

IV* Role of Parliament in the conduct of foreign relations

Report prepared by Mr. Seppe TIITINEN (Finland),
adopted at the Beijing Session (September 1996)

I. Introduction

In addition to the general expansion of the field of international issues, the following belong to the most important development trends in recent decades:

- The relative importance of bilateral treaties is declining and multilateral treaties are becoming more and more important while the international interdependence is constantly growing.
- The international law regulates increasingly and more directly the rights and obligations of individuals and legal persons, and it does not any longer concern exclusively relations between the states as in the past. Treaties and decisions of the international organizations often also apply to the powers of national authorities within the territory of states. The nation-states' exclusive authority over persons coming under their territorial sovereignty is correspondingly reduced. These are issues which have traditionally been covered by national law. More and more matters which previously were considered domestic affairs and fell within the scope of Parliaments are now subject to international decision-making. The distinction between domestic and foreign affairs is likewise fading.
- The significance of international organizations, including those which promote regional cooperation and integration (such as European Union - EU, North American Free Trade Agreement - NAFTA, The Economic Community of West African Countries - CEDEAO, West African Economic and Monetary Union - UEMOA and Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation - APEC) is growing. Decision-making in international organizations is shifting more and more to forms in which a decision can be taken in spite of the opposition of an individual state. In certain cases organizations have direct legislative, judicial and executive powers which extend to their member states and their citizens and economic operators. International

organizations likewise prepare and control the implementation of an increasing proportion of treaties and often are direct parties to these treaties.

- The internationalization of politics and the formal decision-making power of international organizations do not necessarily and exclusively lead to democracy problems nor to a democratic deficit. The internationalization of domestic affairs can also create new opportunities for democracy. Parliaments and parliamentarians become more involved in foreign affairs, and this development brings about efforts in Parliaments to find new ways of work in order to have influence on these affairs.
- In addition to treaties and decisions of international organizations with stricter and more direct obligations, international conferences (for example the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, now OSCE) devise international rules which are not created in the form of treaties or binding decisions to the international organizations. All the same such "soft law" may in practice have a great political significance and more legal effects extending to individuals than actual treaties.

National Parliaments as part of the national system for deciding international affairs face plenty of challenges if they intend to preserve even the most essential parts of their traditional role in national decision-making when the distinction between national and international decision-making is constantly fading. This report aims to describe the present role of Parliaments in both traditional bilateral and multilateral foreign relations, in the preparation and ratification of international treaties, in the work and decision-making of international organizations and in expanding supranational decision-making.

The diversity of political systems and differences between decision-making systems have an important influence on the preparation of such a report. For this reason the report will limit itself to a general description of systems, avoiding excessive details. Details which may be of general interest have, however, been included in the report.

II. General features of the conduct of foreign relations

Foreign policy has traditionally been and is still without exception a key part of the responsibilities of the Executive. In most countries, the leading role of the Executive in the field of foreign policy is clearly established in constitutional law and is supported by both legislation at the lower-level and customary practice. Parliaments' position in the system for deciding foreign policy varies as a result of differences between political systems and cultures. Parliaments

have established their role in foreign policy decision-making through and as a consequence of their traditional areas of power, the dependence of governments on parliamentary support, as well as their legislative and budgetary powers. This especially applies to the ratification of international treaties and the adoption of legislation implementing them at the national level. Parliaments' means to direct and control the conduct of foreign relations have become or are becoming more diverse with the strengthening of Parliaments' general position.

Growing parliamentary diplomacy has created a new and more significant level in the conduct of international relations. Regionally defined supranational forms of decision-making appear to have awakened Parliaments to increase their role in the supranational decision-making which is generally in the hands of Governments.

III. Foreign policy decision-making systems and their bases

Despite differences between foreign policy decision-making systems, a common feature is that the key actor and decision-maker in every country is the Executive. Systems mainly differ with regard to whether this means the Government, the head of state and the Government with a division of tasks and responsibilities or the head of state alone. In classifying different countries' decision-making systems according to the strength of parliamentary influence, it should be noted first of all that Slovenia would appear to have a foreign policy decision-making system in which Parliament plays an exceptionally strong role. Australia, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Namibia, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom have systems in which the Government plays the leading role, influenced by Parliament. In Belgium, Denmark, Germany, India, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway and Spain, the head of state may have broad formal powers, but actual power is in spite of that in the hands of the Government, which is responsible to Parliament.

In Andorra, Bulgaria, the Congo, Egypt, Finland, France, the Republic of Korea, Lebanon, Niger, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Uruguay and Zambia the head of state plays a significant foreign policy role along with the Government, which is responsible to Parliament in varying degrees. In the USA and to a large extent in Russia the president plays a leading role particularly in foreign policy matters.

The forms and scope of Parliaments' participation will be discussed in greater detail later on, as will the question of the Executive's responsibility for foreign policy measures to the Parliaments in different countries, which is important from the viewpoint of parliamentary influence.

The basis of the decision-making system of most of the countries which answered the questionnaire is set out in the national constitution and supplementary legislation. In addition to the constitution and supplementary legislation, customary practice is also significant in Australia, Finland, India, Niger, Norway, Poland, Sweden and Switzerland. Practice is the main basis arrangements for managing foreign policy in the Philippines, New Zealand, United Kingdom and Zambia.

IV. The role of Parliament in foreign policy decision-making

1. In the preparatory phase

Parliaments do not generally play a formal role in the preparation of foreign policy matters, i.e. factual foreign policy measures and treaties. On the other hand, Parliaments generally receive the information they require with regard to foreign policy matters in the preparatory phase through the use of general parliamentary means of influence, which include discussions in advance initiated by the Government or Parliament, oral and written questions and even interpellations and the right to request documents. In most Parliaments the foreign affairs committee plays a key role in supervising matters which are in the preparatory phase.

Certain countries have created formal procedures aimed at avoiding confrontation and maintaining the tradition of national consensus in foreign policy matters. Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland have such procedures, for example. According to the Danish constitution, the Government must consult with the foreign affairs committee when matters are being prepared and before any decision of major importance is taken in foreign policy matters.

The Finnish Parliament's foreign affairs committee always has the right to receive on request or on the initiative of the government a report on foreign policy matters under preparation. After receiving such a report the committee can issue a statement which is politically, though not legally binding on the Government. Arrangements concerning the foreign affairs committee in the Philippine Parliament and the Polish Sejm are very similar. With regard to the Polish system, the Government or an authority subordinate to it must report to the committee within 30 days of receiving special or general instructions from the foreign affairs committee.

In addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Norwegian Parliament has an Enlarged Committee on Foreign Affairs which also consists of the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the President and the Vice President of Parliament, the chairman of the Defence Committee and up to 11 other members. The task of the enlarged committee on foreign affairs is to discuss important foreign, trade and security policy issues with the Government before the final decisions are taken.

In the Swedish system, in addition to the foreign affairs committee a significant role is played by the Foreign Affairs Advisory Council, which consists of the Speaker of Parliament and nine other members elected by Parliament. The task of the Foreign Affairs Advisory Council is to discuss especially important foreign policy matters with the Government. The Government is obliged to keep the council informed on matters related to the nation's foreign relations and to discuss important foreign policy decisions with the council in advance. The council also has the power to decide urgent matters on behalf of the plenary session of Parliament in certain cases.

The federal government of Switzerland has a legal obligation to inform and consult with the foreign affairs committees of both chambers of Parliament regarding the principles to be followed in the preparation of international matters. Such consultation does not mean co-decision or joint responsibility; the Government has final authority and responsibility over the decision. In addition the Government informs the Presidents of the two Chambers on general developments in international relations.

The Slovenian Parliament and its foreign affairs committee play a strong role not only in foreign policy decision-making, but also in preparing decisions. The foreign affairs committee is involved in studying the field of foreign policy of the Republic of Slovenia, preparing policy decisions, forming positions regarding individual questions and preparing, studying and discussing bills and other acts in the field concerned. According to their content and nature, various subjects regarding foreign policy are also discussed by other committees of Parliament. Committees can also propose an extraordinary session of Parliament regarding different foreign policy issues, or propose that a certain item is added to the agenda of the plenary session. Matters of the greatest importance are discussed, already in their preparatory phase, at sessions of Parliament. It should also be noted that in the initial phase the foreign affairs committee confirms the initiative for conclusion of an international treaty and gives its suggestions. In the negotiating phase the delegation which negotiates a certain matter reports to the foreign affairs committee in case of new elements in the negotiations.

In Italy both chambers of Parliament likewise play a significant role in the analysis and investigative stages of foreign policy. They have broad powers to

demand reports from the Government and to direct its activities. Representatives of the Government can at any time be required to appear before the committees. A practical example is decision-making regarding UN military operations, in which Italian participation is preceded by parliamentary debate, possibly with a vote. With regard to UN peacekeeping operations, in the Finnish system the Government can decide on participation in normal peacekeeping operations after hearing Parliament's foreign affairs committee, but participation in operations involving the right to use force requires, as in Italy, debate in plenary session on the basis of a Government report. In Germany the Federal Constitutional Court ruled in July 1994 that the Federal Government was obliged, as a matter of principle, to seek the prior consent of the Bundestag to any missions of the armed forces.

The Philippine Parliament participates in the preparation of foreign policy matters primarily in the form of discussions. The Philippine Parliament can also take initiatives in the field of foreign policy either through its legislative power or by approving special resolutions and thus informing the Government of its opinion. The Philippine Parliament likewise plays a significant role in preparing and deciding highly sensitive and important foreign policy matters through the participation of its select officials in the national security council. To formulate policy there is also a Legislative-Executive Development Advisory Council, which serves as a consultative and advisory body, and has for its members, among others, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and representatives from the main minority political party in both houses of Congress.

The US Senate or the Congress may occasionally propose negotiations informally or in legislation. Moreover, the executive branch is supposed to advise appropriate congressional leaders and committees of the intention to negotiate significant new agreements and consult them about the form of the agreement. This practice provides key Members of Congress with the notice they need to provide negotiating input for the Executive. Sometimes consultations regarding specific treaties and international agreements are provided for in legislation. In addition, Congress has created an express statutory scheme for the negotiation, approval, and implementation of reciprocal and free trade agreements (for example, the GATT agreements and the NAFTA) under which Congress expressly authorizes and approves these agreements, and requires the executive branch to consult with Congress during negotiations.

2. In decision-making

Decision-making power in day-to-day matters appears everywhere to be in the hands of the Executive. There are special regulations regarding Parliament's

influence and the need for approval in decisions regarding war and peace, changes in national borders and allowing foreign military forces access to or transit through national territory. In connection with the signing of treaties, Parliament's role is most often connected and in many cases limited to Parliament's traditional decision-making role in the use of legislative and budgetary power and otherwise matters which come within Parliament's remit, such as treaties which in one way or another limit national sovereignty. Treaties which include significant obligations or are otherwise especially important for the country in question can also require the approval of Parliament. These are described in different terms in various countries and include, for example, treaties pertaining to membership in international organizations (e.g. Andorra, Egypt, Republic of Korea, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland).

