INTRODUCTION

At the theoretical plane the parliamentary system can be designated as the legislature dominant system. It is the system in which the legislature acts as a link between the government and the electorate. The canons of this governmental system seek to ensure the immediate responsibility of the real executive to popular will. The executive is actually a committee of the legislature only. But, paradoxically enough the legislative and executive branches of government are found unified and co-ordinated in the hands of the same person - the Prime Minister.

The genes of the system lay embedded in British tradition. Etymologically, the term 'parliament' takes its root from the French word, 'parler', meaning 'to talk'. Right at par with the etymological connotation, its origin "... lies in the need of the crown to discuss issues with the leading men of the country". The British constitution is neither the product of an intellectual exercise nor the brainchild of constitutional experts. It is the result of an evolution, slow and steady, stretching over a long period of time. Despite systemic strains and stresses, it is still successful in Britain and elsewhere implemented.

At the face of the system is writ large executive dualism leading to the distinction between real and nominal executives. The status of the head of the state is 'titular' only and his powers dejure in nature. Though
classical parliamentarism propounded its goodness in the separation of legislative and executive branches, practically it led to convergence of the two. Thus, legislative and executive branches are found fused. Both in origin and operation, the cabinet functions as a team. What binds it together is political homogeneity. Members of the cabinet belong to the same party. Unanimity in decisions, maintenance of cabinet secrecy and viability of collective responsibility depend upon this. To ensure a free and fair discussion in the cabinet, there should be secrecy in cabinet meetings. Secrecy keeps team spirit and helps to maintain unanimity and harmony.

What strikes one's mind in the context of parliamentary system, however, is the principle of collective responsibility. With organised political parties, "... the cabinet came to be drawn from the leaders of one party and the party and its leaders in the cabinet spoke with one voice". It simply means joint responsibility of ministers to parliament. A minister who is not prepared to defend a cabinet decision should resign. If he doesn't resign, he is responsible. Likewise, the government needs express parliamentary support for its policies, programmes and expenditure in general. If and when the parliament clearly shows that it cannot support the government, it must resign.

If the cabinet is the corner stone of the West Minister System, the prime minister is its core. So formidable is his position in all countries that the system has come to be labelled as prime ministerial. He is appointed by the head of the state. But in the wake of rigidly and
nationally organised political parties, there is practically little scope for the exercise of discretion in appointment. It is well settled in England that the prime minister should belong to the lower House. There were no peer prime ministers since Lord Salisbury.

The prime minister is central to the formation of the cabinet; central to its existence and central to its death. He holds his team together at the instance of frequent shuffles and also by distributing patronage. He is the chairman of his cabinet. Therefore, he ensures smooth administration: steady and flawless co-ordination and direct the administration towards the final goal. Again, it is he who accords solidarity to the cabinet. All these are made possible by his position in the party.

He prevents dual headship in the system from becoming pucca compartmentalism by acting as the channel of communication. Of course, individual ministers have a right of access to the head of the state. But on all important matters, particularly on matters of policy, he is the proper channel.

Practically, the prime minister is the leader of the party both within and outside the parliament. The party is led to the victory stand by his talent, skill and charisma. Therefore, neither the party nor its followers would like to dispense with him.
Political parties are the life blood of parliamentary government. It is the party that founds the government; runs it and sustains it. They are the carriers of public opinion and framers of public policies. Though a historical accident, Britain is fortunate to have a two party system. English parties are above narrow considerations and truly democratically oriented. They “… have really a great patriotism: they can rarely be persuaded even by their passions or their interest to do anything contrary to the real interest of England…”

The ripples of the English constitutional evolution got crystallised in the constitutional documents of many a countries including India. While this evolution brought in structural changes in democratic order the world over, their colonisation changed the habits and temperament of the colonial people in such way as to sustain the system itself.

Statement of the Problem

Functionally, the parliamentary system presupposes people’s participation in law making. People are thus the actual sovereigns. Qualitatively, a system of that type accords to citizens rights and liberties: ensures justice, social, economic and political.

