

Committees in the Nigerian National Assembly:
A Study of the Performance of Legislative Functions, 2003-2013

**National Institute for Legislative Studies
National Assembly, Abuja**

Committees in the Nigerian National Assembly: A Study of the Performance of Legislative Functions, 2003 - 2013

© Copyright 2014 by National Institute for Legislative Studies (NILS), National Assembly, Abuja

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the written permission of the copyright owner.

First Published: November, 2010

ISBN: 978-978-4999397

Second Edition: December, 2014

Compiled by Mike Obadan

Researched by Jake Dan-Azumi and Terfa Gbahabo

Edited by Ladi Hamalai

Contents

List of Tables	viii
List of Figures	xv
List of Boxes	xvii
List of Appendices	xviii
Acronyms	xix
Preface	xxii
Chapter One	1
Introduction	1
1.0 Preamble.....	1
1.1 Objectives of the Study.....	5
1.2 Rationale and Significance of the Study.....	5
1.3 Framework of the Study.....	6
1.4 Scope of the Study.....	9
1.5 Methodology.....	9
1.6 Limitations of the Study.....	11
1.7 Structure of the Book.....	11
Chapter Two	13
The Legislature and its Committees	13
2.0 Introduction.....	13
2.1 Typology of Legislatures.....	13
2.2 Functions of Legislatures.....	16
2.2.1 Representation.....	17
2.2.2 Legislation.....	17
2.2.3 Scrutiny and Oversight.....	21
2.3 Framework for Undertaking Committee Activities: The Committee System.....	22
2.3.1 Merits of Committee System.....	22
2.3.2 Types of Committees.....	24
2.4 International Practices on Committee Systems.....	27
2.5 Impact of Committees.....	33
2.6 Constraints to the Effectiveness of Committees.....	34
2.7 The Committee System in Comparative Perspective.....	36
2.7.1 The United States House Committee System: A Brief Historical Perspective.....	37

2.7.2	The Committee System in the Parliament of Zimbabwe.....	41
2.8	Conclusion	45
Chapter Three	46
Perspectives on Legislative Oversight.....	46
3.0	Introduction.....	46
3.1	Meaning and Purposes of Legislative Oversight	47
3.2	Goal and Objectives.....	49
3.3	Sources of Legislative Oversight Powers	51
3.3.1	Sources of Oversight Powers in the United States	51
3.3.2	Sources of Oversight Powers in Nigeria.....	53
3.4	Methods and Instruments of Legislative Oversight	54
3.4.1	Questioning and Interactive Sessions	55
3.4.2	Oversight Visits and Inspections	56
3.4.3	Investigative Hearings and Investigations	56
3.4.4	Appropriation Process	56
3.4.5	Reporting Requirements.....	57
3.4.6	Committee Reports.....	57
3.5	Survey on Tools of Oversight.....	58
3.6	Incentives and Disincentives to Oversight.....	60
3.6.1	Disincentives to Oversight.....	60
3.6.2	Incentives to Oversight	61
3.7	Effect of Legislative Oversight Activities.....	62
3.8	Factors Determining the Performance of Legislative Oversight Functions	63
3.8.1	Political and Electoral Systems.....	63
3.8.2	Formal Legislative Powers	64
3.8.3	Political Will and Political Space	65
3.8.4	Parliamentary Technical Capacity	65
3.8.5	Transparency and Integrity of Legislative Oversight Process.....	67
3.8.6	Availability of Information	67
3.9	Strategies for Strengthening Legislative Oversight.....	68
3.10	Parliamentary Performance Evaluation Framework.....	72
3.10.1	Importance and Challenges of Performance Evaluation	72
3.10.2	Considerations in Developing and Implementing Parliamentary Evaluation Framework.....	74

3.10.3	Critical Issues in Evaluating African Parliaments.....	77
3.10.4	Gaps in Existing Parliamentary Evaluation Strategies.....	78
3.11	Brief Review of Studies on Legislative Oversight	79
Chapter Four		82
Resource Base for National Assembly’s Legislative Work		82
4.0	Introduction	82
4.1	Human Resources	82
4.1.1	The Legislators	83
4.1.2	Legislative Aides.....	86
4.1.3	Permanent Staff.....	92
4.2	ICT Infrastructure	95
4.3	Physical Infrastructure	99
4.3.1	Office Space.....	99
4.3.2	Motor Vehicles.....	102
4.4	Library Resources.....	102
4.4.1	Objectives and Services	103
4.4.2	Computerization.....	104
4.4.3	Internet Services.....	104
4.4.4	Collection Development	104
4.4.5	Library Use.....	105
4.4.6	Personnel, Equipment and Challenges	106
4.5	Financial Resources.....	107
4.6	How Adequate are the Resources?	110
Chapter Five		113
Background to Legislative Committees and Oversight Functions in the National Assembly		113
5.0	Introduction	113
5.1	Evolution of the Legislature in Nigeria	113
5.2.1	The Committee System in the National Assembly.....	116
5.2.2	Purposes and Types of Committees.....	117
5.2.3	Terms of Reference / Functions of Standing Committees	119
5.2.4	Powers of Committees:	120
5.2.5	Method of Operation of Committees:.....	121
5.2.6	Number of Committees and Members	121
5.2.7	Number of Meetings held by Committees.....	132

5.2.8	Attendance and Participation level of Members at Committee Meetings.....	139
5.2.9	Committee Hearings.....	155
5.2.10	Committee Secretariat and Committee Clerk.....	158
5.2.11	Problems of the Committee System in the National Assembly	159
5.3	Oversight Mechanisms of the National Assembly	159
5.4	Constraining Factors in Implementing Oversight Functions	162
Chapter Six.....		164
Profile of Committee Oversight Activities in the National Assembly.....		164
6.1	Sample Size and Data Issues.....	165
6.2	Overview of Oversight.....	166
6.3	Analysis of Clerks/Secretaries' Responses on Committee Oversight at the National Assembly	190
6.3.1	Purposes and Objectives of Oversight	190
6.3.2	Major Instruments of Oversight	192
6.3.3	Oversight Processes of the Committees of the National Assembly 195	
6.3.4	Guiding Principles for Committee Oversight at the National Assembly.....	198
6.4	Oversight Visits	199
6.5	Public Hearings	207
6.5.1	Overview of Public Hearings	207
6.5.2	Investigative Hearings.....	215
6.6	Interactive Sessions	219
6.7	Bills Referred	226
6.8	Study Tours	238
6.9	Petitions.....	244
6.10	Resolutions.....	253
6.11	Conclusion and Recommendations	260
Chapter Seven		262
Assessment of Legislative Oversight Outcomes of the Committees		262
7.1	Direct Outcomes of Committee Oversight Activities	262
7.2	Discussion of Oversight Outcomes of the Committees	269
7.2.1	Detection and prevention of poor Administration, exposing Corruption, Waste and illegal Conduct.....	270

