



LOK SABHA

Oakridge MUN 2026

Lok Sabha

**Introduction of, and discussion on, the Constitution (131st
Amendment) Bill, 2026; the Union Territories Laws (Amendment)
Bill, 2026; and the Delimitation Bill, 2026**

CONTENTS

Letter from the Executive Board	4
MUN Rules Of Procedure (ROP)	6
1. Roll Call	6
2. Setting the Agenda	6
3. Speakers' List	6
4. Points	6
5. Motions	7
6. Yields	7
7. Caucuses	7
8. Draft Resolutions and Amendments	7
9. Voting	8
Basic Information	8
Committee Guidelines	8
A Primer on Legislative Procedure	10
Stages of a Bill in the Lok Sabha	10
How a Constitution Amendment Bill is Discussed and Voted Upon	11
How the Three Bills are Tied to Each Other	12
Background Guide	13
Introduction and Purpose of the Legislation (per the Government)	13
Historical and Constitutional Background: The Freeze and Its Discontents	14
The Three Bills: Principal Provisions	15
Key Constitutional and Legal Questions	16
The Federal Question: Projections and the North-South Debate	17
Political Landscape and Indicative Party Positions	17

Letter from the Executive Board

Dear Prospective Members,

At the outset on behalf of the Executive Board, we extend a warm welcome to all of you and congratulate you on being a part of the Lok Sabha being simulated at OAKMUN 2026.

The committee being simulated, unlike most other simulations you must have heard of or been a part of, shall focus on political intellect, logical intellect, analytical application of thoughts, and strategic application of thoughts in addressing the issue(s) at hand.

This committee will be Bilingual - English and Hindi (Subject to a unanimous vote) Primary Language shall be English. No translations shall be provided. The Documentation though will be only in English.

Kindly note, we are not looking for existing (read: impractical) solutions, or statements that would be a copy paste of what the person you are representing has already stated; instead, we seek an out of the box solution from you, while knowing and understanding the impending limitations of the person and his politics you represent.

Given the extremely political and volatile nature of the agenda of this committee, your presence of mind and analytical aptitude is something which we as the executive board would be looking to test.

Kindly do not limit your research to the areas highlighted below; but ensure that you logically deduce and push your research to areas associated with the issues mentioned. But do note, the agenda is only one element of the committee which covers about half of your preparation, it is imperative that by design you be well prepared with the general political updates pertaining to the state and specifically your constituency.

IMPORTANT: In this committee we will be revamping the entire Rules of Procedure and aligning it as much as reasonably possible with the real simulation of the Lok Sabha. A brief RoP (Rules of Procedure) guide shall be explained to you during session 1 of the conference. As part of the new procedures, or should we rather say – ‘real procedures’ only 30-40% of the

committee time shall be utilized to discuss on the pre-determined agenda. Majority of the revised RoP's shall be borrowed from the 'Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha – 2024, 17th Edn.'

As a result, your general political awareness and detailed awareness about issues pertaining to your state and constituency in specific are pivotal as they could become topics of discussion in the committee. We therefore urge you to keep yourself updated with latest updates pertaining to national, regional, state and constituency level political updates (of the MP you are representing). Failing which, it would become extremely difficult to manage the pace and expectations of the committee.

Another place members usually err is in understanding their stance and approach towards an issue and other members in co-relation to their political party and its ideology. Please note – being political and being in sync with the stance of your party in general while keeping in mind the person you are representing is non-negotiable. Yes, we do not want a replica of the person, rather we want to see a better version of the person while keeping the individual and political limitations and realities still in place.

Kindly note, that unlike most conventional /unconventional committees you have attended, this committee shall have substantial “substantive” intervention by the Executive Board.

The objective of this background guide is to provide you with a ‘background’ to the issue(s) at hand and therefore it might seem to some as not being comprehensive enough.

We are sure however that this background guide would be a perfect launch pad to start with your research. But please ensure this isn't your only research. This guide shall deal only with a skeletal overview of the agenda(s) and ancillary aspects. You may carry your laptops / tabs with you which may be permitted to be used upon the discretion of the executive board. But Mobile phones shall not be allowed at any cost. It is imperative that all of you follow this guideline. Non-adherence to this rule would result in immediate suspension from the committee. There is a Zero tolerance policy towards Internet usage during committee proceedings unless we permit the same explicitly. Attendance in all substantive committee sessions is a qualifying criteria for awards in addition to other benchmarks that might be stipulated in the Committee Guidelines below.