Parliament's task is most often to approve or authorize the ratification of treaties which come within its remit, or, less often (e.g. Bulgaria, Germany, Greece, Romania and Slovenia) to directly decide on the ratification. On the other hand, as the treaties are presented to Parliaments after negotiations have ended and the parties have signed them. Parliaments do not have real opportunities to change the treaty text. They can either give their consent as such or with certain reservations, if reservations are permitted by the treaty itself, or refuse to give it, or return the matter to the Government for new negotiations. In addition Parliament can, as in Belgium, require that the treaty will be applied and interpreted in a specific way when it enacts legislation approving the treaty. Quite often Parliament's authorization to ratify a treaty and procedure for implementing a treaty at the national level take place in the form of legislation, although in Finland the decision to authorize the ratification of a treaty takes place in the form of a resolution.

In France since the constitutional reform of 1992, the President of the Republic, the Prime Minister, as well as the President of the National Assembly, the President of the Senate, sixty deputies or sixty senators may request the Constitutional Council to declare whether an international commitment involves an arrangement contrary to the Constitution. If that is the case, parliamentary authorization of ratification can be given only after amendment of the Constitution.

The US Senate's role is primarily to pass judgement on whether completed treaties should be ratified by the United States and/or if any final conditions should be set prior to ratification.

As a rule decisions in treaty matters can be made by majority vote. In the Philippines and the United States, however, the Senate must approve treaties by a two-thirds majority. In Finland treaties involving a reduction in national territory as well as treaties including stipulations in conflict with constitutional law likewise require a two-thirds majority.

In some countries it is sufficient for the Government to inform Parliament of signed treaties and provide a chance for discussion (Australia, India, Israel and New Zealand). The role of the Zambian Parliament is mainly to issue a positive or negative recommendation regarding treaties.

In the Netherlands the Government presents treaties to both chambers of Parliament before ratification. If Parliament does not react within a period of 30 days the treaty is agreed to by silent consent. If 15 members or more of the First Chamber or 30 members or more of the Lower House declare that the treaty needs explicit consent, then the treaty has to pass both the Houses like a bill of law. This procedure is called the "voorhang" procedure.

In Australia, proposed treaty actions, including amendments or denunciations and withdrawals, are tabled in both Houses for at least 15 sitting days before the government takes binding action. This means that the texts are tabled after the treaties have been signed for Australia but before ratification. Treaty texts are tabled with a "National Interest Analysis" which provides information in support of the proposal. The Australian Parliament does not have the power to approve or disallow treaty actions, only to review and scrutinise them.

The British Parliament has no formal role in treaty-making. In the normal course of events, and by convention, the so-called "Ponsonby Rule" forms the usual constitutional practice. Under this convention, any treaty subject to ratification is laid before Parliament for at least 21 days before ratification is carried out. The presumption is that time could and would be found for a debate in the House of Commons on any treaty so laid, if there was sufficient political pressure for it. The House of Lords has recently given a unanimous second reading to a bill which would subject treaties to parliamentary control following the practice adopted in Australia.

In most countries denunciation of treaties falls within the powers of the Executive. However, in order to denounce a treaty to which parliamentary consent was necessary when the treaty was concluded, parliamentary approval is necessary in a few countries (Andorra, Bulgaria, Denmark, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and the USA). In some countries Parliament can itself make initiatives regarding the denouncement of treaties (e.g. Belgium, Republic of Korea, Slovenia and Spain).

V. Role of Parliament with respect to appointments and other administrative decisions with foreign policy implications

Parliaments do not generally play a role regarding appointments in the field of foreign policy administration. As an exception to this general rule,

Parliaments do have a certain role in making appointments in the field of foreign policy administration at least in Bulgaria, the Philippines, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovenia, Uruguay and the USA. On the other hand parliaments do play a strong role everywhere in passing legislation pertaining to foreign policy administration and especially in deciding on its budget.

In the Philippines the appointment of ambassadors requires the approval of a separate commission formed by members of both chambers of Congress.

Before voting on the whole Government individual ministers undergo in the Polish Sejm hearings in the committees. The same applies to ambassadors and consuls (committee on foreign affairs and committee on liaison with Poles abroad). In case of the appointment of ambassadors and consuls the committees' opinion is treated as binding by the ministry of foreign affairs even though there are no formal rules in this respect.

In Romania the Parliament gives its vote of confidence to the list of the government members including the foreign affairs minister. The foreign policy committees give their opinion on the proposals concerning the ambassadors of Romania to be sent abroad.

According to the Russian constitution, the President of the Russian Federation appoints and recalls diplomatic representatives working in foreign states and international organizations after negotiations with the appropriate committees in chambers of the Federal Assembly.

The Parliament of the Republic of Slovenia elects, appoints and discharges ministers, including the minister of foreign affairs, who must before his appointment appear before the foreign affairs committee and answer the questions put to him by the members of the committee. The foreign affairs committee of Parliament also conducts the hearing of the candidates for the ambassadors of Slovenia and gives its accord to the appointment.

The Senate of the United States must confirm (approve) the appointments of all cabinet officers of the President - which include the Secretaries of State and Defence. All Deputy Secretaries, and Undersecretaries and Assistant Secretaries of all cabinet departments of the President must likewise be confirmed by the Senate.

On occasion, the President of the United States has appointed temporary advisory commissions to provide him and his administration with options on particular foreign policy issues. These commissions normally are comprised of senior executive branch officials, private sector experts, and Members of Congress.

Other special arrangements worth mentioning in this connection include governmental inquiry commissions in Sweden where parliamentarians are members and which may constitute an important part of the preparatory phase of major foreign policy issues. In Finland "parliamentary committees" can be appointed to prepare major policy positions pertaining to foreign policy as well as other fields. These committees are made up either entirely or partly of MPs summoned by the Government.

VI. Role of Parliament in controlling foreign policy

1. Parliamentary accountability

As was indicated in section III above, foreign policy decision-making systems are directed by the Government in most countries. The Government is generally accountable to Parliament for all its measures and thus for the foreign policy it conducts. In the Republic of Korea neither the head of state nor the Government is accountable to Parliament, which nevertheless can recommend changes in ministers, including the prime minister and foreign minister. Switzerland also lacks provisions on a vote of censure of the Government. The members of the Government are chosen for a fixed term and cannot legally be forced to resign. In spite of this Parliament can control the Government in many ways.

In the sense of parliamentary votes of confidence, the American President is not accountable to the Congress for foreign policy decisions and actions. However, congressional approval of the expenditure of public funds allows it to increase or decrease program funding as a reflection of support or opposition to a particular policy. Cabinet officials and diplomatic representatives can be summoned to appear for congressional committees to explain and defend their foreign policy actions. An executive branch official can be impeached by a majority vote of the House of Representatives and removed from office by a two-thirds vote of the Senate for "high crimes and misdemeanors", but such actions are extraordinarily rare.

The presidents of Finland, France, Poland, Russia and Zambia are not directly accountable to Parliament for their actions. The Governments, however, also in these countries are accountable to the elected chambers of Parliaments.

2. Role of the plenary session

Confidence between Parliament and the Government is naturally the basis for the control of all activities, including foreign policy. Several parliamentary

instruments such as annual general political debates, consideration of the annual budget and other bills submitted by the Government or MPs, different reports by the Government, special sessions and debates, oral or written questions and motions of censure constitute effective means in the parliamentary control of foreign policy. In many Parliaments the opportunity to arrange special debates on timely matters outside the agenda is also an effective way to supervise foreign policy.

It is worth mentioning that the government submits to the Norwegian Parliament every year all treaties which have been concluded. Thus the Parliament is able to control that the government has not on its own concluded a treaty without having submitted it to the Parliament for its consent in cases where parliamentary approval would have been required.

3. Role of parliamentary committees

Owing to the confidentiality generally associated with foreign policy matters, parliamentary control of foreign policy is in a large number of Parliaments mainly in the hands of the foreign affairs committee (e.g. Andorra, Denmark, Ireland, Israel, Italy and the USA). The foreign affairs committee can require the Government to submit reports on specific foreign policy issues and request related documents. The Greek Parliament, for example, can appoint special committees of inquiry for this purpose and the Italian Parliament's committees have specific investigative and supervising functions. The Israeli Government has an obligation to report to Parliament's foreign affairs and defence committee regularly. The Danish Parliament's foreign affairs committee has traditionally been able to submit oral questions to the Government, but recently practice has been altered so that written questions can also be presented.

The US Congress has no procedure for parliamentary questions and interpellations. The principal forum for directing questions to administration officials is at committee hearings held by one or more of the foreign policy related committees of the House and Senate. To understand the crucial role of the committees of the House and Senate both in the legislative process and in the control of foreign policy, the following should be noted. Committees in the House and Senate are given independent operating budgets with which to employ staff, to travel to domestic or international destinations, and to otherwise cover operational costs. Each committee in the House and Senate typically employs 50 or more staff to provide to committee members specialized analyses for pending legislation and for program review. Committees may also use the services of congressional support agencies in reviewing foreign policy priorities.

VII. International contacts of Parliaments and parliamentarians

1. Importance of parliamentary contacts

The international contacts of Parliaments at present play an important and major role in boosting mutual understanding and cooperation among the Parliaments. This parliamentary diplomacy was developed as a reaction to the changes of international relations particularly at the end of secret diplomacy and the fading of the border-line between traditional foreign policy and domestic policy. The issues of development, environment protection, human rights and others which were deemed purely state domestic responsibility have obtained the same significant treatment as security, political and military issues in contemporary international relations. It is also natural that the importance of this parliamentary diplomacy in shaping the state foreign policies increases as a result of the heightened role of international organizations. In this context should be mentioned regional and international parliamentary organizations, besides the increased contribution of local public opinion through the parliamentarians to foreign policy issues, particularly those related to means of subsistence and living conditions. One may say with good reasons that parliamentary diplomacy has become an effective element in formulating contemporary international relations and taking initiatives.

The international contacts of Parliaments and parliamentarians can as well be considered as another "track" of diplomacy, which completes and supports the efforts of national governments in promoting cooperation and understanding. The parliamentary contacts have special advantage in that they are not constrained by diplomatic procedures and are freer in their discussions.

At this particular time it is worth noting that in the different parts of the world, while a great number of countries are still in the period of transition, bilateral contacts and first-hand exchange of views between parliamentarians seem to be an excellent opportunity to discuss matters of concern and help to establish good relations and cooperation between different countries, without forgetting the efforts to support newly-established democracies by the multi-lateral observation of elections.

