

**Some of the important issues discussed at the  
Conferences of Presiding Officers  
of Legislative Bodies in India (1921-2019)**

**September, 1921**

1. It was agreed that as the Legislative Councils and the Assembly were independent authorities within their own spheres, the Conference would be consultative and that its members were not bound by its decisions. At the same time, the Conference took the view that where substantial agreement was reached, the opinion of the Conference must then carry great weight, even with a wholly dissenting member.
2. It was agreed unanimously that a reference in debate to strangers in the gallery is most reprehensible and is out of order.
3. Questions relating to judicial officers and Magistrates, who were under the discipline of the High Court, should not be admitted; they were not within the special cognizance of the member of Government concerned.
4. It was agreed that Questions asking for information already available in public reports should be discouraged as far as is possible and that a protest from the Government against the work involved in this matter is justifiable.

**January, 1923**

1. The Conference unanimously reached the conclusion that while giving a ruling from the Chair, care should be taken not to refer, save in the most general terms, to opinions arrived at in Conferences.
2. The Conference agreed that the right of the Chair to address the Council before putting the question was absolute and unrestricted but that the right should be exercised with great discretion.
3. The Conference unanimously agreed that no inherent power existed in the Chair to impose a time-limit on speeches during discussion on legislative business.

**December, 1923**

1. The Conference adopted the following Resolution:

"This Conference desires to place on record its opinion that, in order to secure the appropriate co-ordination of parliamentary procedure throughout India, a special effort be made in arranging the date and place of meeting of the Fourth Conference to secure the attendance of at least one representative from each Province."

2. It was unanimously agreed that the statutory prohibition measure affecting the public revenues but without the sanction of the Governor or Governor-General did not apply to the moving of Resolutions, the acceptance of which would affect the revenues.

### **January, 1925**

1. The Conference agreed that after the adjournment motion was disposed of, ordinary business of the day could be resumed.

2. The Conference agreed that when a Bill or any specific part of a Bill was returned to the Legislature by the Governor/Governor-General for reconsideration.

3. The Conference was of the view that an outgoing President (Speaker) who was a candidate for election as the next Presiding Officer, should in any case not preside at such election.

### **January, 1926**

1. Whether a matter was urgent or not, in respect of motions for adjournment, must be decided with reference to each particular case and no hard and fast rule could be laid down.

2. The Conference generally agreed that the phrase "grossly disorderly" referred to any conduct which could have the effect of making the conduct of business in the Council (House) impossible.

3. It was resolved "A convention should be established, as in the House of Commons, that members should not publish or countenance the publication in the Press of Questions and Resolutions not admitted, and that Presidents should assist in the creation of such a convention by appealing to the members."

### **September, 1926**

1. The Conference agreed unanimously that private members could bring forward amendments to those portions of the Bill which were affected by the

amendments of the Governor.

2. The Conference generally agreed that the phrase "complete Session" should be taken to mean the period between the first meeting of the Council and the date of its prorogation, and that it was not possible to introduce in the definition any limitations as regards the opportunities for any particular business to be transacted during such session.

### **January, 1928**

1. The majority agreed with the Chairman that once the motion was admitted, it should be discussed on the same day.

2. It was considered desirable that a motion for closure should not generally be accepted by the Chair while a member was making a speech, although the Chair had the power to put a motion for closure even in the middle of a speech.

3. It was agreed that several cut motions for the reduction of the same item were permissible, provided the issue raised was different in each case.

4. It was decided that there was no objection to criticizing the action of a High Court if it was on the administrative side but no criticism of the Court's judicial action or conduct could be permitted.

### **January, 1929**

1. The general consensus of opinion was that a speech delivered by a Governor as such could not be discussed and criticised by an Adjournment Motion, but if the Governor, during his speech, made an announcement on behalf of his Government then the policy underlying that announcement could be the subject-matter of discussion provided the other conditions laid down by the Rules and Standing Orders were satisfied.

### **February, 1932**

1. It was agreed that once the motion for leave to introduce the Bill, or the motion for consideration of the Bill, or the motion to pass the Bill was defeated, the Bill was killed.

2. It was decided that as regards the admissibility of Government Resolutions, the same principles would apply as in the case of non-official Resolutions.

### **August, 1933**

1. The Conference agreed with the opinion of the Chairman that the President of a Legislative Council would not be justified in anticipating the length of the answer and disallowing the Question on the ground that the answer was likely to be of excessive length. Such a Question could only be disallowed on the ground that it was an abuse of the right of questioning.
2. The Conference was unanimously of opinion that a member of Select Committee could not use objectionable or unparliamentary expressions in his minute of dissent which he could not use during debate in the House.

### **January, 1938**

1. The general sense of the Conference was that it was within the competence of a State Assembly to pass a Resolution recommending to the Provincial Government to do certain things with the Government of India or with another Provincial Government in respect of a matter which was within the cognizance of that Government.
2. The Conference considered that it was the inherent power of every House to suspend, by a unanimous resolution of the House, the Rules of Procedure framed by it.

### **July, 1939**

1. As regards the formation of an Indian Parliamentary Association, the Conference unanimously agreed that such an Association should be established at an early date and that it should be independent of the Empire Parliamentary Association.
2. The Conference came to the conclusion that a Select Committee could appoint a sub-committee to facilitate its enquiry, but the report must be of the Select Committee and any report of the sub-committee should not be embodied unless it was adopted by the Select Committee formally.

### **January, 1947**

1. The Conference was in general agreement with the view expressed by the Chairman that in the absence of any rules on the subject, the fixation of a time-limit within which a particular Bill must be finished, could only be done with the consent of the House.

2. The Conference was in general agreement with the views expressed by the Chairman that it was in the discretion of the Speaker to disallow an improperly worded motion, and he might ask the member that if he was prepared to omit certain portions of the motion, or move it in a slightly amended form, he would be prepared to consider whether he would admit the motion or not.

### **April, 1949**

1. The Conference adopted the following Resolution:

"In the opinion of this Conference of Speakers and Presidents of Legislative Bodies of all the Provinces, States and States Unions in India, the relations between the Speakers or Presidents on the one hand and the Executive Government on the other, as also the position of the Legislature Secretariat, should be the same as in case of the Central Legislature till the suggested provisions are included in the Draft Constitution and the Constitution comes into force; and it is hoped that the Provincial and State Governments will be helpful in enabling the Speakers and Presidents to establish the same by convention"

### **September, 1949**

1. The sense of the Conference was that the Speaker must be impartial. All agreed that we should aim at the British model wherein the ideal 'once a Speaker, always a Speaker' prevailed.

2. The Conference was unanimously of the opinion that there should be unanimity of terminology in the various Legislatures of the Indian Union.

### **August, 1950**

1. The Conference unanimously accepted the item on the agenda for the organisation of a Society of Secretaries of Legislative Bodies in India with a view:

(i) to discuss administrative, procedural and other matters at Secretary level;

(ii) to bring about uniformity of organisation in Legislature Secretariats throughout India;

(iii) to consider and to report on any matters referred to by the Conference of the Presiding Officers; and

(iv) to recommend to the Conference of the Presiding Officers any points which

require their consideration.