Good Luck.

Executive Board, Lok Sabha, OAKMUN 2026.

MUN Rules Of Procedure (ROP)

1. Roll Call

- The Chair calls on each country to declare if they are "Present" or "Present and Voting." It refers to the voting procedure on the Draft Resolution, where a delegate can vote "Yes", "No", or opt to "Abstain".
- If "Present and Voting," the delegate cannot abstain from voting. If the delegate chooses to respond with "Present", they may answer with "Present and Voting" on subsequent days, but this is not permissible for "Present and Voting" as this reply must be used consistently from that point forth.

2. Setting the Agenda

- Delegates motion to set the agenda, followed by a formal debate on which topic to discuss first. This motion requires a simple majority to pass.

3. Speakers' List

- After passing a motion to enter formal debate, delegates are placed on a speakers' list to make formal speeches. Time limits are set, and the Chair calls on delegates to speak in order.
- A delegate must raise their placard if they wish to add their name to this list. They can be on this list only once on any occasion.

4. Points

- **Point of Order:** To correct a procedural error by the Chair.
- **Point of Personal Privilege:** For personal discomfort (e.g., if the room is too cold, or if a fellow delegate cannot be heard).
- **Point of Inquiry:** To ask questions about discussion or statements in committee.
- **Point of Parliamentary Inquiry:** To ask questions with regard to the Rules of Procedure.

5. Motions

- **Motion to Suspend the Meeting:** To break for caucuses or adjourn the session.
- **Motion to Close Debate:** Ends the discussion on a topic and moves to voting. Requires a two-thirds majority.
- **Motion to Table the Topic:** Postpones debate on a topic. Requires a majority vote.

6. Yields

- **Yield to the Executive Board:** A delegate yields their remaining time from their speech to the Executive Board. It is to be used as they see fit.
- **Yield to Another Delegate:** A delegate yields their remaining time for another delegate to speak. (This delegate's permission must be sought beforehand)
- **Yield to Points of Information:** A delegate yields their remaining time to Points of Information to the committee.
- **Yield to Comments:** A delegate yields their remaining time to comments from the committee.

7. Caucuses

- **Moderated Caucus:** The Chair controls the speaking order with shorter, focused speeches. The topic selected is a narrowed version of the agenda, chosen by the delegate who proposed the moderated caucus.
- **Unmoderated Caucus:** Informal discussion among delegates not under the moderation of the Executive Board.

8. Draft Resolutions and Amendments

- Delegates collaborate to create draft resolutions, which are formal solutions to the discussed issue.
- **Friendly Amendments:** Accepted by all sponsors without a vote.
- **Unfriendly Amendments:** Need to be voted on to be added.

9. Voting

- **Procedural Votes:** Includes motions and amendments; all members must vote.
- **Substantive Votes:** For resolutions and unfriendly amendments; only "Present and Voting" delegates may vote, and abstentions are allowed.

Basic Information

Committee: Lok Sabha

Session Type: Special Session

Duration of the Session: Two days – April 16, 2026 to April 17, 2026.

Nature of Business: Legislative / Government Business.

Agenda: Introduction of the following bills and the subsequent discussion on relevant rules thereof:

1. The Constitution (131st Amendment) Bill, 2026,
2. The Union Territories Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2026, and
3. The Delimitation Bill, 2026.

Introduction by: Shri Arjun Ram Meghwal, Minister for Law and Justice, Government of India.

Freeze Date: April 16, 2026

Scope for Private Members' Business: No.

Committee Guidelines

Key Pointers to Note:

1. Lok Sabha is a legislative committee primarily. That said, it can't be converted into a highly technical legal committee per se in terms of your approach, an issue we mostly encounter in simulations at MUN's/YP's.

2. Sloganeering and Walkouts and other such over-dramatic political maneuverings, while not recommended, may be executed but ought to be moderated in line with the Rules of Business of the Lok Sabha.
3. The simulation of a Lok Sabha is meant to reflect on a better version of the MP you are representing, not a replica. You will be expected to showcase the better version of the individual you represent keeping in mind the individual and political ideological limitations.
4. Be thorough with your political ideology – from a Political Party perspective and individual perspective. (No, they aren't necessarily the same.)
5. There shall be no award by default – you earn your award. The criteria is pretty simple. To qualify for the:

Best Parliamentarian award – Score a minimum of 75%

High Commendation – Score a minimum of 68%

Special Mention – Score a minimum of 60%

Honourable Mention – Score a minimum of 50% (Comes with a Certificate of Merit).

