SUMMARY

One of the main tasks of the Legislative assembly is to ventilate public grievances. For it, there are various parliamentary devices like governor address, control through discussion on budget, questions, half an hour discussion, call attention notices, adjournment motions, resolutions, private member's bills and no confidence motions. Apart from it, the Assembly watches and controls the government, through various committees. These are employed to voice grievances and to represent the main currents of the public opinion.

Under the Constitution, the Governor is required to address Members of the Legislative Assembly at the Commencement of the first session after each general election as well as at the commencement of the first session of each year. In his Address he informs the Legislature of the causes of its summon.

On the date of the Address, the Governor comes in procession along-with the Speaker and the Secretary, Haryana Vidhan Sabha, to the Assembly Chamber. Members take their seats ten minutes before the Governor arrives and rise in their places on the entry of the Governor, which is indicated by the Sergeant-at-Arms and the Members remain standing till National song is played and the Governor has taken his seat on the dais.

The Annual Financial statement or the statement of the estimated receipt and expenditure of the Government, known as the budget, is presented to the Vidhan Sabha with a speech by the Finance Minister. The budget is then dealt with in two stages-general discussion; and voting of demands for grants.

The general discussion on the Budget takes place for such period as the Speaker, in consultation with the Leader of the House, may determine or on the report of Business Advisory Committee adopted by the House as the case may be. Members are then at liberty to discuss the Budget as a whole or any
question of principal involved in it. The Finance Minister has a general right of reply at the end of the discussion. Other Ministers may also take part in the discussion to answer any criticism that may have been made of the departments under their charge. No motion is moved at this stage, nor is the Budget submitted to the vote of the Assembly.

The Speaker may, if he so chooses, prescribe a time limit for the speeches. The Speaker shall, in consultation with the Leader of the House, allot so many days as may be compatible with the public interest for the discussion and voting of demand for grants.

No demand for a grant can be made except on the recommendation of the Governor.

Members may move cut motions to omit or reduce any item in a grant or reduce any grant. A token cut may be proposed, but when that is done, the object of the cut has to be specified clearly and precisely. But no motion can be moved to increase any grant or alter its discussion.

The charged expenditure is subject to discussion, but not to the vote of the Vidhan Sabha. The debate on motions must be confined to the administrative matters for which the Government is responsible and not deal with matters requiring Legislation.

The main findings of the study are:

**Governor Address**

- The study explains that in 1996 total number of legislatures took participation in governor address from treasury side was nine and the total time taken was one ninety two minutes. 22 members from the opposition side with 386 minutes and no independent member took participation in the governor address discussion.
- Further, in 1997 only 13 members form the treasury side took participation in governor address with 231 minutes and 16 members
from opposition who took 297 minutes and the three members from independents members with 70 minutes took part in the governor address discussion.

- In 1998 only 9 members form treasury side with 229 minutes took participation in governor address discussion. 23 members from opposition members with 583 minutes took participation in governor address discussion and no single independents members took part in the discussion.

- In 1999 form treasury side only 6 members took part in the governor address discussion with 169 minutes and 18 members from opposition side took participation with 509 minutes and only one member form independents with 39 minutes had participated in the discussion.

- Table 5.5 depicts that in 2000 total number of legislatures took participation in governor address from treasury side was 21 and the total time taken was 401 minutes. 19 members from the opposition side with 337 minutes and 5 independent members with 95 minutes took participation in the governor address discussion.

- Further, in 2001 only 12 members form the treasury side took participation in governor address with 263 minutes and 19 members from opposition who took 426 minutes and the five members from independents members with 61 minutes took part in the governor address discussion.

- In 2002 only 8 members form treasury side with 237 minutes took participation in governor address discussion. 8 members from opposition members with 204 minutes took participation in governor address discussion and 2 independents members with 85 minutes took part in the discussion.