### **July-August, 1951**

1. The decision of the Conference was that it was always open to a Legislature to declare the seat of a member vacant after he had remained absent for sixty days, but that normally an opportunity should be given to him to give reasons for absence.

2. The General sense of the Conference was that a motion for referring a question to the Committee of Privileges should be made by the Leader of the House, and the question might be referred to the Committee of Privileges or the House might dispose it of.

3. The Acting Chairman observed that there was unanimity so far as the principle relating to uniformity of Rules of Procedure in different State legislatures was concerned and that the guidance of the Speaker of Parliament would be sought in the matter. The Conference accepted the principle of framing of model rules which would facilitate the revision of rules in the States.

### **October, 1953**

1. The Conference adopted the following Resolution:

"In the opinion of this Conference, it is necessary to have a glossary of administrative, constitutional, parliamentary and legal terms in Hindi as early as possible with words common to as many languages as possible and so framed that the words will be easily understandable to the people in general, and that the Education Ministry be requested, as they are compiling such a glossary, to take this into consideration and proceed with the work with expedition and publish the glossary. The Conference further recommends that the words selected may be sent to the various heads of Legislatures and their suggestions in respect of them be invited".

### **June, 1954**

1. The Conference was in agreement with the following principles laid down by the Speaker, Lok Sabha, regarding recognition of Parties or Groups in the House, namely:

(i) that a Party should have a distinct ideology and programme of its own on the political, economic or social side; and

(ii) that it should have a party organisation, not only inside the House but also outside, which is in touch with the public opinion on all important issues before the country.

2. The Conference adopted the following Resolution:

"This Conference is of the opinion that the Rules of Procedure of all Parliamentary Committees in the various States should be on the same lines as those in force in Parliament, and this Conference requests the Chairman to take up the matter with all the State Legislatures."

### **January, 1955**

1. The Conference was of the view that the power to allow the publication of a Bill prior to its introduction in the House, should vest in the Presiding Officer who should, in exercising his discretion, give due consideration to the interests of the Government as a whole and the importance of the Bill.

2. The following Resolution was adopted by the Conference:

"This Conference recommends that the Rules of Procedure relating to Questions in the Lok Sabha may be adopted by the State Legislatures, with such modifications as may be deemed necessary by the State Legislatures concerned."

### **September, 1956**

1. The Conference considered the following subject:

"To what authority should a reference by the President of India under Article 3 of the Constitution be addressed?"

The decision in regard to this matter was that the President should inform the Governor and the Governor should send a proper message to the Speaker in a formal manner.

### **October, 1957**

1. The Conference adopted the following Resolution:

"This Conference understands that rules and regulations have not yet been framed in some States to ensure the independence of the Legislature Secretariat and, therefore, requests the respective Governments to take early steps to pass rules to ensure such independence. "

### **October, 1958**

1. On the question what exactly was the scope of sub-clause (g) of clause I of article 199 of the Constitution for determining whether any Bill was a Money Bill, the Chairman, summing up the discussion, observed that it was not advisable to define what exact words came under the said clause and it should be left to the good sense of the Speaker.

### **January, 1964**

1. The Conference agreed that the Conferences of the Chairmen of Estimates and Public Accounts Committees should be held once in the lifetime of a Lok Sabha, i.e., five years.

### **Bombay,11-12 January, 1965**

1. "THIS CONFERENCE of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India held at Bombay on 11 and 12 January, 1965, having carefully considered in all its aspects the Opinion of the Supreme Court on Special Reference No.1 of 1964 made by the President under article 143(1) of the Constitution regarding the powers and jurisdiction of the High Court and its Judges in relation to the State Legislature and its officers and regarding the powers, privileges and immunities of the said Legislature and its members in relation to the High Court and its Judges in the discharge of their duties, is of the confirmed opinion that:

(a) where it is not possible for Legislature to function successfully without their having the powers to adjudge in case of their own contempt, whether committed by a member or a stranger whether inside the Chamber or outside it, and to punish that contempt without interference by Courts under any article of the Constitution or otherwise;

(b) whereas such ouster of jurisdiction of courts was intended by the Constitution makers as is clear from the statements of Dr. Ambedkar and Sir Alladi Krishnaswamy Iyer made in the Constituent Assembly when articles 105 and 194 were adopted;

(c) whereas the language of these articles is so clear that according to Justice Sarkar the language can only have one meaning and that is that it was intended to confer on the Legislatures the powers, privileges and immunities which the House of Commons in England had at the commencement of the Constitution; and

(d) whereas the opinion of the Supreme Court has reduced Legislatures to the

status of inferior Courts, and has implications that would deter the Legislatures from discharging their functions efficiently, honestly and with dignity;

### **October, 1967**

1. The Conference expressed its unhappiness over the tendency of legislators changing their allegiance from one party to another and their frequent crossing of the floor.

### **New Delhi, 6-7 April, 1968**

1. The Conference adopted the following Resolution:

"THIS CONFERENCE OF PRESIDING OFFICERS held at New Delhi on 6 and 7 April, 1968;

REVIEWING the recent political developments in the States of West Bengal and the Punjab leading to constitutional deadlock which made it impossible for the Legislatures to function;

NOTING that the situation that arose in the aforesaid States is of an all-India character and may arise in future in any other part of the country;

FEELING that these developments could not be considered in isolation divorced from the political conditions that emerged after the Fourth General Election and which still continue;

OBSERVING that the executive authority was exercised in a manner that was not always in keeping with the constitutional propriety so as to inspire confidence in the people;

CONSIDERING that the nature of political struggle for power and its impact on the Presiding Officers could not altogether be ignored;

IS OF THE OPINION:

(a) that it is imperative to view the problems in the integrated manner so as to cover the whole range of relationship, as envisaged by the Constitution, between the Governor and the Council of Ministers, the President and the Governors, the Governors and the Presiding Officers, Presiding Officers and the Chief Ministers, and the Presiding Officers and the Houses;

(b) that the lasting solutions to these problems can be discovered only if a

binding code of conduct is evolved to govern the relationship between the Executive and the Legislature so as to ensure the independence of the Presiding Officers;

EXPRESSES its deep sense of gratitude to Dr. N. Sanjiva Reddy, Speaker of Lok Sabha and Chairman of the Conference, who took prompt initiative in calling an emergent session of the Conference and provided guidelines in his opening Address;

AGREES generally with the approach envisaged in the Address of the Chairman;

CONSIDERS that it is the duty of the Presiding Officers to allow the Houses to function in spite of any obstruction and further that the Rules of Procedure of the Houses of Legislatures may be so amended as to provide that a Resolution for the removal of a Presiding Officer from his office shall be brought before the House, notwithstanding an order of adjournment made by a Presiding Officer contrary to the rules;

APPEALS to all members of Legislatures and more particularly to all the Political Parties:

(a) to take effective steps to stop defections which are used as a weapon to topple Governments and to bring about stability in Legislatures to help in their smooth functioning; and

(b) to ensure that due respect and cooperation are extended to the Presiding Officers and notices of removal of Presiding Officers from office are not tabled without due deliberation and adequate grounds;

