried the question as to what was the necessity of having the second Chamber? He reiterated that there is no necessity of two Houses and only one House is enough through which we can do service to the people. Dr. Thambidurai termed the move to pass this Bill a retrograde step.

Sharing his views on the issue, Shri Lalu Prasad Yadav (RJD) said that he supported the Tamil Nadu Legislative Council Bill, 2010. The Upper House and the Lower House are integral parts of the democracy, and any of these two Houses should not be abolished. He demanded that proposals for constitution of the Upper House should be forwarded from those states which have no Upper House and Upper Houses should be constituted there also so that the democracy may function properly.

Shri Sansuma Khungur Bwiswmuthiary (BPF) said that it was very important to constitute a Legislative Council in all states including Tamil Nadu where there is no provision of Legislative Council. But there is a need to bring certain changes in the manner of representation mentioned there. Shri Bwiswmuthiary said that there are some states in India like West Bengal where the indigenous *Bodo* people have been languishing like anything without getting any scope to represent themselves into their respective state Assemblies or the Parliament. So is the case with the *Bodo* people living in Meghalaya or Nagaland. Therefore, all those castes from which *Bodo* people have not been elected and sent to Legislative Assembly, arrangements should be made for sending representatives from those castes to the Legislative Council, Shri Bwiswmuthiary emphasized.

Replying to the debate on 6 May 2010, the Minister of Law and Justice, Shri M. Veerappa Moily said that in a democracy, the political will of the people is always reflected by the Party which comes to power with majority. But ours is a rainbow democracy. As a country, we have the States with diversities. After the incorporation of the 73rd and 74th amendments to the Constitution, the federal concept has changed. There are three Governments, namely, Centre, State and District Administration-the *Panchayati Raj*. So, naturally, provisions have been made that there would be representatives elected from the *Panchayats*. As regards the point as to why all the States are not asked to have Legislative Council, he said that he does not have any objections but the constitution does not mandate that. He further stated that as on that day, except the proposal from the Legislative Assembly of Tamil Nadu, there is no other resolution of any State Assembly for the creation of the Legislative Council. Hence, there is

no question of discriminating between one State to another. At this point of time, the Council should be created, the Minister opined.

The Bill was passed.

C. OBITUARY REFERENCE

During the session, Obituary References were made to the passing away of Mr. Lech Kaczynski, President of Poland; Sarvashri Shivsharan Verma, P. Rajarethinam, Varkala Radhakrishnan, Satyendra Chandra Guria, A. Jayamohan, T. Bala Goud, R.P. Yadav, Smt. Sunderwati Nawal Prabhakar and Smt. Prabha Rau—all former members.

References were also made to the death of 75 paramilitary personnel of CRPF and one state police official in a Maoist attack at Dantewada district in Chhattisgarh on 6 April 2010; and death of 11 security personnel of the Special Operations Group in a *naxal* attack in Koraput district of Orissa on 4 April 2010. Besides, references were made to the victims of *Tornado* in the States of Assam, Bihar and West Bengal on 14 April 2010; and the tragic incident in which about 7 people died in a stampede and two others drowned at Haridwar. The House also made reference to the burning of Dalit Houses in Mirchpur village of Hisar district of Haryana.

Thereafter, members stood in silence for a short while as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

RAJYA SABHA**TWO HUNDRED AND NINETEENTH SESSION***

The Rajya Sabha which met for its Two Hundred and Nineteenth Session on 22 February 2010 was adjourned on 16 March 2010 to enable the Department-related Standing Committees to examine the Demands for Grants of the Ministries/ Departments assigned to them and report back to the House. The House reconvened on 15 April 2010 and was adjourned *sine die* on 7 May 2010. The Rajya Sabha was then prorogued by the President on 11 May 2010.

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

A. STATEMENTS/DISCUSSIONS

Motion of Thanks to the President for her Address to the Members of the Parliament: On 22 February 2010, the President of India, Smt. Pratibha Devisingh Patil addressed members of both Houses of Parliament in the Central Hall. The Motion of Thanks to the President's Address was moved by Prof. P. J. Kurien from the Indian National Congress on 3 March 2010. The discussion took place on 3, 4 and 5 March 2010.

Moving the Motion of Thanks to the President's Address, Prof. Kurien stated that all the achievements of the UPA Government narrated in the Address are borne by the facts. He claimed that this Government had taken all steps to protect the values of pluralism and secularism of the country. He complimented the Government for its economic policies that not only empowered the poor but also provided for an inclusive growth. Lauding the Government for its efforts to root out corruption, he mentioned that Right to Information had been the greatest achievement. He stated that the Government was committed to achieve energy security and cleaner energy and added that India had reached the top position for the policies adopted in the field of Information Technology.

Seconding the motion, Shri Santosh Bagrodia of the Indian National Congress appreciated the efforts made by the Government to steer out of recession. He stated that inspite of developed

* Contributed by the General Research Unit, LARRDIS, Rajya Sabha Secretariat

countries registering a negative growth, India had registered a positive growth. Highlighting the achievements of the Government he said that the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA) scheme had benefited crores of poor families. He added that the problems of rural areas were also being addressed by other schemes like the Rural Housing Scheme, Rural Water Supply Scheme and National Agriculture Development Scheme. He added that the Government had taken several steps to provide health care and education and also to increase the production of food grains and opined that corporatisation could aid in increasing productivity.

Participating in the discussion¹, Dr. K. Malaisamy of the AIADMK stated that there had been umpteen omissions in terms of safety and security of the people, rise in prices etc. He questioned as to whether the benefit of the schemes framed by this Government had really reached the targeted groups. He accused the Government of one-sided or lopsided growth. He pointed out that the problem of internal security did not find mention in the President's address.

Supporting the Motion of Thanks, Shri Ranjitsinh Vijaysinh Mohite-Patil of the Nationalist Congress Party stated that the President's Address focused on education as a critical factor to accelerate inclusive growth. He stated that there was a need to move faster in the direction of universalisation of the education process as it would play a very important role in addressing the problem of child labour and child rights. He claimed that the Government made significant investment in primary education. Thanking the Government for taking initiatives to clean river Ganges, he appealed that similar initiatives should be adopted for other rivers too. With regard to youth development, he urged both the Central and the State Governments to harness the energies of the youths by providing them with adequate infrastructure. He emphasized the need to integrate computer technology, information and communication technology with the teaching-learning processes in the schools.

Shri Shanta Kumar of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), pointed out

¹ Others who took part in the discussion: Sarvashri M. Venkaiah Naidu, , N. Balaganga, N.K. Singh, D. Raja, Tiruchi Siva, B.K. Hariprasad, Mohammed Amin, Manohar Joshi, M.V. Mysura Reddy, Rahul Bajaj, Kumar Deepak Das, Rajniti Prasad, Shantaram Laxman Naik, Veer Singh, Mangala Kisan, Bhagat Singh Koshyari, Narendra Budania, Rama Chandra Khuntia, Mohammad Shafi, Arjun Kumar Sengupta, Sardar Tarlochan Singh, Prof. Ram Gopal Yadav, Prof. Anil Kumar Sahani, Dr. Akhilesh Das Gupta, Dr. Janardhan Waghmare, Dr. Ashok S. Ganguly, Dr. Barun Mukherji, Shrimati Shobana Bhartia, Dr. (Shrimati) Najma A. Heptulla

that the Government had failed to tackle the core problems existing in the society *viz*, poverty, naxalism, global warming, etc. He urged the Government to take a serious note of the problem of corruption and implement the policies to address the problems of naxalism and poverty without any laxity. He mentioned that the Government should provide for a law to curb the illegal deposition of money in the foreign banks.

Shri Sitaram Yechury of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) stated that the fight against terror was non-negotiable and there could be no compromise on it. Moreover, he stated that terror could not be bracketed into any one religion, region or area. Talking about the issues not covered by the President's Address he stated that it made no mention about the progress made on the issue of 'one rank one pension' related to Armed forces, the need for a National Judicial Commission and the problems being faced by the NRIs particularly in the Gulf areas. He said that we continue to deny equality in our social and economic life. He pointed out that privatization of health services had made it difficult for the poor to afford health expenditures. He criticized the Government for giving concessions to the rich and to the corporates and stated that it failed to collect approximately Rs.1, 20, 000 crores of legitimate tax, which could have been utilized for building our economy and infrastructure. In order to check price rise he urged the Government to ban all future and forward trading in essential commodities and improve the Public Distribution System. He pointed out that, according to the Economic Survey, against the required 200 lakh tonnes of buffer stock only 474.45 tonnes were present in the godowns. He requested the Government to release the excess stock of rice and wheat through the Public Distribution System so that prices could be controlled. He added that there was a need to maintain our independent foreign policy. He further stated that the Government should endeavour to reduce the gap between the shining and the suffering India.

Replying to the discussion on the Motion of Thanks to the President's address, the Prime Minister, Shri Manmohan Singh stressed that meaningful solutions to the problems of mass poverty could be found through a rapidly expanding economy. He stated that alongwith growth there was a need for strategies to promote employment generation and for social empowerment through health and education. He highlighted the fact that in the face of acute global economic crisis India had still sustained a growth rate of 6.7 percent. He attributed the problem of food inflation to a sharp upsurge in

international commodity prices together with droughts and rains in the country. He brought to the notice of the House that there had been no increase in the prices of the Public Distribution supplies to the below poverty line people since 2002. With regard to internal security he said that there will be zero tolerance in dealing with naxalism or terrorism. He assured the House that firm action was being taken to curb naxalite violence and a high level meeting with the Chief Ministers of the States had been conducted to review the situation. Highlighting the initiatives taken to curb terrorism he said that four Regional Hubs of National Security Guards and the National Committee on Coastal Security were set up, whereas the National Investigation Agency commenced its work and Coastal Police Stations became operational.

He further said that pro-farmer policies had been adopted by the Government and investment in agriculture had been increased through a variety of schemes. He informed that measures had been initiated to bring in greater transparency and accountability in the implementation of the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme. Regarding the statehood of Telangana he said that the matter required wide ranging consultation with the aim of forging a consensus amongst all concerned and a Committee under the Chairmanship of Justice B.M. Srikrishna had already been set up to take things forward. Regarding issue of black money, he stated that the Government had prioritized twenty countries and jurisdictions, including Bahamas, Bermuda and Switzerland, for entering into agreements regarding exchange of information and assistance in the collection of taxes. In respect of the Women's Reservation Bill, he said that he hoped that the support to the Bill would be rendered by the Members to enable its passage in the current Session. He affirmed that the foreign policy of India had been based on national consensus and full adherence to the principles and objectives laid down by the founding fathers of the Republic. Concluding his speech, he stated that the people of India expected both the Treasury and the Opposition to work together constructively for the safety and prosperity of our citizens.

The Budget (General) 2010-2011: The Budget (General) 2010-11 was laid on the Table of the House by the Minister of Finance, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, on 26 February 2010. General discussion on the Budget (General) 2010-2011 took place on 12, 15 and 16 March 2010.

Initiating the discussion the Leader of the Opposition, Shri Arun Jaitley stated that the Finance Minister had a challenging task of presenting the Budget in the backdrop of certain peculiar global events—economic slowdown, agricultural crisis due to drought and the

inflation of food prices. He said crackdown on hoarders was necessary to check inflation of essential commodities. He sought an answer from the Government that if buffer stock was available then why there was inflation of food prices. He alleged that because of inflation all the basic needs viz housing, travelling, health care and education had become costlier. He stated that to increase tourism, low cost airlines had to be encouraged. He pointed out that as shrinking acreage has a negative impact on the productivity and hence private sector investment was needed. He stated that Governments approach in disinvestment was a bit risky; and also that the offloading of PSU shares in the market without change in management was a matter of concern. To undertake expenditure to reach a growth rate of 8-9 percent expenditure had to be undertaken by the Government. Regarding the Direct Taxes Code he stated that it still required a lot of debate. He stated that the internal debt had increased to Rs.37,00,000 crores; every Indian is today indebted because of the public debt to the extent of Rs. 33,966/- and hence the resources and the revenue collection are required to be managed with a vision and efficiency. He said that he was confident that India would grow because of the spirit of entrepreneurship.

Participating in the discussion², Dr. E.M. Sudarsana Natchiappan of the Indian National Congress stated that when Shri Pranab Mukherjee took over from Shri R. Venkataraman as the Finance Minister in the 1982-83 budget the situation that prevailed needed a review of the Nehruvian thought. When Dr. Manmohan Singh took over as the Finance Minister he created a globalised economy. The Twelfth Finance Commission had created a lot of new approaches in various ways to address the situation of globalization. Commenting on the States' participation in the development programmes he said that the States were lacking in associating with the Panchayati Raj institutions and more powers were required at the grass root level. The State Governments had to distribute the funds appropriately to the lower levels for the earmarked programmes. During the short tenure of Shri Pranab Mukherjee the results achieved were in various sectors like

² Others who took part in the discussion: Sarvashri Brij Bhushan Tiwari, D. Raja, Rajeev Chandrasekhar, Rajeev Shukla, Prabhat Jha, Matilal Sarkar, Mahendra Mohan, Kumar Deepak Das, A. Elavarasan, A. Vijayaraghavan, Tariq Anwar, Prakash Javadekar, Ganga Charan, Naresh Gujral, Raghunandan Sharma, Arjun Kumar Sengupta, Sharad Anantrao Joshi, KV.P. Ramachandra Rao, Mangala Kisan, Bharatkumar Raut, Jesudasu Seelam, Shriram Pal, Ahmad Saeed Mallhabadi, Sardar Tarlochan Singh, Prof. M.S. Swaminathan, Dr. K. Malaisamy, Dr. Janardhan Waghmare, Shrimati. Shobana Bhartia, Shrimati Mohsina Kidwai, Shrimati Vasanthi Stanley, Miss Anusuya Uikey, Miss Mabel Rebello

the manufacturing sector, IT, hospitality, travelling industry, real estate and construction sector, education, training and consultancy sector, banking and financial services. Commenting on the compulsory education scheme he stated that the system of Kendriya Vidyalayas and Navodaya Vidyalayas in each block should be expanded so that every child gets access to education.

Shri Tapan Kumar Sen of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) stated that the Union Budget 2010-11, in totality projected a consistent decline in the allocation of resources as a proportion of GDP to the areas of rural economy, agriculture and allied activities. He said that it was shocking that the Government could not stabilise the food prices. In respect of price policies of the Government he said that there had been total decontrol and linkage to import parity prices. He pointed out that while purchasing a company the Government neglected asset valuation, thus ending up paying more and benefitting the private sector and as such the policy needed to be reviewed.