- In 2003 form treasury side only 5 members took part in the governor address discussion with 221 minutes and 19 members from opposition
side took participation with 331 minutes and only 5 member form independents with 94 minutes had participated in the discussion.

- In 2004 form treasury side only 5 members took part in the governor address discussion with 150 minutes and 13 members from opposition side took participation with 283 minutes and only one member form independents with 19 minutes had participated in the discussion.

- Table 5.6 depicts that in 2005 total number of legislatures took participation in governor address from treasury side was 21 and the total time taken was 268 minutes. 04 members from the opposition side with 33 minutes and 2 independent members with 24 minutes took participation in the governor address discussion.

- Further, in 2007 only 7 members form the treasury side took participation in governor address with 380 minutes and 5 members from opposition who took 155 minutes and the three members from independents members with 43 minutes took part in the governor address discussion.

- In 2008 only 28 members form treasury side with 495 minutes took participation in governor address discussion. 7 members from opposition members with 195 minutes took participation in governor address discussion and 4 independents members with 188 minutes took part in the discussion.

- In 2009 form treasury side only 13 members took part in the governor address discussion with 283 minutes and 8 members from opposition side took participation with 147 minutes and only 5 member form independents with 72 minutes had participated in the discussion.

**Budget**

- The Budget Estimates for the year 1997-98 were presented to the house by finance Minister on the 12th march, 1997 and the general discussion was held on the 14th, 17th march. The total time taken by the Opposition
Benches was 271 minutes i.e. four hours and thirty one minutes, by the treasury was 195 minutes i.e. three hours and 15 minutes and by the Independent members was 30 minutes. The total number of members who participated was 27 (13 from the opposition Benches, 12 from the Treasury Benches and 2 Independent M.L.A.).

- The Budget Estimates for the year 1998-1999 were presented to the house by finance Minister on the 21\textsuperscript{st} July 1998 and the general discussion was held on the 22, 23, 24 and 27 July. The total time taken by the Opposition benches were 448 minutes, treasury benches 321 and independent members were 68 minutes. The total number of members who participated was 34 (12 from treasury, 20 from opposition and independent 2 M.L.A.).

- The Budget Estimates for the year 1999-2000 were presented to the house by finance Minister on the 3\textsuperscript{rd} February 1999 and the general discussion was held on the 4, 5, 8 Feb 1999. The total time taken by treasury benches 325 and independent members was 69 minutes. The total number of members who participated was 20 (16 from treasury and independent 4 M.L.A.).

- The Budget Estimates for the year 2000-01 were presented to the house by finance Minister on the 14th March 2000 and the general discussion was held on the 14th march. The total time taken by treasury benches 151, opposition 167 minutes and independent members was 70 minutes. The total number of members who participated was 29 (19 from treasury, 12 from opposition and independent 4 M.L.As.

- The Budget Estimates for the year 2001-02 were presented to the house by finance Minister on the 12th March 2001 and the general discussion was held on the 13, 14th March. The total time taken by treasury benches 281, opposition 251 minutes and independent members was 75
minutes. The total number of members who participated was 25 (11 from treasury, 10 from opposition and 4 independent M.L.A.).

- The Budget Estimates for the year 2002-03 were presented to the house by finance Minister on the 13th March 2002 and the general discussion was held on the 14, 15th March. The total time taken by treasury benches 281, opposition 234 minutes and independent members was 88 minutes. The total number of members who participated was 24 (7 from treasury, 14 from opposition and 3 independent Members).

- The Budget Estimates for the year 2003-04 were presented to the house by finance Minister on the 10th March 2003 and the general discussion was held on the 11,12 and 13th March. The total time taken by treasury benches 566, opposition 299 minutes and independent members was 58 minutes. The total number of members who participated was 52 (30 from treasury, 19 from opposition and 3 independent Members).

- The Budget Estimates for the year 2004-05 were presented to the house by finance Minister on the 12th February 2004 and the general discussion was held on the 13 and 16th March. The total time taken by treasury benches 195, opposition 230 minutes and independent members was 37 minutes. The total number of members who participated was 20 (4 from treasury, 14 from opposition and 2 independent Members).