REQUESTS the Government of India to take urgent and suitable steps to evolve conventions in regard to the powers of Governors to summon or prorogue the Legislatures and to dismiss Ministries in the light of the following observations:

(a) That a Governor shall summon or prorogue the Legislature on the advice of the Chief Minister. A convention shall be developed that the Chief Minister may fix the dates of summoning and prorogation after consulting the Presiding Officer concerned. The Governor may suggest an alternative date but it shall be left to the Chief Minister or the Cabinet to revise their decision or not. Where, however, there is undue delay in summoning a Legislative Assembly and the majority of members of the Legislative Assembly desire to discuss a motion of no-confidence in a Ministry and make a request to that effect in writing to the Chief Minister, the Chief Minister shall advise the Governor to summon the Assembly within a

week of such request;

(b) The question whether a Chief Minister has lost the confidence of the Assembly shall, at all times, be decided in the Assembly; and

EARNESTLY DESIRES that keeping in view the need of self- introspection and the objective assessment of the situation, the Governments, both at the Centre and in the States, the Political Parties, and the members of Legislatures may take all the necessary steps in regard to all the matters referred to above with a view to strengthening the democratic institutions in the country."

### **December, 1969**

1. The Conference generally agreed that when an allegation is intended to be made, the concerned member should give an advance notice to the Speaker and also to the Minister. If he does not give any notice to the Speaker and defies the Chair, the Speaker can just request and persuade him to stop. If the member persists, the other alternative is to ask him to withdraw from the House.

### **July, 1970**

1. On the question whether the courts can issue a summons or a notice to a member of Parliament or of a State Legislature to appear before them for anything said or done by him on the floor of the House, it was agreed that the position with regard to immunity granted in that respect to members of Legislature under articles 105 and 194 of the Constitution was clear, but in case courts were doubtful they should send the request to the Speaker.

### **October, 1971**

1. The Conference held the view that the Speaker's office should be treated as quite a high office and it should be the duty of the Chief Ministers and the Ministers and the Executive to reply to whatever he writes concerning his constituency and also extend him all co-operation in the development of his constituency and attending to the grievances of his constituency.

2. The Conference agreed that if a member of any House is arrested or brought before the Magistrate and punished, it is the duty of the officer or the Magistrate to immediately inform the Speaker or the Chairman, as the case may be. If any officer or Magistrate fails to discharge that obligation, it would be breach of privilege of the House.

### **October, 1972**

1. The Conference unanimously agreed that while nominating the Chairman of the Public Accounts Committee, the convention of appointing the Chairman from the Opposition must be followed.

2. The Conference reiterated the following position in respect of Study Tours by Committee as contained in the Page Committee Report which was adopted at the 1968 Conference held in Trivandrum:

"60. The Committee noted with concern the growing tendency on the part of Parliament Committees either to hold their sittings outside the precincts of the Legislatures or to undertake tours. In some States, such Committees undertake tours even to other States. The Committee feel that in order to check this unhealthy practice, the following guidelines may be followed:

(1) A Parliamentary Committee, of a Legislature should hold its sittings only within the precincts of that Legislature;

(2) If it is absolutely necessary for the Committee to undertake tours, the Committee should approach the Speaker for permission indicating the specific reasons therefor;

(3) If the Speaker is satisfied that any tours are absolutely necessary, he may accord his permission. However, such permission should be accorded for the purpose of studying a specific thing and the Speaker may permit a sub-committee consisting of a few members of the Committee to undertake the study tour and give their report to the Committee;

(4) The Speaker should not permit the Committee to undertake tours outside the State."

### **June, 1976**

1. The consensus opinion of the Conference was that the procedure of issuing Ordinances should be confined to very very special measures of real urgency and the practice of consulting the House if one of the Houses was in session or calling the other House should be there and only when there were very special and practical difficulties and the Government could not wait even for a few hours or a few days, it was then and then only the resort to Ordinances could be invoked.

### **January, 1984**

1. The Conference unanimously agreed that there must be a discretionary

fund for Presiding Officers.

2. The Conference adopted the following Resolution

"This Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India held at Bombay on 2 and 3 January, 1984, having carefully considered all aspects regarding the powers, privileges and immunities of the Legislative Bodies in India as laid down in the Constitution, affirms that the Legislatures are supreme in their affairs in the conduct of the business of the House and their powers, privileges and immunities granted by the Constitution of India and no other authority shall have jurisdiction or power to interfere in that respect. The Conference further authorises the Chairman of the Conference to take such steps in the matter as he thinks fit to achieve the above objectives."

### **April, 1984**

1. The Conference adopted the following Resolution:

"The Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India, assembled in their Emergent Conference in New Delhi on 25 April, 1984, while reiterating the supremacy of the Legislature under the Constitution and faith in the independence of the Judiciary and the freedom of the Press, hereby unanimously resolve:

(a) that under article 105/194 of the Constitution, the Legislatures in India had, and were intended by the founders of the Constitution to have, exclusive jurisdiction to decide all matters relating to the privileges of the House, their members and Committees without any interference from the courts of law or any other authority;

(b) that rules framed under article 118/208 are not subject to scrutiny by any court of law and the provision regarding their being subject to constitutional provisions refers to only the provisions regarding Rules of Procedure enshrined in the Constitution and not to all other provisions;

(c) that mutual trust and respect must exist between the legislatures and courts each recognising the independence, dignity and jurisdiction of the other inasmuch as their roles are complementary to each other;

(d) that, if necessary, an amendment might be made in Constitution so as to place the position beyond all shadow of doubt; and

(e) that the Committee of the Presiding Officers appointed at their Conference in

Bombay in January, 1984 may continuously monitor further progress in the matter and from time to time make suitable recommendations to the Chairman of the Conference and finally to the Conference itself at its Calcutta meeting in October, 1984.

This Conference authorises the Chairman to take such other steps as he deems fit to achieve the above objectives."

### **October, 1984**

1. There was general agreement at the Conference on the desirability of considering the setting up of Budget Committees for in-depth scrutiny of Demands for Grants on an experimental basis.

### **October, 1985**

1. The Conference gave general support to strengthening of the Committee System, especially in respect of the pre-voting scrutiny of the Demands for Grants of Ministries.

2. There was a general consensus at the Conference that Ministers should not be Chairmen of the Committees on Privileges.

### **October, 1986**

1. There was an agreement at the Conference on the proposal for the computerised National Information Grid. The Chairman informed the Conference that the development work on an integrated parliamentary database with vast and upto-date information on Parliament, its activities, legislation, library, etc., was in progress at New Delhi under Parliament Library Information System. Members of Parliament and State Legislatures/ Researchers in any part of the country would be able to have access to this sea of information through a NICNET terminal. Similar systems could also be developed at State Legislatures and subsequently integrated with the Parliament Library Information System at New Delhi. When operational, this would serve as the National Grid on Parliament and State Legislatures information and might prove to be very useful to Parliamentarians, State Legislators and researchers.