As you may have noticed there shall be no fake award called the Verbal Mention, if you deserve an award, you shall get it on the stage like the others. And every single award from this committee (if you qualify for any, that is) shall be given on the stage with a certificate for sure. Merely meeting the qualification criteria doesn't mean you will get that specific award - especially if there is more than 1 MP qualifying for the award. In such cases - we would go in the order of who is ranked higher and give them that award.

6. The official language of the committee for documentation purposes shall be English. However, all oral communication in the committee could be bilingual (contingent on a unanimous vote [refer to letter from the EB]) - English and /or Hindi.
7. Should there be any Press Conference by the IP / National Press – the same may be scheduled during the start of Day 3. No time before or later to ensure that there is no break of flow in committee proceedings.
8. Sample Scoresheet will be explained to you during the RoP session. Details of the scoring criterion shall be explained to you during the RoP session (session 1) of the committee.

9. **NOTE ON THE FREEZE DATE:** The committee operates on a freeze date of April 16, 2026. All substantive deliberation shall proceed on the basis of facts, events, and the state of law as they stood on the freeze date. The eventual fate of the bills in the real Lok Sabha, and any developments subsequent to the freeze date, shall have no binding value in committee – this House writes its own history. Members citing post-freeze developments as fact shall be disregarded (and marked accordingly).

A Primer on Legislative Procedure

Stages of a Bill in the Lok Sabha

Since the business before this committee is legislative, members must be fluent in the life cycle of a Bill. In broad terms, an ordinary Government Bill passes through the following stages in the Lok Sabha:

First Reading (Introduction): The Minister moves for leave to introduce the Bill (Rule 72 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha). Introduction is ordinarily a formality, but leave may be opposed – typically on the ground that the House lacks legislative competence or that the Bill offends the Constitution – in which case the Speaker may permit a brief statement by the opposer and the Minister, followed by a vote on the motion for leave. Upon introduction, the Bill is published in the Gazette.

Reference to Committee (optional): After introduction, the Bill may be referred to a Departmentally Related Standing Committee, or a Select/Joint Committee, for detailed scrutiny – either by the Minister’s own motion, by a motion carried in the House, or by the Speaker’s direction. This stage, though invaluable, is dispensable, and Governments of every persuasion have been criticized for dispensing with it.

Second Reading: This is the substantive stage, in two parts. First, the general discussion: the Minister moves that the Bill be taken into consideration, and the House debates the principles of the Bill – not its individual clauses. Members may, at this stage, move statutory amendments to the consideration motion (for instance, that the Bill be circulated for eliciting public opinion, or referred to a committee). Second, the clause-by-clause consideration: each clause (and any amendment thereto, moved in accordance with the rules of admissibility) is put to the vote of the House, followed by the Schedules, Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Long Title.

Third Reading: The Minister moves that the Bill be passed. Debate at this stage is confined to arguments in support of or rejection of the Bill as a whole, without touching details beyond verbal or formal changes. Upon passage, the Bill is transmitted to the Rajya Sabha, where it undergoes analogous stages; in cases of disagreement between the Houses on an ordinary Bill, a joint sitting under Article 108 is available. Once passed by both Houses, the Bill is presented for the President's assent under Article 111, upon which it becomes an Act.

How a Constitution Amendment Bill is Discussed and Voted Upon

A Bill seeking to amend the Constitution travels a materially different path, governed by Article 368 read with Rules 155 to 159 of the Rules of Procedure, and members must internalize the differences, for they will decide the fate of the first item on this agenda.

A Constitution Amendment Bill may be introduced in either House, requires no prior recommendation of the President, and is introduced like any other Bill. The decisive difference lies in the voting. At every effective stage – the motion that the Bill be taken into consideration, the adoption of each clause and Schedule, and the motion that the Bill be passed – the Bill must be carried by a special majority: that is, a majority of the total membership of the House and a majority of not less than two-thirds of the members present and voting. In the Lok Sabha, voting on such motions is by division and not by voice vote, so that the fulfilment of the special majority is demonstrated on the record. Abstentions and absences are not neutral acts in this arithmetic: the two-thirds requirement is computed on members present and voting, but the majority-of-total-membership requirement is computed on the full strength of the House, so a Bill can command two-thirds of those voting and yet fail.

