

NMMUN 2025

LOK SABHA



LOK SABHA

LETTER FROM THE CHAIR

Greetings Delegates,

I, Aaditya Kekre, chair for the Lok Sabha council for NMMUN'25, am beyond excited to welcome you all to a council where the most important political leaders discuss strategies to improve the functioning of the government of the largest democracy in the world. Here, the various issues affecting the different parts of our population, their effects and solutions, will be deliberated upon, discussed and debated upon. As a chair of this riveting council, it is my duty to guide you all through all the debates, discussions, negotiations, resolutions and caucuses that will always keep you on edge, for Lok Sabha contains within it the diversity of India, with its very many opinions and ideals. This council is more than just a conference; it is a rare platform where the decisions made will echo through the future of the entire nation and affect other nations. I encourage you to come prepared not only with research but with incisive acumen, as Indian politics and the issues to be discussed demand both keen intellect and due consideration of the ideologies of all political parties. To aid your preparations, a concise guide detailing the agendas for our discussions has been compiled. While this guide is your entry point, I emphasize the importance of securing greater specificity and doing your own research. I wish you the utmost success and look forward to an extraordinary council filled with sharp insights, creative strategies, and collaborative spirit.

With Best Regards,

Aaditya Kekre

Chair of Lok Sabha Council

INDEX:

Sl No.	Title	Page No.
1.	History Of Committee	3
2.	Topic 1: a. Introduction b. Relevant information c. Timeline d. Guiding Questions e. Sites For Reference	 5 6 8 10 11
3.	Topic 2: a. Introduction b. Relevant information c. Timeline d. Guiding Questions E. Sites For Reference	 12 14 16 19 20
4.	Sample Position Paper	21

History of the committee

A large part of the Indian subcontinent was directly under British rule from 1850 to 1947. During this period, the offices of the Secretary of State and the Council of India were the very influential machinery of the British parliament which exercised absolute control over the area.

An executive council in India that consisted of several high ranking British officials and the office of the Indian Viceroy. The Indian Councils Act of 1861 enabled a Legislative Council of members drawn from the Executive Council and non-official members. The Indian Councils Act of 1892 gave legislatures for every province of British India and gave additional powers to the Legislative Council.

Although these laws did end up increasing Indian numbers in the parliament, they were still very powerless and their electorate too was very small. The Indian Councils Act of 1909 brought some Indians into various councils. The Government of India Act of 1919 brought Indian participation in the administration further by introducing the Central Legislative Assembly, for which Parliament House in New Delhi was built and opened in 1927.

The Government of India Act of 1935 introduced provincial autonomy and suggested a federal structure in India. The Indian Independence Act of 1947, enacted on 18 July 1947 by the British Parliament, separated British India—excluding the Princely states—into two new sovereign states, India and Pakistan. They would be dominions of the Crown until both accepted a new constitution. The constituent assembly was divided into two parts, for the two nations, with each having its own domain.

On 26th November, 1949, the constitution of India was accepted by the country. It came into effect in India on 26th January, 1950. This included all

the laws and principles that governed the new government of India, and it included all the princely states that had failed to merge with Pakistan.

According to Article 79 (Part V-The Union.) of the Constitution of India, the Parliament of India consists of the President of India and the two Houses of Parliament known as the Council of States (Rajya Sabha) and the House of the People (Lok Sabha).

The Lok Sabha (House of the People) was duly constituted for the first time on 17 April 1952 after the first General Elections held from 25 October 1951 to 21 February 1952.

TOPIC 1: Addressing India's Agrarian Crisis **Through Structural Reform**

INTRODUCTION

Nearly half of India's vast population still depends on agriculture, which is the backbone of the nation's economy even though its GDP share has gradually decreased to less than 20%. The Lok Sabha, the directly elected lower house of Parliament, is the primary decision-making body for India's food suppliers, or annadata. Council members need to address this issue as a critical discussion about social justice, food security, and rural welfare rather than just economics, since most of the nation's poor reside in rural areas.

Despite decades of policy interventions, including the Green Revolution and the accompanying financial packages, the Indian agricultural sector remains mired in a protracted crisis. The persistent issue of low, unremunerative crop prices, widespread farmer debt, and alarming suicide rates are all indicators of this crisis. Contributing factors include fragmentation of landholdings, an over-reliance on weather patterns due to inadequate irrigation, and unsustainable farming practices that degrade soil and exhaust groundwater resources.