- The Budget Estimates for the year 2005-06 were presented on the 9th June 2005 and the general discussion was held on the 13,14 and 15th June. The total time taken by treasury benches 499, opposition 58 minutes and independent members was 63 minutes. The total number of members who participated was 26 (18 from treasury, 4 from opposition and 4 independent Members).

- The Budget Estimates for the year 2007-08 were presented on the 16th June 2007 and the general discussion was held on the 19 and 21st March. The total time taken by treasury benches 345, opposition 17 minutes and
independent members was 47 minutes. The total number of members who participated was 22 (17 from treasury, 1 from opposition and 4 independent Members).

- The Budget Estimates for the year 2008-09 were presented on the 18th March 2008 and the general discussion was held on the 19, 24 and 25th March. The total time taken by treasury benches 375 minutes, opposition 238 minutes and independent members was 72 minutes. The total number of members who participated was 35 (19 from treasury, 8 from opposition and 8 independent Members.

However, the Congress has represented nearly 50% Jats in the successive Lok Sabhas under study followed by the Lok Dal, the HVP and the Janata Party. Similarly it has represented the maximum Brahmins, Bishnois, Banias and scheduled caste apart from many other backward classes.

Call Attention Motion

- Table 4.1 depicts that in 1996 total seventeen times Call Attention Motions notice has been served by the Vidhan Sabha members but in which only five notices were admitted by the speaker. Twelve were ruled out.

- Further, in 1997 total eleven Call Attention Motions notice were served by the members in which only two were admitted and nine were assign as ruled out by the speaker.

- In 1998 total twelve times Call Attention Motions notice has been served by the Vidhan Sabha members in which only two notices were admitted by the speaker and nine were ruled out or one was lapsed due to dissolution of the Vidhan Sabha.

- In 1999 total thirteen times the notice has been served by the members in the Vidhan Sabha in which only one notice was admitted by the speaker and twelve were ruled out.
During the study, it is noticed that in 9th Assembly total 53 times the Call Attention Motions notice has been served by the Vidhan Sabha members on the floor of the house in which only 10 notices were admitted and 42 notice were ruled out by the speaker and one notice were lapsed.

In 2000 total eight times Call Attention Motions notice has been served by the members in the house in which only two notices were admitted and six were not admitted by the speaker.

Further, in 2001 total forty Call Attention Motions notice has been served by the members in the house in which only eight notices were admitted and thirty two were not admitted by the speaker.

In 2002 twenty six total numbers of Call Attention Motions notice has been served in the house in which twelve were admitted and fourteen were not admitted in the house by the speaker.

Moreover, in 2003 total thirty eight Call Attention Motions notices has been served in the house by the members in which eight were admitted and thirty were not admitted in the house.

In 2004 only twenty Call Attention Motions notices has been served in the floor of the house in which only two were admitted and seventeen notices were not admitted in the house by the speaker. One notice was lapsed in the house due to dissolution of the house.

In totality during 10th Assembly total 132 times Call Attention Motions notices has been served in the house which shows that it was very extensively used by the member in the house from the previous 9th Assembly only 53 times.

Further, it described that in 2005 twenty five times Call Attention Motion notice has been served by the members in the house in which eleven notice admitted and thirteen notice not admitted by the speaker and one notice was lapsed due to the end of the session.
• In 2006 only six Call Attention Motion notice was served in the house by the member in which only one notice admitted and five notices were not admitted by the speaker.

• Further, in 2007 seventeen Call Attention Motion notice has been served by the member on the floor of the house in which five notices were admitted and thirteen notice not admitted by the speaker.

• Moreover, in 2008 twenty one Call Attention Motion notice has been served in the house in which three notices were admitted and eighteen notice were not admitted in the house by the speaker.