The inherent fusion between the executive and legislative branches of government in the system is so much so that initiative and leadership are always found emerged from the executive. Thus, policies are virtually made by the executive and authentication by the legislature is subsequently obtained. This inherent executive leadership is further enhanced in the wake of rigid party organisation and the advent of welfare concept.
Today in all parliamentary countries, political parties are rigidly organised. Naturally, there is concentration of power in the hands of the leaders. Even the electoral battle is centred around the leader. It is the skill and charisma of the leader that makes the party to win at the polls. Moreover, whip is a major potential weapon at the hands of the party leadership. In effect, this power configuration equips the executive to lead the legislature.

There is growth of government in the aftermath of welfare state. States are now called upon to perform multifarious functions, mainly administrative and bureaucratic in nature. “The demands of political, social and economic justice make the state the planner, regulator and divider of the national product all at the same time. The upshot is an expansion in the bureaucratic machinery with all its attendant evils.

If the real masters are to enjoy their rights and liberties, if social, economic and political justice is to thrive, there should be a balance between the roles of the legislative and executive branches of government. In the wake of increasing executive ascendancy, this balance will be gone to the utter detriment of democracy itself. For a smooth, speedier and efficient administration, the executive should be allowed to take the lead. At the same time, it should be made accountable to the will of the people. This is true in the context of both national and international environments.
In the modern context, the systemic environment is such that the executive takes the floor everywhere. Multiplicity of functions, complexity of modern administration and lack of time on the legislature’s part caused the pendulum to move in favour of the executive. The result is the emergence of an all powerful executive: an aggravation of what has already existed. It is to check this preponderant executive that the legislature committee system is envisaged in the parliamentary system. For the most part, their role is to check the executive: for the best part, their duty is to make the executive accountable to the legislature. In the light of the factual situation, a detailed enquiry is found relevant. So, an elaborate study on the role and performance of the legislature committees in Kerala is felt imperative.

The study mainly concentrates on the working of legislature committees in Kerala. The choice is drawn and limited to Kerala because she is a role model in India. Kerala is the highly politicised state in India where many experiments in the art of democracy were pioneered. In 1957, she became the first Indian state to elect a communist government. Her record happened to be unchallenged till 1977 by any other state. Internationally, Kerala stands second; next to the Republic of San Marino in the same matter. Travancore, a geographical component of Kerala was the first to introduce a legislative council in the history of any Indian state. Again, we have parties based upon ideologies. But no party is above caste and communal forces. It is also the state where subject committees were, for the first time, brought into existence. It is a
class in itself, so far unknown to any other Indian state or the union. The most perplexing thing with the subject committees is that while they remain as legislature committees, they enlist the minister concerned as its ex-officio member. Thus on many accounts, the state is unique. So naturally, it is interesting to study about the legislature committees of such a state.

**Background of the Problem**

The present day executive in a parliamentary system possesses very lethal powers. There is 100 percent increase in executive functions compared to its counterparts in the early periods of the last century. Moreover, due to rigid party organisations inherent in the transformative parliamentary model, "...the expectation that the executive would be dependent on and responsible to the majority in the parliamentary set up was belied...". Further, no confidence is no more powerful. An arrogant executive may even call for the dissolution of the House at the instance of a no-confidence motion. Thus, extended magnitude of work, ill-fate of no confidence, rigid party discipline, limited floor time and complexities of modern administration altogether put the legislature in a vicious circle. The existing methods of legislative control like questions, discussions, debates and the like are found inefficient. Unless some strict control and vigil is exercised over the executive, the entire democratic edifice shall collapse. Therefore, the only way out is to equip the legislature committees.
But, the extent of check and control exercised by the legislature committees at present in Kerala is felt to be not enough. Therefore, in what way their competency can be improved without undermining the sovereignty of parliament is the point of inquiry. Moreover, the question of privilege, a formidable legislative tool, to enforce its will and keep its dignity often creates problems detrimental to the very spirit of democracy. What is required for the upkeep of a true democratic process is openness in government. There is a "... growing conviction that open government depended largely on the work of committees. Thus, legislative committees are a universal phenomenon.