7.2.2	Evaluation of Government Programmes, Policies and the Performance of MDAs.....	283
7.2.3	Gathering of Information for the Development of new Legislations or for the Amendment of Existing Laws.....	298
7.2.4	Protection of Civil Liberties and Constitutional Rights.....	300
7.3	Significance of Oversight Findings, Outcomes and Recommendations	306
7.4	General Comments on Oversight Findings and Outcomes.....	311
Chapter Eight.....		314
Challenges to Oversight at the National Assembly and some Recommendations		314
8.0	Introduction.....	314
8.1	Challenges to Performance of Oversight Functions.....	314
8.2	Recommendation.....	327
Chapter Nine.....		334
Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.....		334
9.0	Summary.....	334
9.1	Conclusions.....	338
9.2	Recommendations.....	345
Appendices.....		350
Bibliography.....		446
Index.....		451

List of Tables

S/No	Description	Page No.
2.1	Standing Committees in the 113th US Congress	40
4.1(a)	Distribution of Legislators in the 7th National Assembly, by Educational Qualifications	83
4.1(b)	Distribution of Legislators in the 6th National Assembly, by Educational Qualifications	84
4.2	A Comparative Analysis of the Distribution of Senators and Hon. Members in NASS in Three Legislative Periods, by Gender	85
4.3(a)	Distribution of Legislative Aides in the House of Representatives in the 6th National Assembly	87
4.3(b)	Distribution of Legislative Aides in the House of Representatives in the 7th National Assembly	87
4.4 (a)	Distribution of Legislative Aides in the Senate by Cadre in the 6th National Assembly	88
4.4(b)	Distribution of Legislative Aides in the Senate by Cadres in the 7th Assembly	88
4.5 (a)	Comparative Analysis of Distribution of Legislative Aides in the Senate and House by Educational Qualifications in the Sixth National Assembly	90
4.5 (b)	Comparative Analysis of Distribution of Legislative Aides in the Senate and House by Educational Qualifications in the 7th Assembly as at September 2014	91
4.6	Distribution of Permanent Staff of National Assembly by Department and Gender, 2014	93
4.7	Distribution of Permanent Staff of National Assembly by Categories, 2014	94
4.8	Servers in the National Assembly, 2014	97
4.9(a)	Allocation of Offices to Members in the House of Representatives' New Building, in the 7th National Assembly, by Floors	100
4.9(b)	Allocation of Offices to Senators in the Senate New Building, in the 7th National Assembly, by Floors	100
4.9(c)	Distribution of Committee Meeting Rooms in the National Assembly	101
4.10	Number of National Assembly Library Users and Number of Books Consulted, 2010 to 2014	106
4.11	Personnel, Equipment and Challenges of the Library	107

S/No	Description	Page No.
4.12	National Assembly Budget in Relation to the Annual National Budget, 2005 - 2013	108
4.13	Structure of National Assembly Budget, 2009 - 2014	109
4.14	Annual Budgets of the Segments of NASS in relation to the Annual National Budget, 2005-2010 (per cent)	110
4.15	Budgetary Constraints faced by NASS Departments/Units	110
5.1	Membership and Permanent Committees in Selected Legislatures, 2014	123
5.2	Size of 57 Committees in the Senate 2003-2007, 2007-2011 and 2011-2015	126
5.3	Size of 90 Committees in the House of Representatives, 2007 – 2011 and 2011 – 2015	128
5.4	Number of Meetings per Session of 52 Committees in the Senate, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	133
5.5	Number of Meetings per Session of 64 Committees in the House, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	136
5.6	Total No. of Meetings Held by Selected Committees of the National Assembly, 2005/2006 – 2012/2013	138
5.7 (a)	Attendance/Participation Level at Meetings of National Assembly Committees: The Case of the House Committee on Niger Delta Development, 2007 – 2009	141
5.7 (b)	Attendance/Participation Level at Meetings of National Assembly Committees: The Case of the House Committee on Power, 2005 – 2008	142
5.7(c)	Attendance/Participation Level at the Meetings of National Assembly Committees: The Case of the House Committee on Education, 2007 – 2008	143
5.8 (a)	Attendance/Participation Level at Meetings of National Assembly Committees: The Case of House Committee Governmental Affairs, 2012-2013	143
5.8 (b)	Attendance/Participation Level at Meetings of National Assembly Committees: The Case of House Committee on Industry, 2012-2013	144
5.9 (a)	Attendance/Participation Level at Meetings of National Assembly Committees: The Case of Senate Committee on Education, 2011-2013	145
5.9 (b)	Attendance/Participation Level at Meetings of National Assembly Committees: The Case of Senate Committee on Air Force, 2011-2013	145
5.10	Committee Attendance in the UK Parliament: 2002/2003 and	147