Shri N.K. Singh of the Janata Dal (United) stated that economic management was an ongoing process which transcended mere budget making. He stated that the present disinvestment policy was problematic. He said that Rs. 3,45,000 crore market borrowing by the Government would lead to a crowding effect on the private sector. Commenting on energy security, he said that the price rise in petroleum and diesel were inescapable. He urged the Government to take a relook at the classification of the accounts in a pragmatic way and stressed that more emphasis needed be laid on the end outcomes than expenditures. He stated that Rs 400 crores given to the Eastern India by the Government was not enough considering the amount required for the entire seed replication programme.

Shri Rahul Bajaj, an independent member, stated that the three important objectives of the Budget were, continue to promote growth, reduce fiscal deficit, and to contain inflation for which money could be raised through disinvestment and the auction of 3G Spectrum. He stated that the Government should be careful and ensure that the budget figures of expenditure should not rise, because if the expenditure increased, fiscal deficit would become difficult to control. He favoured the expansion in the net of service tax but also mentioned that due to inflationary conditions, service tax on housing and health care could have been postponed by a year or so. As far as Goods and Services Tax (GST) was concerned, he mentioned that the aim had been to lighten the burden on the taxpayer and to include more people under the tax net.

The Minister of Finance, Shri Pranab Mukherjee, replying to the debate on 16 March 2010 stated that Annual Budget was more than a statement of estimated receipts and expenditure of the Union Government; it spoke of the economic and political philosophy of the Government of the day. He pointed out that India was the second country out of the 185 countries in the world to achieve 9 percent GDP growth rate. He projected the developmental outlays for the year to be 3,73,000 crores, out of which 1,37,000 crores had been allotted to the social sector alone, 1,74,000 crores for infrastructure with 25 percent allocation for rural areas. He stated that the rise in petroleum prices during the period 1984-2004 had been nominal. He stated that the top priority had been the agriculture and emphasis had been placed on extending concessions, expanding storing capacities and adopting new technologies. He pointed out that more funds had been allotted for the Rajiv Gandhi Awas Yojana so that the State Government could build houses for the slum dwellers. Speaking about the fiscal deficit, he stated that the expansionary policies had been adopted. Commenting on GST, he stated that all the concerns from different stakeholders would be taken into account. He concluded stating that inflation had to be controlled, because the benefits of growth were essential, to expand the economy to reach those who were still beyond the path of development.

The Budget (Railways) 2010-2011: The Budget (Railways) 2010-11 was laid on the Table of the House by the Minister of Railways, Kumari Mamata Banerjee, on 24 February 2010. The General discussion on the Budget (General,) 2010-2011 took place on 10 and 11 March 2010.

Initiating the discussion, Shri Kalraj Mishra of the Bharatiya Janata Party stated that despite the Indian railways being the largest infrastructure, only eleven thousand kilometers of the Railway route had been increased since independence. He sought to know as to how many of the schemes for modernisation, cold storage and ladies trains announced in the last budget were operational. He stated that required training was not being imparted to the railway employees and no new institutions were being created for the same. He mentioned that the White Paper of the Railways stated that there had been increase in the income of freight and traffic from the year 2004 to 2009 and thereafter it had been on a decline. He pointed that there had been a gap in the anticipated and the actual increase from gross production. Rail budget spent a huge part on sports but they failed to produce any international player in cricket or hockey in the last five years. He questioned as to what had happened to the money recovered from

people travelling without tickets. He also sought information about criteria for recruitment rules of group C and D employees under the discretionary quota of the Minister. He pointed out that though the scheme for linking the pilgrimage centers was a welcome scheme, except West Bengal other states had been ignored.

While participating in the discussion³, Prof. Saif-ud-din Soz of the Indian National Congress lauded the Railway Minister for presenting a good budget. He mentioned that emphasis had to be laid on safety and cleanliness of the trains. With respect to delays in the running of the trains, he appreciated the fact that the condition had improved. Terming it as pro-poor, he highlighted the fact that the passenger fares or freight charges had not increased in the Budget. He stated that Rs 4,011 crores had been earmarked in the budget for expansion programmes and promoting of industry and health care. A good gesture towards women was reflected in the budget with the provision of women guards and crèches of women workers in Railway Department. He stated that the Railway Ministers over a period had been concentrating on development of his/ her constituencies and instead stressed upon a balanced regional development. He urged the Government to set up a rail coach factory in Srinagar as no public sector industries were set up there.

Dr. K. Malaisamy of the AIADMK while highlighting the positive aspects of the Budget said that there had been no increase in passenger fares and freights, termed it as a surplus budget, concessions had been extended to the people accompanying cancer patients, journalists and students. On the grey side, he pointed out that the passenger revenue was on decline, the operating ratio was slipping and no appropriation had been for safety. Speaking about Tamil Nadu, Dr. Malaisamy urged that a time limit be fixed to complete the project connecting the Egmore Railway Station with Central Railway Station.

³ Others who took part in the discussion: Sarvashri Penumalli Madhu, R.C. Singh, M.V. Mysura Reddy, Lalit Kishore Chaturvedi, Praveen Rashtrapal, P. Rajeeve, Birendra Prasad Baishya, Motilal Vora, Rahul Bajaj, Sanjay Raut, Sharad Anantrao Joshi, Kaptan Singh Solanki, Shyamal Chakraborty, Vijaykumar Rupani, Nandi Yelliah, S. Anbalagan, Shreegopal Vyas, Kumar Deepak Das, Ishwar Singh, Varinder Singh Bajwa, A.A. Jinnah, Silvius Condpan, Pyarimohan Mohaptra, B.S. Gnanadesikan, Mangala Kisan, Vijay Jawaharlal Darda, Y.P. Trivedi, P. Kannan, Vikram Verma, Jai Prakash Narayan Singh, Rama Chandra Khuntia, Kishore Kumar Mohanty, Dr. Gyan Prakash Paliana, Dr. Ram Praksah, Shrimati Syeda Anwar Taimur, Shrimati Kusum Rai, Shrimati Maya Singh, Shrimati Renubala Pradhan, Miss Sushila Tiriya,

He mentioned that out of the proposed 16 world class stations, Tamil Nadu should have, at least, one and bottling plants, diagnostic centres and corridors should also be set up there, along with the provision of electrification projects.

Shri P. Rajeeve of the Communist Party of India (Marxist), participating in the discussion stated that the main thrust of the Budget had been on privatization, with most of the proposals to be executed under the Public Private Partnership (PPP) Scheme. He mentioned that this was in contradiction to the statement made by the Hon'ble Minister of Railways in her speech that the Ministry was in favour of Government-controlled Railways and against privatisation. He congratulated the Hon'ble Minister for not increasing the passenger and freight charges but invited the attention of the Minister to the White Paper which stated that the freight tariff in Indian Railways was one of the highest in the world. He stated that manpower shortage was a serious problem and there was lack of proposals to fill up the vacancies in a time-bound manner. He appreciated the Minister for extending concession to the media persons and their minor children too. However, he pointed out that there was no concession for senior citizens in *tatkal* seats. He mentioned that the prime demand of the state Kerala for the formation of a Peninsular Railway Zone had not been considered by the Ministry in the present Budget also. He requested the Hon'ble Minister to include the State of Kerala in the suburban railway map of India.

Shri Ahmad Saeed Malihabadi, an Independent Member, stated that in this country when everything had become costly Railways was an exception because there had been no increase in the fare. He pointed out that with regard to the Rail Budget an objection had been raised that much had been given to West Bengal but he opined that there was nothing wrong in it because the State had lagged behind as far as progress and industrialisation was concerned. He stressed that passengers should be given more amenities and that safety and security were important issues. He felt that more recruitments and better arrangements should be made in the Railway Protection Force to stop the growing incidents of theft and robbery in the running trains. He requested the Hon'ble Minister to recruit eligible candidates of the Muslim minority in the Railway Protection Force. The names of several stations of Metro Railway in Kolkata had been changed and renamed after Tipu Sultan, Mother Teresa, Bahadur Shah

Jaffar etc. In this regard, he added that as Maulana Abul Kalam Azad was deeply associated with Kolkata, a station should be named after him too. Regarding the coolies on the railway stations licensed by the Government, he stated that the Hon'ble Minister should look into the matter of passengers being fleeced by them.

The Minister of Railways, Kumari Mamata Banerjee replying to the discussion thanked all the Members who participated in the discussion and rendered their valuable suggestions. She pointed out that in order to make the Railways passenger friendly it ought to be pro-physically challenged and pro-senior citizens. Due to rise in population there was more demand for trains, resulting in congestion and accidents. Therefore, there was need to create more infrastructure. She asserted that Railways would not be privatised. However, commercial utilisation of land and air space through the PPP mode was needed to generate money and create infrastructure. Since the railways constitute the lifeline of the nation, therefore, no increase in the fares were made. India being a developing country the Railways had become a social obligation and not mere business. Regarding safety and security she said that the problem of unmanned level crossings was being solved. She stated that the Railway Ministry was the only Ministry where the decision making process included the employees' union. She mentioned about the various projects on the anvil like the Diagnostic Centres to be set up on 300 stations. She said that encroachment of land would not be allowed and land would be utilised only for business purpose, for commercial purpose in creating infrastructure, to improve employment generation and for development of the Railways. She assured that all budget commitments made with regard to unmanned crossings, starting of new trains, more stations, new projects, would be fulfilled in the financial year. She said that efforts were being made to clear the backlog in employment, to revive the training system, develop research and development and to check upon the corruption. The Minister informed the House that assistance to North East and Jammu and Kashmir would be given from the National Fund.

Statement made by the Minister of Home Affairs on the Maoist attack on CRPF Personnel in Dantewada District of Chhattisgarh: Making a Statement in this regard in the House on 15 April 2010, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P. Chidambaram informed the House that 141 companies of Central Para-military Forces had been deployed in the State for anti-naxal operations. The 62nd Battalion of the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF) was deployed in March-April 2009 after

it had gained considerable experience in the anti-naxal operations. According to the decision taken by those leading the operation, an Area Domination Exercise was undertaken by the platoons A, C and G Companies of 62nd Battalion. On 6 April at 0550 hours the force came under heavy fire from the naxalites. Upon receiving a wireless message of the attack at about 0600 hours, the Commandant of the 62nd Battalion alongwith 30 men had rushed to the place of the incident and they had also come under fire three kilometres short of the actual place of the incident. Simultaneously, another party led by Inspector Wagdi of the 62nd Battalion moved from Chintalnar with reinforcements towards the place of the incident but that party too had come under fire, just outside Chintalnar. Preliminary enquiries revealed that the deaths were caused largely due to bullet injuries, crude bombs and grenades. Seventy-four men of the CRPF, one Head Constable of the civil police and one driver of the reinforcement party had lost their lives. Seventy-five weapons were also lost to the naxalites. The Minister intimated the House that only the post mortem reports and a thorough inquiry, including de-briefing of the injured jawans, would fully establish the sequence of events and the facts. He stated that the two pillars of the Government's anti-naxal policy were calibrated police action and development. He stated that Central Para-military forces had been provided to the State Governments to help them carry out counter insurgency operations, regain control over areas dominated by the naxalites, restore the civil administration and re-start development work, therefore, the State Governments had the primary responsibility to check the menace. He stated that the goal of the naxalites was to overthrow the established authority of the Government through armed liberation struggle. The State had a legitimate right to deploy its security forces to resist, apprehend and, if necessary, neutralise militants who are determined to strike at the very roots of our nation.

Statement made by the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs on the Prime Minister's visit to the Nuclear Security Summit as well as the IBSA and the BRIC summits: Making a Statement in this regard in the House on 28 April 2010, the Minister of State in the Ministry of External Affairs, Shrimati Preneet Kaur informed the House that the Prime Minister had visited Washington to attend the Nuclear Security Summit and Brasilia for the fourth India, Brazil and South Africa (IBSA) Summit and the second Brazil, India, Russia and China (BRIC) Summit from 10-16 April, 2010. She informed the House that at the invitation of U.S. President Barack Obama, Prime Minister Dr. Manmohan Singh had participated in the Nuclear Security Summit in

Washington from April 12-13. In all, forty-seven countries, the United Nations, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the European Union were represented at the Summit. The Summit had been a personal initiative of President Obama who, in his Prague speech of April 2009, described nuclear terrorism as the most immediate and extreme threat to global security. During the Summit discussions, the Prime Minister had referred to our intention to develop 35,000 MW of nuclear energy by 2022 in the context of India's three-stage programme as well as the newly opened opportunities for civil nuclear cooperation with the international community. He had also underlined India's concerns on clandestine proliferation and the danger of nuclear material and technical know-how falling into the hands of non-state actors. The Prime Minister had also pointed out that the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan of 1988 remained the most comprehensive and elaborate to move towards a nuclear weapon-free world. The Prime Minister had also announced the establishment of a Global Centre for Nuclear Energy Partnership in India which would be wholly owned and managed by the Government of India. The Centre would assist in safe, secure and proliferation-resistant promotion of nuclear energy, upgrading of standards and sharing of experience. The Prime Minister had met the American President and they expressed satisfaction with the progress in India-US relations since Prime Minister's bilateral visit to the USA in November 2009 and reiterated their strong commitment to continue to further strengthen the India-US strategic partnership.

The Prime Minister had also led the Indian delegation to the 4th Summit of the Heads of State of the Governments of India, Brazil and South Africa Dialogue Forum (IBSA) on 15th April, 2010 in Brazil. The South African and Brazilian delegations were led by President Jacob Zuma and President Lula da Silva respectively. IBSA has become a significant vehicle for comprehensive trilateral cooperation between three large democratic countries that shared common values and were engaged in the development process to improve the lives of their peoples. It was a significant fact that IBSA cooperation was not limited to Governments, but it also engaged the civil societies of these countries. The three world leaders reviewed the activities of the 16 IBSA Working Groups including those on Science and Technology and Energy, which had undertaken promising projects. The leaders also decided that IBSA should develop micro satellites for space weather studies. Two MoUs on cooperation in Science and Technology and Innovation as well as Solar Energy were signed during the Summit. The Minister for Commerce and Industry led the Indian delegation for the combined IBSA and BRIC Business Forum Meeting.

During their discussions, the three leaders had focused on UN reform, the impact of global economic and financial crisis and the scourge of terrorism. They reiterated the need for urgent reform of the United Nations, including the Security Council, to make it more representative and democratic. Recognising the negative impact of the global economic and financial crisis on developing countries, the three leaders had emphasised the importance of promoting sustainable development and called for a development-oriented, balanced and successful conclusion of the Doha Round of trade talks.