The birth and growth of open governmental institutions in India in general, and Kerala in particular, lay embedded in history. The role of the British in providing India with the parliamentary system and in guiding the native states to self government—both through the system of education and divide and rule policy—is a historical fact. Therefore, at the instance of systemic resemblance, a look at the institutions of West Minister is necessary.

The parliament is seen as the major open governmental institution in Britain. An observable pertinent feature that stems right from the outset of evolution is that "... the king has never in theory acted in matters of state without the counsel and consent of a body of advisers." Thus, the 'Witan', the earliest of the king’s advisory council, later got changed in name as the 'Commune Concilium'. However, the need for a permanent consultative body got materialised in the 'Curia Regis' which
was drawn out of the same body. The 'Curia Regis' was succeeded by the Privy Council. But when it was expanded in size and powers, Charles II selected an inner circle of privy councillors known as 'CABAL' to advise him. This practice later led to the cabinet system.

However, in 18th century too kings and powerful aristocrats dominated the parliament, despite attempts at legitimation of its authority. The centre of gravity, however, shifted in favour of the House of Commons during the 19th century and the contemporary model of rule making by cabinet and the House of Commons appeared. But further problems crept in. As an operational hazard, there arose an all powerful executive. Therefore, the parliament shifted its attention from rule making to overseeing administration through its own committees.

Committee system like most things British is also "... a gradual evolution based on the lessons of practical experience...". However, in its present form it came into being only in 1882. To assist the British House of Commons, there are five types of committees:

(a) The Committee of the Whole House

Basically, it is a peculiar British constitutional innovation. The House gets itself transformed into this committee by relaxing rules of procedure. Finance, legislation and serious constitutional matters are dealt with by this committee.
(b) **Standing Committee on Public Bills**

The Commons has eight 'standing committees, each one identifiable by the letter of the alphabet. However, the Scottish Committee and Welsh Committee are known after the subject matter.

(c) **Select Committee on Public Bills**

They are temporarily created to study and report on a bill either under contemplation or pending consideration.

(d) **Sessional Committee on Public Bills**

Committee of this type are created to meet the requirements of a session\(^{17}\). On an average about 8 to 10 committees are appointed during a single session.

(e) **Committee on Private Bills**

It deals with private member's bills. Upon induction, a member is to make a declaration that he is not at all interested in the subject matter of the bill.

The Indian scenario do not make much difference with the British system. We have a parliamentary system of government at the two levels. The system seeks to make the executive accountable to the legislature through the mechanism of legislature committees. The major components in the control mechanism at the two levels involve standing committees as well as adhoc committees.
Universe of Study

The study concentrates on committees of the Kerala Legislative Assembly. Practically, for want of time and presence of multitude of committees, it is difficult to deal with them all. Therefore, the attempt made is to analyse the working of legislature committees on a representative basis.

For sake of convenience, firstly all finance committees are treated as a single unit and Public Accounts Committee is taken and analysed as the role model of the finance committees of the Kerala Legislature. The remaining committees are categorised as Committees of Scrutiny, Enquiry and Advisory. Both the Committee on Government Assurances and the Committee on Subordinate Legislation are dealt with as the representatives of the Committees on scrutiny; the Committee on Privileges and Ethics is chosen as the role model of Enquiry Committees and the Committee on Environment is picked up as a functional model of the Committees of advisory nature.

Major Objectives

1. To trace out the factors and circumstances leading to executive domination in a parliamentary system.

2. To know the extent to which the Committees are helpful in checking executive domination in Kerala.
3. To study how the working of committees help the legislature to function effectively.

4. To understand the operation and functioning of committees in Kerala, and

5. To evaluate the performance of legislature committees in Kerala with special reference to the Public Accounts Committee, the Committee on Government Assurances, the Committee on Subordinate Legislation, the Committee of Privileges and Ethics and the Committee on Environment.

