

Lok Sabha



Background Guide

Agenda

Deliberation on Transformative Changes to India's Parliamentary Structure: Implications and Consequences of The Constitution (One Hundred and Thirtieth Amendment) Bill, 2025, Recent Delimitation Reforms, and the Women's Reservation Bill



TGES MUN 2026



AGENDA- Deliberation on Transformative Changes to India's Parliamentary Structure: Implications and Consequences of The Constitution (One Hundred and Thirtieth Amendment) Bill, 2025, Recent Delimitation Reforms, and the Women's Reservation Bill

Disclaimer: The Author(s) of this document, do not claim any authorship over it. All the details, information, and content mentioned in the document is only for educational purposes under the 'fair use' policy. The references through footnotes have been given wherever possible. Please note that the content provided below is in no way related to the personal ideologies of the Executive board. This background guide is authored with a sole intention of giving delegates a direction in the committee and orienting them on the avenues of research. *The content is taken from the internet and the executive board claims no right over it.*



A Letter from The Executive Board

Respected Members, We, as the chair for the Lok Sabha simulation at **TGES MUN,2026**, whole-heartedly welcome each and every single one of you, to this unconventional, yet, the most important Committee.

With the help of this Background Guide, towards the Agenda, we as the Executive Board, aim to give you a starting point, a base, for your research and most importantly, a base for the Lok Sabha, to forbid clarifications.

Delegates, although the Committee might be unconventional, it is still one of the most relevant and the most important committees in the Modern Era.

This is where your research comes in and we would like to reiterate here, that this Background Guide is **only to be used for reference**. Please don't limit or consider your research done after going through the Background Guides contents.

This is - simply a starting point. Looking forward to hosting the best committee at **TGES MUN**, The one, the only, The Lok Sabha.

Regards

Manan Garg (speaker)

Sahasra(deputy speaker)

Imran(scribe)



Preamble to the constitution of India

THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

PREAMBLE

WE, THE PEOPLE OF INDIA, having solemnly resolved to constitute India into a **'[SOVEREIGN SOCIALIST SECULAR DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC]** and to secure to all its citizens :

JUSTICE, social, economic and political;

LIBERTY of thought, expression, belief, faith and worship;

EQUALITY of status and of opportunity and to promote among them all;

FRATERNITY assuring the dignity of the individual and the ²[unity and integrity of the Nation];

IN OUR CONSTITUENT ASSEMBLY this twenty-sixth day of November, 1949 do **HEREBY ADOPT, ENACT AND GIVE TO OURSELVES THIS CONSTITUTION.**

1. Subs. by the Constitution (Forty-second Amendment) Act, 1976, Sec.2, for "Sovereign Democratic Republic" (w.e.f. 3.1.1977)

2. Subs. by the Constitution (Forty-second Amendment) Act, 1976, Sec.2, for "Unity of the Nation" (w.e.f. 3.1.1977)



INTRODUCTION

India's parliamentary democracy stands at a critical juncture as three transformative constitutional reforms converge to fundamentally reshape the structure and composition of the Lok Sabha. For nearly five decades, the number of Lok Sabha seats has remained frozen since the 1976 Constitution (42nd Amendment), a decision made to reward states that successfully implemented population control measures while maintaining federal balance. Now, with the freeze set to end after the 2026 census, the government has proposed delimitation reforms that could expand the House from 543 to approximately 850 seats, triggering intense debate between northern states with higher population growth and southern states that achieved demographic stabilization. Simultaneously, the historic Women's Reservation Bill (Nari Shakti Vandan Adhiniyam, 2023) promises one-third reservation for women in Parliament and State Assemblies, though its implementation remains contingent upon completing the delimitation exercise first. Compounding these structural changes is The Constitution (One Hundred and Thirtieth Amendment) Bill, 2025, which introduces unprecedented accountability mechanisms by mandating removal of the Prime Minister, Chief Ministers, and Ministers if detained for thirty consecutive days on serious criminal charges, thereby raising fundamental questions about due process versus ethical governance. These three reforms are deeply interconnected, creating a complex political landscape where demographic representation, gender justice, and ministerial accountability intersect. The delimitation exercise will determine not only how many seats each state receives but also how women's reservation will be implemented across constituencies, while the 130th Amendment will establish new standards for those who hold office in this reshaped Parliament. Southern states fear being penalized for their successful family planning programs, while northern states demand representation proportional to their population. Women's rights advocates celebrate the reservation bill while its delayed implementation, and legal experts debate whether the 130th Amendment strengthens democracy or undermines the presumption of innocence. *Delegates must examine how these reforms will alter India's federal balance, transform political representation, and redefine the relationship between citizens and their representatives in the world's largest democracy.*



The Constitution (One Hundred and Thirtieth Amendment) Bill, 2025

What is an Amendment?

The Amendment of the Constitution refers to the process of making changes including but not limited to the addition, variation, or repeal of any provision of the Constitution in accordance with the procedure laid down for the same. The purpose of Constitutional Amendments is to ensure that the Constitution remains a living document capable of adapting to changing circumstances while upholding its fundamental principles and values.

Article 368 of the Indian Constitution provides the Parliament with powers to amend the Constitution, so long as it does not alter the Basic Structure

Introduction

A democracy functions by way of active participation of people in decision-making, which requires elected representatives to engage with their constituents on a regular basis.