The focus of this conversation is shifting from short-term solutions like loan waivers to long-term structural reform. For structural change to occur, institutional frameworks—particularly those that govern the distribution of credit, the adoption of new technologies, and the marketing of agricultural products—must be restructured. The challenge facing the Lok Sabha is to enact reforms that modernise the sector to ensure farmers receive just compensation, minimise environmental damage, and maintain political unity in a diverse democracy.

RELEVANT INFORMATION

The primary causes of the agrarian crisis are inadequate marketing and a weak incentive structure. The most contentious issue is still the Minimum Support Price (MSP) system, which sets a price floor for 23 crops. Despite being crucial for guaranteeing income, MSP, which is primarily concentrated in the states of Punjab and Haryana, only sufficiently covers a small percentage of farmers, primarily in cereals like wheat and rice. Due to a lack of resources and transportation to procurement centres, the majority of small and marginal farmers are forced to participate in distress sales below the MSP. Growing crops that require a lot of water is encouraged due to the ecological imbalances this concentration causes, which drastically depletes groundwater supplies.

By giving notified wholesale markets state-level monopolies, the Agricultural Produce Market Committee (APMC) Acts further restrict market access by forbidding farmers from openly selling outside of designated mandis. Although the National Agriculture Market (e-NAM) platform was developed to create a single online marketplace, there are still limitations on its integration and use. The 2020 Farm Laws exposed the glaring ideological divide between contract farming and private market entry, even though they were repealed in 2021 after widespread protests.

Structural reforms are required to address long-standing issues with farm debt and credit availability. Farmers' heavy reliance on high-interest informal money lenders is one of the primary causes of debt distress. Significant post-harvest losses can be reduced by increasing institutional credit penetration, promoting Farmer Producer Organisations (FPOs) to fortify collective bargaining, and investing heavily in post-harvest infrastructure, such as cold storage and warehousing. In every state, technology diffusion is essential for

long-term sustainability and profitability, particularly in the fields of soil health management (Soil Health Cards) and irrigation (micro-irrigation).

TIMELINE

YEAR	EVENT	SIGNIFICANCE TO AGRARIAN REFORM
1965	The Agricultural Prices Commission (later CACP) was established.	Formally established the Minimum Support Price (MSP) recommendation process.
2004	Formation of the National Commission on Farmers (Swaminathan Committee)	One of the main demands of contemporary farmer movements is the C2+50% formula, which states that MSP should be 50% higher than the total cost of production.
2006	The Rashtriya Krishi Vikas Yojana (RKVY) was introduced.	intended to provide states with incentives to boost public spending on agriculture.
2016	Pradhan Mantri Fasal Bima Yojana (PMFBY) and e-NAM (National Agriculture Market) launch	a thorough agricultural insurance program to offer monetary assistance in the event of crop failure and a single electronic trading platform to enhance price discovery and connect APMC markets across states.

2019	PM-KISAN (Pradhan Mantri Kisan Samman Nidhi) launch	Farmer families receive an annual cash transfer through the Direct Income Support program.
2020	The three Farm Laws were enacted (repealed in 2021).	introduced contract farming and eliminated stock limits in an attempt to deregulate agricultural markets; this was met with strong national opposition.

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR DEBATE

1. Should the government implement a legally guaranteed MSP for all 23 required crops, or should a Price Deficiency Payment System (PDPS) take the place of MSP given the financial and environmental ramifications?
2. How can the Lok Sabha successfully enact legislation to break up regional APMC monopolies and advance a single national market without upsetting farmers or causing economic shock?
3. What particular legal framework can be put in place to allow private investment in cold storage, processing facilities, and supply chain logistics while rigorously protecting farmers' land rights and avoiding corporate exploitation?
4. What particular structural changes, aside from monetary subsidies, must the government make in MSP-dominated states like Punjab and Haryana to promote and incentivise sustainable farming methods (such as crop diversification and lower water use)?
5. In order to promote the consolidation of disparate landholdings and provide tenant farmers with increased access to institutional credit, should land leasing and tenancy be formally legalised and regulated in every state?