2. Forms of parliamentary contacts

The strengthening and activation of the role of Parliaments which has taken place as a result of the spread and establishment of the democratic form of government has signified more lively international contacts and parliamentary diplomacy between Parliaments. Bilateral parliamentary exchanges have in-

creased in numbers and importance worldwide. Regional and international organizations have established parliamentary assemblies which are active participants in the work of organizations. The North Atlantic Assembly and OSCE Parliamentary Assembly are examples of these kind of parliamentary organizations. In addition to contacts at the parliamentary level in the interparliamentary organizations, there are also many more direct contacts such as study tours abroad, special conferences and coordination of individual issues at regional and global level.

Nowadays other parliamentary committees besides traditional foreign affairs committees are involved with international matters much more than in the past. For this reason it is only natural that international contacts and exchanges of visits have increased intensely at the committee level as well. Nor should one forget in this connection traditional bilateral exchanges of visits between parliamentary delegations, speakers and foreign affairs committees. Bilateral and to some extent multilateral friendship group activities have likewise flourished in recent years.

With regard to parliamentarians' participation in the work of international organizations, it should be noted first of all that at the global level this involves participation in the activities of the Interparliamentary Union (IPU) and quite generally in different forms MPs' participation in their countries' delegations to the UN General Assembly, generally appointed by the Government. The Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA) and the International Assembly of French-speaking Parliamentarians (AIPLF) are important international forums of their member states. At the civil service level, mention should be made of the Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments (ASGP), which convenes in connection with the conferences of the Interparliamentary Union.

Otherwise Parliament's participation in the work of international organizations is clearly divided geographically. The European Parliaments send delegations to the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, the North Atlantic Assembly, the Assembly of the OSCE and the Assembly of the Western European Union. The Nordic cooperation is quite close at both governmental and parliamentary level within the framework of the Nordic Council. Corresponding organizations include the African Parliamentary Union (APU) and the newly launched SADC Parliamentary Forum in Southern Africa and the Asian-Pacific Parliamentarians Union (APPU), the Asia Pacific Parliamentary Forum (APPF), the Asian Parliamentarians Meeting on Popular Developments (APMPD) and the Asian Forum for Parliamentarians on Population and Development (AFPPD) in Asia. Australia participates in the APPF and in the work of the ASEAN Interparliamentary Organization (AIPO) as well as the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association (CPA).

The US Congress is actively involved in the North Atlantic Assembly, the Parliamentary Assembly of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the Interparliamentary Union. Members of Congress are also appointed as members of US delegations to the UN, the OSCE and other international organization meetings, as well as bilateral and multilateral arms control and peace negotiations. Such appointments are made by the President.

The US Congress has shown reticence to become more deeply involved in formal parliamentary organizations, either bilateral or multilateral. In fact some members have questioned even the current level of congressional involvement in parliamentary organizations, such as the IPU. In the present circumstances, there seems little likelihood that the US Congress will expand its role in formal, bilateral and international organizations.

Only a few Parliaments replying to the questionnaire indicated problems related to international contacts. Even in these cases problems are either financial or involve pressures to be on hand for parliamentary work.

3. The costs of international parliamentary contacts

Costs, which do not include the salaries of personnel assisting in international parliamentary work, appear to be quite reasonable everywhere. Costs are about 1% or less of Parliament's total budget in Belgium, France, Ireland, Italy, New Zealand, the Philippines and United Kingdom. Costs are between 2% and 5% in Andorra, Denmark, Iceland, the Republic of Korea, Poland, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, Uruguay and Zambia and are in the range of 6-7% in Finland, Norway, Romania and Sweden. In this connection it should be pointed out that public opinion does not appear to be very supportive of parliamentary travel in any country.

VIII. Parliaments and supranational decision-making

Apart from the United Nations, supranational decision-making appears to involve mainly different global or regional economic organizations. Parliaments seldom have special arrangements for participating in supranational decision-making apart from normal means of influencing and supervising the Government. In some countries the constitution includes the possibility to delegate powers to supranational organs or at least procedural rules for joining organizations exercising supranational decision-making authority. Such provisions, which generally require a qualified majority, are included e.g. in the constitutions of Andorra, Germany, Norway and Sweden and in the legislation of Switzerland.

The most advanced special arrangements for national Parliament's participation in the formation of national positions in connection with supranational decision-making have been developed in the members states of the European Union. Pioneers in this respect since the 1970s have been the Parliaments of Britain and Denmark, each within the framework of its own parliamentary system. In the Danish Europe committee model, the national Parliament directs and controls activities of the Government in the European Union's supranational decision-making through a special European affairs committee. This model appears to have awakened growing interest in different EU countries as each member state and its Parliament has developed its own participation in the handling of EU matters. At the present moment there are advanced systems from the viewpoint of parliamentary influence in Denmark and in Finland, which has developed its own form of parliamentary participation on the basis of the Danish model.

The role of the German legislative bodies, the Bundestag and the Bundesrat, in the preparation of the national position in the European Union affairs has been adjusted by the amendment of the Basic Law in 1992.

In addition, mention should be made in this context of the rapidly developing cooperation among the national parliaments of the Member States of the European Union and between these and the European Parliament, including regular meetings of Speakers of Parliaments and the biannual meetings of COSAC (Conference of European Affairs Committees).

IX. Constraints on the foreign policy role of Parliament

The secrecy or confidentiality which is often associated with foreign policy matters does not appear to be a special obstacle to the foreign policy role of Parliament, according to replies. On the basis of written procedural rules or customary practices, Parliaments have established possibilities to declare a plenary session or committee meetings closed or secret even in those countries where committee meetings are otherwise open. This means that confidentiality is not a special obstacle in the parliamentary consideration of matters. On the other hand a bigger problem experienced by some Parliaments is the insufficiency of foreign policy information and difficulties in obtaining information at the proper time. This problem is connected to the basic character of the foreign policy decision-making system, in which foreign policy matters mainly fall within the scope of the Executive.

X. Certain development features related to foreign policy decision-making

In certain members of the European Union (Belgium, France, Italy, Sweden and Britain), a key short-term development goal is the strengthening of the role of national Parliament in the European Union's decision-making. In Australia, attention has recently focussed on strengthening the role of the Parliament in the scrutiny of treaties by establishment of a Joint Standing Committee on Treaties to review treaties and proposed treaty actions presented to the Parliament.

The reply of the Zambian Parliament draws attention to the need to maintain national sovereignty. The Federal Council of Russia mentions growth in the role of international organizations and related supranational decision-making and notes that carrying out the decisions of international organizations regardless of the approval or disapproval of individual states is possible only within fixed limits.

The increasing role of non-governmental organizations and interested civic groups (such as Amnesty International, Greenpeace, etc.) should also be considered in addition to the work of international organizations and conferences (Greece).

ANNEX

List of Parliaments replying to the questionnaire

Andorra	(General Council)
Australia	(House of Representatives - joint reply)
Belgium	(both Houses)
Bulgaria	(Parliament)
Congo	(Assemblée Nationale)
Denmark	(Folketing)
Egypt	(People's Assembly)
Finland	(Eduskunta)
France	(Assemblée Nationale)
Germany	(both Houses)
Greece	(Chamber of Deputies)
Iceland	(Althingi)
Italy	(Chamber of Deputies)
India	(Rajya Sabha)
Ireland	(joint reply)

Israel	(Knesset)
Korea (Rep. of)	(National Assembly)
Lebanon	(Assemblée Nationale)
Mali	(Assemblée Nationale)
Namibia	(National Assembly)
Netherlands	(First Chamber)
Niger	(National Assembly)
Norway	(Storting)
New Zealand	(House of Representatives)
Philippines	(joint reply)
Poland	(both Houses)
Portugal	(Assembly of the Republic)
Romania	(both Houses)
Russia	(Federal Council)
Slovenia	(Parliament)
Spain	(both Houses)
Sweden	(Riksdag)
Switzerland	(Federal Assembly - joint reply)
United Kingdom	(House of Commons)
United States of America	(Senate)
Uruguay	(joint reply)
Zambia	(National Assembly)

V. Assistance provided for individual Members in respect of allowances, equipment and staff.

Report prepared by Mr. Michel MEVA'A M'EBOUTOU (Cameroon), adopted at the Istanbul Session (April 1996)

This report summarises the responses to the mini-questionnaire on the assistance provided for individual members in respect of allowances, equipment and staff, in connection with their parliamentary duties.

In practice, it is the result of a simple count of the replies. Such a process precludes the very scientific analysis on which an in-depth report could be based. A number of practical factors have necessitated this.

It should be said first of all that only 54 replies were received and that some bicameral parliaments only replied in respect of one House. Nevertheless, the low number of replies is happily compensated by the satisfactorily representative spread of the responses in terms of region, culture, and level of development.

Furthermore, study of the replies reveals a number of different approaches: while some have followed the issues in the mini-questionnaire point by point, others have replied more generally to a series of questions. Several went beyond the stated issues and their comments have provided a wealth of extra information. This diversity in the responses has necessitated extra effort of interpretation and harmonisation. Because of this the accuracy of some of the information may be somewhat fragile, for which I apologise in advance.

For reasons of clarity, and so as to stay as faithful as possible to the information given and to draw useful conclusions, the report maintains the three part structure of the mini-questionnaire:

- the definition of the assistance in terms of finance, material and staff available to a Member on an individual basis;
- the legal and political basis for this assistance;
- the procedures for management of the assistance.

I. Description of the assistance, in terms of finance, material and staff, available to a members on an individual basis

Almost all Parliaments under consideration respected the distinction in the questionnaire between financial, material and staff assistance.

(A) Financial Assistance

The first observation to be made is that all the parliaments, with the sole exception of Uruguay, provide some financial assistance to Members of Parliament on an individual basis. In almost all cases there is a wide spectrum of financial subventions, the justification for which is the same everywhere (to enable a Member of Parliament to have a reasonable lifestyle and to protect him from being open to pressure) although there are differences in nomenclature from one parliament to another.

In Algeria, for example, the financial assistance comprises a parliamentary salary, an allowance for expenses and a further set allowance; in Australia, and in other countries, reference is made to salaries, to which are added electoral costs and official expenses.

As well as differences in nomenclature, there are differences in form from one country to another; generally there is a payment of a set amount or a reimbursement of expenses incurred, as in Israel, the US Senate, United Kingdom, FYR of Macedonia, Kenya, and Cameroon. However, it should be noted that 15 countries, and the European Parliament, combine these two forms of financial assistance.

Thirdly, it appears that in relatively few countries does the assistance given to a Member of Parliament give rise to any tax concessions. Amongst these rare cases are Denmark, Israel, the United Kingdom (House of Lords), Kenya and Uganda.

On the same lines, it can be seen that in countries where the duties of a Member are considered as part-time, for example, in Switzerland and the United Kingdom (House of Lords), a Member is allowed to combine his financial assistance with other income from the state, although this is formally forbidden in most other countries.

Almost all the replies indicated that the financial assistance given to a Member on an individual basis was given to the Member as of right. Only Uruguay (Senate), Kenya and Sudan regarded it as a discretionary subsidy. On the other hand Brazil, the Rep. of Korea, and New Zealand, appeared to regard

the assistance given as having the characteristics both of an entitlement and a subsidy.