An effective democracy needs accountability of the representatives towards their constituents and an impartial mechanism to check them when they turn alien towards their source of power. However, bearing in mind the current state of the Indian political landscape, it is difficult to fathom a world where at least one relevant leader is not in jail or been effectively prosecuted at any given point of time.

Constitutional disqualification has been provided for under Articles 102 (in case of Parliament) and 191 (in case of State Assembly) which includes that a member should not hold any office of profit, that he is not of unsound mind or that he had not become an undischarged insolvent or that he was not a citizen of India. Curiously, it was also prescribed that under Articles 102(e) and 191(e), the Parliament can prescribe, by law, any other disqualification. This is paradoxical because, by prescription of a law, what was not originally intended by the Constitution could also be made to be a ground for disqualification. We must ask ourselves: should this be cast aside as political propaganda, or should this be considered a threat to democracy?



A case can be made for both sides. For a regular Bill to pass in the Lower House, a simple majority of 50 per cent plus one candidate present and voting is a prerequisite. Now imagine a good chunk of opposition leaders are imprisoned due to the commission of a crime, or due to opposing views. This reduces the burden on the Ruling government to pass a Bill, because the MPs not present do not hold any significance over the voting process.

Breakdown of the Bill

“A Minister, who for any period of thirty consecutive days during holding the office as such, is arrested and detained in custody, on allegation of committing an offence under any law for the time being in force, which is punishable with imprisonment for a term which may extend to five years or more, shall be removed from his office by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister to be tendered by the thirty-first day, after being taken in such custody.”

The purpose of the Bill is to strengthen political accountability and public trust by ensuring that persons who are arrested and detained for serious offences do not continue to hold executive office while in custody. The Bill's Statement of Objects and Reasons frames the change as protecting constitutional morality and governance. There are differing views on the actuality of this proposal. Leaders from the Opposition worry that this Bill, if passed, would be weaponized to remove rival parties' elected officials from office. The Bill has the potential to give effect to administrative/police action without judicial determination and thus circumvent the innocence principle.



Chapter III of the Representation of People (RP) Act dealt with disqualification of members of the House. Section 8(1) dealt with conviction by court under different provisions of law - ranging from offences under the Indian Penal Code (IPC) to the Dowry Prohibition Act. Section 8(2) notes that if anyone is convicted for a period of six months, that person shall be disqualified and that disqualification would continue for six more years after the release. The other provisions from Section 9 to 10A deal with other disqualification, such as that arising out of corrupt practices in the election.

A major question that arises with Section 8, clauses 3 and 4 is that:

Section 8(3): A person convicted of any offence and sentenced to imprisonment for not less than two years other than any offence referred to in sub-section (1) or sub-section (2) shall be disqualified from the date of such conviction and shall continue to be disqualified for a further period of six years since his release.

8(4): Notwithstanding anything 2 in sub-section (1), sub-section 2 and sub-section (3) a disqualification under either sub-section shall not, in the case of a person who on the date of the conviction is a member of Parliament or the Legislature of a State, take effect until three months have elapsed from that date.

The Supreme Court later ruled in the Lily Thomas case that Section 8(4) of the RP Act is ultra vires (beyond the scope) of the constitution. This relates to the 130th Constitutional Amendment Bill because both deal with the timing and fairness of disqualifying elected officials, but differ on whom and what situations they target. Section 8(4), now no longer in effect, targeted MPs/MLAs after conviction, and the 130th Amendment



is for Ministers after being jailed for 30 days with no bail (without waiting for conviction). However, if anyone obtains a stay of conviction or gets the sentence suspended by the higher courts, the disqualification would not come into effect. That was how Rahul Gandhi, initially disqualified after being convicted by a Gujarat court was able to get back his seat after a stay was granted on the sentence.

Need for the Bill

The Central Government's intention to table this bill is indicative in the "statements of objects and reason." The Bill, according to the Central government, strengthens constitutional accountability and morality. The Bill argues that the elected representatives are expected to act in the public interest and maintain a character "beyond any ray of suspicion".

The Bill is introduced as a deterrent law which will remove the PM, Cabinet of Ministers at Center, Chief Minister, Cabinet of Minister at State, and officials in UTs, if they are alleged and serious offences and are not given bail by court within 30days .

The Bill's relevance, according to the Central Government, lies in addressing the constitutional gap in dealing with removal of Ministers facing Criminal trial in serious

crimes. The Central Government believes that a minister should not think of any act which will shake the canons of constitutional morality. The Central Government believes that no minister should be involved in criminal acts either in past or present or in future. The bill is introduced with a motive to decriminalise the politics, it upholds the belief that an accused cannot be a public servant, if the judiciary itself allows the criminal justice system to function, surrendering the rights of the accused public servant to the procedure laid by law, preventing the ministers from indulging in such activities.



It will eradicate the habit of ministers to exercise power gained through democratic means and use it for personal gains and unruly purposes. Most of the ministers take the support of the delayed trials, and hold their respectable positions despite committing crimes, as the law prescribed their removal only on their conviction, and later use their power to abuse the process of justice.

It will attack the reliance of the minister on the delayed criminal justice system, as the proposed law will not grant any protection if the prosecution establishes a prima facie case in the Indian courts.

