



## Codification of Parliamentary Privileges

Click [here](#) for Part I

\n\n

### What is the issue?

\n\n

With no codified laws for what constitutes a breach of privilege, it has become a tool in the hands of the ruling party.

\n\n

### Is the power of privilege too wide?

\n\n

\n

- In our country, the Parliament enjoys almost supreme powers and legislators face no threat from government.

\n

- Legislators have the power to be the sole judges to decide what their privileges are, what constitutes their breach, and what punishment is to be awarded in case of a breach.

\n

- Thus, it can be said it is too wide a power that clearly **impinges on constitutionalism**, i.e. the idea of limited powers.

\n

\n\n

### What are the constitutional provisions?

\n\n

\n

- **Article 105** pertains to the powers, privileges, etc, of Parliament, its members and committees while **Article 194**, protects the privileges and powers of the houses of legislature, their members and committees in the

states.

\n

- They state that the privileges ‘until so defined’, shall be those of the “House of Commons” (lower house of the Parliament of the UK).

\n

- The expression “**until so defined**” **does not mean an absolute power** not to define privileges at all.

\n

\n\n

### How our parliament is different from British parliament?

\n\n

\n

- The drafters of the Constitution committed the mistake of **putting Indian Parliament on a par with the British House of Commons.**

\n

- The supremacy of British Parliament is not applicable to India. In India **the Constitution is supreme**, not the Parliament.

\n

- Also, British Parliament remained the highest court till 2009.

\n

- Thus, Indian legislatures and British Parliament differ not merely as regards their general political status but also in the matter of legal powers.

\n

\n\n

### Is codification of privileges necessary?

\n\n

\n

- Legislators have been arguing that codification of privileges will harm the sovereignty of Parliament.

\n

- Today, by sovereignty, we mean ‘popular sovereignty’ and not ‘parliamentary sovereignty’.

\n

- Our legislators basically resist codification, because **it would make the privileges subject to judicial scrutiny.**

\n

- Also, it would make evolution of new privileges not possible.

\n

- Our legislators also have protection from arrest in civil cases 40 days before the session, during the session and 40 days after the session.

\n

- It means, the MPs & MLAs have protection from arrest for more than 365 days in a year.

\n

- Thus, the need for codification cannot be stressed enough.

\n

\n\n

\n\n

**Source: The Hindu**

\n



**IAS PARLIAMENT**  
*Information is Empowering*  
A Shankar IAS Academy Initiative