• In the last year of the 11th Assembly 2009 only six Call Attention Motion notice has been served in the house in which not even a single notice were admitted in the house by the speaker.

• In totality table 4.3 explains that in 11th Assembly 76 total numbers of Call Attention Motion notice were served in the house in which 20 were admitted and 55 were not admitted in the house and one lapse due to end of the session.

**Adjournment Motion**

• In 1996 fourteen times Adjournment Motion notice has been served in the Vidhan Sabha in which thirteen notices admitted and one was not admitted by the speaker.

• In 1997 only seven Adjournment Motion notice has been served in the house in which one notice was converted into Call Attention Motion and the remaining six were not admitted by the speaker.

• In 1998 twelve tomes Adjournment Motion notice has been served in the house and not even a single time the motion has been carried out in the house.

• In 1999 full year only a single Adjournment Motion notice has been served in the house and that one also out rightly not admitted by the speaker which was converted into Call Attention Motion.
• Further, during 9th Assembly total 34 times Adjournment Motion notice has been served in the house in which 13 was admitted and 19 not admitted and two notices has been converted into call Attention Motion.

• Table 4.5 explains that in 2000 only nine times Adjournment Motion notice has been served in the Vidhan Sabha in which not even a single notice has been admitted by the speaker.

• In 2001 only eight Adjournment Motion notice has been served in the house in which two notices was converted into Call Attention Motion and the remaining six were not admitted by the speaker.

• In 2002 fifteen times Adjournment Motion notice has been served in the house in which twelve times notice not admitted by the speaker and three notices were converted into Call Attention Motion.

• In 2003 seventeen times Adjournment Motion notice has been served in the house in which only one notice has been converted into Call Attention Motion and the remaining sixteen times the motion has not been carried out in the house.

• In 2004 sixteen times Adjournment Motion notice has been served in the house in which fifteen times notice not admitted by the speaker and one notice was converted into Call Attention Motion.

• Further, during 9th Assembly total 34 times Adjournment Motion notice has been served in the house in which 13 was admitted and 19 not admitted and two notices has been converted into call Attention Motion.

• During 10th Assembly 65 times Adjournment Motion notice has been served in the house in which 58 times it was not admitted and the remaining 7 notice has been converted into Call Attention motion. It is interesting to notice that the during the full term of the Assembly not even a single time the speaker grant the permission for Adjournment Motion in the house.
During 11th Assembly 2005-2009 only in 2005 three Adjournment Motion notice has been served in the house in which all three were not admitted in the house by the speaker. Further, it is interesting to know that the remaining years not even a single times Adjournment Motion notice has been served by the member in the Vidhan Sabha.

No-Confidence Motion

- 6th September 2000 raised by the Congress MLAs against the present government INLD. Motion was moved in the house but during the motion no member was present in the house. So the motion was not moved.
- Second time on 31st October, 2002 the speaker admitted the notice of no-confidence motion from the member of Congress party against the INLD government. The motion was lasted in the house for 2 hours and 51 minutes. After discussion the motion was put to the vote of the house and declared lost.
- Third time on 2nd December, 2004 the speaker admitted another notice of no-confidence motion from the Congress party MLAs against the INLD government. The speaker admitted the notice and put it to the vote of the house. The motion was lasted for 3 hours and 16 minutes. After discussion the motion was put to vote of the house and declared lost.

Question Hour

- As per rules the first hour of sitting each day should be the question hour in Indian legislatures but in Haryana, such hours were not held on many occasions on the excuse of obituary references, delivery of Governor's Address, discussions on motion of thanks, discussion on budget, election of the Speaker and Deputy - Speaker etc. and the question hours were suspended in almost all Assemblies under study.
- Answers to starred questions were given on the floor of House and not
released for publication until the answers were laid on the table of the House. Thus, the copies of answers were not given in advance.