This Bill lays heavy reliance on the judicial orders passed by higher courts to prevent the draconian rule feared by opposition. In short, The Central Government's motive to introduce this bill shows an introduction of a harsh and deterrent law to prevent the ministers from indulging into activities prohibited by law, whose only shield from misuse is judiciary, and its use of inherent powers.

Opposing Views

Following the national emergency, after the electoral defeat of the Congress, the newly formed Janata government, under the premiership of Morarji Desai, came to power. When George Fernandes was sought to be inducted as Industries Minister, an objection was raised about the pending Baroda Dynamite case in which he was implicated.

The phrase “on allegation of committing” is of extreme significance. Even considering that being accused of a heinous crime is serious, the Bill entails the removal from office even before conviction. Stripping someone of a rightfully elected office due to an accusation might be irrational on many levels. However, the requirement of detention for thirty days without being granted bail makes it substantially more difficult to misuse and trap political rivals under false cases.



An argument can be made on the excessive powers given to the Executive branch of the government. Earlier, the Ministers could be removed by the President on the advice of the Prime Minister (or Chief Minister in case of State) under Articles 75(2) and 164(1) of the Constitution respectively. Apart from this, they could be disqualified for commission and conviction on the basis of certain crimes, such as holding office of profit, defection, import/export of prohibited goods, etc under Section 8 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951. This Bill negates the requirement for the conviction, while simultaneously excessively increasing the reliance on the Executive in removal of Ministers.

Additionally, intelligence gaps exist in the Bill itself. These concern the continuity problem of the so removed Ministers. The rule applies to the Prime Minister as well, and under the provisions of the Constitution, even when the Parliament is dissolved under Article 85(2) of the Constitution, the President can ask either the same Prime Minister to hold office till the fresh election takes place or he can appoint any other person as an acting Prime Minister. However, the President cannot take actions without the Council of Ministers.

This is a loophole that's been in use for decades.

As for Ministers, be it Cabinet or not, there is no such provision. For fresh elections to be held as frequently as they might have to be held, is neither practical nor possible in the Election Commission's capacity. Even then, the Prime Minister has full control of the investigative agencies (CBI, ED) and it is not expected that there will be a case filed against the Prime Minister anytime soon.



Additionally, for some legislations such as the Unlawful Activities Prevention Act (UAPA), 1967, to get bail within one year, one has to prove that there is no prima facie case against him. It goes without saying that this is next to impossible to do, even with five times the time and resources.

The implication of the Bill, and a very strong one, is that since the landmark judgement of the Kesavananda Bharati Case, 1973, the current regime has been wishing for a reconsideration of the decision. In case this bill reaches the Supreme Court, the debate on whether “parliamentary democracy” is part of the Basic Structure of the Constitution will be reignited.

The Law Commission

In the 244th report of the Law Commission submitted in 2014, the law commission headed by Justice A.P. Shah dealt with the issue relating to disqualifying persons who are facing criminal prosecution. It completely rejected the proposal that the disqualification could happen at the stage of filing of the charge sheet by the police, noting that at such a stage, prima facie determination of the guilt of the accused by a court of law would not have taken place. Further, at the time of filing the final report, a competent court of law would not have applied its mind on the material placed, it noted.

It also stated that disqualifying a person simply on the basis of something which he has had no opportunity to look into, or no knowledge of, would be against the principles of natural justice. It would also tantamount to granting the judicial determination of the question of disqualification to the police, who are a prosecuting authority. In turn, the Law Commission suggested that the framing of the chargesheet could be considered a disqualifying factor as such.



International perspective

There is currently significant reliance on post-conviction removal of Ministers. The international community is in consensus about the requirement of conviction to remove ministers from power.

In the European Parliament, any person is “ineligible” who has been convicted of an act which, in the eyes of public opinion, renders him unworthy to be a member of the European Parliament (in Denmark), and other countries’ requirements are along those lines as well. We can see an emphasis placed on “sentenced” and “declared by court”.

Japan’s constitutional provisions are interesting to note. It states that:

- The Prime Minister may remove the Ministers of State as he chooses.

- The Ministers of State, during their tenure of office, shall not be subject to legal action without the consent of the Prime Minister.

The powers of executive are extraordinarily vested in the Prime Minister, and any minister can be removed by him according to his wishes. Japan calls itself a constitutional democracy, however the excessive power given to the judiciary, although it might not be in the same sense as in India, sets a bad precedent.

In Pakistan, when the military took over the governance, the Constitution was amended to state that all existing higher court judges must retake the older oath of office (mandated by the original Constitution), along with a new oath towards the martial declaration. By this process several judges of the higher judiciary were edged out for the sole reason that they refused to take a new oath. This came to be known as “oath politics”.



Stakeholders

The Central Government is the main stakeholder. They form the Cabinet and the Cabinet is essential for a parliamentary democracy to function. One question to ask here is: in case the Prime Minister is removed from power due to the enactment of this Bill, does the entire Cabinet resign? Or is that reserved for a no-confidence motion? The Central Government's stance revolves around having the moral high-ground, and their point of contention is accountability to the people and restoring public confidence. Constitutional morality is undoubtedly at stake when possible law-breakers are making laws.

The Opposition is another major factor. They are most at risk due to the possibility of this Bill being passed, and public opinion is firm on the grounds of the possibility of the Government wielding this Bill against dissenting and/or regional voices. It is viewed as a threat to democracy, and even called authoritarian. The Bill also threatens the long-standing principle of innocence until proven guilty, established by the Judiciary.