SITES FOR REFERENCE

- https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-981-19-0763-0_9
- [https://ndpublisher.in/files/1757143995Economic%20Reforms%20and%20Agrarian%20Crisis%20in%20India--Sandeep%20Kaur%20\(19-8-25\).pdf](https://ndpublisher.in/files/1757143995Economic%20Reforms%20and%20Agrarian%20Crisis%20in%20India--Sandeep%20Kaur%20(19-8-25).pdf)
- <https://www.sociologyjournal.in/assets/archives/2024/vol6issue1/6005.pdf>
- <https://prsindia.org/policy/discussion-papers/agriculture-and-farmers-welfare>
- <https://niti.gov.in/documents/doubling-farmers-income>

TOPIC 2: Privatisation of Public Sector Undertakings

INTRODUCTION

Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs) have always been crucial to India's industrial and infrastructure growth. They were meant to promote self-reliance, fair development, and national unity. From steel plants and power companies to banks and airlines, these organizations were created not just to make a profit but to support the public good and stabilize India's economy after independence. However, due to globalization, technological changes, and budget constraints, we are now rethinking the role and importance of PSUs.

The Lok Sabha, as the key legislative body in India, must guide this shift with care and responsibility. The privatization of PSUs is more than a financial move. It changes the government's role in managing the economy. While the government aims to free up capital, reduce waste, and draw in private investment, these changes affect much more than just financial statements. They involve job security, fairness across regions, strategic independence, and the essence of public service.

Even after several rounds of selling off PSUs since the 1990s, the process remains sensitive and complicated. There are worries about undervaluing assets, creating monopolies, and losing job protections. Additionally, selling national assets raises concerns about openness, responsibility, and long-term public benefit. The recent privatization of companies like Air India and the proposed sales of BPCL and IDBI Bank have sparked renewed discussions about whether the

government should step back from areas where market forces might not ensure fair outcomes.

As India aims to become a \$5 trillion economy, the Lok Sabha must consider whether privatization leads to empowerment or exclusion. Reforms in this area require strong institutional protections, clear rules, and a focus on social justice. Council members need to balance economic efficiency with democratic fairness. They must ensure that moving from public to private ownership reinforces, rather than undermines, the country's development goals.

RELEVANT INFORMATION

India's Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs) have played a key role in nation-building, industrial growth, and social equity. They were created after independence to address important gaps in infrastructure, manufacturing, and services. PSUs aimed to fill areas where private investment was limited or absent. However, over time, many of these enterprises have become financially weak, technologically outdated, and poorly managed. As India shifts toward a more market-driven economy, the government is increasingly using privatization as a tool to ease fiscal strain, improve services, and encourage private investment. The Lok Sabha, as the main legislative body, is crucial to this change; it evaluates the economic reasons, social impacts, and political viability of disinvestment policies.

The challenges of privatizing PSUs are varied. A major concern is the lack of clear valuation. Several high-profile disinvestment cases have raised worries about assets being sold for less than their market value, often without thorough independent evaluations or parliamentary oversight. This has led to calls for reforms, such as setting up independent valuation boards and requiring disclosures to the Lok Sabha. Labor displacement is another major issue. PSUs have provided stable jobs to millions, especially in industrial areas and underdeveloped regions. Privatization often means job cuts, loss of benefits, and a shift toward insecure contract jobs. These changes have faced pushback from trade unions and opposition parties, making privatization a politically charged issue.

Vulnerability in strategic sectors adds more complexity. While the government has proposed a framework to maintain a small presence in vital areas like defense, energy, and banking, the sale of companies like BPCL and IDBI Bank has raised questions about whether strategic control is being weakened. In sectors with little competition, privatization risks leading to private monopolies, which can harm consumer interests and market fairness. Regulatory bodies like the Competition Commission of India (CCI) and other

specific regulators need to be granted more power to oversee conduct after privatization, ensuring that efficiency gains do not compromise public welfare.

Disinvestment goals set in the Union Budget often do not meet actual results, leading to financial imbalances and diminishing investor trust. These gaps are frequently examined in Lok Sabha budget discussions and committee reviews, showing the need for more practical planning and implementation. Additionally, the Department of Investment and Public Asset Management (DIPAM), responsible for the disinvestment process, must work more closely with NITI Aayog, sector ministries, and state governments to ensure alignment and accountability.