Hypotheses

1. The inherent executive leadership in the parliamentary system is felt aggravated in the wake of rigidly organised political parties and the welfare concept.

2. Legislative control over finance is found to be of post-mortem in nature.

3. Unnecessary and untimely claim for privileges by members of the legislative assembly often cause hurdles in the democratic process in the state, and

4. Organisationally and operationally, committee system in Kerala do not conform to standards of efficiency.
Methodology

The study is mainly based on historical and analytical methods. Historical method is employed to trace out the origin and development of parliamentary system and legislature committees. The transformation from parliamentarism to neo-parliamentarism in the wake of rigidly organised political parties and welfare state is attempted to be exposed partly through historical method. The role and performance of committees are mainly approached from an analytical angle.

Empirical research tools are also employed to collect data in order to assess the performance of the Committee system in Kerala. For this, the researcher mainly depended on questionnaire method. Questionnaires were distributed among those who participate in rule making process. Speakers, both present and former of the Kerala Legislative Assembly were interviewed. Interview schedules were used to extract information from them. Besides, in an effort to gather as much information as possible, certain senior members of the Assembly who have to their credit a good span of service in the various committees of the Kerala Assembly, were also interviewed. The investigator also met the heads of administrative offices of various committees.

Apart from empirical data collected through questionnaires and interview schedule methods, the researcher depended on publications by the legislature like reports of the various legislature committees, Privileges Digests, Hand Books, Souvenirs and Rules of Procedure and
Conduct of Business in the Kerala Legislative Assembly. Documentary evidence from books and other published materials and field notes prepared by the researcher through discussions with key informants like the officers of the Kerala Legislature Secretariat also formed source of data. The data collected are properly verified, classified, interpreted, analysed, evaluated and codified. Statistical analysis was also done wherever necessary.

Concepts and Operational Definitions

Legislature Committees

Rule 2(1) of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Kerala Legislative Assembly defines a committee as that (a) which is appointed or elected by the Assembly or nominated by the speaker; (b) which works under the direction of the speaker; and (c) which presents its report to the Assembly or to the speaker. Neither it offers a general definition of the term 'committee' nor is it provide specifically as to what is a legislature committee. It only reveals the characteristics of such a committee.

Prof. K.C. Wheare spells out a committee as "... a body to which some task has been referred to or committed by some other person or body"\(^{18}\). This definition necessarily highlights the dependent status of a committee. Thus a committee is dependent on the mother body and remains responsible to it. If there is full and final surrender by the
mother body, then the body to which it is committed is not a committee. Viewed thus, a committee means a small group constituted to discharge a specific function or functions and which remains responsible to the mother body. It is in this sense that the term 'committee' is used in the study.

Executive Ascendancy

The term 'ascendancy' literally means domination. In a parliamentary system the legislative and executive branches are found fused. Naturally, this gives rise to executive leadership. At the same time, the system for its efficiency and durability mandates that the executive should be accountable to the legislature.

No system is free from its environment. Under pressures from the environment, this system too has got transformed from classical parliamentarism to transformative parliamentarism. Rigid and disciplined party organisation has reduced executive accountability to the lowest ebb. At present, no-confidence seems to be no more powerful. An arrogant executive may, on party strength, even advise dissolution of the House. Moreover, the switch over from police state to welfare state resulted in increasing bureaucratisation. Thus, inevitably the executive is led to dominate the parliamentary system. It is to refer to this phenomenon that the term is used.
Legislative Privilege

In the context of the legislature, privilege means certain special prerogatives which enables the House to perform effectively without fear or favour. "Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively... and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions..."19. Viewed comprehensively, it means certain collective rights of the House and of its committees. Therefore in the strict sense, there is nothing to be called individual member's privilege. Fundamentally, however, it is only as a means to the effective discharge of the collective functions of the House that the individual privileges are enjoyed by the Members"20.

Members can enjoy privileges inherent in the House only, that too, to the extent to which they are discharging the functions of the House. Moreover, privilege does not put a member at a higher elevation in relation to citizens. This is the meaning attributed to the term in this presentation.