The Judiciary is another important factor. It is only after a judicial conviction that any disqualification of a member of the House arises and not at a period when a Station House Officer arrests a person and locks him up in the police custody; thereafter being an offence triable by a sessions court, the remand magistrate puts the person in judicial custody for a period less than or equal to fifteen days. The essence of the 130th Constitution Amendment Bill is that if a person does not get bail due to any reason and a further extension of custody of another fifteen days is made by the remand magistrate (who is not a trial judge), then the person will lose the office of his ministership. One must question the jurisprudence under which the Bill has aimed to seriously undermine the significance of the judiciary.

The Police would be put into the limelight. Since detention is the only trigger to remove an elected representative from the House, the politicisation of arrests seems apparent, at least at the state level.



Questions to ponder upon

1. Does the reliance on the Independent judiciary to prevent the misuse of the Bill (if passed, act) secure the ends of justice ?
2. Does introduction of concepts like preliminary enquiry and quashing of proceedings in absence of prima facie case by High courts or supreme court, prevent the innocent ministers from automatic removal proposed under the bill?
3. Does the President actually have non-ceremonial powers when it comes to the removal of ministers and/or the Prime Minister?
4. Which machinery will take cognizance if the Head of cabinet fails to advise the respective constitutional heads, for the removal of accused minister/s ?
5. Would the Apex Court uphold that “parliamentary democracy” is part of the Basic Structure Doctrine if this Bill reaches the same court?
6. To what extent does this Bill proclaim the separation of powers, and will it amount to overlap and is it necessary ?
7. In what way would the Bill strengthen or weaken federalism and the choices available to citizens in terms of choosing political leaders?
8. How appropriate is the 30-day detention threshold? Would this Bill be impartial in detaining all Ministers?
9. Is it a “A harsher law on face but necessary to establish clean politics” or “ A heavy antibiotic for disease with dozens of side effects in contra handful gains.” ?



Delimitation Reforms(Background and the 131st amendment bill)

INTRODUCTION

Delimitation is the constitutional process of defining the limits and geographical area of parliamentary and state assembly constituencies as well as the number of seats each State gets in Lok Sabha and Legislative Assemblies. The word comes from the Latin "delimitatus," which means "to set boundaries." Delimitation is the process of redrawing boundaries of Lok Sabha and state assembly constituencies in order to ensure that a vote has roughly the same weight across India, as guaranteed by the democratic principle of "one person, one vote, one value."

Delimitation has a constitutional basis detailed in Articles 82, 81, 170, 330 and 332 of the Constitution of India.

Article 81: Composition of the House of the People (Lok Sabha) — Seats shall be allotted to states in accordance with their population

Article 82: Mandates Parliament to pass a Delimitation Act after every census where constituencies are defined

Article 170: Divides every state into groups of territories.

Article 330: Provides for the reservation of seats for Scheduled Castes in the Lok Sabha to coincide with their population ratio.

Article 332: Provides for reservation of seats for Scheduled Castes in State Legislative Assemblies

This exercise is done by the Delimitation Commission, an autonomous body under the precincts of the Delimitation Act. The Commission typically consists of:
A Chairperson who is or was a judge of the Supreme Court

Chief Election Commissioner (or an Election Commissioner nominated by him)

The State Election Commissioner of the state in question



Orders passed by the Commission shall have the same effect as an order made or passed under an enactment — which is subject only to statutory control and not The disqualification of being questioned in any court.

BACKGROUND

Four Delimitation Commissions (1952–2002)

India has constituted four Delimitation Commissions since independence, each based on a different census:

Commission	Year Established	Based On Census	Key Outcome
First Commission	1952	1951	Initial demarcation after independence; established 543 Lok Sabha seats
Second Commission	1963	1961	Adjusted boundaries for population changes; no change in total seats
Third Commission	1973	1971	Major restructuring post-state reorganizations; freeze initiated shortly after
Fourth Commission	2002	2001	Only boundary adjustments within frozen seat allocation; no change in seat numbers

A Critical Choice: The 42nd Amendment (1976)

The landmark change to the delimitation history of India happened via the Constitution (42nd Amendment) Act, 1976 enforced during the Emergency by then-Prime Minister Indira Gandhi. This amendment imposed a freeze on the re-delimitation of Lok Sabha and State Assembly seats according to population until the first census following 2000.

Why was this freeze imposed?

The main rationale was to avoid depicting political penalties for local community representatives involved in family planning and population stabilization programs. There would be no loss of parliamentary representation for states that succeeded in reducing population growth rates, compared to higher-growth arrangements elsewhere. This was a new mechanism to encourage or assist with the national population control agenda for India.



This freeze prevents the states with the people sprouting like weeds from grabbing more seats, and it punishes states that strategically managed to improve conditions to maintain their numbers — a perverse incentive against good governance.

84th Amendment (2001): Provision for Extend the Freeze till 2026

As the original freeze deadline (2000) neared Parliament passed the Constitution (84th Amendment) Act, 2001 extending it till the first census post-2026.