The Prime Minister also attended the Second BRIC Summit in Brazil on 15th April, 2010 together with President Dimitry Medvedev of Russia, President Hu Jintao of China and the President Lula da Silva of Brazil. The BRIC Summit in Brazil also focused on a range of issues including the international financial and economic crisis, reform of international financial institutions including its management structures, cooperation in G-20, UN reforms, climate change and other issues. While calling for strong, sustainable and balanced growth, the leaders reiterated the role of emerging economies in contributing to economic recovery. BRIC countries supported a multi-polar, equitable, democratic and just world order, based on the rule of law and with the United Nations having a central role in tackling global challenges. These countries together commanded 25.9 per cent of total geographical area, 40 per cent of the global population and 22 per cent of global GDP (PPP), abundant natural resources, growing middle classes, and given their internal economic strengths. The countries as engines of economic growth contributed constructively towards sustainable global economic growth. During his visit to Brasilia, the Prime Minister had also held a bilateral Summit meeting with President Lula. The Prime Minister and President Lula had discussed the growing importance of the multifaceted India- Brazil Strategic Partnership. The Prime Minister had also held separate bilateral meetings with President Hu Jintao of China and President Dmitry Medvedev of Russia. The Minister stated that the visit of Prime Minister to USA and Brazil reflected India's growing role in world affairs, and served to advance our national interests on issues which had a direct bearing on our security and development.

Calling Attention to the situation arising out of role of print and electronic media indulging in paid news in disguise of news: On 5 March 2010, Shri Sitaram Yechury, Communist Party of India (Marxist), called the attention of the Minister of Information and Broadcasting to

the situation arising out of role of print and electronic media indulging in paid news in disguise of news.

Replying to the calling attention, the Minister for Information and Broadcasting, Shrimati Ambika Soni, stated that the Press Council of India (PCI), an autonomous body had been created by the Press Council Act, 1978 to fulfill the objective of preserving the freedom of press, maintaining and improving the standard of newspapers in India and inculcating the principles of self regulation among the press. PCI had laid down guidelines on reporting of specific issues of public and national importance, financial and election issues. She stated that in recent months, there had been a number of media reports that sections of the electronic and print media had received monetary considerations for publishing or broadcasting in favour of particular individuals or organizations or corporate entities, that is, what is essentially "advertisement" had been disguised as "news" (referred now as Paid News Syndrome). She commended the fact that this had been brought to light by a section of media only; the Editors Guild of India had condemned the practice and a number of senior journalists had formally complained about the phenomenon of "paid news" to the Press Council of India and the Election Commission of India. She informed the House that in this regard the PCI had formed a Sub-Committee to consider the issue and collect evidence from stakeholders, including the Election Commission of India. This committee would place the final report before the PCI for further action.

Replying to the points raised by the Members, the Minister said that the Government did not view Paid News Syndrome as freedom of Press. The PCI had been established by an Act of Parliament in 1978 to perpetuate the commitment to freedom of press. In 2009 and 2010 several proposals had been received from PCI, in which the PCI sought to widen its scope, jurisdiction and terms of reference. She requested the Members to exercise patience till the end of March, when the PCI would table the report on its findings/enquires into the Paid News Syndrome in the Parliament. She assured the House that the Government would keep in check all the factors that would affect the democratic structure of the society, or inhibit the flow of free and unbiased news to the citizens.

Calling Attention to the situation arising out of the incidents of radiation exposure detected in a scrap in Delhi: On 20 April 2010, Shri D. Raja, Communist Party of India, called the attention of the Minister of Science and Technology to the situation arising out of the incidents of radiation exposure detected in a scrap in Delhi and the Governments reaction thereto.

Replying to the calling attention, the Minister of State in the Ministry of Science and Technology, Shri Prithviraj Chavan stated that on 7 April 2010, a fax had been received by the National Radiation Regulatory Authority, Atomic Energy Regulatory Board (AERB) office from Indraprastha Apollo Hospital, New Delhi requesting advice on the further course of action regarding a patient, owner of a scrap shop admitted who had symptoms indicative of suspected exposure to radiation. On inspection of the area by AERB officials it was revealed that the said scrap shop and few nearby ones had a very high radiation fields. On 8 April 2010, Radiation Safety experts from Bhabha Atomic Research Centre (BARC), AERB and Narora Atomic Power Station formed a response team and arrived in Delhi. They had combed the area and identified the radiation source as Cobalt-60, secured it in lead shielded flasks. Abundant caution had been exercised by four joint teams of BARC, AERB and National Disaster Response Force (NDRF) while scanning around 800 shops in the surrounding area and then certified the entire area to be free of elevated radiation fields. The Minister informed the House that the affected persons were being treated in various hospitals around Delhi and the Delhi Police registered an F.I.R. on 8 April 2010. The National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) formed in 2005 had raised and trained four battalions of NDRF to respond to radiological emergencies: the Minister further stated that the Department of Atomic Energy (DAE) had established eighteen well equipped Emergency Response Centres all over the country. The NDMA had been created with a mandate to coordinate, review and augment the national capabilities and infrastructure to detect, prevent and respond to radiological incidents of all kinds. Radioactive Material Detection Equipment had been installed at all the border points, and portable equipments were being procured by the NDRF of NDMA and Emergency Response Teams of the DAE. The Ministry of Home, National Disaster Management Division and Ministry of Shipping had been identified as the nodal Ministries to install and operate the equipment. The DAE had organised courses to train the Front Line Officers on the issues of detection, and response related to radiological incidents.

Replying to the points raised by the Members, the Minister said that all radiological equipment for medical purposes had to be registered with the AERB, which in this case were not. He informed the House that stringent mechanism, regulations and rules for radiological equipment were practiced in the country. He assured that the NDMA with training and help of AERB and DAE was fully competent to deal with the radiological disasters, further the borders were being guarded against

any unauthorised entry of radioactive material. He further strongly reaffirmed the House that the guidelines for importation of scrap or any radiological material conformed to the international standards. He emphasised on the fact that there should be a law framed to provide civil compensation for any radiological incident and need had been felt need to spread awareness in the medical syllabus about the symptoms of radiological disease and radiological exposure. He further assured the House that the Government of India, AERB, the DAE and the NDMA were fully prepared to meet any emergency.

Short Duration Discussion on alleged tapping of telephones of certain politicians affecting probity in public life: A Short Duration Discussion on alleged tapping of telephones of certain politicians affecting probity in public life took place on 29 April, 2010. Initiating the discussion, the Leader of Opposition, Shri Arun Jaitley of Bharatiya Janata Party stated that there had been news reports, that the telephones of four prominent politicians had been bugged by a Department of the Government, in addition, certain public relation agencies were also bugged to keep a vigil on their activities. The statements made by the Home Minister and the Ministry of Finance had failed to deny the crux of the allegation. He said that investigative and intelligence arms of the Government was being grossly misused for the purposes of recording conversations and tapping telephones. The present Indian Telegraph Act, 1885 had laid down only specific conditions in which interception of messages and telephonic communications were allowed. He specified about the recent equipment bought by the National Technical Research Organisation (NTRO) that could make it possible for the intelligence agencies to bug the telephones in a radius of 2 kilometers only. Though he could not establish the veracity of the reports, he asked the Government to step in and take appropriate measures in this regard. He requested that a Joint or Select Parliamentary Committee should be appointed to prevent the misuse of official information.

Participating in the discussion, Shri B.S. Gnanadesikan of the Indian National Congress stated that the issue whether tapping had really taken place at all should be thoroughly investigated. He accepted that an independent judiciary and a powerful press were necessary pillars of democracy. Baseless reports from press should not be used for stalling the proceedings of the House, he said. He pointed out that specific rule of the House provided that a discussion on a newspaper report cannot be raised in the House unless the person who raises the issue authenticates the report. He also pointed

out that the Home Minister had made a categorical statement that the Government had not authorised any tapping. He reiterated the fact that the case should be substantiated with ample proof and evidence.

Shri Sitaram Yechury of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) stated that the phone tapping issue had undermined the foundational pillars of our Parliamentary democracy and the Constitution. He called for a relook at the Indian Telegraph Act, 1885. He elaborated that the Supreme Court's judgment had mentioned only five circumstances in which phone tapping could be done. He questioned as to why the Government was not taking any action on the basis of the information gathered from tapping. He emphasised on suitable amendments to the anachronistic Indian Telegraph Act 1885. He appealed to the Government to investigate the entire issue, to cleanse the system and to strengthen democracy.

Replying to the discussion, the Minister of Home Affairs, Shri P. Chidambaram, stated that the discussion had been held on the basis of an article published in a magazine. He stated that Article 21 which is the bedrock of the democratic structure of India expanded by a series of judgments enumerated the right to privacy as an integral part of it. He reaffirmed that the Government would ensure that the procedural safeguards suggested by the Supreme Court would be incorporated to strengthen the rules. Intelligence gathering had always been an important part of any Government's functioning, and hence the National Technical Research Organisation (NTRO) was set up in 2001. The NTRO was placed under the National Security Advisor who reported to the Prime Minister. He said that it was now necessary to examine whether NTRO should now be placed under a Ministry so that a Minister would be accountable to Parliament for the functioning of the NTRO. On the question of balancing the right to privacy and the right and duty of the Government to gather intelligence and safeguards, the Minister endorsed the views of the Members to keep a constant vigil and review the safeguards. He informed the House that all phone tapping authorizations were done by the Home Secretary at Central and State level and Ministers of the Government were not involved in the process at all. He stated that thorough investigation would be carried out; unauthorised tapping done would be identified and appropriate action would be taken against those found guilty. He informed the House that the Central Board of Direct Taxes had stated that a section of the media had reported about their communication between the Income Tax Department, and clarified to the House that all tapping done by the IT department had

been authorised appropriately. He mentioned the fact that the Supreme Court had laid down guidelines with the full knowledge, when the judgement was being delivered, the Intelligence Bureau, the Directorate General (Narcotics), the Revenue Intelligence, the Central Economic Intelligence Bureau and the Enforcement Directorate were authorized by the Central Government to do interception.

Discussion on the working of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation: A discussion on the working of the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation took place on 28 April, 2010.

Initiating the discussion, Shri Avtar Singh Karimpuri of the Bahujan Samaj Party stated that India's population in 2011 would be 32 crore and in 2021 it was projected to be 53 crore. Delving into the reasons for the growth in population in the urban areas he stated that they could be divided into two categories: first, being the non-availability of resources such as education, health service, transport, power supply in rural areas and the second, being the desire of the poor to escape feudalistic terror. He stated that the second category of people had no other option but to live in the slums. He stated that schemes such as NREGA should be implemented for the urban poor also. He further urged the Government to mobilise money that had been estimated in the Eleventh five year plan for housing of the urban poor. He pointed out that urban development could take place only when there was a network of airports connectivity, for this he asked the Ministry of Civil Aviation to look into the matter.

Participating in the discussion⁴, Shri K.N. Balagopal of the Communist Party of India (Marxist) in his maiden speech alleged that the Central Government had a callous attitude towards the common people of the country. He stated that in the UNDP report of 2009, 5 million people were migrating to the developed countries for employment. He stated that in India 27.8 per cent of the population were living in the urban areas at present and by 2050 it had been projected to rise to 45 percent. He remarked that the Minister had also pointed out that there would be dearth of 24.7 million houses in the urban areas at the end of the Tenth Five Year Plan. He stated that there was a need to

⁴ Others who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Prabhat Jha, K.N. Balagopal, Nand Kishore Yadav, N. Balaganga, Ranjitsinh Vijaysinh Mohite-Patil, M.P. Ahtutan, Triuchi Siva, Mangala Kisan, Gireesh Kumar Sanghi, Kaptan Singh Solanki, Kishore Kumar Mohanty, Dr. E.M. Sudarsana Natchiappan, Dr. Radhakant Nayak and Miss Sushila Tiriya

provide more houses to the lower and middle income groups also. He mentioned that in Kerala lakhs of houses had been built under the People Planning Programme and in Bengal too, the scheme of providing land for landless refugees had been a success. He urged the Central Government to undertake experience sharing exercise with these States. He emphasised that measures had to be undertaken to eradicate both urban and rural poverty collectively.

Dr. Gyan Prakash Pilia of the Bharatiya Janata Party stated that as far as the Ministry of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation was concerned the biggest problem was that of migration under duress. He mentioned that if the farmers were provided employment opportunities and basic amenities like water sanitation, health nutrition in the villages they would not migrate to the cities. He remarked that contribution of agriculture to GDP had decreased from 50 percent to 17 percent. He stated that statistically one-third of the world's population resided in India, living on less than two dollars per day. He perceived that the only way to rise out of this situation was to generate employment in the urban areas.

Replying to the discussion, the Minister of Housing and Urban Poverty Alleviation and the Minister of Tourism, Kumari Selja stated that the year 2008 marked transition of the world into urban millennium with more than 50 percent of the population residing in the urban areas. She stated that India was relatively less urbanized, but one-fourth of the urban population living in slums posed an enormous challenge. She said that Jawaharlal Nehru National Urban Renewal Mission (JNNURN) scheme of the Government had two components: one pertaining to infrastructure development and the second one being provision of basic services to the urban poor. She stressed that those not covered under the scheme were brought under the National Urban Housing and Habitat Policy. She mentioned about the various schemes such as interest subsidy for housing of urban poor, Integrated Low Cost Sanitation Scheme, the Swaran Jayanti Shahari Rozgar Yojana and the Rajiv Awas Yojana, aimed to alleviate poverty. She mentioned that the Planning Commission Estimates based on household expenditure data stated that there were eight crore urban people. She assured the House that the Government was on the right track in addressing the problems of the present scenario.

Discussion on the working of the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution: A discussion on the working of the Ministry of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution took place on 30 April, 2010.

Initiating the discussion, Shri Brij Bhushan Tiwari stated that inflation had been on the rise since last two years especially on those items which were required for daily existence. He pointed out that the production of foodgrains had been reducing in proportion to the increasing population. He mentioned that according to the report of Wadhwa Committee on Public Distribution System, the entire system was soaked in corruption and, therefore, the poor were not able to buy foodgrains. Speaking about the Consumer Affairs Department he stated that inspite of the Price Monitoring Cell in place the prices of the household commodities in the market fluctuate drastically. He stated that scientific methods should be adopted by the Ministry to keep hoarding and black marketing of goods in check. He pointed out the ill-effects of the future trading of the foodgrains and the need for management of warehousing facilities to avoid wastage of foodgrains. He urged the Government to take a relook at the Sugar Policy so that proper control on the prices could be achieved.