S/No	Description	Page No.
	2007/2008	
5.11	Ten MPs with low Attendance in the UK Parliament: November 2007 - November 2008	148
5.12(a)	Participation Level of Some Important Committees of the Indian Parliament, 2007 - 2009	150
5.12(b)	Indian Fifteenth Lok Sabha (2010-2014): Summary of No. of Sitzings and Oversight Visits	151
5.13	Participation Level in Committee Plenary Meetings of the 10 Committees of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe, 2001 – 2006	153
6.1	Number of Committees Covered	166
6.2(a)	Distribution of Confirmed Nominees by the Senate, June 2011 - June 2012	170
6.2(b)	Application of the Confirmation Instrument of the Senate, 2008/2009 and 2012/13 Sessions	172
6.2 (c)	Number of Mechanisms/Instruments used by 36 Committees of the Senate, 2008/2009 and 2012/13 Sessions	174
6.2 (d)	Number of Mechanisms/Instruments used by 13 Committees in the House, 2008/2009 and 2012/2013	176
6.2 (e) (i)	Details of Oversight Mechanisms and Instruments used by 49 Committees in the Senate, 2008-2009	177
6.2 (e) (ii)	Details of Oversight Mechanisms and Instruments used by 34 Committees in the Senate, 2012-2013	184
6.2 (f) (i)	Details of Oversight Mechanisms and Instruments used by 12 Committees in the House of Representatives, 2008-2009	186
6.2 (f) (ii)	Details of Oversight Mechanisms and Instruments used by 37 Committees in the House of Representatives, 2012-2013	187
6.3 (a) (i)	House Committee Clerks/Secretaries' Response on Purposes and Objectives of Oversight	191
6.3 (a) (ii)	Senate Committee Clerks/Secretaries' Responses on Purposes and Objectives of Oversight	192
6.3 (b) (i)	House Clerks/Secretaries' Responses on the Major Instruments of Oversight Used by the Committees of the National Assembly	192
6.3 (b) (ii)	Senate Clerks/Secretaries' Responses on the Major Instruments of Oversight used by the Committees of the National Assembly	193
6.3(c)	Committee Clerks' Responses on the Oversight Process	195
6.3 (d)	Committee Clerks' Responses on the Guiding Principles for Oversight	198
6.4 (a)	Number of Oversight Visits per Session of 42 Committees in the	199

S/No	Description	Page No.
	Senate, 2007/2008 - 2012/2013	
6.4 (b)	Number of Oversight Visits per Session of 42 Committees in the House, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	202
6.4 (c)	Frequency Distribution of Oversight Visits by Senate Committees, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	204
6.4 (d)	Frequency Distribution of Oversight Visits by House of Representatives Committees, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	204
6.4 (e)	Trend Analysis of Oversight Visits – The Case of Five Committees of the House of Representatives, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	206
6.4 (f)	Trend Analysis of Oversight Visits – The Case of Six Committees of the Senate, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	206
6.5 (a)	Number of Public Hearings per Session of 21 Committees in the Senate, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	207
6.5 (b)	Number of Public Hearings per Session of 54 Committees in the House, 2008/2009 – 2012/2013	209
6.5(c)	Public Hearings of 14 Selected US House of Representatives Committees	211
6.5 (d)	Frequency Distribution of Public Hearings by Senate Committees, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	212
6.5 (e)	Frequency Distribution of Public Hearings by the House of Representatives Committees, 2008/2009 – 2012/2013	212
6.5 (f)	Trend Analysis of Public Hearings – The Case of Six Committees of the House of Representatives, 2008/2009 – 2012/2013	214
6.5 (g)	Trend Analysis of Public Hearings – The Case of Two Committees of the Senate, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	214
6.5(h)	Number of Probes/Key Investigations in the National Assembly, 1999 – 2014	215
6.6 (a)	Number of Interactive Sessions Held by 45 Committees in the Senate, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	219
6.6 (b)	Number of Interactive Sessions Held by 46 Committees in the House, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	221
6.6 (c)	Frequency Distribution of Interactive Sessions by 45 Senate Committees, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	223
6.6 (d)	Frequency Distribution of Interactive Sessions by 46 House of Representatives Committees, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	223
6.6 (e)	Trend Analysis of Interactive Sessions – The Case of Seven Committees of the House of the Representatives, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	225
6.6 (f)	Trend Analysis of Interactive Sessions – The Case of Six	225

S/No	Description	Page No.
	Committees of the Senate, 2007/2008 - 2012/2013	
6.7 (a)	Number of Bills Referred to 32 Committees in the Senate, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	226
6.7 (b)	Number of Bills Referred to 42 Committees in the House, 2008/2008 – 2012/2013	227
6.7 (c)	Frequency Distribution of Bills Referred to Senate Committees, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	230
6.7 (d)	Frequency Distribution of Bills Referred to 42 Committees of the House of Representatives, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	230
6.7 (e)	Trend Analysis of Bills Referred – The Case of Six Committees of the House of Representatives, 2006/2007 – 2012/2013	232
6.7 (f)	Trend Analysis of Bills Referred – The Case of Five Committees of the Senate, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	232
6.7 (g)	A Summary of Status of Bills Received and Considered in the Senate, June 2003 – May 2014	233
6.7 (h)	Summary of Status of Bills Received and Considered in the House, June 2003 – Jan. 2014	235
6.7 (i)	Total Bills Referred to Committees, June 2003 – May 2004 - June 2013 - May 2014	236
6.7(j)	Bills Passed in the Senate and House, June 1999 - May 2013	237
6.8 (a)	Number of Study Tours per Session of 22 Committees in the Senate, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	240
6.8 (b)	Number of Study Tours per Session of 27 Committees in the House, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	241
6.8 (c)	Frequency Distribution of Study Tours by 22 Committees in the Senate, 2005/2006 – 2012/2013	242
6.8 (d)	Frequency Distribution of Study Tours by House of Representatives Committees, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	243
6.8 (e)	Trend Analysis of Study Tours – The Case of Four Committees of the House of Representatives, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	243
6.8 (f)	Trend Analysis of Study Tours – The Case of Five Committees of the Senate, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	244
6.9(a)	Petitions Referred to the Senate Committee on Ethics, Privileges and Public Petitions, 2012 – 2013 Session	245
6.9 (b)	Number of Petitions Received by 19 Committees in the Senate, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	247
6.9 (c)	Numbers of Petitions Received by 12 Committees in the House, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	248