This amendment: Continued to share more seats on the basis of 1971 Census figures

Permitted only minor boundary adjustments within states (based on 2001 Census) while the total number of seats remains unchanged

Significance: The third provision to Articles 82 and 170 inserted, which states that until the first census after 2026 is published:

The Lok Sabha shall be the same number of seats in each state

No increase in seats of Legislative Assembly in a state

The 87th Amendment (2003): Technical Adjustment

The Constitution (87th Amendment) Act, 2003 technically updated the delimitation provision to reference the 2001 Census instead of 1971, but maintained the freeze on seat numbers. This meant that while boundary adjustments within states could use 2001 data, the total seat allocation remained based on 1971 figures.

CURRENT SITUATION

Demographic Disparities Created by the Freeze

The 50-year freeze (1976–2026) has created significant disparities in representation across India:

Current Lok Sabha Composition (Based on 1971 Census):



- Total seats: 543 (530 from States + 13 from Union Territories)
- Last delimitation: 2008 (based on 2001 Census, but only for boundaries, not seat numbers)

Population Growth Since 1971:

- India's population in 1971: 548 million
- India's population in 2026 (estimated): 1.42 billion

The Value of Vote Disparity

Due to the freeze, the "value of vote" varies significantly across states:

State	1971 Population	2026 Estimated Population	Current Lok Sabha Seats	People per MP (2026)
Uttar Pradesh	83 million	230 million	80	~2.87 million
Tamil Nadu	38 million	78 million	39	~2.00 million
Kerala	21 million	35 million	20	~1.75 million
Bihar	52 million	125 million	40	~3.12 million

This means that **one vote in Kerala is worth approximately 1.6 times more than one vote in Bihar**—a clear violation of the "one person, one vote" principle.

131st CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT BILL, 2026

Background: Why the New Amendment?

On April 16, 2026, Law Minister Arjun Ram Meghwal introduced the Constitution (One Hundred and Thirty-First Amendment) Bill, 2026 in the Lok Sabha Combined with the accompanying report Delimitation Bill, 2026, this Bill attempts to fundamentally change India's electoral architecture by:

End the 50 Year Freeze on Allocation of Seats

Increasing the size of the Lok Sabha from ₹543 to 850

Devolution with respect to delimitation based on the latest census released (2011 Census)

Bringing in women reservation ahead of schedule



NOTE: THE 131ST AMENDMENT BILL IS NOT NEUTRAL, HAVING BEEN NEGATIVED IN LOK SABHA ON APRIL 17, 2026. BUT IT GIVES US A TREMENDOUS POINT OF REFERENCE FOR THE STUFF UNDER DISCUSSION

Key Provisions of the 131st Amendment

Provision	Current Constitutional Position	Proposed Change
Maximum Lok Sabha Seats	550 (530 States + 20 UTs)	850 (815 States + 35 UTs)
Census for Delimitation	Frozen on 1971 Census until post-2026	Latest published census (2011) as determined by Parliament
Seat Freeze	Third proviso to Articles 82 & 170 maintains freeze	Delete third proviso—end restrictions on seat readjustment
Population Definition	Articles 55, 81, 82, 170, 330, 332 reference 1971 census	Update to reflect latest census adopted by Parliament
Women's Reservation	Article 334A: Based on first census after 2023 Act commencement	Substitute Article 334A—immediate implementation post-delimitation
Reservation Duration	15 years for women's reservation	Confirm 15-year period, subject to Parliamentary extension
Seat Rotation	Not specified	Mandate rotation of reserved constituencies across elections
Tribal Protection	Standard provisions	Updated protections for North-Eastern states (Meghalaya, Mizoram, Nagaland)

Technical Implementation Of The Delimitation Bill, 2026

The Delimitation Bill, 2026 acts as the technical counterpart to the constitutional amendment. Key provisions include:

Composition of Commission: Comes into force with the power to comprise a Delimitation Commission.

Chairperson (Supreme Court Judge)

Election Commission of India (Chief Election Commissioner or appointed EC)

State Election Commissioner of parent state

Population Census – most recent census as on date of appointing the Delimitation Commission is utilized (in this case 2011 Census)

Scope — Delimitation of parliamentary and assembly constituencies, allocation of seats reserved will be mentioned for women, SCs and STs



THE NORTH-SOUTH DIVIDE: POLITICAL IMPLICATIONS OF DELIMITATION

The most contentious aspect of delimitation reforms is the potential shift in representation between northern and southern states. This has created what analysts call a "punishment paradox": states that successfully controlled population growth may lose political representation relative to states with higher growth rates.

Even with expansion, the relative share changes significantly:

- Hindi Heartland (North): 38% → 43% of total seats
- Southern States: 24% → 20% of total seats

Political Concerns of Southern States

Strong opposition has come from: Tamil Nadu, Kerala, Karnataka, Andhra Pradesh and Telangana

Punishing success: these were the places that managed to bring their populations under control via effective family planning measures (Kerala's birth rate 1.7; Tamil Nadu 1.8) versus Bihar (3.2) and Uttar Pradesh (2.4).