The right to financial support given to a Member is generally enshrined in some form of official provision. Occasionally, this is in the Constitution (Japan). However, in most countries it is in a law or statute distinct from the rules of parliament; rules of parliament form the legal basis in only a few countries. A few countries give legal force to the idea of financial assistance for a Member by means other than a law or statute; usually by means of a Resolution, notably in Israel, the United Kingdom, Botswana and Brazil. Only in Italy, the Philippines, and Peru, has the principle not been translated into a text of some kind.

As for the level of the financial assistance given to a Member on an individual basis, in 14 countries the amount paid is related to the amount paid to Members of Government including one African country (Zambia), the others being in Europe, Asia or America. In 16 countries (four in Africa, nine in Africa, two in America, and one in Asia) the reference point is the remuneration given to senior civil servants. 13 other countries and the European Parliament do not relate their financial assistance to any of these levels. The response from Iceland is not precise on this point.

As for the levels of assistance given to Members *within* a single parliament, about 13 countries do have some differences in level. The differences usually arise from the particular roles held in the parliament (Member of the Bureau or Chairman of a Committee for example), or from differences in electoral costs or annual expenditure (as in Australia or Canada), calculated respectively on the basis of the size of the constituency (Australia) and on the distance between it and the capital (Canada).

Patterns are not the same in respect of establishing whether financial assistance given to a Member (wholly or partly) are subject to tax, seizure/distrainment, or combinable with other income from the state. From the replies received, it appears that in nine countries - that is, the United Kingdom (Lords), USA (Senate), Uruguay, Denmark, Israel, Philippines (Senate), Kenya, Uganda and Botswana - none of these possibilities (taxation, seizure or accumulation) are applicable.

By contrast, in all the other countries, with the exception of Zimbabwe, Zambia, Chile and the European Parliament, elements of the financial assistance are subject to tax and to seizure, either in total (Spain, Rep. of Korea, Australia, Algeria, Cameroon) or in part (Belgium, Finland, France - National Assembly). In all cases, the element which is so subject is the basic salary (or however it is styled in each country).

While most countries permit the accumulation of income with other income originating from the State, the replies to the questionnaire do not, however, enable the exact elements so authorised to be detailed.

Finally, countries such as Switzerland, Germany and Belgium make such accumulation subject to the rules on incompatibilities.

(B) Material Assistance

The main information sought here was under the following headings: travel, accommodation, offices, office equipment, mail and documents.

1) As for travel, almost all the parliaments and parliamentary organisations concerned accept the principle of paying for transport costs, with the exception of Israel, Rep. of Korea, Uruguay, Panama, Cyprus (in respect of accommodation) and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Western European Union. In some countries, the principle is even enshrined in the constitution or other basic laws. This is the case in France, Belgium, Norway, Spain, Switzerland, Portugal, Greece and Germany.

Differences among the countries which recognise Members' rights to assistance with travel costs arise both in the breadth of the applicability of the assistance and also in the modalities used.

Thus in 22 parliaments, to which may be added the House of Lords of the United Kingdom, the US Senate, and the European Parliament, the payment is made for travel costs both in respect of travel within the constituency and travel between there and the capital. In other countries, responsibility for transport costs is limited to travel between the constituency and the capital. But some countries extend payment to travel within the capital. This is the case in Algeria, Australia, the Belgian, French, Chilean and Polish Senates, in Brazil, Lithuania, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Botswana, Netherlands, Germany, and Iceland.

As for the modalities, these differ according to the country and according to whether the payment is for travel within the constituency, or between the constituency and the capital, or within the capital. The responses may be grouped as follows:

- The parliaments which pay for travel costs within the constituency generally pay a fixed sum to the Member and sometimes reimburse actual costs. In Canada, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Botswana and Australia the amount granted in respect of travel costs is a function of the sparseness of the constituency or the electorate.

- In respect of travel costs between the constituency and the capital, these are given in most cases by provision of transport, or of travel tickets, or by reimbursement of fares or a travel grant (Cyprus for example).
- Within the capital, assistance sometimes takes the form of free use of a car park; in others, it is reimbursement of costs and sometimes also payment of a fixed sum.

It should be noted that the assistance applies only to transport costs incurred in the course of official duties. The assistance given in some countries (Kenya, Cameroon, Papua New Guinea) through various forms of loan for the purchase of a private or official vehicle must also be noted. In Iceland, a Member is given a monthly allowance for the maintenance of a vehicle; the lowest rate of allowance is given to Members representing the capital and the highest rates are given for the Members who are furthest away. French Deputies travel free by train.

2) As for accommodation, only seven countries (Denmark, Korea (Rep.), Spain, Uruguay, FYR of Macedonia, Greece and Panama) and in addition the American and French Senates and the Philippine House of Representatives do not offer such assistance.

On the other hand, amongst those which do offer such assistance, only seven parliaments pay for accommodation of a Member of Parliament both in the constituency and in the capitals. These are Australia, Canada, the French Senate, Peru, Sweden, Germany and Iceland.

The modalities of such assistance are diverse and more than one can apply at the same time in some countries. Thus in Canada, Italy, Algeria, and Belgium, for example, the Member of Parliament receives for the purposes of accommodation, either subsistence costs or an accommodation grant. In Iceland for example a monthly accommodation allowance is paid to Members who live outside the capital or the surrounding area. Provision is also made for a fixed annual sum to pay the living costs in the constituency of a Member resident in the capital whose constituency is elsewhere. In Cameroon, Norway, Brazil, India, Chile etc a form of accommodation grant is paid directly by the parliament to hotels, whether to private hotels, or to hotels belonging to parliament or government. In India, accommodation is provided either in the capital or at the seat of Parliament. In Finland, Zimbabwe and France (Senate) loans for the acquisition of accommodation, particularly in the capital, are provided or guaranteed. The French National Assembly may provide loans to Deputies to acquire accommodation.

3) Use of a telephone, either free of charge or at a reduced cost, is one of the forms of material assistance given to Members of Parliament in almost all the

cases examined. In only two countries, New Zealand and Zambia, was there any exception to this, together to some extent with the US Senate.

In all, 32 parliaments, as well as the European Parliament, the French Senate, the Uruguayan Senate and the Philippine House of Representatives accept responsibility for telephone costs.

But in 11 of these countries (including Cyprus) as well as the European Parliament, the Belgian Senate, and the Philippine Senate, it is only calls made from the Parliament which are covered, while in some 20 other countries, such as Canada, Australia, France (Senate), Sweden and Italy, it covers also calls made by a Member of Parliament from his constituency. In India (Lok Sabha) the Member of Parliament has the right to two free telephone lines from his residence to his office in New Delhi and to his main home or another location in his constituency, up to an amount equivalent to 50,000 local calls. Finally, 15 countries pay a special grant for telephone costs.

4) Among the material forms of assistance covered by the questionnaire are offices made available to Members of Parliament and their staff.

The information gathered on this shows that many parliaments lack sufficient space to offer individual offices to each Member, and *a fortiori* to personal staff of the Member. Few countries even offer the possibility of two or more Members sharing the same office.

Members only have the benefit of an office on an individual basis in the following countries: Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Chile, Denmark, European Parliament, Finland, France (Senate), Germany, Israel, Italy, Korea (Rep), Lithuania, New Zealand, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines (House of Representatives), Portugal, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (House of Commons), Uruguay, and the USA (Senate).

However in 10 of these countries (for example Switzerland) some Members of Parliament share their offices with two or more people. Some countries supplied information showing the number of Members to whom this applied: Belgium (13 Senators and 14 Members), United Kingdom (27 Members and 199 Peers), Zimbabwe (8 Deputies per office), Italy (24 Senators). In addition the Philippines, Greece and Italy provide assistance to enable Members without an office within the parliamentary buildings to buy or rent an office close by. In Switzerland, a member of Parliament receives a grant for all supporting costs (telephone, offices, office equipment).

On the same point, 11 of the countries replying to the questionnaire make offices available separately to the staff of Members; these included Australia, Canada, Israel, Korea (Rep.) etc. The same number of countries, including

Algeria, India, USA (Senate), Poland, Botswana etc., as well as the European Parliament, give assistance to a Member of Parliament to maintain an office in the constituency for his personal use.

5) The replies received furnish information on the office equipment and other equipment made available to Members individually.

An analysis of these replies shows that most Parliaments are not able to make available to individual Members the equipment that they need (computers, typewriters, photocopiers). Only 12 countries, plus the Belgian and the US Senates and the European Parliament, do this. In certain other parliaments only some such material is made available to a Member. In all the other cases such equipment is made available to Members as a whole for their common use.

However, it is nevertheless generally the case that where equipment is given to an individual it must be returned to parliament on completion of the user's mandate.

6) By contrast with the situation just considered in respect of office equipment, general office supplies are made available to an individual member in almost all countries, with the exception of: Korea (Rep), Philippines, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Sudan, Uganda, Switzerland, Greece and Germany. However even in these countries some such assistance to individual Members may still be provided, albeit supplied in various ways. In the Philippines, for example, there is a special grant. Elsewhere a monthly sum is made available on an individual basis to cover expenditure on office supplies, particularly envelopes and headed or unheaded paper. It can also be added that in almost all these cases printing of such material is undertaken by the parliament.

7) As for assistance given in respect of the handling and postal charges for the mail, only 10 parliaments indicated explicitly that such assistance is not given. These were the Parliaments of Denmark, Finland, Netherlands, Spain, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Italy, Sudan, Sweden and Uganda. It should be added that the European Parliament and the Republic of Korea, while indicating that such assistance was in principle given, gave no details as to the modalities.

For all the other countries assistance with mail takes the form of free postage, or payment by parliament for franking, or reimbursement of postal charges. Sometimes there is a special grant for postal charges.

Thus by way of illustration the United Kingdom House of Lords provides pre-paid envelopes; in Australia, France, India and Zambia etc a sum of money is allocated for this purpose as a supplementary payment; in Canada, as well as the Member receiving pre-franked envelopes, the law excludes parliamentary mail (both that sent to a Member and sent by a Member) from postal charges.

8) As for documentation 14 countries and the European Parliament provide some subscriptions free of charge to a Member. However this rarely covers periodicals other than parliamentary publications.

Where there is provision for non-parliamentary publications, most parliaments supply to the Member a list of possible titles allowing him to make his own choice of those to which he wishes to subscribe. In other cases, the library or documentation services usually subscribe to publications and then make them available to members. In the same way, parliaments with computer equipment may give the Member free access to their database and seek to arrange, in different ways in different countries, free access to databases outside parliament. In all these cases the cost of accessing databases is borne by the parliament.

While all parliaments distribute parliamentary documents to their Members, none listed the particular documents so distributed. It can therefore be assumed that all the documents cited in the questionnaire are made available.