### **September, 1987**

1. The Conference was of the view that while it was for each Legislature to frame its rules, it would be desirable to have, as far as possible, more or less uniform set of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in all the Legislatures

in the country. Where it was deemed necessary to make variations to suit local conditions, the Legislatures concerned could work out the details of the same and decide on the broad measures of uniformity. The Lok Sabha Rules of Procedure could be considered as a general mode of guidance.

### **January, 1989**

1. It was held that the question of undertaking Legislation on the subject on codification of privileges has engaged the attention of Presiding Officers of Parliament and State Legislatures in India since 1951. It has been an on-going subject since then. The dominant view has all along been that any codification is more likely to harm the prestige and sovereignty of Parliament and State Legislatures without any benefit being conferred on the members and that in the present circumstances, codification of parliamentary privileges is neither necessary nor desirable. The Conference agreed to maintain the same view.

### **September, 1989**

1. The Conference unanimously reiterated that State Legislature, like Parliament should have an Independent Secretariat and the Speaker or the Chairman of the Legislature should have similar powers to that of the Speaker and the Chairman of the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha, respectively. Constitutionally also the demand is genuine as the same is contemplated under articles 98 and 187 of the Constitution. The Conference decided to pursue the issue further and to send the consensus opinion on the matter to the Prime Minister of India and all the Chief Ministers.

### **February, 1992**

1. There was a consensus at the Conference that it was necessary to protect the dignity and the prestige of the Legislature and that of the Presiding Officers insofar as jurisdiction in the matter of Anti-Defection Law was concerned.

2. There was a consensus that the Presiding Officers should decide about matters pertaining to the Anti-Defection Law.

### **May, 1992**

1. The Conference had agreed that it would be better to have the Subject-based Committee System. Subject Committees should not only examine all that had already happened but also, to the extent possible, all that should happen. They could help the Ministries, to the extent possible, in formulating the plans and policies also.

2. The Conference adopted the following Resolution:

"This All India Conference of Presiding Officers held at Gandhinagar, Gujarat, resolves that the Secretariat of the State Legislature be independent of the Executive in all financial, administrative and functional aspects on the pattern of Lok Sabha/Rajya Sabha Secretariat as provided in the Constitution.

It is further resolved that until the Legislatures of the States may, by law, regulate the conditions of service of persons of the Secretarial Staff under article 187(2) of the Constitution of India, the conditions of service of the Secretarial Staff of the Legislatures should be framed under article 187(3) by following, in form and substance, the pattern of the Lok Sabha Secretariat Staff Rules framed under article 98(3)."

### **2 February, 1994**

1. This meeting of 59th Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India held in the Assembly Hall, Bhubaneswar on 2 February, 1994 resolves:

(i) that the Secretariat of every Legislature shall prepare a report on important developments taking place in the Legislature during the period between one Conference and another and send it to the Lok Sabha Secretariat six weeks before the next Conference; and

(ii) that the Lok Sabha Secretariat shall consolidate these reports, including the reports on important developments in Lok Sabha and Rajya Sabha, and publish them in a book form for circulation to all the Presiding Officers so as to make it available to them at least a week before the commencement of the Conference."

2. "This meeting of the 59th Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India held in the Assembly Hall, Bhubaneswar, on 2 February, 1994 recommends that all important debates in the State Legislatures such as the Address of the Governor and the presentation of the Budget, etc. may be telefilmed and televised."

### **10-11 October, 1996**

1. "It is a matter of grave concern that, of late, the business of the Legislative Bodies has tended to get seriously disrupted due to deterioration in the performance and conduct of the legislators and in some cases, inadequate response of the Governments concerned. Having discussed this problem, in 1992 at New Delhi, with leaders of parties and whips, the Conference had inter-alia resolved that the political parties should evolve a code of conduct for their

legislators and ensure its observance by them. Draft of a Code had also been prepared and circulated to legislatures for observance by all concerned. Nonetheless, the problem of orderly conduct of business of the Houses subsists. This is not conducive to the strengthening of democracy in the country. The root-cause of the problem is traceable to the manner of selection of candidates by political parties for being returned to the legislatures and the field environment from which the candidates hail. In this background, and considering that several positive developments have taken place of late, such as reduction of voting age from 21 to 18 years, establishment of the Panchayati Raj System, affirmative actions for empowerment of women, the political parties should take appropriate measures for the right choice of candidates, including with reference to their antecedents, their education and training so that when they gain entry into the Legislatures, their standard of performance and conduct would enhance the over-all performance of the Legislatures. The members, particularly the new ones, should be given orientation and training in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of the Legislatures and in parliamentary decorum.

2. Training in elements of parliamentary system should be imparted even at the school stage and the educational system from rather early levels should be oriented for the purpose.

3. Conduct of the legislators inside and outside the Houses has come to be considered as a matter of very serious concern by the people in general. This has very grave implications for the dignity of the Legislatures and the future of democracy. In this context, constitution of Ethics Committees by the Legislatures for ensuring basic standards of probity of the members should be examined with special reference to the establishment of such institutions by legislative bodies elsewhere in the world.

4. Ideally, the persons who are to occupy the office of the Presiding Officer of Legislatures should be such that they have aptitude for maintaining proprieties and orderly conduct of business; are reputed for their impartiality, tact and diplomacy, and understanding and sympathy; and are capable of infusing confidence in the members.

5. It is also a matter of serious concern that the periodicity as well as duration of sittings of several Legislatures are grossly inadequate. There should be more frequent and longer sittings, lest the members get frustrated in that they are not able to transact business on the problems of their constituencies. In this context, Legislatures should establish conventions rules or practice of enhancing the minimum number of sittings and stipulating the minimum duration of each of the sittings, largely following the model of the Parliament."

6. "It is noted that pursuant to the earlier Resolution of the Conference, the Subject-related Parliamentary Committee System has not yet become universal in all the Legislatures. Considering that the Committee system helps in enhancing the accountability of the Executive to the Legislatures through comprehensive Budget scrutiny, examination of performance of the Ministries/Departments, making Governments spending and performance more transparent, detailed scrutiny of legislative proposals and examination of policy initiatives of the Governments, it is desirable that the Committee System is made universal. Measures should also be taken for the removal of the inadequacies of the existing Committee System. In particular, Ministers should not be Chairmen of these Committees, as it would be inconsistent with control of the legislatures over the Executive; and implementation of the recommendations of the Committees should be improved and should be made time bound too."

7. "While the media has a very legitimate role to play in bringing about a healthy interface between the Legislatures and the people, it should come to play a more creative and productive role. It would need to get appropriately oriented such that excessive projection is not given to disruption of business in the Legislatures and media projection is balanced covering the positive side of business actually transacted as well.

8. Telecasting of the proceedings of the legislative bodies have implications for giving feedback to the people regarding their business transaction; it also has long-term implications for the orderliness of the conduct of business in these bodies. Therefore, Governments at the Centre and in the States should take such measures as are feasible for telecasting proceedings of the legislative bodies, live or pre-recorded, atleast selectively so as to cover important items of business. As telecasting has wide ranging implications in operational terms, a Committee of Presiding Officers headed by the Hon'ble Speaker, Lok Sabha, should examine all aspects of the matter and make a report, giving its considered recommendations.