Where an amendment seeks to change the provisions enumerated in the proviso to Article 368(2) – including, *inter alia*, the representation of States in Parliament, Articles 54, 55, 73, 162 and 241, the Union judiciary and the High Courts, the legislative lists, or Article 368 itself – the Bill, after passage by both Houses with the special majority, must additionally be ratified by resolutions of the Legislatures of not less than one-half of the States before it is presented for assent. There is no provision for a joint sitting on a Constitution Amendment Bill: each House must pass it in identical terms with the requisite majority, or the Bill fails. Following the Constitution (Twenty-fourth Amendment) Act, 1971, the President is bound to give assent to a duly passed Constitution Amendment Bill. Finally, members should recall that the power of amendment is itself bounded: under the basic structure doctrine laid down in

Kesavananda Bharati v. State of Kerala (1973), an amendment that damages or destroys the basic features of the Constitution – among which free and fair elections, federalism, and democracy have all been counted – is liable to be struck down notwithstanding compliance with every procedural requirement.

The other two Bills on this agenda – the Union Territories Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2026 and the Delimitation Bill, 2026 – are ordinary legislation, passable by a simple majority of members present and voting. The asymmetry between the majorities required for the three Bills is not a procedural triviality; as explained below, it is the very hinge of the politics of this session.

How the Three Bills are Tied to Each Other

The three Bills before the House are not three agendas but one agenda in three instruments, and members must grasp the architecture of the package before descending into its details.

The Constitution (131st Amendment) Bill, 2026 is the constitutional key. The Constitution, as it stands, freezes the allocation of Lok Sabha seats among States on the basis of the 1971 census and defers the next readjustment to the first census taken after the year 2026; it likewise conditions the commencement of the women's reservation introduced by the 106th Amendment upon a delimitation undertaken after the first census following that Amendment's commencement. Until these constitutional locks are opened, no statute of Parliament can undertake a fresh delimitation on earlier census figures or advance the commencement of women's reservation. The 131st Amendment Bill proposes to open them.

The Delimitation Bill, 2026 is the statutory machinery. It supplies what the amended Constitution would then permit: the constitution of a Delimitation Commission, the census upon which it shall act (the latest published census as on the date of its constitution – in effect, the 2011 census), and the mandate to readjust constituencies and to allocate the seats reserved for women, including women of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

The Union Territories Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2026 is the extension arm. Because the legislatures of Delhi, Puducherry and Jammu and Kashmir are creatures not of Articles 168 to 170 but of their respective statutes – the Government of Union Territories Act, 1963, the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Act, 1991, and the Jammu and Kashmir Reorganisation Act, 2019 – the readjustment of their

constituencies and the reservation of seats for women therein require parallel amendment of those statutes.

The dependency, members will note, runs in one direction. The two ordinary Bills are meaningful only if the Constitution Amendment Bill is carried with the special majority; should the amendment fail, the statutory Bills are left standing on constitutional ground that does not exist. Conversely, the amendment without the statutes is a key without a machine. The Government has accordingly brought the three together in a single special session – and the Opposition, equally, understands that the entire package can be brought down by defeating the one Bill that demands a two-thirds majority. Every calculation in this committee – every speech, every abstention, every absence – should be made with this arithmetic in mind.

Background Guide

Agenda: Introduction of, and discussion on,

1. The Constitution (131st Amendment) Bill, 2026;
2. The Union Territories Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2026; and
3. The Delimitation Bill, 2026.

Freeze Date: April 16, 2026

Introduction and Purpose of the Legislation (per the Government)

On April 16, 2026, the Government of India convened a special session of Parliament for the introduction of a legislative package that touches the deepest structures of Indian representative democracy: the size of the Lok Sabha, the distribution of its seats among the States, the census upon which constituencies are drawn, and the commencement of the one-third reservation of seats for women promised by the Constitution (One Hundred and Sixth Amendment) Act, 2023 – the Nari Shakti Vandan Adhiniyam.

The Government's case, as reflected in the Statement of Objects and Reasons accompanying the Bills, is one of urgency and good faith. The 106th Amendment, though enacted with near-unanimity, tied the commencement of women's reservation to a delimitation exercise undertaken after the first census following its commencement. With the decennial census now scheduled to conclude in 2027 and its results to follow thereafter, the reservation would, on the existing constitutional

text, remain a promise on paper well into the next decade. The package before the House proposes to redeem the promise sooner: by amending the Constitution to permit delimitation on the basis of the latest published census – the census of 2011 – by expanding the Lok Sabha so that readjustment does not become a zero-sum contest among States, and by extending the machinery to the Union Territories with legislatures, the Government contends that women's reservation can be operationalized in time for the next general election.