In the same way, the responses received to the questionnaire indicate that all parliaments are provided with a library or documentation service which makes its holdings available to Members allowing them to consult them there, or to borrow for consideration at home, books and other documents of their choosing.

(C) Assistance with staff

Apart from four countries (Kenya, Norway, Poland, Zimbabwe) and the Parliamentary Assembly of the Western European Union, all those who replied in one way or another provide each Member of Parliament with staff to assist with his research or in his work with the voters.

Thus in 20 countries (including Australia, Belgium (Chamber of Deputies), Canada, Denmark, as well as Peru and Lithuania) such assistants are recruited by the Member himself outside parliament and paid by the parliament. About 13 parliaments (including the European Parliament) pay a grant to the Member for the salary of such staff. Other parliaments by contrast make staff available to the Members - Finland, India, House of Representatives of the Philippines, Uruguay, New Zealand and Uganda.

Two things should be observed. On the one hand, wherever staff are taken from the staff of parliament, they are paid by the parliament directly or indirectly by means of a special grant allotted to the Member or to the parties represented in the House in proportion to their strength in parliament (as in Iceland). On the other hand, the parliaments making their staff available to Members did not

give any detail on certain matters, for example, the permanent or temporary character of the secondment, or the exact status of staff made available on a permanent basis.

As for the provision of secretarial assistance for a Member, most parliaments help the Member with provision of secretarial assistance. In effect, only the European Parliament and to some extent Finland do not do so.

It should also be noted that only around 30 parliaments help a Member with secretarial assistance on his own account, either by paying the secretary directly or by an allowance made available to the Member. Other parliaments make secretarial assistance available to Members via a typing pool. For the former, the secretaries are recruited outside parliament.

II. Legal and political basis for the assistance made available to members of Parliament

The questionnaire was drafted so as to allow, on the basis of the responses, a presentation of the various kinds of authority providing the legal and political basis for the assistance given to Members individually, notably the constitution, parliamentary rules, statutes etc. However, very few responses followed this approach. They mostly cited the particular legal authority which formed the basis of the assistance given to a Member.

Apart from financial assistance, assistance in other ways (equipment and staff) is laid down by the Constitution in 20 countries, by rules of parliament or standing orders or other equivalent legal texts in a further 20 countries, or by one or more resolutions of parliament in about 17 countries.

Overall, the different means underlying assistance given to a Member of Parliament is laid down in most cases by several authorities at the same time, some of which only lay down the methods by which the principles set out in other authorities shall be enforced.

All parliaments replied affirmatively to two questions asking whether such authorities lay down the nature, level or conditions of assistance to Members, and whether they set down limits to the power of parliament to determine the allocation or management of such assistance.

III. Procedures for determination and management of the assistance given to members of Parliament

Five fundamental points are involved: the procedure, the competent authority, the frequency of payment, the point at which assistance becomes payable, and possible suspension of assistance.

As for the procedures for determining and amending the assistance given to a Member, in most cases this is either by the ordinary legislative route or by regulatory or other measures internal to parliament. The different procedures or combination of procedures can be explained not only by the need to respect the differing constitutional or legal requirements in different systems but also by the autonomy, the sovereignty even, which parliament is generally recognised as possessing over its internal organisation and management.

The United Kingdom House of Commons is a rare example of recourse being had to a special legislative procedure: this involves proposals by an independent body (the Senior Salaries Review Body) which the Government submits to the House for approval; in Papua New Guinea the level of assistance is set by adoption without amendment of a report from a body known as the Salaries and Remuneration Commission; in Australia, it is by combination of the ordinary legislative procedure, special procedures and governmental decisions.

As for the body holding competence to decide the allocation, suspension or reduction of assistance, the replies received indicated several different types of body, respectively:

- the Bureau of the Assembly, a special organ set up within the Assembly, the Presiding Officer of the Assembly, the Chamber itself, or an extra-parliamentary body.

Most frequently, it is the Bureau of the Assembly and/or some other special organ of the Assembly. In the latter case, there is for example die Board of Internal Economy (House of Commons of Canada), die Internal Affairs Commission (Chile), die Privileges Committee (Uganda), the Parliamentary Service Commission (New Zealand).

Another option is to give competence to the House as a whole: this is the case in die Senate of Canada, and the Parliaments of Botswana, the Czech Republic, Germany, Greece, and Switzerland.

Kenya is the only parliament to give competence in diese matters to an extra-parliamentary body. In Germany it is the President of the Assembly who decides.

Constitutional and Parliamentary Information

82

It is worth noting that in some parliaments there are limits to the competence given to the designated body. Thus in France, the relevant body has no competence in respect of parliamentary salaries and the taxation regime to which they are subject.

As for the frequency of payments of benefits made available to Members, all Parliaments follow a regular pattern of payments which in most cases is monthly, though it is quarterly in Switzerland, annually in Israel, and over a 5-year period in Botswana. But in most such countries this regular pattern only applies to certain headings of assistance, the others being paid for as the occasion arises.

As for the point from which a Member may receive benefits, in most Parliaments benefits are payable from one of two dates: either the date of validation of the mandate, or from the proclamation of the election results.

Other countries however choose to use the date on which an oath is taken or the date from which the duties are undertaken (Belgian Senate, Lithuania, Portugal) or the first day of the month following the elections (Denmark), or the day of the first sitting of the Chamber (Italy).

As for the grounds on which benefits can be suspended, the most frequent ground cited was absenteeism (mentioned in 21 replies). This was followed by indiscipline (mentioned 10 times), followed by a court decision (cited 8 times).

In addition to these three principal causes a few others were also mentioned, including resignation (Canadian Senate), censure or imprisonment (France), imprisonment (India), incapacity or incompatibility (Portugal). It should be added that while no country listed all such causes at the same time, many cited two or three at least.

*

* *

Overall, only one of the parliaments under review made no assistance available to Members at all. For the others, the general rule was that assistance was given to a Member in respect of finance, equipment and staff. The principle of such assistance was the same: to allow the elected Member to lead an appropriate way of life, and, in the interests of democracy and to allow proper representation of the sovereignty of the people, sheltering him from various kinds of pressure.

Precise figures were rarely given but a brief analysis of those which were received shows that the level of assistance is largely a function of the level of

the development of the country. Overall, the average level seemed to be satisfactory.

In determining the level of assistance and its management, it is possible to pick out tendencies which could be described as 'anglo-saxon', 'latin', and 'intermediate'.

The results would perhaps have been a little different if a larger number of parliaments had replied to the questionnaire but it seems possible to say that the spread of replies which were received was sufficiently representative and largely describes the general position.

List of Chambers replying to the questionnaire

Algeria	
Australia	(Joint reply - Senate & House of Representatives)
Belgium	Senate Chamber of Representatives
Botswana	
Brazil	Senate
Bulgaria	
Cameroon	
Canada	Senate House of Commons
Chile	Senate
Cyprus	
Czech Rep.	
Denmark	
Finland	
FYR of Macedonia	
France	Assembled Nationale
France	Senate
Germany	Bundestag
Greece	
Iceland	
India	Rajya Sabha Lok Sabha
Israel	
Italy	Senate Chamber of Deputies

Constitutional and Parliamentary Information

84

Japan	House of Councillors and House of Representatives
Kenya	
Korea (Rep. of)	
Lithuania	
Netherlands	1st Chamber
New Zealand	
Norway	
Panama	
Papua New Guinea	
Peru	
Philippines	Senate
	House of Representatives
Poland	Senate
Portugal	
Spain	Senate
	Congress of Deputies
Sudan	
Sweden	
Switzerland	(Federal Assembly)
Uganda	
United Kingdom	House of Lords
	House of Commons
Uruguay	Senate
USA	Senate
Zambia	
Zimbabwe	
—	
European Parliament	
Western European Union	
—	

Total: 54 replies, from 44 countries and 2 international assemblies

Annex to the Report on

**The assistance provided for individual members
in respect of allowances, equipment and staff**

Rapporteur: Mr. Michel Meva'a m'Eboutou (Cameroon)

Comparative Tables

A - FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE	%n Cam. Cncci	AM- nla (bat Hooa)	Same Rep	Be ⁸ AM	Brai Same	Cm. crocn NL An.	Sera	Cm	c&c Same	Cash Rep. Ok. at Of	Deo. mtic Fot&M- kt	la1 bja	FODCC Sey tie	NL An	FVKrf Mice- do&S- AM	Germany Bndctog	Grace Ch. of Dept	Iceland AL- HA*
[PAGE 1 OF 3]																		
Financial Assistance?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Payment of a lump sum?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Reimbursement of costs?	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	-	Y	N	N	Y		Y	N	Y	Y
Considered to be a right?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
Considered to be a subsidy?	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Same level as members of Government?	N	N	N	N	-	N	-	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Same level as senior officials?	Y	Y	Y	N	-	Y	-	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Same for all Members?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Can be additional to other public income?	Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y	-	-	-	-	-	-	Y	Y	-	Y	N	Y
Partially or entirely subject to tax?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	-	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y <A is not subject to tax	Y
Distrainable?	N	Y	Y	-	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	-	-	Y		-	Y	-	Y
Specific legal authority?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

A - FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE	India		Israel Knesset	Italy		Japan	Kenya Nat An.	Korea, Rep. Nat. Ass.	Lithuania Seimas	Netherlands tit Ch.	NZ H. of Reprs	Norway Smiting	Papua New Ouinea	Panama	Peru Congress	Philippines		Poland Senate
	Rajya Sabha	Lok Sabha		Senate	Deps											Senate	Reps	
[PAGE 2 OF 3]																		
Financial Assistance?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Payment of a lump sum?	-	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Reimbursement of costs?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	-	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Considered to be aright?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Considered to be a subsidy?	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N
Same level as members of Government?	Y	N	YV4 the rate	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Same level as senior officials?	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	-	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y
Same for all Members?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Can be additional to other public income?	-	-	N	N	-	-	N	-	N	Y	-	-	Y	-	-	N	N	Y
Partially or entirely subject to tax?	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	N	Y partially
Distrainable?	-	-	N	N	-	N	N	-	-	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	Y	N	Y
Written legal authority?	Y	Y	-	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	N	Y	N	Y

A - FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE	Portugal ASS. or the Rep	Spain		Sudan Tnns. NIL AM.	Sweden RUadaf	Switzerland Fed. Aaa.	Uganda	United Kingdom		USA Senas	Uruguay Semis	Zambia Nat. Ass.	Zimbabwe Parit		Eur Partt	WEU
		Scute	Congress					Loida	Com- tious							
[PAGE 3 OF 3]																
Financial Assistance?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	
Payment of a lump sum?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	
Reimbursement of costs?	N	N	Y		Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	
Considered to be a right?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	
Considered to be a subsidy?	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		N	
Same level as members of Government?	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N		N	Y	N	Y	N		N	
Same level as senior officials?	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y		N	
Same for all Members?	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y		Y	
Can be additional to other public income?	-	-	N	-	-	N	N	-	Y	N	N	-	-		-	
Partially or entirely subject to tax?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	-	-		Y	
Distrainable?	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	N	N	-	N	N	-	-		-	
Written legal authority?	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	N	Y	Y		Y	