- The ministers gave wrong answers which were contradicted by the members with the help of data given in the government reports.
- On the whole, the opposition raised questions thrice more then the treasury benches during the period under study.
- Thus, the question hour, which should be the most important phase in daily business of legislature, was no longer so in Haryana.
- The object of eliciting vital information on more important questions on the agenda was defeated due to barrage of supplementaries which were raised solely to discredit the Minister.
- For their parts, ministers gave short, wrong, vague answer and tried to withhold information on petty grounds.
- A few members, 5 on an average, were seen to monopolise the process of raising questions in the House and about 10 in putting the supplementaries during the period under study.
- Furthermore, the Speaker failed to enforce the rules of procedure and conduct of business during the questions hours and had to remain on his legs to order the House.
- There is a provision of short notice questions in the Haryana Assembly but only 59 such questions were received, 11 of them admitted and only 4 were answered during the period under study. Thus, it is clear that such questions were not liked by both ruling as well as the opposition members.
- Call attention notices combine asking a question with short comments on the manner of fact in which all points of views were expressed concisely and the government is given adequate opportunity to state its case. However, the members as well as the government failed to utilize the opportunity as the rules for this purpose were defied.
- Table 4.10 indicates that the Tenth Assembly has received the highest 2438 notices of starred questions followed by the Eleventh – 1852 and the lowest by the Ninth Assembly 1491. However, the maximum numbers of starred questions are accepted during the Tenth Assembly 76.94% followed by the Ninth 70.22%, and the lowest by the Eleventh Assembly 67.98%.

- The highest no of starred questions answered under rule 45 in Eleventh Assembly 747 followed by Tenth Assembly 434 and the lowest number in Ninth Assembly 285 only. Table 4.11 point out that the maximum notices of questions are received during the Tenth Assembly - 247, followed by the Eleventh- 236, and the lowest by the Ninth Assembly - 77. However, the Ninth Assembly has accepted the highest number of un-starred questions 75.32% followed by the Tenth 74.08%, and the lowest by the Eleventh Assembly 61.44%.

- But more than 91% of them were answered in written except the Ninth Assembly where 89.65% were answered.

- As per Table 4.14, the number of questions put by the opposition members are answered more than the treasury benches during the Eleventh Assembly but it is vice-versa during the Ninth Assemblies when the treasury benches dominated the question hours. However, it is against the opposition which put questions more than thrice in comparison to the treasury benches.

- There is a provision of certain 'do's' and don'ts for members during the question hour like no point of order, personal discussion, questions of policy personal reflection, sub-judice matters, conduct of any person not responsible to the government etc. is not allowed. But the above provisions were raised both by the members of ruling and opposition as well as ministers and Chief Minister. Due to it, most of the time was consumed only in one question and the remaining questions on the
agenda could not be taken up.

- A bloody fool, salable, living with other's wife, peon, dog, silly, black marketer, smuggler, ruffian, flatterer, chamchagiri, beggar, criminal, tees- tees repaye main tumahari balm bation ki ejatt bikti hai, dirty hippism, nikama, sala, gaddar, behuda , doom, bhand, fraud, impotent, characterless, concocted, corrupt, blackfaced, rand to randapa kat leti hain per rand way nahin katne dete, nuisance, unprincipled, frail-minded, naked, bogus, cheap, enemy of the state, fascist, nonsense, monkey, looter, shameless, chandal-chokhari, conspirator, rascal etc.

- The Speaker from time to time had to name the defiant members. But they did not comply with the order and continued their presence in the House. At this the Speaker ruled "It is a matter of shame and disgrace that the dignity and decorum of the House is not maintained. It is also not healthy for our democracy.

- The maximum number of walkouts took place in the 11th assembly with 89 walkout followed by 72 in 10th assembly and 66 in 9th assembly. Moreover, it is being noticed during the study that the walkout is basically an instrument of opposition party in power. Whenever the opposition party felt that they are not being noticed by the ruling party they use it widely.