Participating in the discussion⁵, Shri Rajeev Shukla of the Indian National Congress stated that the Government was taking a lot of steps to protect the interests of the consumers inspite of the impediments and compulsions faced by it. He asked the States to percolate the allocations made by the Central government appropriately. He stated that the land available for cultivation was decreasing day by day and middlemen were pocketing the profits rightly due to the famers. He mentioned that the consumer courts should be strengthened and adequate public awareness should be created to make it more effective in its functioning. He mentioned that the State government should ensure that the ration shops function well and adequate supply was made to the consumers.

Shri Rajiv Pratap Rudy of the Bharatiya Janata Party stated that sensitivity should be maintained while discussing about poverty. He said that poverty line decided on the basis of calories had revealed that the cost of 2400 calories was Rs 19 in urban areas and in rural areas it was Rs. 15. He said that in India on the basis of calorie calculation 25 crore of the population was living below the poverty line. He said that if 19 percent inflation was added to any definition

⁵ Others who took part in the discussion were: Sarvashri Shanta Kumar, Ganga Charan, S. Anbalagan, N.K. Singh, R.C. Singh, Kumar Deepak Das, Kishore Kumar Mohanty, Sabir Ali, Dr. Ram Prakash, Shrimati Brinda Karat, Shrimati T. Ratna Bai, Shrimati Vasanthi Stanley

of poverty the poor remain the most seriously affected and the subsidy of Rs. 52000 crore was not sufficient to tide above the crisis. He pointed out that there were many uncovered areas in the Food Security Act and the Government should take a look into it for its successful implementation.

Replying to the discussion on 3 May 2010, the Minister of Agriculture and Minister of Consumer Affairs, Food and Public Distribution, Shri Sharad Pawar stated that in the present scenario rising prices was the major problem and this was due to the overall reduce in the agricultural production in the first season, but when last year figures were compared to the current year, the situation was not alarming. He assured that both fiscal and administrative measures were being taken to address the issue. He said increasing production of foodgrains would result in decreasing inflation. Regarding the demand that had been made to discontinue the Targeted Public Distribution System and to replace it with the Universal Public Distribution System, he stated that for that production should be increased to 700 lakh tonnes. For BPL identification there were many definitions available and in this regard the Planning commission would decide the norms, he said. He assured the House that the Food Security Bill would be implemented at the earliest. Regarding the Consumer Affairs Department he stated that efforts were being made to implement the provision of the Essential Commodities Act. He pointed out that inspite of the fixation of the MSP for a crop; in some States the farmers did not get that price. He urged the states to also co-operate in implementation of measures taken by Central Government.

B. LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

*The National Green Tribunal Bill, 2010**: On 5 May 2010, the Minister for Environment and Forests, Shri Jairam Ramesh moved for consideration of the House the National Green Tribunal Bill, as passed by the Lok Sabha, to provide for the establishment of a National Green Tribunal for the effective and expeditious disposal of cases relating to environmental protection and conservation of forests and other natural resources including enforcement of any legal right relating to environment and giving relief and compensation for damages to persons and property. [The Bill stated that the Supreme Court of

* The Bill as passed by the Lok Sabha was laid on the Table of the House on 30 April 2010.

India taking into account the large number of environmental cases pending in the higher courts and the involvement of multidisciplinary issues in such cases, requested the Law Commission of India to consider the need for constitution of specialised environmental courts. Pursuant to the same, the Law Commission had recommended the setting up of environmental courts having both original and appellate jurisdiction relating to environmental laws. In the light of it, need had been felt to establish a specialised tribunal for protection and conservation of forests and other natural resources effective and expeditious disposal of cases relating to environmental protection and conservation of forests and other natural resources including enforcement of any legal right relating to environment.]** Introducing the Bill, the Minister stated that there would be one Central Tribunal and four Benches of this Tribunal. The Benches would operate on a circuit Bench model so that instead of people coming to the Tribunal, the Tribunal would make every effort to go to the people particularly in the areas where environment and forestry laws were not being implemented. He informed the House that the important amendments that were moved and approved by the Lok Sabha were: any aggrieved party or individual could approach the Tribunal for non-implementation of the laws listed in Schedule I of the Bill, and that the decisions of the Tribunal could be appealed in the Supreme Court. He said that he intends to locate the Tribunal in Bhopal because of its association with India's worst environmental tragedy; the location of this Tribunal at Bhopal would underline the environmental jurisprudence associated with the Bill.

Replying to the debate⁶, Shri Jairam Ramesh stated that the word 'green' being naturally associated with environment has been chosen instinctively and there was no intention of trivialising the purpose for which it stood. He asked the Members to let the nomenclature National Green Tribunal stand and to let the seriousness of the Tribunal be demonstrated by its work. He pointed out that the norms such as the 'polluter pays' principle, the principle of sustainable development, the principle of intergenerational equity and the principle of no-fault had found place in the revised legislation as passed by

** Extract from the 'Statement of Objects and Reasons' of the Bill

6 Those who took part in the discussion were Sarvashri Balavant *alias* Bal Apte, Rama Chandra Khuntia, Saman Pathak, Brij Bhushan Tiwari, M.P. Achuthan, Kumar Deepak Das, Rajiv Pratap Rudy, Kishore Kumar Mohanty, Bharatkumar Raut, Rajniti Prasad, Moinul Hassan, Dr. V. Maitreyan, Miss Sushila Tiriya

the Lok Sabha. He mentioned that the larger issues pertaining to the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972 involved criminal cases whereas the Tribunal was for the purpose of providing civil damages from the non-implementation of the Environment Protection Laws. Addressing the concerns that the number of Benches being established was less in number, the Minister stated that there were 5, 616 cases pending before the courts on matters relating to environment and forest for disposal; if more Benches were required then expansion would be sought. He stated that the approach of the Tribunal was to ensure flexibility in devising the procedures and speedy adjudication, therefore, a normal time limit of six months had been fixed. Regarding the debate on the selection of Members of the Tribunal he stated that the selection process would be institutionalised and in consultation with the National Green Tribunal a transparent set of rules would be devised for selecting the judicial and technical members. Mentioning about the amendment made in the Lok Sabha, he stated that any individual, or NGOs/ social action groups/activists on behalf of the individual could approach the Tribunal for redressal and Schedule II of the Bill laid down 15 grounds on which one could approach the Tribunal. He mentioned in the House that the operational meaning of 'substantial claim' had been elaborated in Schedule II of the Bill. He cleared the confusion regarding the fine of Rs. 25 crores which he stated would be imposed for non-compliance to the orders of the Tribunal and it was not the maximum penalty or the damage limit that an individual can get. Concluding his remarks, he stated that by adopting the National Green Tribunal Bill, we chose specialisation and speed vs larger network.

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

The Constitution (One Hundred and Eighth Amendment) Bill, 2008: On 8 March 2010, the Minister of Law and Justice, Shri M. Veerappa Moily moved the Constitution (One Hundred and Eighth Amendment) Bill, 2008 for consideration of the House. [The Bill stated that the issue of empowerment of women had been raised in different fora in the country from time to time. Political empowerment of women had been rightly perceived as a powerful and indispensable tool for eliminating gender inequality and discrimination. The Government in its National Common Minimum Programme had stated that it would take lead to introduce legislation for one-third reservation of seats for women in the Vidhan Sabha and the Lok Sabha. The aforesaid idea followed by debate amongst the political parties and intellectuals had

paved the way to get insight into the matter.] *

Replying to the debate⁷ on 9 March 2010, Shri Moily stated that it had been a historical day since it was a day for repaying mother. He stated that the amendment had been made necessary because of the fact that there were only 11.25 percent of women represented in the Indian legislature, the Asian average being 18.7 percent and the world average being 19 percent. He further stated that the House had witnessed convergence of unity in diversity. Congratulating the Members who had extended their whole-hearted support to the Bill, he wanted to clarify certain misgivings about the Bill. He stated that after the amendment was passed there would be a separate legislation, just like the Delimitation Act to determine the seats and quota separately, which would be properly discussed in the House. Clarifying about the reservation for minorities and OBCs he stated that the Constitution provided for reservation SCs/STs only, there was no consensus on minorities and OBCs because they differed from State to State.

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

C. QUESTION HOUR

During the Session, 12936 notices of Question (9565 Starred and 3371 Unstarred) were received. Out of these 616 Questions were admitted as Starred and 4752 Questions were admitted as Unstarred. 99 Starred Questions were orally answered. The total number of Questions received in Hindi was 2343.

Daily average of Questions: All the lists of Starred Questions contained 20 questions each. On an average, 3.3 Questions were orally answered, for all the sittings having Question Hour. The maximum number of Questions orally answered was 7 on 30 April, 2010 and the minimum number of Question orally answered was 1 on 16 April, 2010.

The list of Unstarred Questions contained 119 on 24th February,

* Extract from the 'Statement of Objects and Reasons' of the Bill.

7 Those who took part in the discussion were Sarvashri Arun Jaitley, Sitaram Yechury, Shivanand Tiwari, Tariq Anwar, D. Raja, Ahmad Saeed Malihabadi, Satish Chandra Misra, M.V. Mysura Reddy, Manohar Joshi, Raj Mohinder Singh Majitha, Pyarimohan Mohapatra, Naresh Gujral, Birendra Prasad Baishya, Sharad Anantrao Joshi, Mohammed Adeeb, Abani Roy, Abdul Wahab Peevee, Parimal Nathwani, Sardar Tarlochan Singh, Dr. V. Maitreya, Dr. Manmohan Singh, Shrimati Jayanthi Natrajan, Shrimati Brinda Karat, Shrimati Maya Singh, Shrimati Kanimozhi, Dr. (Shrimati) Najma Heptulla, Dr. (Shrimati) Kapila Vatsyayan, Dr. Prabha Thakur, Miss Anusulya Uikey

2010. On the rest of the days, it contained 155 Questions each.

Half-an-Hour Discussion: 24 notices of Half-an-Hour Discussion were received; and one was discussed clubbing 4 notices together.

Short Notice Question: 20 notices of Short Notice Question were received; out of which one was admitted and answered.

D. OBITUARY REFERENCES

During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing a way of Shri Dinesh Chandra Swami, Shri Ram Niwas Mirdha, Shri V.M. Surendra Ram, Shri Chimanbhai Mehta, Shri M.S. Abdul Khader, Shri Nana Deshmukh, Shrimati Ila Bhattacharya all former Members, and Shri Janeswar Mishra and Shri Krishan Lal Balmiki, both of them Sitting Members.

Members stood in silence for a short while as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased.

STATE LEGISLATURES

KERALA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY*

The Fifteenth Session of the Twelfth Kerala Legislative Assembly, which commenced on 28 June 2010, was adjourned *sine die* on 29 July 2010. The Governor prorogued the House on the same day. There were 24 sittings in all.

Obituary references: During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing away of Sarvashri Varkala Radhakrishnan, former Speaker of the Kerala Legislative Assembly; Bhairon Singh Shekhawat, former Vice-President of India and Chairman, Rajya Sabha; M.P. Thami and B.M. Sherief, former members of the Kerala Legislative Assembly.

MADHYA PRADESH LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**

The Sixth Session of the Thirteenth Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly which commenced on 11 May 2010, was adjourned *sine die* on 14 May 2010.

Obituary references: During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing away of Smt. Prabha Rao, Governor of Rajasthan; Sarvashri Chhotelal Bhardwaj and Narayan Singh, both former members of the Madhya Pradesh Vidhan Sabha.

WEST BENGAL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY***

The Ninth Session of the Fourteenth West Bengal Legislative Assembly, which commenced on 9 March 2010, was adjourned *sine die* on 30 July 2010.

Obituary references: During the Session, obituary references were made on the passing away of Shri Bhairon Singh Shekhawat, former Vice-President of India and Chairman, Rajya Sabha; Sarvashri Mrinal Banerjee, Minister-in-charge of the Department of Power and Non-Conventional Energy Sources, Government of West Bengal; Ramanarayan Goswami, former member of the Rajya Sabha and former Minister of State, Government of West Bengal; Syed Masudal Hossain, former

* Material contributed by the Kerala Legislative Assembly Secretariat

** Material contributed by the Madhya Pradesh Legislative Assembly Secretariat

*** Material contributed by the West Bengal Legislative Assembly Secretariat

member of the Lok Sabha; Atish Chandra Sinha, former member of the Lok Sabha, Leader of the Opposition, West Bengal Legislative Assembly and former Minister of State Government of West Bengal; Jagadananda Roy, former State Minister Government of West Bengal; Smt. Chhaya Ghosh, former Minister-in-charge, Government of West Bengal; Sarvashri Sundar Naskar, Sunil Santra, Satyanarayan Singh, Bijoy Krishna Das, Ramgati Mondal, Arup Bhadra, Subhas Chandra Mahato, Ajit Basu, Ananda Gopal Das, Jaleswar Hansda, Dr. Sukumar Roy and Smt. Kamal Sengupta (Bose), all former members of the State Legislative Assembly; Sarvashri K.K. Maitra and L.K. Pal, both former Secretaries of the State Legislative Assembly; Dr. Amlam Dutta, eminent economist; Prof. Bhabotosh Dutta, eminent educationist; Sarvashri Nihar Mukherjee, veteran freedom fighter; Moti Nandi, eminent sports journalist; Shyamananda Jalan, Kumar Roy, both eminent theatre personalities; Neel Kantha Sengupta, eminent actor and director, Dr. Sovan Some, eminent critic, writer and painter; Tapen Chattopadhyay, eminent comedian, Proshanto Mitra, veteran footballer, Madan Tamang, President, All India Gorkha League; and others.