B - MATERIAL ASSISTANCE <i>I. ACCOMMODATION</i> (PAGE 1 OF 3)	Algeria Cons. Council	Austria (bo* Houei)	Belgium Senate Repts	Botswana Asa.	Brazil Senate	Can. Nat. Aaa.	Canada Senats Commons	Chile Senate	Czech Rep. Ch. of Depa.	Denloaxk Folk- etfnj	Finland Edut- kumla	France Senate Nat. Ass	FYR of Macedonia An.	Germany Bund estag	Greece Ch. of Deps	Iceland Al- thingi		
Assistance for Members' accommodation?	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y
Within the constituency?	N	Y		N	N	N	N	Y	-	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	-	-
Within the parliamentary capital?	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	-	-	
Special grant?	N	Y		N	Y	N	Y	Y	-	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	-	-	
Provision of loans?	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	-	-	
Preferential hotel rates?	-	-		N	N	N	-	N	Y	N	N	N	-	N	N	-	-	
Accommodation in hotel belonging to Parliament?	N	N		N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	-	-	
Accommodation in hotel rented by Parliament?	Y	N		N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	-	-	

B - MATERIAL ASSISTANCE	India		Israel Knesset	*inly		Japan	Kenya Nal. Ass.	Korea, Rep. Nat. Ass.	Lithuania Seimas	Netherlands 1st Ch.	NZ H. of Reprs	Norway Storting	Papua New Guinea	Panama	Peru Congress	Philippines		Poland Senate
	Rajya Sabha	Lok Sabha		Senate	Depts											Senate	Reps	
LACCOM-MODATION																		
[PAGE 2 OF 3]																		
Assistance for Members' accommodation?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y
Within the constituency?	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y
Within the parliamentary capital?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y
Special grant?	N	N	N	Y	Y	-	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	-	Y	N	Y
Provision of loans?	N	N	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Preferential hotel rates?	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Accommodation in hotel belonging to Parliament?	Y		N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N		N	N	N	N	N	N	Y
Accommodation in hotel rented by Parliament?	N		Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N		Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y

B - MATERIAL ASSISTANCE	Portugal Ass. of the Rep	Spain		Sudm Tram. Nu. Ass.	Sweden Riksdag	Switzer- land Fed. Ass.	Uganda	United Kingdom		USA Senate	Uru- guay Senate	Zambia Nat. Ass.	Zimb- abwe Pull		Eur Parlt	WEU	
		Senate	Congress					Lords	Commons								
[PAGE 3 OF 3]																	
Assistance for Members' accommodation?	Y	Y	N	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y		Y	Y	
Within the constituency?	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	
Within the parliamentary capital?	Y	N	N	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		Y	Y	
Special grant?	Y	N	N	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N		Y	N	
Provision of loans?	N	N	N	-	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y		N	N	
Preferential hotel rates?	N	N	N	-	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		N	Y	
Accommodation in hotel belonging to Parliament?	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N		N	N	
Accommodation in hotel rented by Parliament?	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N		N	N	

B - MATERIAL ASSISTANCE	Algeria Cons. Council	Austria (both Houses)	Belgium Semce Reprs		Bot-twins Ass.	BnzO Senna	Cameroon Nat. Alt.	Canada ssimf Commons		Chile Senas	Czech Rep. Ch. of Depa	Denmarc Folk-etins	Fin-land Edns-kum	France Senate Nat. Ass	FYR of Mace-donia Ass.	Ger-many Bund estag	Greece Ch. of Deps	Ice-land Al-thingi
2. TRANSPORT																		
[PAGE 1 OF 3J																		
Payment for transport within constituency?	N	Y	N	N	Y	-	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y
Payment for transport between constituency and capital?	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Reimbursement of expenses?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	-	Y	-	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	N	Y	Y
Payment for transport tickets?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	-	Y	Y	-	N	N	Y	Y
Access to car pool?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	-	Y	N	N	-	-	-	-	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Reimbursement of taxi fares in capital?	N	-	-	N	-	Y	N	N	N	-	-	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	-
Payment of a lump sum?	Y	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	-
Other?	N	Y	-	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	-	-	Y	-	-	-	-	-	N
J. TELEPHONES																		
Telephone costs paid by Parliament?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Total/pan reimbursement of telephone costs in constituency?	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	-	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
A grant for telephone costs?	N	Y	N	Y	Y	-	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	-	Y	N

B - MATERIAL ASSISTANCE	India		Israel Knesset	Italy		Japan	Kenya Nat. Ass.	Korea, Rep. Nat. Ass.	Lithuania Seimas	Netherlands Ch.	NZ H. of Reps	Norway Storting	Papua New Guinea	Panama	Peru Congress	Philippines		Poland Senate
	Rajya Sabha	Lok Sabha		Seate	Deps											Senate	Reps	
2. TRANSPORT																		
[PAGE 2 OF 3]																		
Payment for transport within constituency?	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Payment for transport between constituency and capital?	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Reimbursement of expenses?	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	-	Y	N	-	Y	N	N	Y	N	-	N	-	Y
Payment for transport tickets?	-	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	-	N	Y	Y
Access to car pool?	N	N	N	Y	N	-	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	-	Y
Reimbursement of taxi fares in capital?	-	-	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	-	N	Y	N	N	N	-	N	N	Y
Payment of a lump sum?	Y	-	N	Y	N	-	Y	Y	-	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Other?	-	-	-	-	Y	-	Y	-	-	-	N	Y	Y	N	-	-	-	N
3. TELEPHONES																		
Telephone costs paid by Parliament?	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y
Total/part reimbursement of telephone costs in constituency?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N
A grant for telephone costs?	N	-	-	-	Y	Y	N	Y	-	N	-	N	Y	-	N	Y	N	N

B - MATERIAL ASSISTANCE	Pon- gti Ass. of die Rep	Spain		Sudan Tnns. Nil. Ass.	Sweden	Switzer- land Fed. Ass.	Uganda	United Kingdom		USA Senate	Uru- guay Senate	Zambia Nat. All.	Zimb- abwe Parit	Eur Parit	WEU	
		Senate	Congress					Lords	Commons							
[PAGE 3 OF 3]																
Payment for transport within constituency?	Y	N	N	-	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y		Y	N
Payment for transport between constituency and capital?	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y		Y	N
Reimbursement of expenses?	N	Y	Y	-	-	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y			N
Payment for transport tickets?	N	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	N	-	Y	N	N	-	Y		N	N
Access to car pool?	N	N	N	-	N	Y	N	-	N	N	N	N	N		Y	N
Reimbursement of taxi fares in capital?	N	N	N	-	Y	N	Y	-	N	Y	N	-	N			N
Payment of a lump sum?	Y	N	N	-	N	N	Y	-	N	N	N	-	N			N
Other?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		Y	-
3. TELEPHONES																
Telephone costs paid by Parliament?	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y		Y	N
Total/part reimbursement of telephone costs in constituency?	N	N	N	-	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y		N	N
A grant for telephone costs?	N	N	N	-	N	Y	N	Y	Y	-	-	N	N		N	Y

B - MATERIAL ASSISTANCE 4. OFFICES (PAGE 1 OF 3)	Algeria Cons. Council	Australia bolt Hses	Belgium		Botswana An.	Brazil Senate	Cameroon Nu. All.	Canada		Chile Senate	Czech Rep. Ch. of Deps	Denmark Folli- ching	Finland Edus- kuntt	Prince Sen ue	NIL An	FYR Macedo- nil Ass.	Germany Bund- stag	Greece Ch. of Deps	Iceland Al- thingi
			Senate	Reps				Senate	Commons										
Individual office within Parliament?	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y
Office shared with other Members?	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
No. of Members having individual offices?	-	-	171	148	N	-	N	104	N	-	-	-	-	-	577	-	-	-	all
No. of Members sharing with another?	-	-	13	14	N	-	N	N	N	-	-	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	N
Assistance towards an office near Parliament?	-	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	-	Y	-
Separate office for staff?	-	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	-	Y
Assistance towards office in constituency?	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	N	N	-
Own offices for party leaders/spokesmen?	Y	-	-	-	-	-	Y	Y	-	-	Y	Y	-	-	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
5. OFFICE EQUIPMENT																			
Computer equipment?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y		N	Y	Y	Y
Typewriters?	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Photocopier?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	Y
Other?		Y	Y	Y	-	Y	N	Y	-	-	N	Y	Y	Y		-	Y	-	-
6. OFFICE SUPPLIES																			
Envelopes?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y
Headed paper?	Y	Y		N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y

Assistance provided to Members

en

B - MATERIAL ASSISTANCE * OFFICES (PAGE 2 OF 3)	India		bncl Knesset	buy		Japan	Kenya Nit. All.	Korea. Rep. Nil. Ass.	Uth- mania Seimas	Nether- buds 1st Ch.	NZ H. of Reps	Norway StDraaj	3P-	Pin- —	Pem Cong- ress	Philippines		Poland Senate
	Rajya Sabha	Lok Sabha		Scute	Dcpi											Senate	Reps	
Individual office within Parliament?	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Office shared with other Members?	N	-	N	Y	Y	-	-	N	70	Y	-	N	N	N	N	-	N	N
No. of Members having individual offices?	-	-	-	163	412	-	-	-	-	-	ALL	N	N	ALL	N	-	213	-
No. of Members sharing with another?	-	-	-	24	-	-	N	-	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	-	N	-
Assistance towards an office near Parliament?	N	-	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N
Separate office for staff?	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
Assistance towards office in constituency?	Y	Y	N	N	N	-	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y
Own offices for party leaders/spokesmen?	-	Y	-	Y	Y	N	-	-	-	Y	-	Y	-	-	-	-	-	Y
5. OFFICE EQUIPMENT																		
Computer equipment?	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Typewriters?	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	-	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Photocopier?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	N	Y
Other?	-	-	-	Y	-	N	Y	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
6. OFFICE SVPPUES																		
Envelopes?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y
Headed paper?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y

B - MATERIAL ASSISTANCE 4. OFFICES [PAGE 3 OF 3]	Portugal Ass. of the Rep	Spain		Sudan Trans. Nit. Ass.	Sweden Riksdag	Switzerland Fed. Ass.	Uganda	United Kingdom		USA	Uruguay Senate	Zimbabwe Nat. Assa.	Zimbabwe Park	Eur Pant	W E U
		Senate	Congress					Lords	Commons						
Individual office within Parliament?	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Office shared with other Members?	Y	N	N	-	N	Y	-	4	66	N	N	N	Y	N	N
No. of Members having individual offices?	"	ALL	*	-	-	-	-	33	553	100	30	N	N	-	-
No. of Members sharing with another?	-	-	N	-	-	-	-	199	27	N	N	N	8 offices	-	N
Assistance towards an office near Parliament?	N	N	N	-	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Separate office for staff?	N	N	N	-	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Assistance towards office in constituency?	N	N	N	-	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N
Own offices for party leaders/spokesmen?	-	Y	Y	-	Y	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Y	-
5. OFFICE EQUIPMENT															
Computer equipment?	Y	N	N	-	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Typewriters?	Y	N	Y	-	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Photocopier?	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y
Other?	-	-	-	-	Y	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Y	-
6. OFFICE SUPPLIES															
Envelopes?	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Headed paper?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y