The Opposition's case, articulated from the moment the special session was announced, is that the package conceals within a popular cause a fundamental reordering of federal power: that delimitation in proportion to present population rewards the States that failed the demographic transition and penalizes those that delivered it, and that the fate of women's reservation has been deliberately handcuffed to a delimitation design that the southern and several other States cannot accept. The task of this House, across two days, is to introduce the Bills, to discuss them under the relevant rules, and to decide – by the majorities the Constitution respectively demands – whether this package shall become the law of the Republic.

Historical and Constitutional Background: The Freeze and Its Discontents

Articles 81 and 82 of the Constitution embody the founding principle of 'one person, one vote, one value': seats in the Lok Sabha are to be allocated to States in such manner that the ratio between seats and population is, so far as practicable, the same for all States, and constituencies are to be readjusted upon the completion of each census. Article 170 mirrors these principles for the State Legislative Assemblies. Delimitation Commissions constituted under successive Delimitation Acts (1952, 1962, 1972 and 2002) carried out this exercise, and their orders – by statutory design and judicial affirmation, beginning with *Meghraj Kothari v. Delimitation Commission* (1966) – have the force of law and are immune from challenge in the courts.

The principle was suspended in 1976. The Constitution (Forty-second Amendment) Act froze the allocation of seats among States, and the total seats in each Assembly, on the basis of the 1971 census until the first census after the year 2000 – a measure justified as protecting States that pursued population control from losing parliamentary weight to those that did not. The Constitution (Eighty-fourth Amendment) Act, 2001 extended the freeze until the first census taken after the year 2026, while permitting the 2002 Delimitation Commission to redraw boundaries within States (on the 1991, later 2001, census under the Eighty-seventh Amendment)

without altering inter-State allocation or Assembly strengths. The result, a quarter-century later, is a Lok Sabha of 543 members elected on a seat distribution frozen to the India of 1971 – an India whose population has since more than doubled, and whose demographic weight has shifted markedly northward. Constituencies today vary enormously in the number of electors they contain, a state of affairs difficult to reconcile with electoral equality; yet the freeze is precisely what secured, for five decades, the federal bargain between States of divergent demographic trajectories.

Onto this frozen landscape arrived the Constitution (One Hundred and Sixth Amendment) Act, 2023, which reserved, through Articles 330A and 332A, one-third of the seats in the Lok Sabha and the Legislative Assemblies for women, including within the seats reserved for the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. Article 334A, however, provided that the reservation shall take effect after an exercise of delimitation is undertaken for this purpose after the relevant figures of the first census taken after the commencement of the Amendment have been published. The commencement of women's reservation was thereby chained to the census and to delimitation – and it is that chain which the present package proposes to cut.

The Three Bills: Principal Provisions

The Constitution (131st Amendment) Bill, 2026. Introduced in the Lok Sabha on April 16, 2026 by Shri Arjun Ram Meghwal, Minister for Law and Justice, the Bill makes four principal changes. First, it raises the ceiling on the strength of the Lok Sabha from 550 to 850 members – up to 815 chosen from the States and up to 35 from the Union Territories. Second, it removes the constitutional requirement that the next delimitation await the first census after 2026, and instead authorizes Parliament to determine by law when delimitation shall be undertaken and which census shall be its basis. Third, it restores the principle that seats shall be allocated among States in proportion to their population – in effect, ending the 1971 freeze. Fourth, it amends Article 334A so that the women's reservation introduced by the 106th Amendment commences upon the completion of the delimitation exercise, without awaiting the next census. Being an amendment under Article 368, the Bill must be carried at every effective stage by the special majority described in the primer above.

The Delimitation Bill, 2026. The Bill repeals and replaces the Delimitation Act, 2002. It empowers the Central Government to constitute a Delimitation Commission, to be chaired by a person who is or has been a Judge of the Supreme Court, with the mandate to readjust parliamentary and assembly constituencies and to allocate the

seats to be reserved for women – including women belonging to the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes. Critically, the Bill provides that the Commission shall act upon the latest census published as on the date of its constitution: in present circumstances, the census of 2011. In keeping with precedent, the orders of the Commission are to have the force of law and are not to be called in question in any court.