RECENT LITERATURE OF PARLIAMENTARY INTEREST

I. BOOKS

Bhambhri, C.P., *Coalition Politics in India: First Decade of 21st Century* (Delhi: Shipra Publications), 2010

Buksinski, Tadeusz, ed., *Democracy in Western and Post-colonial Countries: Twenty Years after the Fall of Communism* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang), 2009

Bunce, Valerie, ed., *Democracy and Authoritarianism in the Post-Communist World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2010

Chaudhuri, Azizur Rahman, ed., *Issues in Human Rights* (New Delhi: Atlantic Publishers), 2010

Das, Samir Kumar, ed., *Terror, Terrorism, States and Societies: A Historical and Philosophical Perspective* (New Delhi: Women Unlimited), 2010

Deutschmann, David, and Shnookal, Deborah, ed., *Fidel Castro Reader* (New Delhi: Leftword Books), 2009

Elkins, Zachary, *The Endurance of National Constitutions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2009

Goa Legislative Assembly Secretariat, *Who's Who: Fifth Legislative Assembly of the State of Goa* (Porvorim: Goa Legislative Assembly Secretariat), 2009

Goswami, B., *Parliamentary Democracy at Cross Roads* (Chandigarh: Abhishek Publications), 2009

Gupte, Pranay, *Mother India: A Political Biography of Indira Gandhi* (New Delhi: Penguin Group), 2009

Hodgson, Godfrey, *Martin Luther King* (London: Quercus Publishing), 2009

Hooja, Rakesh, ed., *Fifty Years of Panchayati Raj and Decentralised Development* (New Delhi: Kanishka Publishers), 2010

Irfan Habib, *On Socialism: Selections from Karl Marx, Frederick Engels, V.I. Lenin, J.V. Stalin, Mao Zedong* (New Delhi: Tulika Books), 2009

Jha, Anjana, *Hannah Arendt: Politics as a Noble Activity* (Delhi: Sumit Enterprises), 2010

Jha, Rajesh K., *Chief Justices of India: With Special Reference to our Judiciary* (Delhi: Surendra Publications), 2010

Kalyani, Shankar, *Nixon, Indira and India: Politics and Beyond* (New Delhi: Macmillan Publishers), 2010

Kampfner, John, *Freedom for Sale: How we made Money and lost our Liberty* (London: Simon and Schuster), 2009

Kaviraj, Sudipta, *The Imaginary Institution of India: Politics and Ideas* (Ranikhet: Permanent Black), 2010

Kochler, Hans, *World Order: Vision and Reality* (New Delhi: Manak Publications), 2009

Krishnamurthy, B., ed., *Changing World Order: India, EU and US—A Trialogue* (New Delhi: Shipra Publications), 2009

Kundu, Nivedita Das, ed., *Russia-India-China: Evolution of Geo-Political Strategic Trends* (New Delhi: Academic Foundation), 2010

Malhotra, Sanjeev, *Father of Indian Constitution: Dr. B.R. Ambedkar* (New Delhi: Om Laser), 2010

Mann, James, *The Rebellion of Ronald Reagan: A History of the end of the Cold War* (New York: Penguin Group), 2009

Meghalaya, Legislative Assembly Secretariat, *Who's Who: Eighth Meghalaya Legislative Assembly Secretariat* (Shillong: Meghalaya Legislative Assembly Secretariat), 2009

Muni, S.D., *India's Foreign Policy: The Democracy Dimension* (New Delhi: Foundation Books), 2009

Naik, G. Bhadr, ed., *Dr. B.R. Ambedkar's Philosophy of Social Justice and its Relevance* (Hyderabad: Sree Bhagavan Publications), 2009

Pant, Harsh V., *Contemporary Debates in Indian Foreign and Security Policy: India Negotiates its Rise in the International System* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), 2008

Prem Singh, *Soviet Collapse: How and Why* (Chandigarh: Unistar), 2008

Pylee, M.V., *Constitutional Amendments in India (3rd Edition)* (Delhi: Universal Law Publishing), 2010

Ram Kumar, *General Elections 2009* (New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications), 2010

Rueschmeyer, Marilyn, ed., *Women in Power in Post-Communist Parliaments* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), 2009

Salka, William M., *Reforming State Legislative Elections: Creating a new Dynamics* (Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers), 2009

Service, Robert, *Trotsky: A Biography* (London: Macmillan), 2009

Shapiro, Ian, ed., *Political Representation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2009

Shukla, Vivekanand, *Life and Vision of Jawaharlal Nehru* (Jaipur: ABD Publishers), 2010

Smith, Stephen S., *The American Congress (6th Edition)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2009

Soroka, Stuart N., *Degrees of Democracy: Politics, Public Opinion and Policy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), 2010

Swanson, Darren, ed., *Creating Adaptive Policies: A Guide for Policy Making in an Uncertain World* (New Delhi: Sage Publications), 2010

Vlassopoulos, Kostas, *Politics: Antiquity and its Legacy* (London: I.B. Tauris), 2010

Woods, Alan, *Reformism or Revolution: Marxism and Socialism of the 21st Century (reply to Heinz Dieterich)* (Delhi: Aakar Books), 2009

Yechury, Sitaram, *Socialism in Changing World* (Hyderabad: Prajasakti Book House), 2008

II. ARTICLES

Acharya, Pritish, "Remembering Ram Manohar Lohia", *Mainstream (New Delhi)*, Vol. 68, No.13, 20 March 2010, pp. 22-24

Bhattacharya, Pinaki, "In Search of a Role: India in Global Affairs", *World Focus (New Delhi)*, Vol. 30, No.11-12, November-December 2009, pp.431-437

Biswas, A.K., "Untouchable Ambedkar: Saga of his Discrimination in America", *Mainstream (New Delhi)*, Vol. 68, No.17, 17 April 2010, pp.6-10

Biswas, Aparajita, "Some aspects of India-Africa Relations", *World Focus (New Delhi)*, Vol. 30, No.11-12, November-December 2009, pp. 443-450

Chakraborty, Tridib, "India's Look East Policy: Time for Stock-Taking", *World Focus (New Delhi)*, Vol. 30, Annual Number, November-December 2009, pp.461-469

Chandrachud, Abhinav, "Insulation of India's Constitutional Judiciary", *Economic and Political Weekly (Mumbai)*, Vol. 45, No.13, 27 March 2010, pp.38-42

Chhibber, Bharti, "Indo-Nepal Relations in Contemporary Times", *World Focus (New Delhi)*, Vol. 30, Annual Number, November-December 2009, pp.539-544

Giri Pradhan, Nivedita, "Democratic Socialism in India: Bringing it to the Centre Stage", *Janata (Mumbai)*, Vol. 64, No.1, Republic Day 2009: pp. 31-32

Hariharan, R., "Changing Dynamics of India-Sri Lanka Relations", *World Focus (New Delhi)*, Vol. 30, No.11-12, November-December 2009, pp.513-520

Hariharan, R., "Defeat of the LTTE and the Future of Tamil Militancy", *World Focus (New Delhi)*, Vol. 30, No.7, July 2009, pp. 267-273

Mahapatra, Chintamani, "Indo-US Relations under Obama Administration", *World Focus (New Delhi)*, Vol. 30, No.11-12, November-December 2009, pp. 438-442

Mishra, Mukesh Kumar, "Democratisation Process in Kazakhstan: Gauging the Indicators", *India Quarterly (New Delhi)*, Vol. 65, No.3, July-September 2009, pp. 313-427

Mitra, Subrata, "Citizenship in India: Some of a National Survey", *Economic and Political Weekly (Mumbai)*, Vol. 45, No.9, 27 February 2010, pp. 46-53

Narayan, Jayaprakash, "Citizen-Centered Governance: A Tribute to our Founding Father", *Yojana (New Delhi)*, Vol. 54, January 2010, pp.17-20

Pasha, A.K., "India and Turmoil in West Asia: Challenges and Emerging Responses", *World Focus (New Delhi)*, Vol. 30, No.11-12, November-December 2009, pp. 484-490

Pattanaik, Smruti S., "New Dawn in Indo-Bangladesh Relations?", *World Focus (New Delhi)*, Vol. 31, No.2, February 2010, pp.42-45

Pawan Kumar, "Empowering Citizens through Right to Information", *South Asian Politics (New Delhi)*, Vol. 8, No.11, March 2010, pp. 36-39

Sachar, Rajinder, "Urgent Democratic Need", *Janata (Mumbai)*, Vol. 65, No.1-2, 3-10 January 2010, pp.1-2

Shifter, Michael, "Obama and the Latin America: New Beginnings, Old Friction", *Current History (Philadelphia)*, Vol. 109, No.724, February 2010, pp. 67-73

Sudhir Singh, "Japan and the Emerging New Asian Balance of Power", *World Focus (New Delhi)*, Vol. 30, No.1, January 2009, pp. 27-31

Surban Ali, "Seventy-Five Years of Socialist Movement in India: An Appraisal", *Janata (Mumbai)*, Vol. 64, No.17, 18 October 2009, pp. 7-13

Surendra Mohan, "Karzai's Re-election", *Janata (Mumbai)*, Vol. 64, No.17, 8 November 2009, pp. 4-5

Uyangoda, Jayadeva, "Sri Lanka after the Presidential Election", *Economic and Political Weekly (Mumbai)*, Vol. 45, No.6, 6 February 2010, pp.12-13

APPENDIX I
STATEMENT SHOWING THE WORK
TRANSACTIONED DURING THE FOURTH SESSION
OF THE FIFTEENTH LOK SABHA

1. PERIOD OF THE SESSION	22 November 2009 to 16 March 2010 15 April to 7 May 2010
2. NUMBER OF SITTINGS HELD	32 sittings
3. TOTAL NUMBER OF SITTING HOURS	137 hours and 51 minutes
4. NUMBER OF DIVISIONS HELD	2 (27 April 2010)
5. GOVERNMENT BILLS	
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session	14
(ii) Introduced	27
(iii) Laid on the Table as passed by Rajya Sabha	3
(iv) Returned by Rajya Sabha with any amendment/recommendation and laid on the Table	Nil
(v) Referred to Select Committee	Nil
(vi) Referred by Joint Committee	Nil
(vii) Reported by Select Committee	Nil
(viii) Reported by Joint Committee	Nil
(ix) Reported by Standing Committee	5
(x) Referred to Departmentally Related Standing Committee by Speaker, Lok Sabha/Chairman, Rajya Sabha	5
(xi) Discussed	21
(xii) Passed	21
(xiii) Withdrawn	Nil
(xiv) Negatived	Nil
(xv) Part-discussed	Nil
(xvi) Discussion postponed	Nil
(xvii) Returned by Rajya Sabha without any recommendation	13
(xviii) Motion of concurrence to refer the Bill to Joint Committee adopted	Nil
(xix) Pending at the end of the Session	23
6. PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS	
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session	59

(ii) Introduced	45
(iii) Motion for leave to introduce negatived	Nil
(iv) Laid on the Table of the House as passed by Rajya Sabha	Nil
(v) Returned by Rajya Sabha with any Amendment	Nil
(vi) Reported by Select Committee	Nil
(vii) Discussed	1
(viii) Passed	Nil
(ix) Withdrawn	Nil
(x) Negatived	Nil
(xi) Circulated for eliciting opinion	Nil
(xii) Part-discussed	1
(xiii) Discussion postponed	Nil
(xiv) Motion for circulating of Bill negatived	Nil
(xv) Referred to Select Committee	Nil
(xvi) Removed from the Register of Pending Bills	Nil
(xvii) Pending at the end of the Session	104
7. NUMBER OF DISCUSSIONS HELD UNDER RULE 184	
(i) Notices received	673
(ii) Admitted	273
(iii) Discussed	Nil
8. NUMBER OF MATTERS RAISED UNDER RULE 377	311
9. NUMBER OF MATTERS ON URGENT PUBLIC IMPORTANCE RAISED DURING ZERO HOUR	213
10. NUMBER OF DISCUSSIONS HELD UNDER RULE 193 (Matters of Urgent Public Importance)	
(i) Notices received	258
(ii) Admitted	4
(iii) Discussions held	3
(iv) Part-discussed	Nil
11. NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MADE UNDER RULE 197 (Calling attention to matters of urgent public importance)	2
12. STATEMENTS MADE BY MINISTERS UNDER RULE 372 & DIRECTION 73A	57
	(Under Rule 372-17; Under Dir. 73A-35; and Hon. Minister of Parliamentary Affairs-5)
13. MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS	
(i) Notices received	Nil
(ii) Admitted and discussed	Nil
(iii) Barred	Nil

(iv) Withdrawn	Nil
14. RESOLUTION(S) PLACED BEFORE THE HOUSE BY SPEAKER, LOK SABHA	Nil
15. GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS	
(i) Notices received	1
(ii) Admitted	1
(iii) Moved	Nil
16. PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS	
(i) Received	5
(ii) Admitted	5
(iii) Discussed	2
(iv) Adopted	Nil
(v) Withdrawn	1
(vi) Part-discussed	1
(vii) Discussions postponed	Nil
17. MOTIONS REGARDING MODIFICATION OF STATUTORY RULES	
(i) Received	11
(ii) Admitted	3
(iii) Moved	Nil
18. NUMBER OF ADJOURNMENT MOTIONS	
(i) Total Number of Notices received	50
(ii) Brought before the House	38
(iii) Admitted	Nil
(iv) Consent withheld by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, outside the House	12
(v) Consent given by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, but leave not asked for by members concerned	Nil
19. NUMBER OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE(S) CONSTITUTED, IF ANY, DURING THE SESSION	6
20. TOTAL NUMBER OF VISITORS' PASSES ISSUED DURING THE SESSION	24,752
21. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF VISITORS' PASSES ISSUED ON ANY SINGLE DAY AND THE DATE ON WHICH ISSUED	1,228 issued on 16.3.2010
22. TOTAL NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ADMITTED	
(i) Starred	620
(ii) Starred answered orally	76

(iii) Un-starred			7,029	
(iv) Short Notice Questions			Nil	
(v) Half-an-Hour discussions			Nil	
23. NUMBER OF MEMBERS GRANTED LEAVE OF ABSENCE			10	
24. PETITIONS PRESENTED			Nil	
25. NUMBER OF NEW MEMBERS SWORN IN			Nil	
26. NUMBER OF PRIVILEGE MOTIONS				
(i) Notices received			12	
(ii) Brought before the House			1	
(iii) Consent withheld by Speaker			Nil	
(iv) Observation made by Speaker			1	
27. NUMBER OF REPORTS OF VARIOUS PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES PRESENTED IN LOK SABHA	<u>Original</u>	<u>Action Taken</u>	<u>Study Tour</u>	
i) Estimates Committee	Nil	2	Nil	
ii) Public Accounts Committee	12	2	Nil	
iii) Committee on Public Undertakings	2	1	Nil	
iv) Business Advisory Committee	6	Nil	Nil	
v) Committee on Absence of Members from the sittings of the House	1	Nil	Nil	
vi) Committee on Subordinate Legislation	4	1	Nil	
vii) Committee on Petitions	Nil	4	Nil	
viii) Committee on Private Members Bills and Resolutions	—	Nil	Nil	
ix) Committee on Government Assurances	—	Nil	Nil	
x) Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes	2	1	Nil	
xi) Joint Committees:				
(i) Paper Laid on the Table	1	1	Nil	
xii) Rules Committee	1	Nil	Nil	

Co-ordination Cell

28. NUMBER OF REPORTS OF DEPARTMENTALLY-RELATED STANDING COMMITTEES PRESENTED IN LOK SABHA	<u>Original</u>	<u>Action Taken</u>	<u>Study Tour</u>	
i) Committee on Agriculture	6	Nil	Nil	