### **Shimla, 21-23 October, 1997**

1. The Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India, having met in Conference at Simla on 21, 22 and 23 October, 1997 and deliberated on "Fifty Years of Parliamentary Democracy in India" and "Discipline and Decorum in the House" adopted the following Resolution: "The sub-continent size democracy of our country can be sustained amidst our diversities only through meaningful decentralised governance, and national unity and integrity protected and strengthened only by drawing energy from the grass-roots. For the purpose, our federalism should be reinforced by meaningful devolution of power to States and the Panchayati Raj System faithfully implemented in terms of the 73rd and 74th

Constitutional Amendments. Our parliamentary democracy is based on multi-party system. Proliferation of political parties has thrown up challenges to majoritarian Governments. Defections by members of Legislative Bodies elected on specific party candidatures are assuming new and alarming dimensions, apart from raising basic ethical issues and telling upon political stability. Experience with the Anti-defection Law has also projected several practical problems apart from its inadequacies. The entire issue of defections and the Tenth Schedule of the Constitution should be reviewed and reconsidered in detail in all their dimensions including in respect of imposing a legal ban on defections altogether. The Legislative Bodies in the various States may consider holding Special Sessions, as the Parliament has done, to deliberate on their democratic experience and on basic State and national issues in a non-partisan manner in commemoration of the golden jubilee of the country's Independence. They may further consider adopting Resolutions by consensus on the model of the Special Session of the Parliament. Considering that the surest way to ensure greater accountability of the Executive to the Legislature is to have meaningful scrutiny of the functioning of the Government, the State Legislative Bodies may have sittings for not less than sixty days in the case of smaller States and hundred days in the case of larger States in a year, sessions not being a mere formality of fulfilment of obligation under article 174(1) of the Constitution. The Standing and Subject-related Committee System may be activated and committee reports may also be discussed in detail by the Legislative Bodies in adequate number of sittings specially devoted for the purpose."

### **Delhi, 22-23 September, 1998**

1. The Sixty-second Conference of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies in India, having met at New Delhi on 22 and 23 September, 1998 and having deliberated on the Anti Defection Law and bringing about uniformity of procedures in the Legislative Bodies with special reference to time management observe that Whatever may be the law and its intricacies, it will not bring about any change in the political scenario in the country, unless the legislators desist from taking recourse to "number games" by paying any price for destabilising existing Governments and bringing into power new ones.

Having taken note of the above problems and some of the important/controversial decisions of Presiding Offices, including the latest one taken by the Hon'ble Speaker of Goa Legislative Assembly which is still under adjudication processes, the Conference recommends that the Speaker, Lok Sabha may constitute a Committee of a few Presiding Officers to comprehensively review the Anti-Defection Law, particularly in the context of the working paper circulated by

the Law Commission and present its report within six months."

2. The Conference unanimously adopted the following Resolution:

"That a fund be constituted by annual contributions from different States and the Centre at such rates as may be fixed by the Conference in consultation with the respective Legislatures and the required expenses for the annual conference and the cost of administration of the activities of the Forum shall be wholly met out of that fund."

### **Hyderabad, 29<sup>th</sup> May, 2000**

1. Tenth Schedule, Article 102(2) and 191(2) – Provisions as to Disqualification on the ground of Defection
2. Can Sub-Judice matters be discussed in the House?
3. Is there any necessity to fix up a limit for asking supplementary Questions?
4. How to regulate the so-called Zero hour?
5. Can the administrative report of the Government be laid in the House before its release?
6. Is there any scope of the Committee on Papers Laid on the Table to examine any paper/report of any Undertakings or any other statutory authority which are not laid on the Table of the House for strict observance of statutory requirement?
7. Status of Special Motions, Censure Motions or any other Motions not specified in the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in any State Legislature

### **Chandigarh, 27<sup>th</sup> June, 2001**

1. Can quorum of a House as specified in Article 189(3) of the Constitution be altered by Rules of the House?
2. Can quorum of a House as specified in Article 189(3) of the Constitution

be altered by Rules of the House?

3. Can an item of business, which has the effect of eliciting decision of the house be included in the agenda without sufficient advance intimation?
4. Whether the new Government assuming office after General Elections to the Assembly is competent to seek Grants in advance again viz., Vote on Account for a second time in the same year instead of Revised Estimates notwithstanding the 'Vote on Account' already obtained by the outgoing Government for a specific period?
5. What happens when the person presiding the House does not cast his vote in case of a tie?
6. Should not the Rules of Procedure of the House specify the time limits by which the Governor and the President shall signify their assent to a bill presented to them?
7. Parliamentary privileges-Guidelines for implementation
8. What is the remedy against non-implementation of an assurance given by Minister of the floor of the House?
9. The Scope of Discussion in Legislature on the State of Affairs in Judiciary

### **Bangalore, 19<sup>th</sup> June, 2002**

1. Provision in the Rules for automatic suspension of member for coming into the well of the House and obstructing its business
2. If the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business of a State Legislature stipulating a prescribed number of sitting days of the Assembly is binding on the Government or not?
3. Should not statement explaining reasons for promulgating an ordinance be laid at the time of laying of the ordinance on the Table instead of laying at the time of introduction of bill seeking to replace the Ordinance?
4. Does a Bill involving expenditure from the Consolidated Fund, after introduction, require recommendation of the President/Governor for being referred to a Select Committee?

5. Whether adoption of a Motion by the House is necessary for adjourning the House sine-die?
6. Whether a Member suspended from the House can exercise his right to vote as Legislator in elections to statutory bodies?
7. Should the facilities available to the Speaker remain suspended during the Conduct of general elections to the Parliament and the State Legislatures? If yes, to what extent and what procedure should be adopted for suspending such facilities?
8. Status of the Secretary of the State Legislatures

### **MUMBAI, 3<sup>rd</sup> February, 2003**

1. Whether the discussion and voting on the motion for disapproval of ordinance gets precedence over the motion for introduction of the bill seeking replacement of ordinance?
2. The power of Legislature Committees to send for persons, etc for evidence. with specific reference to the Public Service Commissions
3. Need to preserve Independence of Legislatures' Secretariat by giving them Financial Autonomy
4. Desirability of not including the Audit Paras pertaining to the State Legislature Secretariat in the C & A.G.'s Report

### **KOLKATA, 8<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER, 2004**

1. Admissibility of the notice for the removal of Speaker/Deputy Speaker under Article 179 (c) during the inter-session period
2. Whether the rule relating to the allotment of time for the general discussion on the Budget need be relaxed in order to adopt a Motion or Resolution
3. Should the Speaker be assisted by a Committee while taking decision under Anti-Defection Law which is against the Legislative intent of Parliament?
4. Whether the matters relating to "enforcement of attendance of persons for giving evidence or producing documents before Committees" come within the ambit of the powers, privileges and immunities of a House?