B - MATERIAL ASSISTANCE	Algeria Cons. Council	Australia (both Hull)	Belgium Senate Reprs	Botswana Ass.	Brail Senate	Cameron Nil. Ass.	Caoada Senate Commons		Chile Senate	Czech Rep. Ch. of Deps	Denmark Folketing *	Finland Edus-louua	France Sen-Nat ate A n	FYK of Moss Ass.	Germany Bund esrag	Greece Ch. of Deps	Iceland Al-ihingi
7. POSTAL SERVICES																	
[PAGE 1 OF 3]																	
Postal assistance?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y
Free post for Parliamentary mail?	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	-	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Reimbursement of postage?	N	N	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
Franking of mail by Parliament?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N
Allowance for free post?	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	-	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	-
Other?			-	-	-	-			Y	-	Y	-	-	-	-	-	-
S.DOCUMENTATION																	
Free subscriptions to periodicals?	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y		Y	N	Y
Free provision of periodicals/parliamentary documents?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Free access to parliamentary databases?	Y	Y	N	Y	-	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y
Access to external databases?	-	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	N	Y	Y	-	N	Y	Y		N	Y	Y
Free books?	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	-	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y		N	N	-

B - MATERIAL ASSISTANCE 7. <i>POSTAL SERVICES</i> [PAGE 2 OF 3]	Ilkio		Israel Knes-sett	Italy		Japan	Kenya Nat. Ass.	Korea, Rep. Nat. An.	Ua-uania Setmas	Nether-lands 1st Ch.	NZ H. of Reprs	Norway Soering	Papua New Guinea	Panama	Peni Con-gress	Philippines		Poland Senate
	Rajya Sabha	Lot Sabha		Senate	Deprs											Senate	Reps	
Postal assistance?	Y	N	Y	-	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Free post for Parliamentary mail?	N	Y	Y	-	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Reimbursement of postage?	N	N	N	-	N	-	N	N	-	N	N	N	N	-	N	N	N	N
Franking of mail by Parliament?	N	N	N	-	N	-	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	-	Y	N	Y	Y
Allowance for free post?	Y	N	N	-	N	-	N	N	Y	N	Y	-	Y	N	N	Y	N	N
Other?	-	-	-	-	N	-	N	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
8. DOCUMENTATION																		
Free subscriptions to periodicals?	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Free provision of periodicals/parliamentary documents?	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Free access to parliamentary databases?	Y	Y	Y	-	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y
Access to external databases?	-	-	-	-	Y	-	N	-	N	-	-	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
Free books?	N	Y	N	Y	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N

B - MATERIAL ASSISTANCE	Portu- gal ASL/Of the Rep	Spain		Sudan Tnns. N.r. Ass.	Sweden Riludig	Switzer- land Fed. Ass.	Uganda	United Kingdom		USA Senate	Uru- guay Senate	ZambU Nat. AM.	Zimb- abwe Parll		Eur Parit	WEU	
		Senate	Congress					Lords	Commons								
[PAGE 3 OF 3]																	
Postal assistance?	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N		Y	N	
Free post for Parliamentary mail?	Y	N	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N		N	N	
Reimbursement of postage?	N	N	N	N	Y	N	N	Y	-	N	N	N	N		N	N	
Franking of mail by Parliament?	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	-	Y	-	N	N		Y	N	
Allowance for free post?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N		N	N	
Other?	-	-	N	N	-	-		N	N	N	N	N	N		-	N	
8. DOCUMENTATION																	
Free subscriptions to periodicals?	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N		Y	N	
Free provision of periodicals/ parliamentary documents?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	
Free access to parliamentary databases?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		Y	-	
Access to external databases?	Y	Y	-	-	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		Y	-	
Free books?	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N		Y	Y	

C - PERSONNEL	Algeria Cons. Council	Aust- ralia (both Houses)	Belgium Sen- Reprs ate	Bot- swana Ass.	Brazil Senate	Cam- eroon Nat. Ass.	Canada Senate Commons		Chile Senate	Czech Rep. Ch. of Deps	Den- mark Folk- eting	Fm- land Edus- kunnt	France Sen- Nat. affi * Ass	FYR of Mac- edonia Ass.	Ger- many Bund- estag	Greece Ch. of Deps	Ice- land Al- thingi
I. ASSISTANCE																	
[PAGE 1 OF 3]																	
An assistant for each Member?	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Assistants are recruited from outside parliament?	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	-	N	Y	N	Y	Y	N	Y	N
Assistants made available to Members by parliament?	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	-	N	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N
Allowance for assistants' salaries?	N	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	-	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N
Payment of staff directly by parliament?	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	-	N	N	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N
Other?	Y	N	Y	N	-	Y	Y	-	-	Y	-	-	-	Y	-	-	-
2. SECRETARIAL ASSISTANCE																	
Secretary for each Member?	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	N	N
Secretary recruited from outside parliament?	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	-	Y	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	-	N
Provision of a secretarial pool?	Y	Y	N	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	-	Y	Y	N	-	N
An allowance for secretaries' salaries?	N	N	N	Y	N	N	-	Y	Y	-	Y	-	Y	N	Y	-	N
Payment of secretaries directly by parliament?	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	-	N	Y	N	-	N

C - PERSONNEL	India		Israel Knes- set	Italy		Japan	Kenya Nat. Asj.	Korea, Rep. Nat. All.	Lith- uania Seimas	Nether- lands 1st Ch.	NZ H. of Reps	Norway Sthing	Papua New Guinea	Pan- ama	Pam Cong- ress	Philippines		Poland Senate	
	Rajya Sabha	Lok Sabha		Senate	Depts											Senate	Reps		Senate
<i>L. ASSISTANCE</i> [PAGE 2 OF 3]																			
An assistant for each Member?	Y	N		Y	Y	Y	N		Y		Y	N	Y	Y	Y				N
Assistants are recruited from outside parliament?	N	-		-	Y	Y	N		Y		N	N	Y	Y	Y				N
Assistants made available to Members by parliament?	Y	-		-	N	N	N		N		Y	N	N	N	N				N
Allowance for assistants' salaries?	N	-		-	Y	N	Y		N		N	N	Y	N	N				N
Payment of staff directly by parliament?	Y	-		-	N	Y	N		Y		Y	N	N	Y	Y				N
Other?	-	-		Y	-	Y	-		-		-	Y	-	-					-
<i>2. SECRETARIAL ASSISTANCE</i>																			
Secretary for each Member?	Y	Y		-	Y	Y	Y		Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				Y
Secretary recruited from outside parliament?	N	N		-	Y	Y	N		N		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				Y
Provision of a secretarial pool?	Y	Y		-	N	N	Y		Y		N	N	N	N	N				N
An allowance for secretaries' salaries?	Y	N		Y	Y	N	N		N		Y	N	Y	N	N				Y
Payment of secretaries directly by parliament?	Y	Y		-	N	Y	Y		Y		N	Y	N	Y	Y				N

C - PERSONNEL	Portugal Ass. of the Rtp	Spain Senate Congress	Sudan Trans. Nal. Ass.	Sweden Riksdag	Switzer- land Fed. Ass.	Uganda	United Kingdom Lords Commons		USA Senate	Urugu- ary Senate	Zambia Nat. AM.	Zimb- abwe Parti	Eur Patt	WEU
<i>1. ASSISTANCE</i>														
[PAGE 3 OF 3]														
An assistant for each Member?	Y	N	N	N	N	N							Y	
Assistants are recruited from outside parliament?	Y	N	-	Y	N	N							Y	
Assistants made available to Members by parliament?	N	N	-	N	N	Y							N	
Allowance for assistants' salaries?	N	N	-	N	N	-							Y	
Payment of staff directly by parliament?	Y	N	-	N	N	Y							N	
Other?	N	Y	-	-	Y	-							-	
<i>2. SECRETARIAL ASSISTANCE</i>														
Secretary for each Member?	Y	N	N	N	N	N							N	
Secretary recruited from outside parliament?	Y	N	-	Y	N	N							N	
Provision of a secretarial pool?	N	Y	-	Y(1 sec per 3 Members)	Y	Y							N	
An allowance for secretaries' salaries?	N	N	-	Y	N	N							N	
Payment of secretaries directly by parliament?	Y	Y	-	N	N	Y							N	

Assistance provided for Individual Members

VI. The Upper House: «to be or not to be?»

Communication of Mrs V. S. RAMA DEVI (India), Seoul Session (April 1997).

Mrs V S RAMA DEVI said first of all that she was struck by the fact that she was often invited to speak on the importance of the Upper House but that similar speeches were not made on the importance of the Lower House. That in itself showed that the Upper House was not considered in general a necessity but something optional.

In India the way in which the Upper House was elected meant that the Government did not enjoy a majority in that chamber. In the Lok Sabha, the Lower House, there had on occasion been motions tabled to abolish the Upper House on the grounds that its activities blocked the development of the nation. It was not, however, easy to abolish the second chamber since India was a federal system and the Upper House, 'the Council of States', was where the federal units were represented. She explained that Ministers were often members of the Rajya Sabha. The former Prime Minister, who had recently resigned after he lost the confidence of the Lower House, was himself a member of the Upper House. Members of the Upper House often had important positions in Government. This sometimes resulted in anomalies - for instance, the Finance Minister was a member of the Upper House although that House did not have financial powers, the result being that he could not initiate his own bills in his own House.

She had the sense that in countries such as the USA and India the Upper House was gaining in importance. On occasion visitors came to India to discuss with her the role of the second chamber. She refused to help one such visitor whose Government was considering the establishment of a second chamber with the sole purpose of helping the majority party. On the other hand, representatives of the parliaments of South Africa and Namibia also came to India to observe the Upper House because that chamber could block the hasty legislation and decisions of the Lower House whilst not bringing down the government. The Upper House safeguarded the national interest rather than merely pursuing the short-term political interests of a particular party which would leave office in a few years.

The Upper House did not have financial powers but this was not because of a lack of expertise but because, with the Government not enjoying a majority, financial powers would be used to block legislation and precipitate elections. In fact, during her 25 years as a parliamentary draftsman Mrs RAMA DEVI had ample opportunity to observe both Houses in operation and was much more impressed by the Upper House. Some persons claimed that the lack of financial powers meant there were in effect no "no confidence" powers and that the Upper House was not, therefore, very powerful. In fact in India there had been two occasions, one under Indira Gandhi and one under Rajiv Gandhi, where the amendments made by the Upper House to bills had forced the calling of an election.