Regional Economic Inequity: Southern states are net contributors to GDP but would receive fewer Lok Sabha seats

Federal Balance: Apprehensions that the change strengthens a "Hindi heartland", concentrating swathes of power -- on raw numbers in particular sectors -in fewer hands and eating into what is perceived is India's national identity

Human Development: Southern States Do Better on Literacy, Health and Infrastructure But Lose Political Voice



Government's Position

The Union Government — represented by Home Minister Amit Shah particularly — has contended: Democratic Representation: A key democratic principle — "one man, one vote" — can never be put on hold indefinitely

This Fast Track Fresh Delimitation is a New Axiom of The Viksit Bharat Goal Which Is Vital for India's Progress Towards A Developed Nation By 2047

Fairer Development: representation to large number of states with larger population will make sure their development needs are addressed

Phased-in: The increase to 850 seats is intended to reduce relative losses for other southern states

DELIMITATION AND WOMEN'S RESERVATION BILL

The Original Linkage (106th Amendment, 2023)

The Constitution (One Hundred and Sixth Amendment) Act, 2023 (Nari Shakti Vandan Adhiniyam) reserves one-third (33%) of seats for women in the Lok Sabha, State Legislative Assemblies, and Delhi Assembly. However, the original provision stated:

"Reservation shall come into effect based on the first census after the commencement of this Act."

Since the 2023 Act commenced in 2023, and the next census is scheduled for 2027 (with reference date March 1, 2027), the delimitation exercise based on this census would not be completed before the 2029 Lok Sabha elections. This meant women's reservation would likely not apply until the 2034 elections—a delay of over 10 years.

The 131st Amendment's Solution: Changing the Census Basis

The 131st Amendment Bill, 2026 fundamentally altered this linkage by:

1. Removing the requirement for women's reservation to be based on the "first census after 2023 Act"
2. Enabling reservation based on the latest published census (2011 Census) available at the time of delimitation
3. Allowing immediate implementation post-delimitation, potentially for the 2029 elections



Key Change: Article 334A was substituted to enable immediate implementation of 33% reservation post-delimitation, rather than waiting for the 2027 Census.

Critics argue:

Do not hold women's justice hostage in delimitation debate

A 15-year-old version (2011) of a data set used for 2029 implementation may not be realistic demographic-wise. In that sense, the amendment sacrifices accuracy for speed

CRITICISMS AND CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

1.No Constitutional Certainty on Periodicity

Problem: Articles 81 and 82 at the time of their introduction in the Constitution mandated delimitation after every Census based on the most recent census. The 131st Amendment leaves it to Parliament to shortlist when delimitation will take place as well as the census that will be used—by a simple majority.

Impact: The government can postpone or bring forward delimitation at will eroding democracy. Justification.

2.Changes to Federal Balance

Effect: Share of states in Lok Sabha will undergo drastic changes share potentially Reducing Rajya Sabha's federal role

Focusing power into numerically more powerful northern states

Erosion of the Rule on State Equality

3.Lok Sabha v/s Rajya Sabha Size comparison

Issue:

Current ratio: Lok Sabha (543) : Rajya Sabha (250) = 2.2:1

Adjusted ratio: Lok Sabha (815) : Rajya Sabha (250) = 3.3:11.

Consequence

Narrows the scope of Rajya Sabha's dominion over Bills
Strengthens the power of the Lok Sabha in case of joint sittings (Article 108)

Government may override Rajya Sabha with only 56% backing in Lok Sabha



4. Increased Council of Ministers Size

Problem: 15% cap on ministers in Lok Sabha strength in Article 75

At present: 15 % of 543=81 ministers

New : 15%(of) 815 Ministers = 122 Ministers value

5. Reduced MP Participation Opportunities

Issue: In a larger Lok Sabha:

Every MP has less time to deliver debates and Bills

More difficult to get questionnaire based (questions, public importance matters)

Chance of getting selected in ballot goes down

6. "Delimitation Commission" Not Defined

Problem: The Amendment references the term but does not define it, leaving uncertainty of what powers fall under the Commission's purview.

Importance

Delimitation reforms are one of the most substantial constitutional changes India has made since the 42nd Amendment in 1976. In three important ways, the decision to end the 50-year freeze and expand Lok Sabha from its present size of 543 seats to 850 will reform Indian democracy at its root level.

1. Democratic Representation-

Delimitation will bring back "one person, one vote, one value" which means a citizen's vote carries equal weight no matter what state they call home. And this is a must for a democracy that claims to represent 1.4 billion people.

2. Federal Balance-

The reforms will shift political power around the country, possibly enhancing the power of the Hindi heartland but weakening southern states' relative strength. This throws up basic issues regarding the federal structure of India or whether numerical superiority ought to translate into political pre-eminence.

3. Gender Justice

Implementing the women's reservation based not on 2027 but the 2011 Census will also help accelerate gender parity in Parliament by 5-10 years -a life-changing assistance to increase representation in politics.



Women Reservation Act(106th amendment)

INTRODUCTION

India is home to nearly one-fifth of the world's population. Among them, women constitute almost half of its citizenry. From entrepreneurship and scientific research to public service and national defence, women play a crucial role in the functioning of the Republic.

In a representative democracy, participation in public life must find expression within institutions that are responsible for lawmaking and governance. Article 79 of the Constitution of India provides for a parliament consisting of the President and two Houses, including the Lok Sabha. As the House of the People, the Lok Sabha is expected to reflect the composition and aspirations of the Indian electorate. Despite this, only 75 of the Lok Sabha's 543 seats are held by women, accounting for approximately 13.8% of its membership.