5. Setting up of the Committee on Ethics in Parliament and in the State Legislatures
6. Extension of time limit for presentation of the report of the select Committee
7. Whether a member of Assembly/Council who has been declared absconder by any Court in connection with any criminal case is liable to be suspended from the membership of Assembly/Council till he appears before the said Court. And in case he is also absenting from Assembly or Council simultaneously would he be entitled to get pay and allowance for the period of absence?
8. Can a privilege proceeding be initiated against a Judge of an High Court for summoning a Cabinet Minister in a contempt proceeding pending for non-compliance of its previous order?

#### **NEW DELHI, 31<sup>ST</sup> JULY, 2005**

Need for parity in Salary, Allowances, Perks and Terms and Conditions of Service of Secretarial Staff of State Legislatures with State Government / Parliament Secretariat.

#### **RAIPUR THE 14<sup>TH</sup> NOVEMBER, 2005**

1. The Pros & Cons of the Right to Information Act, 2005 with respect to the Power and Functions of the Speaker and Privileges of the State Legislature.
2. Can members of the Legislature give notices of questions / amendments to bills on-line and if so, what are the governing principles under which such a facility can be allowed?
3. What will be the fate of unfinished work of the Committees after dissolution of the Assembly?
4. Is a member of the Assembly / Council who has been declared absconder by any Court in connection with any criminal case liable to be suspended from the membership of the Assembly / Council till he appears before the said Court?
5. Is a member of Assembly or Council, against whom a criminal case is pending, and who is evading his arrest or appearance in Court and a proclamation has been issued against him and, simultaneously, who is absenting from Assembly or Council, as the case may be, entitled to get pay and allowances for the period of his absence from the respective house?
6. Need for uniform guidelines for formation of Independent Legislature

Secretariats and review of the question of upgradation of the post of Secretary in the State Legislatures.

**THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, 24<sup>th</sup> MAY, 2007**

1. Neither the Tenth Schedule to the Constitution and the Rules thereunder nor any other provisions under the Rules of Procedure in Lok Sabha contain any provisions to deal with the cases of leadership disputes in Legislature Parties. As per the opinion of the Attorney General of India (Shri K. Parasaran) in 1989, in such cases the voice of the majority prevails. In the event of a tie on the issue of leadership in a legislature party, what should be the appropriate course of action for the Presiding Officer to decide such cases?
2. What if a member of State Legislature elected to the Lok Sabha and not yet resigned from State Assembly, votes in the Lok Sabha and *vice-versa*? Is there any constitutional bar for such practice?
3. Desirability of giving effect to Articles 98(2) for Parliament and 187(2) for State Legislatures, related to legislation on the regulation of recruitment and conditions of service of persons appointed to the Secretariat staff of the Houses
4. Procedure for raising matters of urgent public importance for immediate discussion in the House
5. What is the position with regard to the laying of written speeches of Ministers/Members on the Table of the House, particularly when the speeches are supposed to be made on the floor of the House in order to be included in the debates ?
6. Need to evolve certain guidelines for implementation of Right to Information Act.
7. Whether a citizen can be given information relating to proceedings of the House before their Publication? Similarly, if a matter pending before a Parliamentary Committee lapses due to dissolution of the House without the Report of the Committee being presented to the House or the Speaker, can the proceedings of the Committee (evidence and deliberations) be made available to a citizen under the Right to Information Act ?
8. Right to Information regime *vis-à-vis* Privileges of Legislatures, with special reference to furnishing information relating to administrative matters /

parliamentary functioning, events, day to day activities, etc.

**CHANDIGARH (HARYANA V.S.),  
20<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER, 2008**

1. When will Speakers resume party affiliation after shedding it under para 5 of the Tenth Schedule?
2. In view of the Supreme Court judgment in Rajender Singh Rana Vs. Swami Prasad Maurya delivered on 14.2.07, should not the Speakers and Chairman have powers to pass interim orders to the effect that votes cast by Legislators in violation of whip, be not counted in the result, pending adjudication of such violations on petitions for disqualification?
3. Are Chairmen and Speakers of Upper and Lower Houses of Legislatures empowered to administer oath to Members?
4. Can Oath Taking function be deemed as sitting of the House?
5. When every vote in the Legislatures is routinely bound by whip, should not the Presiding Officers record votes on all motions to check for violations of anti-defection law and abolish "voice vote" from Parliamentary procedure?
6. Notifications and Reports issued by the State Government are laid in the Houses of Parliament when under President's Rule. Whether such notifications and reports can be examined by the new Legislative Committees of the State Legislatures, when appointed?
7. Need to evolve guidelines for implementation of the Right to Information Act.
8. Should Whip be necessarily a Legislator?
9. Is it not conducive for better Parliamentary functioning if notices by fax and e-mail are also allowed?

**SUPPLIMENTARY AGENDA:**

10. Should a petition filed under para 2(1)(b) of the Tenth Schedule of the Constitution contain the averment that the Party has not condoned the voting or abstention contrary to its directions ? In the absence of such an averment can the petition be rejected?

## **BHOPAL, 2<sup>ND</sup> FEBRUARY, 2010**

1. Confidence Vote after the general elections to prove majority: should the address by the President/Governor precede or succeed it?
2. Resignation of Members *en-mass* and the implications thereof
3. Making the Question Hour more Efficient and Effective
4. Declining participation & presence of Members in debates on Bills and sittings of the House
5. Legislatures and the model Code of Conduct of the Election Commission
6. Financial autonomy of Parliament and Legislature Secretariats
7. Confidentiality of Evidence tendered before a Parliamentary Committee *vis-à-vis* disclosures under the RTI Act, 2005
8. Conflict of interests of Members of Committees need to have a fair and reasonable approach

### **SRINAGAR, 19<sup>TH</sup> JUNE, 2010**

1. Resignation by Member from State Assembly on election to Parliament – Implication of non-acceptance of resignation by the Speaker
2. 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 Parliamentary/Legislative Committee even after his expulsion?
3. Conflict of interests of Members of Committees need to have a fair and reasonable approach
4. 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
5. Legislative Bodies vis-a-vis the RTI
6. Violation of Members' Protocol – Need to evolve a procedure

### **SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA:**

7. 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"

### **JAIPUR, 20<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER, 2011**

1. Disclosure of information from 'Register of Members' Interest' under the RTI Act, 2005.
2. Decisions taken by the Presiding Officers in the Discharge of his Constitutional and Legislative functions – Disclosure of reasons under Right to Information Act.
3. Procedure for Election of Speaker when the Deputy Speaker/Minister is a candidate.
4. Whether State Legislature can withdraw a Bill which has been reserved by the Governor for the consideration of the President?
5. Procedure for presentation of Committee reports when the Chairman is not in

agreement with the majority of Members.