Reform in this area must go beyond just selling assets. It should involve rethinking governance in PSUs, including adopting performance-based incentives, independent boards, and transparent audit practices. Social safety measures are vital to ease the impact of transition, such as retraining programs, pension security, and job placement assistance for affected workers. A National Strategic Asset Registry could be created to categorize and protect crucial PSUs from complete privatization, balancing economic efficiency with state control. Finally, the Lok Sabha must ensure that privatization is not just a quick financial fix but a thoughtful reform strategy that strengthens India's economic framework while maintaining democratic accountability and social justice.

TIMELINE

YEAR	EVENT	SIGNIFICANCE TO PSU PRIVATISATION
1991	Introduction of New Economic Policy	Marked the beginning of liberalisation, privatisation, and globalisation (LPG); initiated disinvestment in select PSUs to reduce fiscal burden and improve efficiency.
1996	Establishment of the Disinvestment Commission	Created to identify PSUs for disinvestment and recommend modalities; laid the groundwork for structured privatisation.
2000	Creation of the Department of Disinvestment	Institutionalised the disinvestment process under the Ministry of Finance; signaled a shift from ad hoc sales to strategic planning.

2004	National Common Minimum Programme (UPA I)	Stated that PSUs would not be privatised indiscriminately; emphasised strategic interest and social equity, slowing down disinvestment momentum.
2016	NITI Aayog tasked with identifying PSUs for strategic sale	Replaced Planning Commission's role; began shortlisting non-strategic PSUs for full privatisation, reviving the agenda.
2020	Announcement of New Public Sector Policy	Defined strategic and non-strategic sectors; committed to retaining a bare minimum presence in strategic areas while privatising others.
2021	Privatisation of Air India	First full sale of a government-owned airline to the private sector; considered a landmark move in strategic disinvestment.

2022	LIC IPO launched	Partial privatisation through public listing; raised ₹21,000 crore, making it India's largest-ever IPO and expanding retail investor participation in PSU equity.
2023	Strategic sale process initiated for IDBI Bank and BPCL	Signaled deeper penetration into financial and energy sectors; raised concerns over strategic autonomy and valuation.

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR DEBATE

1. To what extent should the Government of India retain ownership in strategic sectors while pursuing privatisation?
2. How can Lok Sabha members ensure that disinvestment policies uphold transparency, accountability, and public interest?
3. What mechanisms can be introduced to protect workers and communities affected by PSU privatisation?
4. Should a National Strategic Asset Registry be established to safeguard critical public enterprises from full divestment?
5. How can regulatory bodies be strengthened to prevent monopolistic practices and ensure fair competition post-privatisation?
6. What role should parliamentary committees play in evaluating the valuation and sale of major PSUs?
7. How can privatisation be balanced with regional equity, especially in states dependent on PSU employment and infrastructure?
8. What lessons can be drawn from past privatisation cases (e.g., Air India, LIC) to inform future policy decisions?
9. Should India explore hybrid models like public-private partnerships (PPPs) instead of full privatisation in certain sectors?
10. How can the Lok Sabha ensure that privatisation contributes to inclusive economic growth rather than deepening inequality?

SITES FOR REFERENCE

- <https://ijrar.org/papers/IJRAR1CAP021.pdf>
- <https://journal.mysocialbliss.com/wp-content/uploads/2024/03/Impact-of-Privatization-of-Public-Sectors-in-India.pdf>
- [https://icpe.int/images/publications/Article6 pp 65-83.pdf](https://icpe.int/images/publications/Article6_pp_65-83.pdf)
- <https://dipam.gov.in/en/disinvestment-dashboard>
- <https://www.orfonline.org/research/strategic-disinvestment-in-india/>

SAMPLE POSITION PAPER

POSITION PAPER



Committee: Lok Sabha

Delegation: Nishikant Dubey

Topic: Addressing Allegations of “VoteChori” in the 2024 General Election and Ensuring Electoral Integrity.

Delegate:

Background

The **2024 General Elections** in India, one of the **largest democratic** practices conducted in the world were held from **19 April to 1 June 2024** in seven phases, to elect all **543** members of the **Lok Sabha**. On **7 August 2025**, the leader of opposition in the Lok Sabha, **Rahul Gandhi**, reveals what he had been describing as **evidence** on the **Election Commission of India (ECI)** of large-scale **voter manipulation and fraud** in the **2024 General Elections**, citing data from the **Mahadevapura segment in the Bangalore Central district, Karnataka**. This data included **over 1,00,000 suspicious entries, including duplicate voters, invalid addresses and bulk registrations** at the same location. He also accused the ECI with **tampering of electoral rolls** in the ongoing **Special Intensive Revision (SIR)** in the state of **Bihar**. He stated that the **Indian National Congress (INC)** had lost **at least 70 seats** in the **Lok Sabha** with a **margin of under 50,000 votes** as a direct result, questioning the **genuineness** of the **ruling party’s victory**.