This disparity has formed the basis of a long-standing debate. While there is broad agreement that women's representation in Parliament remains limited, there is far less consensus on the appropriate means of addressing the issue. Should the electoral outcomes be left entirely to political competition, or should the Constitution have a role in correcting imbalances in representation?

Successive governments, political parties, and legal experts have provided different answers to this question. One of the most prominent proposals to emerge from these discussions was the reservation of seats through a constitutional amendment.

Prior to 2023, the Constitution of India contained no provision that reserved seats for women.



BACKGROUND

NARI SHAKTI VANDAN ADHINIYAM

After decades of parliamentary debate, public discourse, and repeated legislative attempts, the Parliament enacted the Constitution (One Hundred and Sixth Amendment) Act, 2023, commonly known as the Nari Shakti Vandan Adhiniyam. The Act introduced major changes to the constitutional framework.

Firstly, the Act inserted Article 330A into the Constitution. Before the amendment, Article 330 provided reservation of seats in the Lok Sabha for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The appended Article 330A extends this framework by reserving, as nearly as may be, one-third of all seats in the Lok Sabha for women. It further provides that one-third of the seats already reserved for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes shall be reserved for women belonging to those communities.

Secondly, the Act inserted Article 332A, which creates an identical framework for State Legislative Assemblies. Lastly, the Act inserted Article 334A, which has been the most debated provision of the amendment. Unlike Articles 330A and 332A, Article 334A determines when and how the reservation will operate. It provides that the reservation shall come into force only after the publication of the first Census conducted following the commencement of the Act and the delimitation exercise undertaken thereafter.

The Article also introduces a system of rotation. That is, constituencies reserved for women will not remain permanently reserved but will rotate following subsequent delimitation exercises.

Additionally, Article 334A provides that the reservation shall cease to have effect after **15 years of its commencement**, *unless Parliament decides otherwise through future constitutional action.*



NEED FOR THE BILL

Women constitute approximately 48.7% of the Indian electorate. However, the Lok Sabha houses only 75 of its 543 seats for women, accounting for approximately 13.8% of its membership. A similar pattern of underrepresentation can be observed across several State Legislative Assemblies.

Supporters of the legislation held that legislative bodies are responsible for framing laws, scrutinising executive action, allocating public resources, and shaping national policy. The decisions taken in these spheres frequently concern issues that affect women; these include maternal healthcare, workplace participation, public safety, access to education, sanitation, and protection against gender-based violence. They argued that the limited presence of women within legislative bodies risked creating a disconnect between those who are affected by such issues and those who are empowered to address them.

It was further argued that the Constitution has historically intervened in the electoral process when political competition alone was considered insufficient to provide equitable representation. The reservation for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes under Articles 330 and 332 was frequently cited as an example of such intervention. According to this view, the underrepresentation of women justified a similar constitutional response.

Supporters also argued that constitutional reservation would provide a more reliable framework than voluntary action by political parties. In the absence of any legal obligation, the nomination of women candidates would remain dependent on electoral strategy and internal party affairs.



OPPOSING VIEWS

Several critics accepted the objective of increasing women's representation while questioning the mechanism adopted by the Act: opponents argued that the amendment does not provide for the immediate reservation of seats. Article 334A makes the operation of the reservation *contingent on the publication of the Census* and the subsequent delimitation exercise. As both processes carry significant electoral and federal implications, critics questioned whether the implementation of reservation had been unnecessarily tied to matters that could become subjects of political disagreement.

Another prominent criticism concerned the absence of a separate reservation for women belonging to Other Backward Classes (OBCs). Many political leaders and parties argued that the amendment would effectively benefit only women from relatively more privileged social groups.

It was also questioned whether reservation was the only available method for increasing women's representation. An alternative proposal that surfaced was the introduction of mandatory candidate quotas. This requires political parties to nominate a minimum proportion of women candidates. Supporters of this method argued that it would increase women's participation in electoral politics while preserving voter choice. Similar models have been adopted in countries such as Mexico.

AFTERMATH AND CURRENT POSITION

When voted upon, the Bill received support across party lines in both Houses of Parliament. It was passed in the Lok Sabha by 454 votes in favour and 2 against. It was approved unanimously in the Rajya Sabha. Despite receiving overwhelming support in Parliament, the enactment of the Nari Shakti Vandan Adhiniyam did not bring an end to the debate on women's representation.



bring an end to the debate on women's representation.

The statements raised during the passage of the Act have continued to shape discussions, including debates surrounding multi-member constituencies as an alternative. At present, the reservation framework introduced by the 106th Amendment has not yet come into operation. The conditions prescribed under Article 334A have not yet been satisfied. Consequently, no seats are currently reserved for women in the Lok Sabha or State Legislative Assemblies.

It is against this backdrop that the Constitution (One Hundred and Thirty First Amendment) Bill, 2026 has been introduced.

The 131st Amendment

OVERVIEW

The Constitution (One Hundred and Thirty First Amendment) Bill, 2026 seeks to operationalise the reservation framework introduced by the Constitution (One Hundred and Sixth Amendment) Act, 2023. While the 106th Amendment created the constitutional basis for reserving one-third of seats for women in the Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assemblies, its implementation was made contingent upon a future Census and the delimitation exercise.