S/No	Description	Page No.
6.9 (d)	Frequency Distribution of Petitions Received by 19 Committees in the Senate, 2007/2008 –2012/2013	249
6.9 (e)	Frequency Distribution of Petitions, House of Representatives Committees, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	249
6.9(f)	Actual and Percentage Distribution of Gestation Periods of Petitions Considered by the House, June 2007- May 2013	252
6.10	Highlights of 10 Senate Motions and Resolutions, June 2007 - June 2009 and June 2011 - May 2013	254
6.11	Highlights of Eight House Motions and Resolutions, June 2012 – June 2014	258
7.1	Direct Oversight Outcomes of Some Committees of the National Assembly, 2003/2004- 2009/2010 – 2012/2013	263
7.2	Summary of Selected Oversight Findings/Achievements Related to Poor Administration, Corruption and Illegal Conduct, 2003-2007, 2007-2011; and 2012/2013	280
7.3(a)	Oversight Findings Relating to the Performance of MDAs up to 2010	291
7.3 (b)	Oversight Findings Relating to the Performance of MDAs, 2012-2013 Session	295
7.4	Members’ Rating of the Roles of the Legislature in Nigeria	312
7.5	Delivery of Responsible and Accountable Governance as the Principal Role of Oversight	312
8.1	Members’ Opinion on Whether Committees Have Full Access to All Financial Information of the Government	316
8.2	Legislators’ Opinion about the Adequacy of Resources	318
8.3	Members’ Opinion on Whether Committees Are Financially Supported for Oversight	319
8.4	Clerks/Secretaries’ Responses on the Source of Funds for Committee Oversight Activities	317
8.5	Members’ Opinion on Whether Committees’ Reports are considered on Time	320
8.6	Some Committees that Complained about Absenteeism/Low Attendance of Committee Members	320
8.7	Members’ Opinion on Sanctioning of Those Who Fail to Implement the Decisions of Committees	322
8.8	Challenges/Problems of Selected Oversight Committees of NASS as Reported by the Committees, 2012/2013 Session	323
8.9(a)	Recommendations of Selected Committees of the National Assembly (as at 2010)	329

S/No	Description	Page No.
8.9(b)	Recommendations of Selected Committees of the National Assembly, 2012/2013 Session	332

List of Figures

S/No.	Description	Page No
4.1	Comparative Analysis of Percentage Distribution of Senators and Hon. Members from 1999-2015 by Gender	86
4.2(a)	Percentage Distribution of Legislative Aides in the Senate in the 7th Assembly by Cadres	89
4.2(b)	Percentage Distribution of Legislative Aides in the House of Representatives in the 7th Assembly by Cadres	89
4.3	Percentage Distribution of Legislative Aides in the Senate and House by Educational Qualifications in the 6th National Assembly	92
4.4	Distribution of Permanent Staff of National Assembly by Categories, 2014	95
4.5(a)	Distribution of Offices for Members in the House of Representatives' New Building, in the 7th National Assembly, by Floors	100
4.5(b)	Distribution of Offices to Senators in the Senate New Building, in the 7th National Assembly, by Floors	101
4.6	Percentage Share of National Assembly Budget in the Annual National Budget, 2005-2010	108
4.7	Percentage of Recurrent Budget in Total National Assembly Budget, 2009 - 2014	109
6.2 (a)	Oversight Mechanisms/Instruments used by 49 and 34 Selected Committees in the Senate, 2008 – 2009 and 2012 – 2013 Sessions	168
6.2 (b)	Oversight Mechanisms/Instruments used by 12 and 37 Selected Committees in the House of Representatives, 2008 – 2009 and 2012 – 2013 Session	168
6. (3)	Frequency Distribution of Oversight Visits of Selected Committees in the National Assembly, 2007/2008, 2009/2010, 2010/2011 and 2012/2013	205
6.5 (a)	Frequency Distribution of Public Hearings of Selected Committees in the National Assembly, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	213
6.5	Trend Analysis of Public Hearings – The Case of Six Committees	214

(b)	of the House of Representatives, 2008/2009 – 2012/2013	
6.5(c)	Number of Probes/Key Public investigations in the National Assembly, 1999 – 2014	216
6.6	Frequency Distribution of Interactive Sessions of Selected Committees in National Assembly, 2007/2008 – 2012/2013	224
6.5	Trend Analysis of Interactive Sessions – The Case of 7 Committees of the House of the Representatives, 2007/2008, 2009/2010 and 2012/2013	225
6.7	Figure 6.7 :): Frequency Distribution of Bills Referred to Selected Committees of the National Assembly, 2007/2008, 2009/2010, 2011/2012 and 2012/2013	231
6.8	Frequency Distribution of Study Tours of Selected Committees of the National Assembly, 2007/2008 – 2012/201	243
6.9(a)	Frequency Distribution of Petitions to Selected Committees of the National Assembly, 2007/2008 – 2013/2013	250
6.9(b)	Percentage Distribution of Gestation Periods of Petitions Received and Considered by the House, June 2007- May 2013	253

List of Boxes

S/No	Description	Page No
6.1	Oversight Instruments of Committees of the National Assembly	167
7.1	Reform of the Due Process Mechanism in Relation to Budget Implementation	285
7.2	Oversight Findings - The Case of the Senate Committee on Women's Affairs and Youth Development on the State of Nigerian Prisons in Edo, Delta and Rivers States	304
7.3	Oversight Findings – the Case of the Senate Committee on Aviation	305

List of Appendices

S/No	Description	Page No
A.	Key Senate Probes/Investigative Public Hearings (2007 -2014)	359
B.	Key House of Representatives Probes/Investigative Public Hearings (1999-2014)	368
C.	Key Senate Motions and Resolutions, June 2007 - June 2009 and June 2011- May 2013	393
D.	Resolutions of the House from June 2012- June 2014	400
E.	Activities of Some Senate Committees, 2008 - 2009	420
F.	Oversight Activities of Some Senate Committees, 2011-2013	425
G.	Trends of the Activities of Six Selected Committees, House of Representatives, 2003/04 – 2009/10	433
H.	Trends of the Activities of Two Senate Committees, 2003/04 – 2009/10	443
I.	Permanent Committees and Membership in Selected Legislatures, 2009	451