The Union Territories Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2026. The Bill amends the Government of Union Territories Act, 1963, the Government of National Capital Territory of Delhi Act, 1991, and the Jammu and Kashmir Reorganisation Act, 2019, so as to provide for the readjustment of parliamentary and assembly constituencies in the Union Territories concerned by the Delimitation Commission, and to give effect to the reservation of seats for women in the Legislative Assemblies of Puducherry, Delhi, and Jammu and Kashmir. It thereby carries the package into territories whose legislatures exist by statute rather than directly under Part VI of the Constitution.

Key Constitutional and Legal Questions

Members should prepare on several questions of law that are certain to surface in the discussion. First, the question of majorities and procedure: the Constitution Amendment Bill demands the special majority at every effective stage, while its two companions require only a simple majority – and members may debate whether the proviso to Article 368(2) is attracted, requiring ratification by one-half of the State Legislatures, given that the redistribution of seats among States arguably touches the representation of the States in Parliament. The Government may be expected to contend that precedent – the 42nd, 84th and 87th Amendments, none of which was ratified by the States – settles the point in its favour; the Opposition may contend that a measure which redistributes, rather than merely freezes, is of a different constitutional character.

Second, the question of basic structure: whether delimitation indexed to present population, in the demographic circumstances of the Union, so alters the federal balance as to damage federalism – a recognized basic feature – and whether the political equality of ‘one person, one vote, one value’ and the federal principle can be reconciled, or must one yield. Third, the question of data: whether a delimitation of the 2030s can legitimately be founded on a census of 2011 – fifteen years stale, and soon to be superseded by the census of 2027 – and what it signifies that the same Government which has notified a fresh census proposes to redraw the map on the old one. Fourth, the question of judicial exclusion: whether the traditional immunity

of Delimitation Commission orders from judicial review, carried forward into the new Bill, remains defensible in an exercise of this magnitude. Fifth, the question of the 106th Amendment's design: whether amending Article 334A to accelerate women's reservation honours the intent of a near-unanimous Parliament, or reopens a settled compact for collateral ends.

The Federal Question: Projections and the North-South Debate

The heart of the political contest is arithmetic. Independent analyses circulated upon the Bills' publication indicate that if the Lok Sabha were retained at its present strength and seats reallocated on the 2011 census, Tamil Nadu's seats would fall from 39 to about 32 and Kerala's from 20 to about 15, while Uttar Pradesh would rise from 80 to about 89, Bihar from 40 to about 46, and Rajasthan from 25 to about 30 – and that the shift in relative shares persists even when the House is enlarged. The southern States, joined by several smaller and north-eastern States, contend that they are being punished for having achieved population stabilization – the very objective the freeze of 1976 was designed to reward – and that a permanent diminution of their share in the Union legislature will follow them into every future Parliament, every constitutional amendment, and every distribution of national resources.

The Government's answer, pressed by its senior-most ministers in the public debate preceding and accompanying the session, is that expansion dissolves the zero-sum: that in an enlarged House every State gains seats in absolute terms, that the southern States' share of the House would remain broadly at its present proportion, and that the North-South framing is a manufactured divide unworthy of members sworn to the Constitution. The Opposition's rejoinder is that proportions, not absolute numbers, are the currency of parliamentary power – a two-thirds majority is a proportion – and that assurances offered in debate are no substitute for guarantees written into the constitutional text. Members should note that several formulations of a 'no-loser' or share-preserving formula have circulated in public discourse; whether any such formula finds its way into the text through amendment, and whether it could survive the principle of proportionality the Bill itself enacts, are questions this House may have to confront directly on the floor.

Political Landscape and Indicative Party Positions

Any realistic simulation of the Lok Sabha must reflect not only ideological differences but also how parties balance principle, governance, and political optics – and on this

agenda, the arithmetic of Article 368 makes every bench consequential: the Government commands a majority of the House, but not, on its own, the two-thirds of members present and voting that the Constitution Amendment Bill demands. The special session is therefore, in its essence, a contest of persuasion, procedure, and floor management.