Contempt of House

'Contempt' means anything that lowers the authority and dignity of the House in the estimation of the public21. There need not be any specific instance of violation of privilege. On the other hand, breach of privilege occurs when there is any violation, attack, or disregard of the privileges, rights and immunities of the House or of its committee or of
its members, if and when they are discharging the House’s functions. Thus, in breach of privilege there is a specific instance of violation of privilege whereas in contempt, there need not be. It is in this distinctive sense that the term is used in the study.

**Review of Literature**

Review of Literature is considered an important aspect of research work. It helps the researcher to understand specific problems and draw some hypothesis. The literature reviewed in the context of the present study mainly consist of books, articles and publications under the auspices of the Kerala Legislative Assembly. There are many works on parliamentary system, the role of political parties and the status of bureaucracy in democracy, the concept of welfare state, legislative process and committee system. But no detailed study on the Committees of the Kerala Legislative Assembly has hither to been made with the exception of certain individual committees and legislative process in general. Hence, this study is made.

In *Government and Parliament* (1956) Herbert Morrison clearly presents the close-knit nexus between the legislature and executive in a parliamentary system. Analysing the nexus, he says that in such a system there is the parliamentary balance of power. Neither formation nor survival of a government is possible unless it is supported by the legislature. The government must have a majority in the House. It must command the support and confidence of the House. At the same time, the legislature looks to the government for guidance and leadership.
A similar systemic reference can be seen in the pioneering and positive venture of one of the early speakers of the Lok Sabha, Dr. Bal Ram Jakhar. In his worthy contribution titled “The People, the Parliament and the Administration” (1982), he describes the legislature in a parliamentary system as the link between the government and electorate. If the government is accountable to the legislature, the legislature is answerable to the people. Sovereignty of the parliament resides in the will of the people which is expressed through the parliament itself.

Alexander Brady in “Democracy in the Dominions - A Comparative Study in Institutions” (III Edition: 1960), provides a vivid account of the characteristics of parliamentary system. Symbolism of monarchy, the intimate tie between the legislature and executive and presence of parties disciplined by parliamentary leadership are the major features. The prime minister and his colleagues constitute the apex of government; decide all important policy and legislation and possess an authority founded on bonds of party discipline.

'Major Modern Political Systems' (1977) by Dr. J.C. Johari is another major source of analysis of the parliamentary system. The immediate and legal responsibility of the real executive to the legislature is the hallmark of the system. There is fusion between the legislative and executive departments so much so that the real executive is formed like a committee of the legislature. It lives in office so long as it commands the support of the mother body. Moreover, a parliamentary
system has two heads, the nominal and the real, the latter being the prime minister. He is the leader of the major party, leader of the legislature and chairman of the executive.

'Government, Politics and People' (1995) authored by S. Saraswathi is an honest attempt at exposing the real nature of the modern state. The modern state, according to the author, is an administrative state. The responsibilities of the state have increased tremendously and so also the demands of the people. State sponsored social justice and social welfare are the main reasons for this phenomenon.

The author also distinguishes between the political systems of the west and the third world countries in terms of popular participation. In the west political activity is said to be focused on the input stage of the policy process while in the third world, it occurs at the output stage. Thus organised people influence the administration rather than policy formulation in the third world. This is termed as the 'politics-administration mix up' or citizen-government interaction.

A worthful work in the context of the study comes from S.P.Sathe - 'Administrative Law' (VI Edition, 1999) in which he describes very clearly the increase in the functions of the state in the light of welfare concepts and its aftermath in the context of globalisation. Twentieth century witnessed a phenomenal growth in the powers of the state due to the advent of welfare concept. Welfare state envisaged state intervention in all walks of human life in an effort to bring about a just social, economic and political order.
With liberalisation of economy evolved since 1991, there is a going back to private sector. The new policy, however, does not mean bidding farewell to state intervention. It only aims at weeding out unnecessary control out of which emerge corruption. It is only a change in public interest.