Acronyms

ABUTH	Ahmadu Bello University Teaching Hospital
ACBF	African Capacity Building Foundation
AGF	Accountant-General of the Federation
APC	All Progressives Congress
APRM	Africa Peer Review Mechanism
ASC	Ajaokuta Steel Company
BASA	Bilateral Air Services Agreement
BMPIU	Budget Monitoring and Price Intelligence Unit
BOT	Build Operate and Transfer
BPE	Bureau of Public Enterprises
BPP	Bureau of Public Procurement
CBN	Central Bank of Nigeria
CBO	Congressional Budget Office
CCECC	China Civil Engineering Construction Company
COE	Council of Europe
COREN	Council for the Regulation of Engineering in Nigeria
CRS	Congressional Research Office
DG	Director-General
DPM	Due Process Mechanism
DSC	Delta Steel Company
FA	Federation Account
FAAN	Federal Airport Authority of Nigeria
FCT	Federal Capital Territory
FERMA	Federal Roads Maintenance Agency
FMBN	Federal Mortgage Bank of Nigeria
FMT	Federal Ministry of Transport
GAO	General Accountability Office
GINL	Global Infrastructure Nigeria Limited
ICAO	International Civil Aviation Organization
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
INEC	Independent National Electoral Commission
LUTH	Lagos University Teaching Hospital
MCA	Millennium Challenge Account

MDAs	Ministries, Departments and Agencies
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MPs	Members of Parliament
NAF	Nigerian Air Force
NAMA	Nigerian Airspace Management Authority
NAPEP	National Poverty Eradication Programme
NASS	National Assembly
NBTE	National Board for Technical Education
NCAA	Nigerian Civil Aviation Authority
NCBWA	National Congress for British West Africa
NCC	Nigerian Communications Commission
NCCE	National Board for Technical Education
NCS	Nigeria Customs Service
NDDC	Niger Delta Development Commission
NDI	National Democratic Institute
NDIC	Nigeria Deposit Insurance Corporation
NDPHC	Niger Delta Power Holding Company
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NESREA	National Environmental Standards and Regulations Enforcement Agency
NGOs	Non-Governmental Organizations
NHF	National Housing Fund
NAICOM	National Insurance Commission
NCCE	National Commission for Colleges of Education
NILS	National Institute for Legislative Studies
NIMET	Nigerian Meteorological Agency
NIOMCO	National Iron Ore Mining Company
NIPPs	National Integrated Power Projects
NISER	Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research
NNDP	Nigerian National Democratic Party
NNPC	Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation
NOSDRA	National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency
NRC	Nigeria Railways Corporation
NUC	National Council on Privatisation
NURTW	National Union of Road Transport Workers
NYSC	National Youth Service Corps
OPVs	Oral Polio Vaccines

PA	Personal Assistant
PAC	Public Accounts Committee
PACE	Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe
PARP	Policy Analysis and Research Project
PDP	Peoples Democratic Party
PHCN	Power Holding Company of Nigeria
PMG	Parliamentary Monitoring Group
PRC	Parliamentary Reform Committee
RBDAs	River Basin Development Authorities
REA	Rural Electrification Agency
RMAFC	Revenue Mobilisation, Allocation and Fiscal Commission
SABI	State Accelerated Broadband Institute
SAHCOL	Skypower Aviation Handling Company Limited
SEC	Securities and Exchange Commission
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SOs	Standing Orders
SON	Standards Organisation of Nigeria
SPDC	Shell Petroleum Development Company
SROC	Standing Rules and Orders Committee
TRACON	Total Radar Coverage of Nigeria
TSC	Ticket Sales Charge
UBE	Universal Basic Education
UCH	University College Hospital (Ibadan)
UN	United Nations
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VAT	Value Added Tax
WIN	Women in Nigeria

Preface

This book is the second edition of *Committees in the Nigerian National Assembly: A Study of Performance of Legislative Functions* covering the period, 2003 – 2010, and published in 2010 by the Policy Analysis and Research Project, the forerunner of the National Institute for Legislative Studies. The specific focus of the book remains the performance of oversight functions by the National Assembly Committees.

Legislative oversight is a core responsibility of the Legislature. It refers to parliamentary checks on the implementation of the law, policies and programmes by the executive. Among the objects of oversight are the identification and avoidance of inefficiency and waste in government; determination of government's effectiveness in carrying out public policy, as set by the Legislature; and ensuring that the Executive complies with legislative intent. Over time, Legislatures have increasingly become scrutinizing bodies aiming to deliver responsible and accountable government. When the Legislature performs the oversight function well, along with the other functions of law making and representation, it is able to connect citizens to their government by providing a place where their needs can be articulated, giving them a say in shaping rules that govern them, and providing them with a redress if government power is abused.

Two considerations led to the publication of the second edition of this book. First, significant data challenges were encountered while writing the first edition, resulting in notable data gaps. These gaps needed to be remedied with updated data collected through a more painstaking and consistent strategy. Second, it is necessary to update the first edition with information that covers legislative activities up to the 2013/2014 legislative session, thus assisting the Institute to meet its goals of data bank development and enhancement of information availability to legislators, researchers and other stakeholders. Although this edition has also been challenged by relatively incomplete data due to poor storage of legislative documents and limited cooperation of officials, the information used in this new edition is more robust and provides a basis for better insights into the performance of legislative functions by the NASS committees.

Significant improvements have been made to the nine chapters of the First Edition of the book. This Edition demonstrates greater success in quality and depth of data, perspectives on legislative oversight, comparative analysis of the committee system, empirical data on oversight performance, and analysis/interpretation. Chapter one provides background information on the objectives and methodology of

the study, while chapters two and three review concepts, theoretical and empirical perspectives on the legislature and its committees, and oversight. Chapter four examines the resource profile for legislative work in the National Assembly and observes that although the National Assembly has achieved significant improvements in human capacity and physical facilities over the past years, funding has remained a subsisting challenge to legislative activities including oversight. The other main chapters, namely, five to eight, provide empirical information on and analysis of legislative activities of committees of the National Assembly, in particular oversight. The specific issues covered include the following: dimensions and structures of oversight, mechanisms and instruments for oversight, oversight activities and achievements of committees, committee oversight activities in relation to international best practices, capacity issues in oversight, outcomes of legislative oversight, and challenges and constraints to the performance of oversight functions. The final chapter contains summary, conclusions and recommendations.

This book provides significant insights into the performance of the oversight function by the National Assembly committees. The findings and outcomes indicate that oversight of the executive has been successful to some degree while there is room for significant improvement. While the oversight function has not been neglected by NASS, and a good number of the committees have done well, various challenges, identified in the book, to effective oversight performance remain. An accomplishment of the recommendations in the concluding Chapter, will enhance the confidence of the public in the legislature and its legislative activities.