The 131st Amendment proposes to *remove this requirement. Instead of awaiting the first Census conducted after the commencement of the 106th Amendment, the Bill seeks to facilitate a delimitation exercise on the basis of the latest published census figures and thereby bring the reservation framework earlier.*

BREAKDOWN OF THE BILL

The most significant amendment proposed by the Bill is the substitution of Article 334A. The Bill removes the conditions stipulated in the article. Instead, reservation would come into effect following a delimitation exercise undertaken specifically for that purpose, without requiring a post-amendment Census.



The Bill proposes to amend Article 81 by increasing the maximum strength of the Lok Sabha. Under the proposed framework, the House of the People may consist of not more than 815 members elected from the States and not more than 35 members representing the Union Territories. The Bill further amends Articles 82 and 170 of the Constitution. These provisions govern the readjustment of seats and territorial constituencies.

The Bill also amends Articles 55, 81, 170 and 330 by replacing the existing constitutional definitions of the expression "population". The amended provisions would define population as that ascertained through such Census as Parliament may determine by law, provided that the relevant figures have been published. This amendment would no longer require linking population figures to particular Census cycles.

RATIONALE AND SUPPORTING VIEWS

According to the Statement of Objects and Reasons, the primary objective of the Bill is to operationalise the frameworks of the Nari Shakti Vandan Adhiniyam. It occurs as a legislation to prevent the indefinite postponement of women's representation.

It notes that the constitutional framework governing the allocation of seats and the drawing of constituencies has remained substantially influenced by population figures that no longer reflect contemporary demographic realities. Factors like significant interstate and intrastate population shifts, migration, and urbanisation are cited to have created disparities between population distribution and political representation.

Accordingly, the Bill seeks to facilitate a delimitation exercise on the basis of the latest published Census figures and bring the reservation framework into operation without awaiting a future Census.



Beyond structural considerations, supporters justify the Bill on the ground that integrating reservation with delimitation ensures implementation through a constitutionally structured electoral process rather than ad hoc executive determination.

Supporters further hold that the delimitation exercise provides the most institutionally coherent mechanism for translating population-based representation into legislative composition. It simultaneously governs both the number of seats and the territorial configuration of constituencies across both the Union and the states.

OPPOSING VIEWS

The Bill was accompanied by several concerns regarding its practical implementations and possible repercussions. A central concern was the structural consequences of linking women's reservation with the delimitation exercises. Critics argued that delimitation in India is a rather politically sensitive exercise that directly affects the seat distribution of both Union and State Legislature. This, by extension, also has repercussions on the federal balance. Opponents had flagged that linking the implementation of women's reservation to delimitation could potentially deepen regional cleavages between North and South India, given the uneven population growth across States. The exercise would inevitably advantage States with higher population growth, largely in the northern and central regions. This in turn would reduce the relative representation of the southern States that have successfully implemented population control measures. With reference to concerns of the federal balance, critics argued that the delimitation-driven restructuring could disproportionately alter the political power of States and fuel regional disparities. In that context, alternative approaches to delimitation have been suggested in public discourse, including proposals drawing from comparative federal models such as the United States Senate, where equal representation is provided to constituent units regardless of population.



Additionally, a proposal for the increase of Rajya Sabha seats has also been championed. Such models have been referenced to argue for hybrid or corrective mechanisms in delimitation that balance demographic proportionality with safeguards for federal equity, so as to prevent significant dilution of representation for States with stabilised population growth. It is also worthy to note that these implications have contributed to concerns regarding the politicisation of a structural constitutional reform on gender representation. Experts have apprehended that linking reservation with delimitation may expose the process to political manipulation through redrawing of constituencies to advantage certain parties or regions, a concern associated with gerrymandering. In this context, the reform has also been viewed as potentially consolidating political advantage under the guise of electoral restructuring, thereby deepening mistrust in an already sensitive constitutional exercise.

How to Research Further:

Start with the Five Wives and One Husband formula: Why, What, When, Who, Where and How. Research your portfolio's stance on the agenda through personal websites, videos of speeches given or statements laid. Move to your party policy and possible weak points that could be attacked by the opposing candidate. Further move to "Oppo research" to garner information for Questions or Speeches aimed at questioning the validity of the opposing person's statements. Mention relevant facts, statistics and legislations wherever necessary. The perfect speech in an Indian committee is judged on oratory skills, confidence, Legal and Factual research mentioned, Party or Portfolio stance displayed, relevance in committee, political rhetoric and possible solutions.



Sources for additional research-

- 1.Lok Sabha site
- 2.Rajya Sabha site
- 3.Standing committee reports
- 4.Starred chits and unstarred chits of parliament,
- 5.Press bureau of India
- 6.press trust of India
- 7.Rajya sabha tv channel on YouTube
8. Sansad tv channel on YouTube
9. govt verified sources

All the delegates have to compulsorily bring the printout of this document on the day of conference. We expect a policy statement by each delegate, a sample policy statement is shared below. A policy statement is written by a member individually talking about their stance on the agenda. You have to make one single policy statement minimum 500 words covering the agenda. You have to make it on the name and stance of your allocated portfolio.

Sample policy statement

<https://peach-franni-93.tiiny.site>

to keep in mind AI generated policy statements and solutions will be discarded we hope all members make their policy statement as it will be marked, to note this background guide is just for your reference in understanding the agenda and cannot be used as a source/proof in the committee The rules of procedure and committee flow on the first day of the conference will be explained by the executive board



TGES MUN 2026



Unleashing Global
Perspectives