In the commentable work, 'Administrative Law' (V Edition, 2001), Dr. I.P. Massey speaks about the welfare state. In the last century, the role of the government had changed from laissez-faire to paternalism and from paternalism to maternalism. What the people at present expect from the government is not only protection but also the assurance that it will take care of them from birth to death. The people demand that the government must solve their problems rather than defining their rights. Phenomenal growth in science and technology also contributed to this. The author finally evaluates the position thus: today the administrative process has grown so much so that we are not governed but administered.

M.G. Chitkara in 'Bureaucracy and Social change' (1994) depicts the bureaucracy as an inevitable out come of the welfare state. Just like the growth in the functions of the state, bureaucracy has also grown and tightened its grip. Neither total subjugation nor domination of it is feasible. But, it should be guarded.
Way back in 1931 itself, Conrad Gill in ‘Government and People’ (II Edition 1931) had prophesied about the degeneration of parliamentary democracy into bureaucratic government. Laws passed by the parliament can be implemented only with the help of officials of state departments. Such a system would be efficient, but it is derogatory to democratic safeguards.

‘Public Administration and Responsible Governance’ (1998) by Anand Bhandari mainly concentrates on the pattern of interaction between bureaucratic structures and political processes. As an illustration, he suggests the ability of the policy makers to manipulate the formal structure with relative ease. The manifestation of this interaction, very often and initially finds expression at the structural level.

R.Venkata Raman in ‘The Role of Bureaucracy in Developmental Administration in India’, in P.S.N. Sinha (ed) ‘Studies in Development Administration, challenges and change (Vol.3, 1991) qualifies the Indian bureaucracy as the oldest one; even older and richer in values than what had been inducted by the British in India. But, today’s bureaucracy, according to the author, is in bad odour.

In an article on ‘Evolving Patterns of Administrative Responsiveness to the Public’, in the work cited supra, K. Kernaghan highlights the present state of administration in a democratic society. Citizens of today are aware that most government activities affecting their life are decided by public servants. Moreover, citizens who find little scope of access to legislators try to establish contact with the policy process through bureaucrats.
Paul H. Appleby, in an article on 'Public Administration and Democracy', in Roscoe C. Martin (ed) (1965) speaks of the relation between democracy and administrative process. A democratic government must be both responsible and responsive. Thus public administration in a democratic society should strive to attain these objectives.

Prof. Amreshwar Avasthi and prof. Anand Prakash Avasthi in their work 'Public Administration in India' (VIII Edition, 2002) emphasis the need for public accountability. Governmentalisation brought forth bureaucratisation. Today, it has become the most powerful organ of the government. For speedier, smooth and efficient administration, a powerful bureaucracy is essential. But, the more the power, the more will be the extent of corruption. Therefore, it should be checked.

'Parliamentary Control of Administrative Function in India' [A study in Procedure], (1973) authored by Dr. A. Balakrishnan Nair, highlights the need for legislative control over administration. The right of the legislature to exercise control over the executive is never disputed. Today's administration is highly complex and very vast. Therefore, the legislature cannot provide for detailed legislation. This compels the legislature to leave to the executive wide discretion. Thus emerges the increased need for administrative accountability. But, such controls should be exercised without any obstruction and without affecting efficiency in administration.
In 'Parliamentary Control of Public Administration in India' (1981), Udai Narain speaks of the function of the legislative branch of parliamentary government as to watch and control the government. But, the legislature, as a body has neither the time nor the expertise to oversee the administration. Thus various instrumentalities have been created: instrumentalities based on rules of parliamentary procedure is one among them.

Dr. R. Prasannan, in the 'Fourth Kerala Legislative Assembly Souvenir' (1979) exposed the need of the hour — the need to equip the legislature committees to oversee administration. The conventional methods of legislative checks like the debates and the question hour lack any chance for close and continuous examination of what is being done by the executive. Therefore, he concludes on the inevitability of committees.