The Institute acknowledges the efforts of Prof. Mike I. Obadan and Mr. Abidemi Adegboye in writing this revised edition of the book. The updated data were collected and collated by Messrs Gbahabo Terfa and Gabriel O. Falade. The Institute appreciates their contributions.

Dr Ladi Hamalai, MFR
Director-General

December, 2014

Chapter One

Introduction

1.0 Preamble

Modern democracies are characterized by shared decision-making between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government. Each country's Constitution formally structures this interaction, allocating political powers and the relative influence each branch of government has over the other and over policy making (NDI, 2000). Among the branches of government, the legislature occupies a central position in the machinery of governance as it is traditionally vested with formal lawmaking power, giving it some capacity to shape or at least influence public policy. Aside from this traditional role, the parliament performs oversight functions through which the government is held accountable to the electorate. The oversight functions are vested in the Legislature as a fundamental principle of the separation of powers and on account of Parliament being an institution of the people's representatives. These oversight functions are performed within the framework of the Committee system. The Committee system assumes great importance since Parliament in its corporate nature cannot have complete oversight over government and all its activities. The committees employ several oversight tools or mechanisms to effectively carry out their functions. Among the oversight tools employed in Nigeria are questioning and interactions, visits and inspection, bill referral and committee hearings, investigative hearings, examination and approval of appropriation bill, and vetting of the auditor-general's reports. With these oversight tools, the legislative body plays an active role in understanding and monitoring the performance of the executive arm of government and applies this knowledge to its traditional function of lawmaking.

Legislative oversight functions vary depending on the nature and type of government adopted. For example, in Nigeria, during the consideration of Appropriation Bills, each standing committee is given charge over the estimates of the Ministry for which it has oversight or functional responsibilities, thereby becoming sub-committees of the Appropriation Committee in both chambers. However, in the

United States there is no such framework; rather there are about 12 - 13 sub-chambers of the Appropriation Committee (Salim, 2001).

Regardless of the variations in oversight functions and tools available, there appears to be a consensus on its central idea, namely, review and evaluation of selected activities of the executive branch of government linked to lawmaking (Ohio, 2008; NDI, 2000). Oversight empowers the legislature to scrutinize the policies of the executive well before they are enacted like the Appropriation Bill and also see to the effective implementation of the laws made, whether in fact they address and correct the problems or improve the purpose for which they were made. The general essence of oversight therefore is to provide checks and balances so as to enhance development. Accordingly, it has been argued that the principle behind legislative oversight of Executive activity is to ensure that public policy is administered in accordance with the legislative intent. Following this principle, the legislative function does not cease with the passage of a bill. It continues with oversight of the implementation of the law. It is only by monitoring the implementation process that members of the Legislature uncover any defects and act to correct misinterpretation or maladministration. In this sense, the concept of oversight exists as an essential corollary to the law making process.

In Nigeria, the Constitution clearly spells out the oversight functions of the legislature. The 1999 Constitution, section 88, provides as follows:

“(1) Subject to the provisions of this Constitution, each house of the National Assembly shall have power by resolution published in its journal or in the official gazette of the government of the federation to direct or cause to be directed an investigation into:-

- a) Any matter or thing with respect to which it has power to make laws; and
- b) The conduct of affairs of any person, authority, ministry or government department charged or intended to be charged with the duty or responsibility for:
 - i) executing and administering laws enacted by the National Assembly.
 - ii) disbursing or administering moneys appropriated or to be appropriated by the National Assembly.

- (2) The powers conferred on the National Assembly under the provisions of this section are exercisable only for the purpose of enabling it to:
- a) Make laws with respect to any matter within its legislative competence and correct any defect in existing laws; and
 - b) Expose corruption, inefficiency or waste in the execution or administration of laws within its legislative competence and in the disbursement or administration of funds appropriated by it”.

One may be tempted to suggest that the oversight functions of the legislature are only incidental to legislation. However, this view may need to change considering, for example, that the Appropriation Acts on which the oversight functions are primarily based, are laws within the competence of the National Assembly following section 88 (2) (a) of the 1999 Constitution. The oversight functions in that section are aimed at exposing corruption, inefficiency, and waste not only in the administration of the Appropriation Act generally, but in the disbursement or administration of funds appropriated by the Act. Accordingly, the sections also allow the oversight functions to cover the implementation of any current Appropriation Act with a view to identifying any defects made to some projects for the purposes of correcting same in the next Appropriation Act. With this Constitutional power bestowed on the Legislature, the Nigerian law-makers, like those of other parliaments, are vested with notable roles in oversight activities and they perform them in the context of the committee system.

In recent years, the legislature has carried out a range of oversight activities (ex-ante and ex-post) through the committee system. Some of these activities include the technical appraisal of Appropriation Bills, conduct of several reviews of executive branch programs, conduct of public hearings on some of the executive branch activities, establishment of a formal procedure for the review of all administrative rules adopted by the executive branch (Ministries, Departments and Agencies - MDAs).

For effective legislative oversight, there must be the means of measuring the committee’s effectiveness. While the principle of legislative oversight largely remains as espoused by the 14th Century House of Commons and reinforced by

the Wilsonian political philosophy, its application in modern days demands that there must be a set of objectives or standards against which it can be assessed and measured. If this is not done, the Parliament's oversight role will tend to be unclear as there will be no identifiable criteria by which to judge the reporting bodies - given the new politico-economic order where many governmental functions are being hived off to agencies outside ministerial control.

However, although it is not easy to measure the effectiveness of an oversight committee, it is necessary to make some attempts to do so as the information provided will be helpful in the sense that it will identify means of improving on oversight performance where there are lapses. In other words, the measurement will provide feedbacks and thus help improve the effectiveness of Parliamentary oversight.