- Absenteeism becomes a regular feature during the working hours of the Assembly, which amounts to be undemocratic, because being the representatives of the people they do not perform their duty properly and many lapses on the part of the government go unheeded during their absence which can be very vital and detrimental for the decision making process in the House.

- Many of times it is found that the legislatures could not follow the order of speakers and continuously argued with each other. Finally, the speaker called the Marchals and they are being throughout from the
Suggestions:

- It is to be noticed that the total numbers of legislatures participation are very low in Governor Address discussion, which must be increased by the legislatures.
- Legislatures must participate as well as provide feedback during Governor Address discussion.
- Governor Address must be in simple and easy language. So the legislatures can understand it easily.
- The copy of the Governor Address must be provide in due time to the legislatures. So they can study it and provide positive feedback.
- Governor address always includes the achievements of the government. It must provide some suggestion to the government to make improvement in its working.
- Many of times Governor address discussion is taken lightly by the legislatures which shows the casual behaviour of the legislatures.
- It is seen that the Presence of the legislatures during governor address discussion in the Vidhan Sabha very low. Speaker must look after this matter.
- During Budget speech the finance minister use technical terms which can only be understand by a specialist person. It must be in simple and easy language.
- The copy of the Budget speech must be in bi-lingual nature and it must be provide to the legislature during the Budget speech.
- During Budget discussion the present of legislatures are very low in the Vidhan Sabha which must be tackle by the political parties.
- Time taken by the legislatures during the Budget discussion is very low which must be increase by the legislatures.
• There is also a provision that a question can be asked on behalf of other member if he is absent from the House. But in this regard, the behavior of the Speaker was not uniform as in some cases he allowed and in other disallowed which led to uproarious scenes and walk-outs from the House.

• Questions standings in the names of suspended members were not allowed to be asked by other members.

• There is no provision in the Haryana Legislature which can bind a Minister to reply a question on the floor of the House. Therefore, a Minister can refuse to answer a question without assigning any reason. He may also do so on other grounds like, time and labour involved in collecting the information will not be commensurate with the benefit to be obtained and is not in the public interest to disclose the information, give separate notice, it is not a supplementary etc. On the other hand, the members emphasize that 'the government should give the information in the House because the ministers and the officers were paid for it. The Speaker can pressured them to answer the question under the pressure of half-an-hour discussion'.

• Sometimes, the ministers gave irresponsible answers in the House. When requested by the members to direct the ministers to give answers, the Speaker quoted the rules that, "It is not the function of the Speaker to direct the government to give proper answers. Rather, it is the function of the government to give relevant answers".

• Extension to a question was demanded almost in every question hour during the period under study and it was granted in each case by the Speaker. There was a lot of discussion on the issue and sometimes, the Speaker reminded the ministers of 15 day's notice for a question during which the answers can be prepared.

• Many Questions were postponed when the name of the members asking
the questions were not called by the Speaker. Sometimes, irrelevant questions were raised by the members.

- The members of both ruling and opposition were given a right to move resolution where the government has to clarify its stand by giving a reply. But the impact of such resolutions was not informed as the resolution moved by the opposition was rejected after some discussion whereas those moved by the ruling party were accepted. Moreover, only a day was provided for discussion on private members resolution and even the day was taken up for official resolution on many occasions. Furthermore, discussion on such resolutions had no controlling effect on the working of the government in the House.

- In case, a member was not satisfied during the question hour, he could raise the matter on adjournment. The provision for a division could make the atmosphere more tensed if the government in the House commands a thin majority. But the opposition took these motions as an instrument of agitation rather than for resolving the problem by discussion. So the importance and seriousness of such motions had considerably deceased.

- The members were given the right to hold the government accountable through no-confidence motion and in some cases the government can be removed. But in Haryana no confidence motions failed to bring down the government and the only thing the opposition could do was to point out the problems of their respective constituency. However, the government did not take the points made by the opposition seriously.

- However, the members deviated from the purpose behind the half-an-hour discussion and each participation tried to consume more time and their had been disorderly scenes in such discussion also.