6. The consequences of suspension of members by passing the resolution by the House.
7. Whether the Financial Memorandum is required to each and every financial Bill even if it does not involve imposition, abolition, alteration and remission of any Tax?
8. If the principal Act is published after obtaining the Assent of the President, is it necessary to obtain Assent of President for amending the principal Act?
9. Autonomy of Legislature Secretariat in respect of creating new post, recruitment of staff, administration and financial matters.
10. Desirability of periodical interchange of services of the Officers and staff of Rajya Sabha, Lok Sabha and State Legislature Secretariats?
11. Enhancing the Minimum Educational Qualifications for Members of the Municipal Education Board under the Bombay Primary Education Act, 1947.
12. Not maintaining the dignity and respect of the Members in Public and Government functions

### **JAIPUR, 20<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER, 2011**

1. The Need for a broad based Questions Procedure.
2. Question of Privilege
3. Whether ratification of a Constitution Amendment Bill under Article 368 by State Legislatures may include a proposal for amendments also?
4. Prioritization of Notices to be done by ballots / lots or should be left to the discretion of the Speaker
5. Legislature and Information Technology
6. Discussions of the Secretaries' Conference – Follow up mechanism

## **Lucknow, 30<sup>th</sup> January, 2015**

1. The need for a broad based Questions Procedure.
2. Question of Privilege
3. Whether ratification of a Constitution Amendment Bill under Article 368 by State Legislatures may include a proposal for amendments also?
4. Prioritization of Notices to be done by ballots / lots or should be left to the discretion of the Speaker
5. Legislature and Information Technology
6. Discussions of the Secretaries' Conference – Follow up mechanism

## **Gandhinagar, 21<sup>st</sup> January, 2016**

1. Communicating Legislatures to People: Initiatives and Challenges.
2. How to make the Members Information Service more effective, including providing Research Support to the Committees of the Legislature for the Efficacy of their Investigatory Role.
3. Changing Dimensions of Legislative Libraries: Imperative of Digitisation of Legislative Debates and other Relevant Documents.
4. Audio and Video recording of the Debates of the House and their legal validity.
5. Right of the Governor to address the House.
6. (i) Prioritization of notices to be done by ballots / lots or should be left to the discretion of the Speaker.  
  
(ii) Procedure followed for determination of inter-se priority when a number of notices of No-Confidence Motion are received for the same sitting.
7. (a) How to reckon the period of six weeks in case of an Ordinance laid before the bicameral State Legislatures?.

(b) If an Ordinance is not laid before both the Houses on the same day of re-assembly of the bicameral State Legislature and an Ordinance is laid before one House and the Ordinance conversion Bill is introduced and passed by that House before laying such Ordinance in the other House, what will be the consequences?

8. Whether the Government can seek Supplementary or Additional Demands for Grants before passing of the Appropriation Bill for the Financial Year.

9. Need to simplify and redefine the Rules of Procedure after the experience of sixty five years of Parliamentary Democracy in India.

10. Committee System: Key Instrument of ensuring Executive Accountability to the Legislature.

### **Dehradun, 17<sup>th</sup> December, 2019**

1. Need to review the Procedure for expunction in the Legislatures
2. Legislature – Opening new windows for reaching masses

### **Kevadiya, Gujarat, 25-26 November, 2020**

1. Harmonious Coordination between Legislature, Executive and Judiciary – Key to a Vibrant Democracy

\*\*\*\*\*

## **CONFERENCES OF PRESIDING OFFICERS**

### **SUBJECTS DISCUSSED SINCE 1985**

#### **Lucknow, 26-27 October, 1985**

1. The desirability of framing uniform rules by the Presiding Officers of State Legislatures under paragraph 8 of the Tenth Schedule on the lines of the rules framed by the Speaker, Lok Sabha
2. Consideration and adoption of Report of the Committee of Presiding Officers on "Committee System"
3. How long a member duly elected to the Assembly and notified as such by the Election Commission under section 73 of the Representation of People Act, 1951, can continue without making and subscribing an Oath or Affirmation under article 188 of the Constitution?
4. Whether a Minister should be appointed as Chairman of the Committee of Privileges?
1. Should the Speaker have the power not only to name a member who disregards the authority of the Chair or abuses the rules of the House by persistently and willfully obstructing the business thereof, but also to suspend him from the service of the House for a specified period?

#### **DELHI, 21-22 October, 1986**

1. Can there be notice of a resolution for removal of *pro tem* Presiding Officer of a Legislative Body?
2. Effect of Act on expulsion of a member from the party on whose ticket he was elected
3. Desirability of developing an integrated computerised National Information Grid to cater to Legislators' references
4. Financial accountability of government aided autonomous organisations to Parliament
2. Desirability of uniform salary, allowances and other amenities to Presiding Officers of Legislatures of States and Union Territories and M.L.As

### **SRINAGAR, 16-17 September, 1987**

1. Under what circumstances a motion rescinding a decision of the House on question, as contemplated in the May's Parliamentary Practice, can be entertained?
2. Whether Committee of the House, while on tour for on-the-spot study of a subject should enjoy the privileges contemplated under Article 194 of the Constitution and if not, how any obstruction offered while discharging its responsibilities can be dealt with?
3. Whether non compliance of whip issued by a party to its members to file nomination papers for specified financial committee attract the provisions of the Constitution (fifty second amendment) Act, 1985 and can a Member disqualified for this Act
4. Consideration and adoption of Report of Committee of Presiding Officers on "Need for a uniform set of Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in all Legislatures in the country"
5. Proposal for the formation of an All India Parliamentary Service
6. Uniformity of Control of MLAs Hostels

### **DISPUR, 20-21 JANUARY, 1989**

1. Consideration and adoption of the Report of the Committee of Presiding Officers on "All India Presiding Officers Forum"
2. Whether Parliamentary Questions should be allowed regarding the working of Public Undertakings, in order to make their functioning more effective?
3. What option is there for a Presiding Officer when a motion for suspension of a Member is not moved in spite of the fact that he has been named by the Chair for such defiance?
4. Necessity to codify the privileges granted under article 105 and 194 of the Constitution
5. If a Member of a legislature resigns his seat by writing under his hand addressed to the Presiding Officer and his thereupon is declared vacant by an order:
  - (a) can such an Order be questioned in a Court of Law, and

- (b) if a Court entertains an application questioning such order and issues notice to the Presiding Officer, what course of action should the Presiding Officer take?
6. Uniform procedure for recognition and providing facilities to Leader of Opposition Group/Party
  7. Independence of Legislature Secretariats as contemplated in Article 187 of the Constitution of India

**BHOPAL, 20-21 SEPTEMBER, 1989**

1. The necessity of codifying the immunities and privileges of the Members of the Parliament and State Legislatures with reference to the notice issued by the Supreme Court to the Speaker, Andhra Pradesh Legislative Assembly
2. The propriety of deciding the question of majority outside the House
3. Duties and functions of legislators : Need to evolve a code of conduct and laying down guidelines
4. Autonomy of Legislature Secretariat in respect of creating new posts, recruitment of staff, administration and financial matters
5. Situation arising out of shrinking days of the sessions of Legislatures in India.
6. Constitutional position and status of the Deputy Speaker / Deputy Chairman of the Legislature
7. Consideration and adoption of the Report of Committee of Presiding Officers on "All India Presiding Officers Forum" (Part-I)