Several articles have been written and studies carried out on the various activities (including oversight performance) of the National Assembly since 1960. Ojo (1997), in volume I of his book, provides a historical survey of Colonial Administration in Nigeria before Independence. In volume II is a historical survey of Nigerian governmental system: 1960-1993 while in Volume III, the author assesses the Nigerian Legislature in terms of its origin, organization, processes, procedures, and practices. Dunmoye, et al (2007), in their edited book, provided a compendium of articles which provide insights into the relationship between the legislature, Constitution, and Democracy, within the context of historical, social, economic and political issues, as well as the role of the legislature in institution building, foreign policy and economic development. Other studies on legislative oversight functions in Nigeria, include Oyewo (2007), (Ojo, 1997), Obayuwana (2008). However, in spite of the literature available on legislative oversight in Nigeria, there was, as at 2010, little knowledge of the performance and effectiveness of committees with respect to their oversight functions. This prompted the Policy Analysis and Research Project, National Assembly, to undertake a study, published in 2010 that sought to redress the problem. The study evaluated the performance of committees of the National Assembly in relation to their oversight functions over the period, 2003 to 2010, but with data being generally more available in the sub-period, 2007-2009. The

present book updates the information in the original study to 2013/2014. The book is richer in both the data content and analysis. Greater efforts have been made to minimise data gaps.

1.1 Objectives of the Study

The subsisting general objective of the study is to evaluate the Committees of the National Assembly with respect to the performance of their oversight functions with a view to coming up with recommendations to improve performance. The evaluation is extended from 2010 to 2013. In furtherance of the broad objective, the study specifically examines the following, among others:

- Resource base for legislative work
- Dimensions of and structures for oversight;
- The mechanisms and instruments of oversight employed;
- Various oversight activities and achievements of the committees;
- Committees' oversight activities in relation to international practices;
- Capacity issues in the performance of oversight;
- Outcomes of legislative oversight;
- Challenges and constraints to the performance of oversight functions;
- Implications of the findings and challenges for policy in the form of recommendations.

In executing the study, it was recognised that all the committees have a general obligation to perform oversight functions but that the terms of reference do vary from one committee to another depending on their specific functions and objectives.

1.2 Rationale and Significance of the Study

The legislature is not only vested with formal lawmaking power which tends to shape and influence public policy, but also with the power to oversee the effective implementation of the laws made. However, in Nigeria, there is no current knowledge of the extent to which the legislature has been effective in carrying out the constitutional responsibility of oversight. One of the motivations for the study therefore is to provide insights into this issue. Insights are also provided from an international comparative analysis of the performance of Committee activities,

particularly in other nations with similar constitutional provisions. The information provided will be helpful to the legislature. In this direction, the study does not only provide information on performance but also on the critical challenges and ways of improving on performance. The study is thus indispensable for providing feedbacks and helping to improve the effectiveness of National Assembly (NASS) programs organized by the National Institute for Legislative Studies (NILS).

Since NILS is the capacity builder for the National Assembly, the analysis and findings in the study provide information that will enable it have knowledge of the capacity constraints and the gaps to be filled. Essentially, the study will help NILS make relevant decisions relating to its programs, budgets, and strategic planning towards enhancing the capacity of the NASS legislators and staff. Since the budgetary allocation of funds highly depends on the results achieved, this study has great value.

1.3 Framework of the Study

A study of this kind can be approached from different perspectives depending on the conceptual interpretation of evaluation. Evaluation plays an integral role in determining the effectiveness or impact of programs, projects, and policies. DHHS (1999) defines evaluation as the assessment of program performance (efficiency, effectiveness, and responsiveness) through the analysis of data or information collected systematically and ethically, and the effective use of the resulting information in program or policy decision-making and program management. This definition encompasses a range of evaluation activities with their respective meanings as follows:

Outcome evaluation: measures the immediate or intermediate effects of a program with respect to the stated goals or objectives.

- Impact evaluation: looks at the broader and long-term results, intended or unintended, of program on populations or institutions involved.
- Implementation or process evaluation: assesses the nature of program inputs and outputs and their relationship to the stated goals and objectives.
- Policy assessment: examines policies with respect to their development, implementation, or their impact on program activity.
- Cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness analysis: develops methodology and its

application to assess the relationship of program results to program costs (direct and indirect), often in comparison with alternative programs.

- Survey data analysis: evaluates the results of programs or policies by analysing data obtained from surveys.
- Performance measurement and data system: identifies and tests the validity and reliability of process, output, and outcome indicators to measure the performance of programs and develop programs or data system supporting implementation of the government performance.
- Simulations and models: use computer simulations and modelling techniques to analyse the impact of policy changes on services delivery systems and beneficiaries.
- Management synthesis: integrates the results from multiple independent evaluation studies within a defined program or policy area in a fashion that improves the accessibility and application of those results.
- Evaluation feasibility study: assesses the clarity and importance of program goals and objectives, the consensus of program stakeholders on the potential utility of evaluation information, and the availability of relevant performance data before committing to a full-scale program evaluation.
- Evaluation design project: procures assistance in developing an evaluation design, measurement tools, or analytic models in preparation for fully implementing an evaluation.
- Instrument development project: develops evaluation instruments (design, measurement, or analytic) for a specific program or for general use by any Ministry, Department, or Agency.
- Evaluation technical assistance: helps donor officials and grantees with any aspect of evaluation planning, project design, implementation, analysis, or use of results.
- Evaluation dissemination: identifies target audiences and mechanisms to inform program constituencies and evaluation stakeholders about evaluation results.
- Evaluation training/conference: maintains the professional skills and expertise of evaluation staff through opportunities, and promotes the

dissemination of evaluations through conferences.

Even though there are many evaluation approaches in line with a wide range of activities that exist, the main objective of evaluation is to influence decision-making. With different objectives which reflect different evaluation activity, it is necessary that the appropriate evaluation design is chosen for the relevant activity or programs. NDI (2000), however, posits that how complex and precise the evaluation technique will be, depends on who the decision maker is and on what type(s) of decisions will be taken as a consequence of the findings. Sequel to that, different decision makers demand not only different types of information but also vary in their requirements of how informative and precise the findings must be. Based on that, the evaluator's first concern is the indicators of interest, whether the evaluation would be on provision or utilization of services, coverage or impact measures. The second concern pertains to the type of inference to make, whether the evaluation would be a statement of adequacy, plausibility, or probability. In addition to these, Habicht (1999) opines that other factors that affect the choice of an evaluation design include the efficacy of the intervention, the field of knowledge, timing and costs.