29. WORKING OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES

Sl. No.	Name of the Committee	No. of sittings held during the period	No. of Reports presented
1	2	3	4
i)	Business Advisory Committee	—	—
ii)	Committee on Absence of Members from the Sittings of the House	—	—
iii)	Committee on Empowerment of women	—	—
iv)	Committee on Estimates	—	—
v)	Committee on Ethics	—	—
vi)	Committee on Government Assurances	—	—
vii)	Committee on Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme (MPLADS)	2	—
viii)	Committee on Papers Laid on the Table	2	—
ix)	Committee on Petitions	—	—
x)	Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions	—	—
xi)	Committee of Privileges	—	—
xii)	Committee on Public Accounts	—	—
xiii)	Committee of Public Undertakings	3	4
xiv)	Committee on Subordinate Legislation	—	—
xv)	Committee on the Welfare of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes	—	—
xvi)	General Purposes Committee	—	—
xvii)	House Committee		
	(a) Accommodation Sub-Committee	—	—
	(b) Sub-Committee on Amenities	—	—
xviii)	Library Committee	—	—
xix)	Railway Convention Committee	—	—
xx)	Rules Committee	—	—
JOINT / SELECT COMMITTEE			
i)	Joint Committee on Offices of Profit	—	—
ii)	Joint Committee on Salaries and Allowances of Members of Parliament	—	—
DEPARTMENTALLY-RELATED STANDING COMMITTEES			
i)	Committee on Agriculture	—	—
ii)	Committee on Chemicals and Fertilizers	—	—
iii)	Committee on Coal & Steel	—	—

iv)	Committee on Defence	5	2
v)	Committee on Energy	—	—
vi)	Committee on External Affairs	—	—
vii)	Committee on Finance	—	—
viii)	Committee on Food, Consumer Affairs and Public Distribution	—	—
ix)	Committee on Information Technology	4	8
x)	Committee on Labour	—	—
xi)	Committee on Petroleum and Natural Gas	—	—
xii)	Committee on Railways	—	—
xiii)	Committee on Rural Development	—	—
xiv)	Committee on Social Justice and Empowerment	—	—
xv)	Committee on Urban Development	—	—
xvi)	Committee on Water Resources	—	—

28. CELL ON PARLIAMENTARY FORUM

Sl. No.	Name of Forum	No. of Meetings held during the period	No. of lectures held
1.	Parliamentary Forum on Children	—	—
2.	Parliamentary Forum on Water Conservation and Management	—	—
3.	Parliamentary Forum on Youth	—	—
4.	Parliamentary Forum on Population and Public Health	—	—

APPENDIX II

**STATEMENT SHOWING THE WORK
TRANSACTIONED DURING THE TWO HUNDRED AND
NINETEENTH SESSION OF THE RAJYA SABHA**

1. PERIOD OF THE SESSION	22 February 2010 to 7 May 2010
2. NUMBER OF SITTINGS HELD	32
3. TOTAL NUMBER OF SITTING HOURS	182 Hours
4. NUMBER OF DIVISIONS HELD	1
5. GOVERNMENT BILLS	
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session	35
(ii) Introduced	10
(iii) Laid on the Table as passed by the Lok Sabha	13
(iv) Returned by Lok Sabha with any amendment	—
(v) Referred to Select Committee by the Rajya Sabha	—
(vi) Referred to Joint Committee by the Rajya Sabha	—
(vii) Referred to the Department-related Standing Committees	13*
(viii) Reported by Select Committee	—
(ix) Reported by Joint Committee	—
(x) Reported by the Department-related Standing Committees	3*
(xi) Discussed	16
(xii) Passed	16
(xiii) Withdrawn	1
(xiv) Negatived	—
(xv) Part-discussed	—
(xvi) Returned by the Rajya Sabha without any Recommendation	9

* 8 Bills introduced in Lok Sabha and 5 Bills introduced in Rajya Sabha were referred to the DRSCs of Rajya Sabha

Reports of the Committee were presented after the completion of the 219th Session.

(xvii) Discussion postponed	—
(xviii) Pending at the end of the Session	47
6. PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS	
(i) Pending at the commencement of the Session	183
(ii) Introduced	27
(iii) Laid on the Table as passed by the Lok Sabha	—
(iv) Returned by the Lok Sabha with any amendment and laid on the Table	—
(v) Reported by Joint Committee	—
(vi) Discussed	—
(vii) Withdrawn	—
(viii) Passed	—
(ix) Negatived	—
(x) Circulated for eliciting opinion	—
(xi) Part-discussed	—
(xii) Discussion postponed	—
(xiii) Motion for circulation of Bill negatived	—
(xiv) Referred to Select Committee	—
(xv) Lapsed due to retirement/death of Member-in-charge of the Bill	62 ^a
(xvi) Pending at the end of the Session	148
7. NUMBER OF DISCUSSIONS HELD UNDER RULE 176 (Matters of Urgent Public Importance)	
(i) Notices received	64
(ii) Admitted	12
(iii) Discussions held	2
NUMBER OF STATEMENTS MADE UNDER RULE 180 (Calling Attention to Matters of Urgent Public Importance)	
8. STATEMENT MADE BY MINISTERS	5
9. HALF-AN-HOUR DISCUSSIONS HELD	1
10. STATUTORY RESOLUTIONS	
(i) Notices received	—
(ii) Admitted	—
(iii) Moved	—
(iv) Adopted	—

^a 52 Bills got lapsed due to retirement of members after the completion of 219th session

(v) Negatived	—
(vi) Withdrawn	—
11. GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS	
(i) Notices received	1
(ii) Admitted	1
(iii) Moved	—
(iv) Adopted	—
12. PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTION	
(i) Received	15
(ii) Admitted	15
(iii) Discussed	1
(iv) Withdrawn	1
(vi) Negatived	—
(vii) Adopted	—
(vii) Part-discussed	1
(viii) Discussion Postponed	—
13. GOVERNMENT MOTIONS	
(i) Notices received	—
(ii) Admitted	—
(iii) Moved & discussed	—
(iv) Adopted	—
(v) Part-discussed	—
14. PRIVATE MEMBERS' MOTIONS	
(i) Received	243
(ii) Admitted	230
(iii) Moved	—
(iv) Adopted	—
(v) Part-discussed	—
(vi) Negatived	—
(vii) Withdrawn	—
15. MOTIONS REGARDING MODIFICATION OF STATUTORY RULE	
(i) Received	—
(ii) Admitted	—
(iii) Moved	—
(iv) Adopted	—

(v) Negatived	—
(vi) Withdrawn	—
(vii) Part-discussed	—
(viii) Lapsed	—
16. NUMBER, NAME AND DATE OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE CREATED, IF ANY	—
17. TOTAL NUMBER OF VISITORS' PASSES ISSUED	2,176
18. TOTAL NUMBER OF VISITORS	4,429
19. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF VISITORS' PASSES ISSUED ON ANY SINGLE DAY, AND DATE ON WHICH ISSUED	116 on 12.3.2010
20. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF VISITORS ON ANY SINGLE DAY AND DATE	400 on 10.3.2010
21. TOTAL NUMBER OF QUESTIONS ADMITTED	
(i) Starred	616
(ii) Unstarred	4,752
(iii) Short-Notice Questions	1
22. DISCUSSIONS ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRIES	5
23. WORKING OF PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES	

Sl. No.	Name of the Committee	No. of meetings held during the period 1 April to 30 June 2010	No. of Reports presented during the 219 th Session
1	2	3	4
(i)	Business Advisory Committee	8	—
(ii)	Committee on Subordinate Legislation	2	2
(iii)	Committee on Petitions	4	—
(iv)	Committee of Privileges	2	—
(v)	Committee on Rules	1	—
(vi)	Committee on Government Assurances	2	—
(vii)	Committee on Papers Laid on the Table	3	3
(viii)	General Purposes Committee	—	—
(ix)	House Committee	1	—
Department-related Standing Committees :			
(x)	Commerce	8	3
(xi)	Home Affairs	9	3
(xii)	Human Resource Development	10	6
(xiii)	Industry	2	6

(xiv) Science and Technology, Environment and Forests	9	7
(xv) Transport, Tourism and Culture	5	6
(xvi) Health and Family Welfare	5	4
(xvii) Personnel, Public Grievances, Law and Justice	2	2
Other Committees		
(xviii) Committee on Ethics	1	—
(xix) Committee on Provision of Computers Equipment to Members of Rajya Sabha	1	—
(xx) Committee on Member of Parliament Local Area Development Scheme	3	—
24. NUMBER OF MEMBERS GRANTED LEAVE OF ABSENCE	8	—
25. PETITIONS PRESENTED	—	—

APPENDIX III
STATEMENT SHOWING THE ACTIVITIES OF THE LEGISLATURES OF THE STATES AND UNION TERRITORIES DURING THE PERIOD FROM 1 APRIL TO 30 JUNE 2010

Legislature	Duration	Sittings	Govt. Bills [Introduced (Passed)]	Private Bills [Introduced (Passed)]	Starred Questions [Received (admitted)]	Unstarred Questions [Received (admitted)]	Short Notice Questions [Received (admitted)]
	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
STATES							
Andhra Pradesh L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Andhra Pradesh L.C.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Arunachal Pradesh L.A.*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Assam L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bihar L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bihar L.C.	—	—	—	—	460(448)	12	154/119
Chhattisgarh L.A.*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Goa L.A.*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gujarat L.A.	—	—	—	—	—	890(577)	—
Haryana L.A.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Himachal Pradesh L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jammu & Kashmir L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jammu & Kashmir L.C.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jharkhand L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Karnataka L.A.	28.6.2010 to 16.7.2010	3 (upto 30.6.10)	—	—	45(45)	117(117)	—

Karnataka L.C.	28.6.2010 to 16.7.2010	-00-	—	—	80(45)	14(49)	—
Kerala L.A.	28.6.2010 to 29.7.2010	24	5(5)	—	12,145(3,954)	7,481	2
Madhya Pradesh L.A.	11.5.2010 to 14.5.2010	4	—	—	882	581	—
Maharashtra L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Maharashtra L.C.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Manipur L.A.*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Meghalaya L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mizoram L.A.*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nagaland L.A.*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Orissa L.A.	22.6.2010 to 7.9.2010	28	1(1)	—	640(534)	637(549)	—
Punjab L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rajasthan L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sikkim L.A.	21.6.2010 to 24.6.2010	5	4(4)	—	—	—	—
Tamil Nadu L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tripura L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uttarakhand L.A.*	—	—	—	—	488	—	—
Uttar Pradesh L.A.*	—	—	—	—	1,427(1,025)	1,525(1,122)	77
Uttar Pradesh L.C.*	—	—	—	—	495(465)	316(275)	—
West Bengal L.A.	9.3.2010 to 30.7.2010	42	31(37)	—	1,055(841)	381(294)	—
UNION TERRITORIES							
Delhi L.A.*	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Puducherry L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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

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

• Starred Questions and Short Notices admitted as Unstarred

	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24
Sikkim L.A.	—	2(1)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tamil Nadu L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tripura L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uttarakhand L.A.	—	4	—	—	—	2	—	—	2	—	—	—	4	—	—	—
Uttar Pradesh L.A.	—	13	—	—	—	10	4	7	6	—	—	—	21	—	—	15 ^(a)
Uttar Pradesh L.C.	—	19	13	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	69 ^(a)
West Bengal L.A.	16(12)	15(2)	14(1)	—	3	13(8)	10(1)	—	15(1)	—	14	10(1)	14(4)	1(1)	—	414(97) ^(a)
UNION TERRITORIES																
Delhi L.A.	—	2	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	1 ^(a)
Puducherry L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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

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

- (a) Committee on Question and Call Attention-12; Nivedan Committee-13; Committee on Zero Hour-10; Committee on State Language-9; Welfare of Minorities-10; Committee on Zilla Parishad & Panchayati Raj-17 and Committee on Papers Laid on the Table-9; Implementation Committee-12; and SC/ST Committee-11
- (b) Question & Reference Committee-3; Committee relating to the Exam of the Papers Laid on the Table-3 and Women & Children Welfare Committee-3
- (c) Adhoc Committee on Home-4; Adhoc Committee on Law-4; Adhoc Committee on Finance-3; Adhoc Committee on Industries, Labour and Tourism-2; Adhoc Committee on Public Works, Panchayats and Transport-2; Adhoc Committee on Education, Sports and Information Technology-4; Adhoc Committee on Agriculture and Forests-4 and Adhoc Committee on Health and Social Welfare-3
- (d) Panchayati Raj Committee-6; Welfare of Socially and Educationally Backward Classes Committee-2; Papers Laid on the Table Committee-2 and Absence of Members Committee-1
- (e) Committee on Welfare of Women and Children-8; Committee on Papers Laid on the Table-11; Committee on Backward Classes and minorities-08; and Iskcon House Committee-7

- (f) Committee on the Welfare of Women Children and Physically Handicapped-6; Committee on Environment-6; Committee on the Welfare of Backward Class Communities-6; Committee on Official Language-6; Committee on Papers Laid on the Table-4; Committee on Local Fund Accounts -8; Subject Committee I-5(2); Subject Committee II-8(3); Subject Committee III-4(2); Subject Committee IV-4(2); Subject Committee V-5(2); Subject Committee VI-4(2); Subject Committee VII-4(2); Subject Committee VIII-3(2); Subject Committee IX-4(2) and Subject Committee X-4(2)
- (g) Committee on Question & Reference-3; Committee on Paper Laid on the Table-1 and Committee on Welfare of Woman & Children-4
- (h) Hill Areas Committee -1(1) and Delegate Committee-1(1)
- (i) Subject Committee I-1; Subject Committee II-1; Subject Committee III-1; Subject Committee IV-2 and Subject Committee V-1
- (j) House Committee on Environment-1; House Committee on Linguistic-1; House Committee on Railway-1; House Committee on Power Generation-1; House Committee on Boundary Dispute-1; House Committee on Submission-8; House Committee on Rehabilitation-1; Ethics Committee-9; Special Committee on OTV-1; P.L.C. Committee-4; Standing Committee-3; Standing Committee-5; Standing Committee-III-4; Standing Committee IV-5; Standing Committee V-4; Standing Committee VI-4; Standing Committee VII-4; Standing Committee VIII-4; Standing Committee IX-5 and Standing Committee X-5
- (k) Committee Relating to Examination of Audit Reports of the Local Bodies of the State-11 and Joint Committee Relating to Women & Child Welfare-4
- (l) Committee on Reference & Question-9; Committee on Financial & Administrative Delayed-6; Committee on Rules Revision-10; Committee on Parliamentary Study-3; Committee on Enquiry of Housing Complaints of U.P. legislature-9; Parliamentary & Social Welfare Committee-5; Committee on Contrast of Irregularities in Development Authorities, Housing Board, Zila Panchayats & Municipal Corporation-7; Committee on Enquiry of Provincial Electricity Arrangement-18; Committee on Regulation Review-3; Committee on Enquiry of Ragging in Colleges/ Engineering Institution in Provincial -4; Daivee Aapda Prabandhan Samiti-3; Committee on Commercialization of Education-1; Committee on Enquiry of Universities/Degree Colleges which is establishes by Legally in Province-2
- (m) Committee on Bidayak Elaka Unnayan Prabalpa-16; Committee on Papers Laid on the Table-16(5); Committee on the Entitlement of the Members-1; Committee on Affairs of Women and Children-17(1); Standing Committee on Agriculture, Agriculture Marketing and Fisheries-15(6); Standing Committee on Commerce & Industries, Industrial Reconstruction and Public Enterprises-16(4); Standing Committee on Micro and Small scale Enterprises & Textiles and Animal Resources Development-14(6); Standing Committee on Higher Education-16(3); Standing Committee on Environment, Forests & Tourism-15(4); Standing Committee on Finance, Excise and Development & Planning-20(7); Standing Committee on Food & Supplies, Food Processing & Horticulture and Cooperation & Consumer Affairs-15(6); Standing Committee on Home, Personnel & Administrative Reforms, Jails, Law, Judicial & Civil Defence-14(7); Standing Committee on Information & Cultural Affairs, Sports and Youth Services-15(2); Standing Committee on Housing, Hill Affairs & Fire Services-15(2); Standing Committee on Irrigation & Waterways and water investigation and Development-18(2); Standing Committee on Labour-15(3); Standing Committee on