- Since Haryana is an agricultural state, it is expected the government would pay high priority to the farming and agriculture labours apart
from the irrigation and power, education and health in rural areas.

- The Speaker had been instrumental in carrying out the wishes and whims of the Leader of the House during the sessions and sittings of the Assembly in general and question hour in particular.
- Actually it is the ruling party which dominated in the process of the question hour and also in the process of admission and putting them on the agenda of the day.
- The Speaker is held responsible for maintaining decorum and order in the House by application of rules of procedure and conduct of business. But he could not do so without the co-operation of members of Opposition as well as the ruling party. However they did not cooperate with him during the period under study.
- The members were supposed to follow certain rules to maintain the decorum of the House. However, it was seen that majority of members did not have knowledge of such rules and those having knowledge of rules, never observed them sincerely and seriously.
- The members had been frequent in using unparliamentarily language against each other and also against the Leader of the House and the Speaker on petty political considerations. Also the members defied the chair much against the principal of parliamentary democracy.
- The members indulged in personal reflection, abusive language, undesirable expressions, derogatory remarks and the ministers and even the Chief Minister were no exception to it.
- Sometimes, the Speaker used undignified words against the members of opposition like 'Tu', 'Tere se chaprise achha hain' etc.
- The members used unparliamentarily words like a bloody fool, peon, dog, silly, ruffian, beggar, criminal, dirty, nikama, sala, gaddar, behuda, doom, bhand, impotent, randhua, nanga etc. very frequently.
- Sometimes even the old and seasoned members behaved in an
irresponsible manner and their remarks were expunged by the Speaker with greater pain.

- In a session, the Chief Minister was heard abusing MLAs and secretary of Vidhan Sabha and ridiculed the press. He made unparliamentarily references even to the Speaker.
- The House instead of being prime forum of discussion became rather a field of private and personal wrangles and the standard of debate became very low.
- Uproarious scenes, bitter clashes consumed much time of the House during the question hour.
- Many times, the Speaker had to take help of the Marshall for removing the defying members from the House.
- The House, on many occasions, was adjourned when the defiant members kept on speaking even after being named by the Speaker.
- Interestingly such members again defied the Chair by being present in the House when it re-assembled.
- Sometimes, the Speaker had to suspend the members persistently defying the Chair and for gross contempt of the House. But the members, on occasions, refused to leave the House even after their suspension and the Speaker had to adjourn the Assembly for the next day. Much against the democratic norms and rules of procedure such members presented themselves even the next day when the House re-assembled and the help of Marshall was taken to get them out for the Assembly.
- On occasions, the defying members raised slogans - Murdabad, against the Chief Minister as well as the Speaker in the House.
- The members raised points of order much against the rules of procedure only to obstruct the proceedings of the question hour.
- The tendency to raise more and more points of order increased
tremendously from Assembly to Assembly under study and many members were named by the Speaker. Moreover, the members adopted the strategies either to hamper the proceedings by raising slogan or staged a walk out as a protest in cases of non-acceptance of their points of orders.

- For contingency, the rules of procedure provide for leave of absence to members from the House. But the rules did, not bind a member to be present continuously during the proceedings. So the members after marking their presence in the attendance register, went out from the House either in lobbies or in party meetings. Consequently, the presence remains very thin the House and sometimes, the Assembly had to stop its proceedings for want of quorum. This poses a great problem because the members given notices of their questions, motions several of which are admitted but when the members concerned were called upon by the speaker to put their questions and motions, many of them were found absent from the House. Thus, absenteeism became a regular feature during the working hours of the Assembly which amounts to be undemocratic because being the representatives of the people they did not perform their duties properly and many lapses on the part of the government went unheeded during their absence which can be very detrimental for the decision-making process in the House.

- The ruling as well as the opposition parties misused the right of privilege given to their member in the House. Both sides raised frivolous issues and many of them were not allowed by the Speaker which led to uproarious scenes in the House.