***New Delhi, 11 February, 1992 (Emergency Conference)***

1. Anti Defection Law
2. Relations between the Legislature and the Judiciary

### **GANDHINAGAR, 29-30 May, 1992**

1. Disorder and disturbances in the House at the time of Address by the President / Governors and measures to curb them
2. Relationship between Legislature and Judiciary
3. Committee System
4. Need to establish an institution to impart training in Parliamentary Practice and Procedure to the staff of Legislature Secretariat and the newly elected Members of Legislatures
5. Invoking of Anti-defection Law
6. Accountability and stability of Government
7. Independence of Legislature Secretariats

All India Conference of Presiding Officers, Leaders of Parties and Whips on Discipline and Decorum in Parliament and State Legislatures,

**New Delhi, 23-24 September, 1992**

### **MADRAS, 25-26 June, 1993**

1. Need to lay down constitutional limit for minimum number of sittings of Legislatures and minimum number of sessions
2. The Need for a unanimous recommendation to the Government for making in built provisions in the law for exempting the Presiding Officers from appearance in the Courts
3. Shakhder Committee Report on inadequate response of the State Governments to the Audit Reports constituted by the C & AG

### **BHUBANESWAR, 1-2 February, 1994**

1. Steps to make Parliamentary System more effective?
2. Decorum in the House
3. Consideration and adoption of the Report of the Committee of Presiding Officers on "Measures to promote harmonious relations between the Legislature and Judiciary"

### **NEW DELHI, 10-11 October, 1996**

1. Need to create an atmosphere and functioning of present day legislatures conducive to the growth of democracy and to check the deterioration in the performance and behaviour of our legislators inside the House
2. Role and introduction of the Committee System in the Legislatures for Parliamentary Surveillance over Executive
3. Relationship between the Legislature and the Press
4. Telecasting of the proceedings of the House

### **SHIMLA, 21-22 October, 1997**

1. 50 years of Parliamentary Democracy in India
2. Discipline and Decorum in the House

### **NEW DELHI, 22-24 September, 1998**

1. Need to review the Tenth Schedule of the Constitution
2. Need for Procedural Reforms and better Management of the Time of the House

### **Hyderabad, 30-31 May, 2000**

1. Issues arising out of the so-called Dual Membership of Parliament – and / or State Legislatures
2. Relationship between the Legislature, the Executive and the Judiciary
3. Office of the Speaker in Multi-Party System
4. Proposal regarding future pattern of Presiding Officers' Conference

### **Chandigarh, 28-29 June, 2001**

1. Need to evolve a Code of Conduct for Legislators and steps to contain frequent adjournment of the Legislatures on account of interruptions / disturbances
2. Harnessing information and communication technologies in the Legislatures and need for strengthening of the Libraries *inter alia* with computer connectivity

3. Consideration and adoption of the Report of the Committee of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies on "Procedural Uniformity and Better Management of the Time of the House"

All India Conference of Presiding Officers, Chief Ministers, Ministers of Parliamentary Affairs, Leaders and Whips of Parties on "Discipline and Decorum in Parliament and State Legislatures"

**New Delhi, 25 November, 2001**

**Bangalore, 20-21 June, 2002**

1. Role of Legislatures in strengthening accountability and need for independent Secretariat for Legislatures
2. Electoral Reforms

**Mumbai, 4-5 February, 2003**

1. Changing dimensions of Zero Hour – How to make it more productive?
2. Parliamentary Privileges and the publication of proceedings of the Legislatures by the Media
3. Consideration and adoption of the Report of the Committee of Presiding Officers of Legislative Bodies to review the Anti – Defection Law

**Kolkata, 9-10 October, 2004**

1. Legislative Privileges and Freedom of Press
2. Consideration and adoption of the Report of the Committee of Presiding Officers on "Regulation of Zero Hour"
1. Consideration of suggestions received on the Report of the Committee of Presiding Officers to review the Anti-Defection Law
4. Consideration and adoption of the Report of the Committee of Presiding Officers on "Telecasting of Proceedings of the Legislatures"

### **New Delhi, 20 March, 2005 (Emergency Conference)**

Relationship between the Legislature and the Judiciary

### **New Delhi, 30 July, 2005**

1. Enhancing the accountability of the Executive to the Legislature by strengthening the Committee System and ensuring implementation of Government assurances
2. Computerization of State / UT Legislatures under National E-Governance Plan and establishing e-connectivity between Parliament and State Legislatures.

### **Raipur, November, 2005**

1. Poverty Alleviation – How the Parliament and Civil Society can work in Tandem?
2. The Legislature and the Media – Roles and Responsibilities

### **New Delhi, 4 February, 2006 (Emergency Conference)**

Issues arising out of and related to proceedings initiated in the Courts of Law challenging the Expulsion of Members of Lok Sabha on 23 December, 2006

### **Thiruvananthapuram, 25-26 May, 2007**

1. Indiscipline including disregard of Presiding Officers, disturbances, disruptions and other serious acts of misconduct in Legislatures – Future strategies to improve the situation
2. Relationship between the Legislature and the Judiciary

### **Haryana Vidhan Sabha, Chandigarh, 21-22 September, 2008**

1. Need to evolve procedural devices and frame rules to control unruly behaviour of the Members, their entry in the well of the House, obstruction in the business of the House and ensure improved time management
2. Need to strengthen public faith in Democratic Institutions
3. Terrorism – a threat to National Unity – Role of Legislatures

***SUPPLEMENTARY AGENDA:***

4. Presentation, consideration and adoption of the Committee of Presiding Officers to go into different aspects of the Future Pattern including Funding of the Presiding Officers' Conference

**Bhopal, 3-4 February, 2010**

1. Self-assessment by Legislatures for Enhancing its Relevance
2. Creation of Smaller States – A National Perspective
3. The Role of Speaker in the Administration of Legislature

**Srinagar, 20-21 June, 2010**

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

**Jaipur, 22-23 September, 2011**

1. Determination of maximum period of Assents to Bills passed by the Legislature
2. The Role of the Legislature in Scrutinizing and Making Laws for Good Governance
3. Era of Coalition Government – Its Compulsions and Challenges

**Supplementary Agenda:**

4. Presentation, consideration and adoption of Report of the Committee of Presiding Officers on Ensuring Accountability of the Executive to the Legislature.

**Lucknow, 31 January-1 February, 2015**

1. Role of Parliaments in Development
2. Paperless Parliaments
3. Presentation, consideration and adoption of Report of the Follow up Sub-Committee of the Standing Committee of All India Presiding Officers' Conference

**Gandhinagar, 21-30 January, 2016**

1. Changing Public Perception of Legislatures: The Role of Legislators in strengthening public faith in democratic institutions and the relevance of the Speaker's Research Initiative in supporting the Legislators.
2. Measures to be taken for ensuring attendance of the members during the sittings of the House, and for improving the quality of the debate and the need to ensure minimum 60 days sittings of the House in a year in State Legislatures.

**Dehradun, 17-21 December, 2019**

1. Strengthening Parliamentary Democracy and Capacity Building through in house devices including Zero Hour
2. Tenth Schedule of the Constitution and the Role of Speaker

**Kevadiya, Gujarat, 25-26 November, 2020**

1. Harmonious Coordination between Legislature, Executive and Judiciary – Key to a Vibrant Democracy

\*\*\*\*\*