Municipal Affairs & Urban Development-16(3); Standing Committee on Panchayats & Rural Development, Land & Land Reforms and Sundarban Development-15(4); Standing Committee on Power & Non Conventional Energy Resources-15(2); Standing Committee on Publications and Public Health Engineering-14(2); Standing Committee on Science & Technology, Information, Technology and Bio-Technology-14(2); Standing Committee on Self Help Group and Self Employment-14(2); Standing Committee on Backward Classes Welfare-15(1); Standing Committee on Social Welfare, Disaster Management and Refugee Relief & Rehabilitation-12(3); Standing Committee on Transport-14(2) and Standing Committee on Minority Affairs-15(1)

(n) Committee on Environment-1

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

1 APRIL TO 30 JUNE 2010

Sl. No.	Title of the Bill	Date of Assent by the President
1.	The Appropriation (Railways) No. 3 Bill, 2010	26.4.2010
2.	The Appropriation (No. 2) Bill, 2010	4.5.2010
3.	The Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 2010	4.5.2010
4.	The Finance Bill, 2010	8.5.2010
5.	The Payment of Gratuity (Amendment) Bill, 2010	17.5.2010
6.	The Tamil Nadu Legislative Council Bill, 2010	18.5.2010
7.	The Plantations Labour (Amendment) Bill, 2010*	18.5.2010
8.	The Employees' State Insurance (Amendment) Bill, 2010 [†]	24.5.2010
9.	The National Green Tribunal Bill, 2010 [‡]	3.6.2010

The Bill was introduced in Rajya Sabha as the Plantations Labour (Amendment) Bill, 2008. The short title of the Bill was changed to the Plantations Labour (Amendment) Bill, 2010 by Rajya Sabha through an amendment to Clause 1.

* The Bill was introduced in Lok Sabha as the Employees' State Insurance (Amendment) Bill, 2009. The Short title of the Bill was changed to the Employees' State Insurance (Amendment) Bill, 2010 by Lok Sabha through an amendment to Clause 1.

‡ The Bill was introduced in Lok Sabha as the National Green Tribunal Bill, 2009. The short title of the Bill was changed to the National Green Tribunal Bill, 2010 by Lok Sabha through an amendment to Clause 1.

APPENDIX V**LIST OF BILLS PASSED BY THE LEGISLATURES
OF THE STATES AND THE UNION TERRITORIES
DURING THE PERIOD****1 APRIL TO 30 JUNE 2010**

KERALA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Kerala Finance Bill, 2010
2. The Kerala Appropriation (No.2) Bill, 2010
3. The Munnar Special Tribunal Bill, 2010
4. The Kerala Inland Fishery Bill, 2010
5. The Kerala Appropriation (No.3) Bill, 2010

ORISSA LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Orissa Motor Vehicles Taxation (Amendment Bill) Ordinance, 2010

SIKKIM LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The Registration of Companies (Amendment) Bill, 2010
2. The Sikkim Value Added Tax (Amendment) Bill, 2010
3. The Sikkim appropriation (No.12) Bill, 2010
4. The Sikkim Appropriation Bill (No.13) Bill, 2010

WEST BENGAL LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

1. The West Bengal Anti-Profiteering (Amendment) Bill, 2010
2. The Kolkata Municipal Corporation (Amendment) Bill, 2010
3. The New Town, Kolkata Development Authority (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
4. The West Bengal Panchayat (Amendment) Bill, 2010
5. The West Bengal Madrasah Service Commission (Amendment) Bill, 2010
6. The West Bengal School Service Commission (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
7. The West Bengal Appropriation Bill, 2010
8. The West Bengal Appropriation (Vote on Account) Bill, 2010
9. The West Bengal Finance Bill, 2010
10. The Acharya Bhavan of Late Sir Jagadis Chandra Bose and his Wife late Lady Abala Bose (Acquisition and Transfer of Undertakings) Bill, 2010
11. The West Bengal Fiscal Responsibility and Budget management Bill, 2010
12. The West Bengal State Election Commission (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
13. The West Bengal Land Reforms (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
14. The West Bengal Acquisition of Homestead for Agricultural Labourers, Artisans and Fishermen (Amendment) Bill, 2010*

15. The West Bengal Commission for Backward Classes (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
16. The West Bengal Health Service (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
17. The West Bengal Co-operative Societies (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
18. The Indian Stamp (West Bengal Amendment) Bill, 2010*
19. The West Bengal Heritage Commission (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
20. The West Bengal Valuation Board (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
21. The West Bengal Advocates Welfare Fund (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
22. The West Bengal Taxation Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
23. The West Bengal Thika Tenancy (Acquisition and Regulation) (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
24. The West Bengal Appropriation (No.2) Bill, 2010
25. The West Bengal Public Works Contractors (Regulation and Control) (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
26. The Burdwan University (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
27. The West Bengal Legislative Assembly (Members' Pension) (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
28. The Bengal Legislative Assembly (Members' Emoluments) (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
29. The West Bengal Land Reforms and Tenancy Tribunal (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
30. The West Bengal Premises Tenancy (Amendment) Bill, 2010*
31. The West Bengal Medical Council Bill, 2009*
32. The Calcutta Unani Medical College & Hospital (Taking over of Management and Subsequent Acquisition) Bill, 2010*
33. The Sidho-Kano-Birsha University Bill, 2009
34. The Presidency University Bill, 2009
35. The West Bengal Yoga & Naturopathic System of Medicine Bill, 2009
36. The West Bengal Motor Transport Workers' Welfare Cess Bill, 2009
37. The West Bengal Clinical Establishment (Registration & Regulation) Bill, 2009*

* Bills awaiting assent

APPENDIX VI
ORDINANCES PROMULGATED BY THE UNION AND
STATE GOVERNMENTS DURING THE PERIOD

1 APRIL TO 30 JUNE 2010

Sl. No.	Title of Ordinance	Date of Promulgation	Date on which laid before the House	Date of Cessation	Remarks
UNION GOVERNMENT					
1.	The Indian Medical (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	15.5.2010	27.7.2010	—	Replaced by Act of Parliament
2.	The Securities and Insurance Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	18.6.2010	27.7.2010	—	Replaced by Act of Parliament
KARNATAKA					
1.	The State University Ordinance, 2010	20.5.2010	1.7.2010	—	—
KERALA					
1.	The Kerala Local Authorities Loans (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	7.4.2010	29.6.2010	—	—
2.	The Kerala State Housing Board (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	7.4.2010	29.6.2010	—	—
3.	The Kerala Agricultural Workers (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	7.4.2010	29.6.2010	—	—
4.	The Kerala University of Health and Allied Science Ordinance, 2010	7.4.2010	29.6.2010	—	—

5.	The Kerala Police (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	7.4.2010	29.6.2010	—	—
6.	The Advocates' Welfare Fund (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	7.4.2010	29.6.2010	—	—
7. *	The University Laws (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	7.4.2010	29.6.2010	—	—
8.	The Kerala Panchayat Raj (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	17.5.2010	29.6.2010	—	—
9.	The Kerala Stamp (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	27.5.2010	1.3.2010	—	—
10	The Kerala State Higher Education Council (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	8.6.2010	1.3.2010	—	—
11	The Kerala Co-operatives Societies (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	11.6.2010	1.3.2010	—	—
12	The Kerala Tourism (Conservation and Preservation of Areas) Amendment Ordinance, 2010	14.6.2010	1.3.2010	—	—
13	The Kerala Headload Workers' (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	14.6.2010	1.3.2010	—	—
14	The Kerala Panchayat Raj (Second Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	14.6.2010	1.3.2010	—	—
15	The Kerala Municipality (Amendment) Ordinance, 2010	14.6.2010	1.3.2010	—	—
16	The Munnar Special Tribunal Ordinance, 2010	14.6.2010	1.3.2010	—	—

17	The Kerala Public Service Commission (Additional Functions as Respects Sports Councils) Ordinance, 2010	14.6.2010	1.3.2010	—	—
18	The Kerala Veterinary and Animal Sciences university Ordinance, 2010	14.6.2010	1.3.2010	—	—
19	The Kannan Devan Hills (Taking over by Resumption of certain Lands) Ordinance, 2010	14.6.2010	1.3.2010	—	—
20	The Kerala Nadheethera Samrakshanavum Manalvaral Niyanthranavum (Bhedagathy) Ordinance, 2010		14.6.2010	1.3.2010	—
MADHYA PRAESH					
1.	The Madhya Pradesh Neeji Viswavidyalaya (Esthapana Evam Sanchalak (Sanshodhan) Aadyadesh, 2010	29.4.2010	—	—	—
2.	The Madhya Pradesh Aadhyakasha tatha Upadhyakasha Evam Neeta Patipakasha Vetan Tatha Bhatta Vedhi (Sanshodhan) Aadyadesh, 2010 Viswavidyalaya, Aadyadesh, 2010	11.6.2010	—	—	—
ORISSA					
1.	The Orissa Motor Vehicles Taxation (Amendment Bill) Ordinance, 2010	15.5.2010	—	—	Replaced by Legislation

APPENDIX VII
A. PARTY POSITION IN 15TH LOK SABHA (STATE-WISE) (AS ON 24.6.2010)

States	No. of Seats	INC	BJP	SP	BSP	JD (U)	AITC	DMK	CPI (M)	BJD	SHIV SENA	NCP	AIA DMK	TDP	RLD	CPI	SAD	RJD	JKNC	JD (S)	AIFB	
Andhra Pradesh	42	33	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Assam	14	7	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Bihar	40	2	12	—	—	20	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—
Chhattisgarh	11	1	10	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Goa	2	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Gujarat	26	11	15	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Haryana	10	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Himachal Pradesh	4	1	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Jammu & Kashmir	6	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	—
Jharkhand	14	1	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Karnataka	28	6	19	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Kerala	20	13	—	—	—	—	—	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Madhya Pradesh	29	12	16	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Maharashtra	48	17	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Manipur	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Meghalaya	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mizoram	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Nagaland	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Orissa	21	6	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	14	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Punjab	13	8	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rajasthan	25	20	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sikkim	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tamil Nadu	39	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tripura	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uttarakhand	5	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uttar Pradesh	80	22	10	22	20	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
West Bengal	42	6	1	—	—	—	19	—	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	—	2
UNION TERRITORIES																						
A & N Islands	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Chandigarh	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Daman and Diu	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
The NCT of Delhi	7	7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Lakshadweep	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Puducherry	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total	543	206*	116	22	21	20	19	18	16	14	11	9	9	6	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	2

APPENDIX VII (CONTD.)

States	JMM	MLK SC	FBP	IFS	AIM EIM	AGP	AUDF	BVA	BFF	H-C (BL)	JVM (P)	HC (M)	MD MK	NFF	SDF	SMP	VCK	IND	TOTAL	VACA NCES
Andhra Pradesh				2	1														42	
Assam						1	1												2	
Bihar									1									1	14	1
Chhattisgarh																			39*	
Goa																			11	
Gujarat																			2	
Haryana										1									10	
Himachal Pradesh																			4	
Jammu & Kashmir																		1	6	
Jharkhand	2										1							2	14	
Karnataka																			28	
Kerala		2									1								20	
Madhya Pradesh																1			29	
Maharashtra							1											1	47	
Manipur																			2	
Meghalaya																			2	
Mizoram														1					1	
Nagaland																			1	
Orissa																			21	
Punjab																			13	
Rajasthan																		1	25	
Sikkim															1				39	
Tamil Nadu												1					1		2	
Tripura																			5	
Uttarakhand																			80	
Uttar Pradesh																			1	
West Bengal			2																1	42
UNION TERRITORIES																				
A & N Islands																				1
Chandigarh																				
Dadra & Nagar Haveli																				1
Daman and Diu																				1
The NCT of Delhi																				7
Lakshadweep																				1
Puducherry																				1
Total	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8	539	1

* Excluding Speaker, Lok Sabha

Abbreviations used for Parties :

AGP-Asom Gana Parishad; AIFB-All India Forward Bloc; AIADMK-All India Anna Dravid Munnetra Kazhagam; AIMEIM-All India Majlis-e-Ittehadul Muslimeen; AITC-All India Trinamool Congress; AUDF-Assam United Democratic Front; BJD-Biju Janata Dal; BJP-Bharatiya Janata Party; BPF-Bodoland Peoples Front; BSP-Bahujan Samaj Party; BVA-Bahujan Vikas Aaghadi; CPI(M)-Communist Party of India (Marxist); CPI-Communist Party of India; DMK-Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam; HJC(BL)-Haryana Janhit Congress(BL); INC-Indian National Congress; IND-Independents; J&KNC-Jammu & Kashmir National Conference; JD(S)-Janata Dal (Secular); JD(U)-Janata Dal (United); JMM-Jharkhand Mukti Morcha; JVM(P)-Jharkhand Vikas Morcha (Prajantrik); KC(M)-Kerala Congress(M); MDMK-Marumalarchi Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam; MLKSC-Muslim League Kerala State Committee; NCP-Nationalist Congress Party; NPF-Nagaland Peoples Front; RJD-Rashtriya Janata Dal; RLD-Rashtriya Lok Dal; RSP-Revolutionary Socialist Party; SAD-Shiromani Akali Dal; SDF-Sikkim Democratic Front; SP-Samajwadi Party; SWP-Swabhimani Paksha; SS-Shiv Sena; TDP-Telugu Desam Party; TRS-Telangana Rashtra Samithi; VCK-Viduthalai Chiruthaigal Katchi.