In practice there were many ways for the Upper House to demonstrate its importance - in particular through its expertise. Many Ministers disliked appearing before members of the Upper House because of this knowledge and experience. Members continued longer in the Upper House and this contributed to the building up of expertise in a particular area. There were also 12 seats in the Rajya Sabha reserved for nominated experts, such as Ravi Shankar and R. K. Narayan. She deprecated, however, the tendency for some who failed to get elected to the Lower House then attempting to secure a place in the Upper House. The political parties were to blame for this. She concluded by suggesting that unicameral parliaments should think of changing and establishing a second chamber - indeed Sri Lanka was now considering setting up a second chamber, having previously abolished it.

*
* *

Mr OLLÉ-LAPRUNE thanked Mrs RAMA DEVI for a very lively and interesting presentation and asked for comments from the floor.

Mr DAVIES (United Kingdom) said that Mrs RAMA DEVI had put the case for a second chamber very well and he supported what she said. He had recently taken part in a seminar of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association on the role of the second chamber and was on a panel with a Labour member who supported the abolition of the hereditary principle. Although illogical, there was an advantage to the hereditary principle in the very wide range of expertise it produced. One young member of the House of Lords was the Chairman of Christies, the auctioneers, while another young peer recently made his maiden speech in the debate on BSE, revealing his expertise as a cattle auctioneer in the problems of the English cattle market. Life peers were often former generals, civil servants and judges, or others appointed for their knowl-

edge and experience. Mr DAVES pointed out that, with an election campaign in process in the United Kingdom, his country's delegation to the IPU conference in Seoul consisted entirely of members of the House of Lords.

The Upper House should be seen as complementary to the Lower House rather than as confrontational. The powers of the House of Lords had developed over centuries. They had gradually been reduced, but he hoped they would not be reduced much further. The Labour party was proposing not a change to the powers of the House of Lords but a change to its membership through the abolition of the voting rights of hereditary peers. Thus its role would be maintained although its expertise affected.

The House of Lords should in particular concentrate on areas of activity other than those of the House of Commons. Examples were the specialism of the House of Lords in the scrutiny of European legislation. The House of Lords was very influential in this matter in the United Kingdom, Brussels and Luxembourg. Similarly, the House of Lords had a Committee on Science and Technology, established when the House of Commons abolished its own committee on this subject, and a Committee on secondary legislation, unique to the House of the Lords, which followed the Australian pattern.

He envied the federal character of the Rajya Sabha. The House of Lords lacked the electoral authority of those chosen to represent a particular group of people. The problem of the powers of the House of Lords continued in the United Kingdom. Five years previously the House of Lords twice rejected the War Crimes Bill, which was to permit the prosecution of those accused of Nazi war crimes. After two rejections, however, the provisions of the Parliament Act meant that the Bill was passed without the agreement of the House of Lords. The constitution worked and was perhaps strengthened by this incident. He ended by again congratulating Mrs RAMA DEVI on her communication.

Mrs RAMA DEVI said that she watched with interest developments in the House of Lords - after all, the United Kingdom parliament was "the mother of parliaments". She considered that another valuable aspect of the House of Lords was the range of ethnic representation there.

Mr BENVENUTO (Italy) said that he had listened with interest and much pleasure to Mrs RAMA DEVI. The question raised was one of the most important issues discussed in Italy at the moment. He was naturally in favour of the Upper House since he worked there. There were reforms of the Italian constitution being discussed. A committee had been appointed to propose a new constitution and appeared to be in favour of a bicameral system. Next month there would be an international meeting in Tokyo to discuss the role of the Upper House. It was open only to elected chambers so the House of Lords could

not participate but Italy had received a report from the House of Lords to present there.

In Italy the two chambers were elected similarly and had the same powers. Probably there would be a reform to establish a difference. The Upper House would have the power to control the Government and the Lower House have greater legislative responsibility. The electoral law was also a problem. In many parliamentary systems the Upper House represented the interests of the regions. In France it was elected by local representatives. Italy had adopted a system closer to that of Spain - the Upper House was elected in part directly by the people and in part by local bodies.

Mr NYS (Belgium) said that Belgium had one and a half years previously abandoned a complete bicameral system. The constitution had been reformed - the powers of the Senate being changed in three areas. First, the Senate was no longer competent to exercise control over the Budget and financial matters. Secondly, for certain matters specified in Article 77 of the Constitution the federal assemblies enjoyed equal competence. Thirdly, the Senate could still amend legislation. The Lower House, however, had the final voice. It was for the Lower House to accept or reject the amendments. His personal view was that an Upper House was important since it was necessary to have second view of a bill. Duplication between the two Houses had to be avoided and it had to be understood that it was up to the Lower House to control the Government.

Ms DINGANI (Zimbabwe) said that the Senate had been abolished in 1990 but there was now a debate on whether to reintroduce it. Its usefulness depended on who were its members. The Senate had been abolished because 20 of its 40 members had been chosen by the Lower House, 10 by the President (usually unsuccessful candidates in the election) and 10 were traditional chiefs. The result was simply another government majority. It would be more useful to have an Upper House of experts. The question was how to elect them.

Mr MAVOUNGOU (Congo) stressed the importance of the Senate and said that Mrs RAMA DEVI had posed a number of serious questions. The bicameral system was adopted in the Republic of Congo in 1992. In many ways the Senate was as important as the National Assembly. It could not, however, vote on a no confidence motion. The Senate had a vital constitutional function. The Speaker of the Senate took on the Presidential functions if the Presidency was vacant. The Senate was in effect the House of institutionalised wisdom - it was necessary to be over 50 years old to be a member.

Dr MULONGENI (Namibia) said that the Lower House tended to be where politics prevailed and the Upper House where wisdom prevailed. Namibia had from the beginning had an Upper House but for a few years it was viewed

merely as a rubber stamp. Ministers came only from the Lower House, although Deputy Ministers could come from the Upper House. The Government could only introduce bills in the Lower House. The Upper House, however, had given careful critical scrutiny to the bills it received. A bill was introduced dealing with identity cards. One clause stated that without an identity card a person was liable to arrest and either a jail term or a fine of 400 Namibian dollars. Given the use of identity cards under the South African occupation this was most controversial and the clause was rejected by the Upper House, which was more representative of the rural population which felt particularly strongly on this issue. The Upper House had also blocked a bill on the media which would have made the disclosure of certain kinds of confidential information a criminal offence. People had begun to realise that it was also necessary to lobby the Upper House. It was now difficult to say that the Upper House was not important in Namibia. Indeed it was vital for checks and balances in the constitution.

Mr AL-MASALHA (Jordan) thanked Mrs RAMA DEVI for her communication. He said that the question was whether the Upper House was necessary and of practical benefit. Tradition was not enough. Since 1946 Jordan had a bicameral system. The members of the Lower House were younger and with little experience whereas those in the Upper House had a rich experience in public life. This made the Upper House most useful.

Ms MATYOLO (South Africa) said that the constitution made clear that the two chambers were on an equal footing. The Council of Provinces had replaced the former Senate. It had the particular role of representing the interests of the provinces. Certain bills could not be handled, such as section 76 bills, without the involvement of the Council. The Council promoted accountability in politics. Because the members were there to take care of the interests of the provinces they often went back to the provinces to consult and get advice on a given issue. It also promoted national unity. The Council took aspects of its structure from Westminster, from Germany (its federal character), and from India. Voting in the Council was much more on the basis of province than party. This enhanced the project of building national unity.

Mr KHATRI CHHETRE (Nepal) said that the Upper House was very important in the Nepalese constitution. The Upper House had 60 members, 35 elected by the Lower House (including 3 women), the others elected on a regional basis from five regions. Ten were appointed on the recommendation of the Prime Minister. There was very good regional representation in the Upper House, many talented and expert members, and the chamber fulfilled an important role in the checks and balances of the constitution, for instance in remedying hasty legislation from the Lower House. The Upper House had the power to

amend financial bills and also particular powers with regard to constitutional amendments. The two Houses worked well together.

Mrs RAMA DEVI thanked her colleagues for their contributions and felt educated by the many problems and solutions outlined. Italy appeared to have a very effective Upper House. She wished her colleagues well for the forthcoming conference in Tokyo. With regard to the comments from Belgium, she said that the most important function for the Upper House was legislative. It was bad to have over-hasty legislation. She was happy to note the positive comments made about the value of a second chamber by her colleagues from Zimbabwe, Congo and Jordan. The Upper House in Namibia deserved congratulation for its work in defending the freedom of the press. The Upper House in India had acted similarly to protect freedoms in recent years. She was happy to hear of the South African success, particularly in the representation of the provinces. Nepal had also looked at some aspects of the Indian Upper House. It was important for the Upper House to attempt to include all groups, including women.

ASSOCIATION OF SECRETARIES GENERAL

OF PARLIAMENTS

Aims

The Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments, constituted as a consultative body of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, seeks to facilitate personal contacts between holders of the office of Secretary General in any Parliamentary Assembly, whether such Assembly is a Member of the Union or not.

It is the task of the Association to study the law, procedure, practice and working methods of different Parliaments and to propose measures for improving those methods and for securing co-operation between the services of different Parliaments.

The Association also assists the Inter-Parliamentary Union, when asked to do so, on subjects within the scope of the Association.

Executive Committee (November 1997)

President: Michael Davies (United Kingdom).

Vice-Presidents: First: Manuel Alba Navarro.(Spain)

Second: Mario Farachio (Uruguay).

Elected members: M. Meva'a M'Eboutou (Cameroon), S. Benvenuto (Italy), J.-F. Moufonda (Congo), K. Goraya (Pakistan), S. Tiitinen (Finland).

Former Presidents and honorary member: S. L. Shakhder (India), J. Lyon (France), H. Hjortdal (Denmark), N. Lorch (Israel), W. Kooops (Netherlands), Sir K. Bradshaw (UK), C. Lussier (Canada), T. Hadjioannou (Cyprus), D. Ndiaye (Senegal), Sir D. Lidderdale (UK), J. Ollé-Laprune (France).

Membership (November 1996)

Secretaries General or Clerks of parliamentary assemblies in the following countries or international institutions are Members of the Association:

Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte-d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea (Republic of), Guyana, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Korea (Democratic People's Republic of), Korea (Republic of), Kuwait, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Malta, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russia, Rwanda, Senegal, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe, Western European Union, European Parliament, Council of Europe.

Constitutional and Parliamentary Information

Published by the Association of Secretaries General of Parliaments, under the auspices of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, is issued twice a year in both English and French.

Swiss francs

One number. 25 F
One year (2 numbers). 40 F

Orders for Subscriptions may be sent to:

Secrétariat de l'Association des Secrétaires Généraux des Parlements
Assemblée Nationale
Palais-Bourbon
75355 Paris - France