The Bharatiya Janata Party and its allies in the National Democratic Alliance will present the package as the redemption of the Nari Shakti Vandan Adhiniyam – women’s reservation made real rather than deferred to the 2030s – and as the restoration of the Constituent Assembly’s principle of one person, one vote, one value. Its members will argue that the enlargement of the House protects every State in absolute terms, that delimitation is the routine constitutional mechanism by which representation, including that of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes, is kept current, and that the Opposition’s resistance is resistance to women’s reservation itself, dressed in federal clothing. Allies from the south and east within the NDA will bear the heaviest cross-pressure of the House, torn between coalition loyalty and the anxieties of their States, and members portraying them should expect their speeches to be scrutinized – in committee as in life – for every carefully hedged sentence.

The Indian National Congress will support women’s reservation – it can do no other, having long claimed the idea – while opposing the package as presently constructed. Its argument will be that the Government has deliberately welded a universally supported cause to a contested delimitation design so as to force the Opposition into the appearance of opposing women; that reservation can and should be operationalized by delinking it from a population-proportional redistribution; and that a measure of this constitutional magnitude, introduced in a compressed special session without reference to a committee or meaningful federal consultation, is procedure as ambush. The Dravida Munnetra Kazhagam will lead the federal charge: for Tamil Nadu, the package is the long-feared ‘delimitation penalty’ arrived at last, and its members will argue that a State cannot be asked to accept permanent political diminution as the price of its success in social development. Similar positions may be expected from other southern parties, with varying intensity, and from parties of Kerala across the spectrum.

The All India Trinamool Congress will combine support for women’s reservation – pointing to its own record of fielding women – with opposition to the centralizing design and timing of the package. The Left parties will oppose the pairing of reservation with a 2011-census delimitation, arguing for immediate operationalization

of reservation delinked from redistribution. The Samajwadi Party and the Rashtriya Janata Dal must navigate a subtler course: their States stand to gain seats from population-proportional delimitation, yet they sit in opposition to the Government – and their older demand for a sub-quota for backward class women within the women’s reservation supplies them a distinct ground of critique. Parties such as the Biju Janata Dal, the YSR Congress Party and other unaligned formations hold, in a special-majority vote, influence disproportionate to their numbers, and members representing them should expect to be courted, pressured, and tested. Regional parties of the north-east will weigh assurances regarding their States’ small delegations. Across the House, members should remember that on this agenda the fault lines run within alliances as much as between them – and that in a division under Article 368, an absence is a vote.

A Note on the Conduct of Business in this Committee

The business of this special session shall proceed, as far as practicable, in the manner of the House itself: the introduction of the Bills by the Minister, the discussion thereon under the relevant rules, and such further stages as the progress of business and the discretion of the Chair permit within the two allotted days. Members should be thorough with the rules governing legislative business – including Rules 72 and the connected rules on introduction and opposition thereto, the rules governing consideration and amendment, and Rules 155 to 159 in respect of the Constitution Amendment Bill – and with the arithmetic of the special majority, which shall be applied strictly in any division. The Executive Board reminds members that the freeze date of April 16, 2026 governs: the House deliberates as the House of that day, with the fate of the package unwritten, and it is the members present in this committee – their persuasion, their strategy, and their votes – that shall write it.

Conclusion

The package before this House compresses into three Bills the oldest unresolved tensions of the Indian constitutional order: between political equality and federal comity; between the promise of representation and the design of its delivery; between the urgency of a cause – the presence of women in the legislatures of the Republic – and the suspicion that urgency is being made to serve other ends. It is rare for a single sitting of Parliament to be asked to decide the size of the House, the map of its constituencies, the census that shall draw that map, and the commencement of the largest expansion of political representation since universal adult franchise itself. This House is being asked to decide all of it in two days.

Members should resist the temptation to reduce the debate to its slogans. 'One person, one vote, one value' is a real principle, and so is the federal bargain of 1976; the promise to the women of India is real, and so is the anxiety of the States that kept their side of a demographic compact. A member who cannot state the strongest form of the argument against their own position has not prepared for this committee.

For participants in this simulation, it is important to recognize that the debate is not confined to the text of the Bills alone. It extends to questions of principle, precedent, and policy design. It requires an engagement with legal reasoning, constitutional arithmetic, and political strategy. Most importantly, it demands an awareness that the outcomes of such debates have tangible consequences – for every State of the Union, for every future Parliament, and for the women whose seats in this House the package proposes, at last, to number. Whether the special session of April 2026 is remembered as the moment the Republic enlarged its democracy or the moment it unsettled its federal compact will depend on the depth of deliberation – and, in this committee, on you.