Again, the very same author in 'Twenty Five Years of Kerala Legislature' (1983) examines the viability of the existing procedures to cope with the present situation. The control of the purse is the key to parliamentary democracy. According to him it was with this idea that in 1979, the Kerala Legislature appointed an all parties committee of the House to study on the feasibility of a new system of committee. Thus was born the subject committee in Kerala.
Dr. R.K. Suresh Kumar in an article on ‘Subject Committees of the Kerala Legislature’ (Review of Social Sciences, Vol. 1; Nos. 4 and 5; January-July, 1996) evaluates the induction of subject committees as a timely response on the part of the Kerala Legislative Assembly to make legislative control more effective and efficient in the wake of complexities of modern administration. The article ends with a sketch of its defects and the methods to overcome it.

Mr. M. Vijaya Kumar, the former speaker in ‘Tenth KLA Shows the Way’ (Millennium Souvenir, Kerala Legislature Secretariat, 2001) critically analyses the possible ills in the law making process and says that the way out experimented by the Tenth KLA was on Select Committee. The Tenth KLA sent as many as five bills to the select committees.

A write up captioned ‘The Legislature Committees’, in the supra cited Souvenir deals with the evolution of the legislature committees in general, its importance and purpose. What is highlighted is the overwhelming importance of legislature committees. Legislature committees facilitate in-depth study of specific areas of governmental activities and this would make parliamentary scrutiny of government performance real and meaningful.

Major Contents of the Study

This work makes an earnest attempt to provide a comprehensive account of the functional role of legislature committees in Kerala for the period from 1996 to 2001. However, in the case of the Committee of
Privileges and Ethics all the major issues right from the beginning are incorporated in view of their importance. The whole presentation is made in seven chapters.

**Introduction**

Introduction is devoted to the presentation of the research problem, objectives, hypotheses, review of literature and discussion of concepts and methodology.

**Chapter – I**

This chapter is devoted to tracing out the growth of open governmental institutions in India in general and Kerala in particular. It discusses the theoretical aspects of the parliamentary system of government and subsequent transformation that it had undergone in the context of rigidly disciplined party system. It also involves an analytical survey of the inevitable changes to which the system was put to on account of the welfare concept resulting in the growth of a preponderant executive.

**Chapter – II**

This chapter presents a brief historical sketch of the Public Accounts Committee taken as a role model of all the financial committees in the state. It analyses the need for legislative control over
finance, the mode of such control and the performance of the Public Accounts Committee during the period between 1996 and 2001.

**Chapter - III**

It offers an analytical explanation of the role and performance of the Committee on Government Assurances. Since the Committee on Subordinate Legislation is a major committee serving as a tool of the legislature to check arbitrariness and malafides, its analytical sketch at the functional level is also incorporated in this chapter.

**Chapter – IV**

Chapter IV concentrates on the Committee of Privileges and Ethics. It seeks to present the concept of privilege in a historical perspective. It also tends to expose analytically the importance of privilege as a necessary pre-condition for the smooth and uninterrupted exercise of powers by the legislature as well as the hurdles that it may pose in the way of the democratic process in the state.

**Chapter – V**

It covers a detailed analysis of the role and performance of the Committee on Environment, drawn as a role model of the Advisory Committees of the Kerala Legislature. A comparatively recent arrival in the committee constellation, its role as the protector of environment in the state is highlighted.
Conclusions

This chapter highlights the Findings and Conclusions of the study.

Limitations of the Study

The study has the following limitations:

1. It is not fully based on empirical data.

2. All the Committees individually are not considered comprehensively due to limited time and presence of multitude of committees.

3. The study is confined to the working of legislature committees in Kerala from 1996 to 2001. However, in view of the importance of privilege questions, all major privilege issues right from the beginning are incorporated.

4. Lack of availability of comprehensive study reports and other publications on committee system in Kerala is another major handicap. Even certain reports of legislature committees during the period under study were not available with the Kerala Legislature Library, and

5. The approach of certain Members of the Hon’ble Assembly was not positive when consulted for the study.
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