B. PARTY POSITION IN RAJYA SABHA (AS ON 2 OCTOBER 2010)

Sl. No.	States/Union Territories	Seats	INC	BJP	SP	CPI (M)	JD (U)	AIA-DMK	BSP	CPI	*Others	IND	Total	Vacancies
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
STATES														
1.	Andhra Pradesh	18	13	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	4 ^(a)	—	18	—
2.	Arunachal Pradesh	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
3.	Assam	7	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3 ^(b)	—	7	—
4.	Bihar	16	—	3	—	—	7	—	—	—	6 ^(c)	—	16	—
5.	Chhattisgarh	5	2	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	—
6.	Goa	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
7.	Gujarat	11	3	8	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	—
8.	Haryana	5	4	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 ^(e)	5	—
9.	Himachal Pradesh	3	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—
10.	Jammu & Kashmir	4	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2 ^(e)	—	4	—
11.	Jharkhand	6	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 ^(f)	1	6	—
12.	Karnataka	12	4	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 ^(g)	2	12	—
13.	Kerala	9	3	—	—	4	—	—	—	2	—	—	9	—
14.	Madhya Pradesh	11	2	9	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	11	—
15.	Maharashtra	19	6	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	10 ^(h)	—	19	—
16.	Manipur	1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
17.	Meghalaya	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 ⁽ⁱ⁾	—	1	—
18.	Mizoram	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 ^(j)	—	1	—
19.	Nagaland	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 ^(k)	—	1	—
20.	Orissa	10	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	6 ⁽ⁿ⁾	—	10	—
21.	Punjab	7	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	3 ^(m)	—	7	—
22.	Rajasthan	10	5	5	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	10	—
23.	Sikkim	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1 ^(e)	—	1	—

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
24. Tamil Nadu			18	4	—	—	1	—	5	—	1	7 ^(e)	—	18	—
25. Tripura			1	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
26. Uttarakhnad			3	1	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—
27. Uttar Pradesh			31	1	4	5	—	—	—	18	—	1 ^(b)	2	31	—
28. West Bengal			16	—	—	—	9	—	—	—	1	4 ^(e)	1	15	1
UNION TERRITORIES															
29. The NCT of Delhi			3	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	—
30. Puduchery			1	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—
31. Nominated			12	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9 ^(f)	—	11	1
TOTAL			245	71	49	5	15	7	5	18	5	62	6	243	2

*OTHERS

(Break-up of Parties/Groups)

- (a) Telegu Desam Party-4
- (b) Asom Gana Parishad-2; and Bodoland People's Front-1
- (c) Rashtriya Janata Dal-4; and Lok Jan Shakti Party-2
- (d) Indian National Lok Dal-1
- (e) Jammu and Kashmir National Conference-2
- (f) Jharkhand Mukti Morcha-1
- (g) Janata Dal (Secular)-1
- (h) Nationalist Congress Party-6; Shiv Sena-4
- (i) Nationalist Congress Party-1
- (j) Mizo national Front-1
- (k) Nagaland Peoples' Front-1
- (l) Biju Janata Dal-6
- (m) Shiromani Akali Dal-3
- (n) Sikkim Democratic Front-1
- (o) Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam-7
- (p) Rashtriya Lok Dal-1
- (q) All India Trinamool Congress-2; Revolutionary Socialist Party-1; All India Forward Bloc-1
- (r) Nominated

Manipur L.A. (1.8.2010)	—	31	—	—	4	—	—	—	11 ⁽ⁿ⁾	10	60	—
Meghalaya L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Mizoram L.A. (2.8.2010)	—	32	—	—	—	—	—	—	8 ^(p)	—	40	—
Nagaland L.A. (1.7.2010)	—	19	—	—	—	2	—	—	32 ^(p)	7	60	—
Orissa L.A. (2.8.2010)	—	27	6	—	1	4	—	—	103 ⁽ⁿ⁾	6	147	—
Punjab L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Rajasthan L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Sikkim L.A. (2.8.2010)	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	32 ^(p)	—	32	—
Tamil Nadu L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Tripura L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Uttarakhand L.A.	—	20	36	—	—	—	8	—	7 ^(m)	—	71	—
Uttar Pradesh L.A.	—	20	48	—	—	—	227	—	106 ⁽ⁿ⁾	9	404	3
Uttar Pradesh L.C.	—	3	9	—	—	—	62	—	24 ^(o)	3	100	1
West Bengal L.A.	—	18	—	—	173	7	—	—	94 ^(p)	3	295	—
UNION TERRITORY												
Delhi L.A. (2.8.2010)	—	41	24	—	—	—	2	—	2 ^(d)	1	70	—
Puducherry L.A.**	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

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

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

⊕ Excluding Speaker/Chairman

(a) All India Trinamool Congress-5; People's Party of Arunachal-4

(b) Nominated

- (c) United Goan Democratic Party-1 and Maharashtra Gomatantak Party-2
- (d) Indian National Lok Dal-31; Haryana Janhit Congress Party (BL)-1 and Shiromani Akali Dal-1
- (e) Nominated-1
- (f) Muslim League-7; Kerala Congress (M)-8; Kerala Congress-4; Revolutionary Socialist Party-3; Congress (Secular)-1; Kerala Congress (Secular)-1; Kerala Congress (B)-1; Janathipathya Samrakshana Samithi-1; Indian National League-1; and Nominated-1
- (g) Bharatiya Jan Shakti-5; Samajwadi Party-1 and Nominated-1
- (h) Manipur Peoples' Party-5; Rashtriya Janata Dal-3; National Peoples' Party-3
- (i) Mizo National Front-3; Mizoram Peoples' Conference-2; Zoram Nationalist Party-2; and Mara Democratic Front-1
- (j) Nagaland Peoples' Front-32
- (k) Biju Janta Dal-103
- (l) Sikkim Democratic Front-32
- (m) Uttarakhand Party-3; Nominated-1 and Others-3
- (n) Samajwadi Party-85; Rashtriya Swabhiman Party-1; Rashtriya Lok Dal-10 and Nominated-1
- (o) Samajwadi Party-14; Rashtriya Lok Dal-1; and Sikchhak Dal (Non-Political)-9
- (p) All India Forward Bloc-24; Revolutionary Socialist Party-19; West Bengal Socialist Party-4; Marxist Forward Bloc-2; Democratic Socialist Party-1; Rashtriya Janata Dal-1; All India Trinamool Congress-36; Gorkha National Liberation Front-3; Socialist Unity Centre of India-2; Jharkhand Party (Naren)-1; and Nominated-1
- (q) Lok Jan Shakti Party-1; Rashtriya Janata Dal-1

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT PUBLICATIONS AVAILABLE ON SALE

BOOKS	PRICE (In Rs.)	
	English	Hindi
Anti-Defection Law in India and the Commonwealth	2400.00	—
Babu Jagjivan Ram in Parliament: A Commemorative Volume	1000.00	—
Cabinet Responsibility to the Legislature: Motions of Confidence and No-confidence in the Lok Sabha and State Legislatures	1650.00	—
Calligraphed copy of the Constitution	800.00	800.00
Conferment of Outstanding Parliamentarian Awards	75.00	75.00
Constituent Assembly Debates	2000.00	2000.00
Constitution Amendment in India	3500.00	3500.00
Constitution of India in Precept & Practice	895.00	
Council of Ministers	15.00	15.00
Council of Ministers (1947-2004)	350.00	350.00
Dada Saheb Mavalankar—Father of Lok Sabha	200.00	100.00
Demarcation of Responsibilities in Government of India	150.00	150.00
Dictionary of Constitutional and Parliamentary Terms	300.00	
Directions by the Speaker (6 th Edition)	75.00	75.00
Discipline and Decorum in Parliament and State Legislatures	300.00	—
Disqualification of Members on Ground of Defection (Sept. 1999)	20.00	10.00
Fifty Years of Indian Parliament	1500.00	1500.00
Fifty Years of Indian Parliamentary Democracy	300.00	300.00
Glossary of Idioms	80.00	—
Handbook for Members, Lok Sabha (14 th Edn.)	80.00	80.00
Hiren Mukerjee in Parliament—A Commemorative Volume	800.00	—
Honouring National Leaders—Statues and Portraits in Parliament Complex	400.00	400.00
India and Human Rights	550.00	550.00
Indian Parliamentary Companion—Who's Who of Members of Lok Sabha (First to Thirteenth Lok Sabha)	1000.00	1000.00
Indira Gandhi—Speeches in Parliament	2350.00	—
Indrajit Gupta in Parliament—A Commemorative Volume	1400.00	—
International Parliamentary Conference to mark the Golden Jubilee of the Parliament of India (22-24 January 2003)—A Commemorative Souvenir	550.00	—
Into the Third Millennium—A Speaker's Perspectives	800.00	800.00
Lal Bahadur Shastri and Parliament	1695.00	—
Legislators in India, Salaries and Other Facilities	200.00	200.00
List of Members: Fourteenth Lok Sabha	130.00	130.00
Lohia and Parliament	200.00	—
Prof. Madhu Dandavate in Parliament: A Commemorative Volume	1200.00	—
Madhu Limaye in Parliament: A Commemorative Volume	1200.00	—
Maulana Abul Kalam Azad	200.00	100.00
Members of 14 th Lok Sabha—A Brief Introduction	400.00	—
Motions and Resolutions in Parliament	16.00	20.00
Muhawara and Lokokti Kosh (Hindi-Angrezi) (Hindi-English Glossary of Idioms and Proverbs)	65.00	—
Netaji & INA	150.00	150.00
Parliament of India	2500.00	—
Parliamentary Debates	160.00	—
Parliament of India (11 th Lok Sabha)	450.00	450.00

Parliament of India (12 th Lok Sabha)	450.00	450.00
Parliamentary Privileges—Court Cases	200.00	—
Parliamentary Procedure (Abstract Series 1-40)	480.00	480.00
President's Rule in the States and Union Territories	140.00	140.00
Presidential Addresses to Parliament	1400.00	1400.00
Presidential Ordinances (1950-96)	80.00	—
Privileges Digest—Digest of Cases (1950-2000)—Vol. I & II	500.00	—
Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Twelfth Edition)	100.00	100.00
Sir Speaks—Selected Speeches of Manohar Joshi	800.00	800.00
Speakers of Lok Sabha	250.00	250.00
Speaker Rules	600.00	—
The Constitution and Constituent Assembly (Some Selected Speeches)	50.00	—
The Speaker and the Deputy Speaker—Procedure for Election and Removal	35.00	35.00
The Speaker Speaks: Selected Speeches of Speaker Balayogi	800.00	800.00
Unparliamentary Expressions	850.00	—
Who's Who (11 th Lok Sabha)	700.00	700.00
Who's Who (12 th Lok Sabha)	900.00	900.00
Who's Who (13 th Lok Sabha)	900.00	900.00
Who's Who (14 th Lok Sabha)	1650.00	1650.00
Women Parliamentarians in India	1275.00	—

EMINENT PARLIAMENTARIANS MONOGRAPH SERIES

Dr. Lanka Sundaram	50.00	30.00
Bhupesh Gupta	50.00	30.00
Dr. B.R. Ambedkar	—	30.00
Dr. Chintaman D. Deshmukh	50.00	30.00
Dr. Rajendra Prasad	50.00	30.00
Dr. Syama Prasad Mookerjee	50.00	—
Jaisukh Lal Hathi	50.00	30.00
M.A. Ayyangar	50.00	30.00
Panampilli Govinda Menon	50.00	30.00
Pandit Mukut Behari Lal Bhargava	60.00	60.00
Pandit Nilakantha Das	50.00	30.00
Raj Kumari Amrit Kaur	50.00	30.00
S.M. Joshi	50.00	30.00
Shelkh Mohammad Abdullah	50.00	30.00
V.K. Krishna Menon	50.00	30.00

PERIODICALS

	PRICE	
	Per copy	Annual Subs.
English		
The Journal of Parliamentary Information (Quarterly)	120.00	350.00
Digest of Legislative and Constitutional Cases (Quarterly)	50.00	160.00
Digest of Central Acts (Quarterly)	50.00	160.00
Privileges Digest (Annual)	50.00	50.00
Hindi		
Sansadiya Patrika (Quarterly)	100.00	320.00
Kendriya Adhiniyam Sar (Quarterly)	50.00	160.00



THE COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION RANGE

Distinctive Commonwealth Parliamentary Products for Members and Officials of the CPA

The following exclusive CPA Range may be purchased through your local CPA Branch Secretary. Orders accompanied by payment in Sterling can be forwarded by the Secretary to CPA Headquarters in London. (All prices include postage and packing. Add 15 per cent for air mail.)

	Pound Sterling	US \$
PULLOVER	37.00	60.00
TIE	8.00	12.00
LADIES SILK SCARF	10.00	15.00
LADIES BROOCH	5.00	8.00
FLAG BADGES	1.00	1.50
CUFFLINKS	5.00	8.00
ROLLER BALL PEN	3.00	5.00
BALL PEN	2.00	3.00
CROSS BALL PEN	25.00	40.00
WATERMAN FOUNTAIN PEN	50.00	80.00
CPA VIDEO	15.00	25.00
JOURNAL BINDER	5.00	8.00
CPA PLAQUES		
Presentation size	10.00	15.00
Regular size	5.00	8.00
CPA FLAGS		
Full size	50.00	80.00
Table size	3.00	5.00
BOOKS		
<i>Office of the Speaker</i>	10.00	15.00
<i>The Parliamentarian</i>	8.00	12.00
<i>A Guide for Election Observers</i>	7.50	12.00
<i>Strengthening Democracy</i>	15.00	25.00
<i>Parliament and the People</i>	17.50	28.00

Name _____ Branch _____

Address _____

ORDERS

(Please specify, as necessary, Standard or Anniversary, Badge, Pullover colour and size, Tie colour)

Item 1 _____ Quantity _____ @ _____ Total _____

Item 2 _____ Quantity _____ @ _____ Total _____

Item 3 _____ Quantity _____ @ _____ Total _____

Item 4 _____ Quantity _____ @ _____ Total _____