Lok Sabha’s involvement and ECI’s response

The **Lok Sabha** has **not** had any **investigative involvement** in the “**VoteChori**” (vote theft) **allegations**. Since election-related issues fall under the jurisdiction of the **Election commission of India and the Judiciary**, the Lok Sabha has not made any **formal inquiries** into the issue. However, the issue was actively **raised, debated upon and questioned** by several **members of the parliament (MPs)**, Especially MPs from the **Opposition party**.

The **Election Commission of India (ECI)** has remained adamant on the allegations regarding **vote manipulation and fraud**. They have firmly and repeatedly clarified that there has been **no credible evidence** provided by **any political party or candidate**, emphasizing on the fact that **Voter rolls, data of electronic voting machines (EVMs) and counting procedures** are all **publicly available**, even **verifiable** and **monitorable** by the **representatives of all contesting parties**. The ECI has also demanded an **official formal complaint** filed along with an **affidavit**, they have also **requested** the opposition for **further proof** on the issue. It has **accused certain leaders** of attempting to **diminish** the **trust** of citizens in **democratic institutions** and the **ruling party**.

Nishikant Dubey’s side

As **Nishikant Dubey**, I firmly believe that India’s **greatest strength** lies in its **democratic election**

process. Therefore, I believe that the “**VoteChori**” (vote theft) allegations must be addressed with **utmost seriousness** and **transparency** to preserve **public trust**.

- **Firstly**, I believe that **the opposition parties** are raising **allegations** like “**VoteChori**” because of **their electoral losses**, using them to **distract and shift attention**.
- **Secondly**, I believe that the **ECI** is in the right for demanding a **signed oath**, a **written complaint** and an **affidavit** submitted. **Mere speeches** and **conferences** are not enough to **prove the legitimacy of this issue**.
- **Thirdly**, **Rahul Gandhi** has been **overly inconsistent** with his claims, using the **ECI** when it suits **Congress** whereas attacking it otherwise. **INDI Alliance** had its **highest vote share in 35 years** in the **2024 Lok Sabha** elections. If the allegations are really as **legitimate** as they make it to seem, questions arise to how such a **high voter share** was **attained**.

Proposed solutions

To help prevent such allegations in the future and to ensure **voter security** and **electoral integrity**, I, **Nishikant Dubey**, provide the **following solutions**:

- Introduce **real-time voter verification** systems that are linked with citizens’ **Aadhar and biometric data**.
- Allow citizens to **verify their voter details** and **challenge discrepancies** by publishing **publicly verifiable** voter poll updates **before every election**.
- Establish a **Parliamentary Electoral Review Committee** to periodically **audit election commission procedures**.
- Regulate and monitor **AI generated misinformation** and enforce **stronger social media accountability** for spreading **exaggerated falsifications**
- Allow **independent audits and inspection** of **EVMs** by **neutral third parties** or **IIT/NIC teams** **before and after elections**.

Conclusion

The **Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP)** strongly **opposes** the “**VoteChori**” Allegations and the opposition party’s **politically driven propaganda**. We believe these allegations have been made to **undermine** the **legitimacy** of India’s **democratic institutions** and **fair and transparent** election process; they are meant to **erode trust** in the **ECI** and **India’s democratic framework**. The party thus believes that rather than making such **unsubstantiated claims on verified systems**, we must instead focus on **educating voters**, **ensuring transparency** and **respecting democratic outcomes**.

Bibliography

- *Chronology of events (2024 General election, “VoteChori” Allegations, etc.) and background:*

[\(Source 1\)](#) [\(Source 2\)](#)
- *Election commission of India’s response*

[\(Source 1\)](#)

[\(Source 2\)](#)

- *Nishikant Dubey and BJP's side*

[\(Source 1\)](#)

[\(Source 2\)](#)

[\(Source 3\)](#)