The foregoing framework can be conveniently categorized into the summative evaluation (of established interventions) and the formative evaluation approaches. The formative evaluation technique seeks to fine-tune program implementation at the infancy stage, thereby assessing the overall adequacy of changes in outcomes which may support a decision in the right direction. The summative evaluation framework provides two classification axes: the first refers to the indicators of interest, that is, whether one is evaluating the performance of intervention delivery or the impact of intervention or behavioural indicators. The second axis refers to the type of inference to be drawn, including how confident the decision maker should be, that any observed effects were in fact due to the intervention. The kind of inference refers to the adequacy, plausibility or probability of the intervention.

For the purpose of this study, no formal use is made of both the summative and formative evaluation techniques because of serious data limitations; rather some elements of the frameworks are reflected in the simple evaluation approach adopted entailing an analysis of the oversight activities and assessment of the outcomes.

1.4 Scope of the Study

Nigeria operates a presidential system of government involving a central federal government and sub-national governments, each deriving its powers from the constitution. Under the arrangement, there is the National Assembly and the State Houses' of Assembly. This study however, is limited to the National Assembly which is bi-cameral in structure, comprising the House of Representatives and the Senate. The study focuses on evaluating the performance of the activities of committees in the National Assembly with particular reference to their oversight functions over the period, 2003 – 2013, especially the more recent years with more robust data. However, the study does not try to evaluate the performance of all the Committees in both chambers; rather, it concentrates on some committees that have 'key roles' to play in the dynamics of the Nigerian governance and economy. Data availability was also a major consideration in focussing on some committees. However, in this second edition of the book, in a few cases, analysis is carried out for all the committees where data are available.

The period of the study covers 2003 – 2013, implying updating of the data for the period, 2010 - 2013. The entire period spans the tenures of three governments under three different leaderships. However, because of data incompleteness there is no firm basis for any comparison of the periods.

1.5 Methodology

In the study that gave rise to the first edition of this book, two major approaches were employed to collect data: questionnaire survey and content analysis of sessional reports from the Senate and House of Representatives. The oral interviews technique was used to complement the questionnaire survey method. Two questionnaire surveys were conducted. The first targeted all distinguished senators and all Honourable members who were committee chair-persons as well as all committee clerks/secretaries in both the Senate and House of Representatives. But only the Committee clerks/secretaries (22 of them) in the Senate completed and returned the questionnaires administered on them. A huge data gap thus surfaced. This necessitated another field survey also entailing the use of questionnaires to generate a fresh set of data. The structured questionnaire was designed to reflect the

composition of the two chambers and covered Senators and Members of the House of Representatives who served in the National Assembly from 2003 to 2007. 25 questionnaires were administered purposively to the legislators. The information obtained from the 20 questionnaires retrieved was rather limited. Hence much reliance was placed on the sessional reports.

Thus, the second stage of data collection was the extraction of data from sessional reports. These reports include the periodic and annual reports of committees of the National Assembly. Altogether, information was obtained on 220 Committees, made up of 74 from the Senate and 146 from the House of Representatives. This apparently skewed committee representation can be explained. There are more members and committees in the House of Representatives than the Senate. Secondly, and very importantly, in the last two years of the study, information was available on committees in the House but the research team could not obtain the required information from the Senate.

The data for the revision and updating of the analysis in this second edition of the book were obtained with approaches similar to the above for the first edition: questionnaire survey, oral interviews and content analysis of sessional reports from the Senate and House of Representatives. The oral interview method targeted the Library and Information and Communication Technology (ICT) staff, and the clerks of committees, where data was limited from the sessional reports of such committees. The questionnaire survey conducted targeted the management staff and the committee clerks in both chambers of the National Assembly. Of the 50 questionnaires administered to committee clerks in the Senate, only 23 were completed and returned while in the House of Representatives, of the 65 questionnaires administered to committee clerks, only 17 were completed and returned. Also, out of the 18 questionnaires distributed to the management staff, only 10 were completed and returned. But more importantly, and regrettably, there was not much useful substance in the completed questionnaires from clerks and management staff, perhaps, due to their limited interest in completing the questionnaires. Consequently, much reliance had to be placed on the sessional reports and some oversight reports of the committees. To this end, information was obtained from a total of 146 Committees. According to the National Assembly website, there

are 90 committees in the House of Representatives and 56 committees in the Senate. This explains why more committees were targeted in the House of Representatives.

In both editions of the book, the data obtained formed the basis of the analysis in chapters 4 to 8. The method of data analysis included content analysis of the sessional reports while the quantitative data were analysed with frequency tables, simple percentages, charts, etc. The essence is to make the analysis and reporting readable and easy to understand.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

The major limitation of the first study was the relatively inadequate (and in some cases, poor quality) data which precluded the use of more sophisticated evaluation techniques. Secondly, the non-coverage of the oversight activities of all the committees was another limitation. It was then advised that some of the generalizations and conclusions might have to be taken with caution. And very importantly, too, was the caution that the comparison of the oversight activities of the Senate and the House should not be taken far as a uniform basis for such comparison was not available. This revised edition has also been challenged by the phenomenon of relatively inadequate data due to poor storage of legislative documents, lukewarm attitude and limited cooperation of committee clerks and staff of NASS. Access to sessional reports was difficult and this delayed the data collection process. Nevertheless, the information used for this second edition is more robust and it provides a basis for better insights into the performance of legislative functions by the NASS committees.

1.7 Structure of the Book

The rest of the report is divided into eight chapters. Chapters 2 and 3 provide a theoretical review of issues relating to the legislature and oversight. While chapter 2 examines the legislature and its committees, chapter 3 discusses perspectives on legislative oversight. International perspectives on the issues are also reflected in the two chapters. In chapter 4 is a discussion of the resource base for oversight and legislative work generally. The effectiveness of the oversight committees depends partly on the availability of resources – human, financial and physical resources in the

form of infrastructure, among others. The analysis shows that human and physical facilities in NASS have improved significantly since 1999 when democratic governance resumed in the country. But financial resources still pose a challenge to legislative activities. Chapter 5 discusses the background to legislative committees' activities and oversight in Nigeria while Chapters 6 and 7 provide empirical information and analysis on oversight activities. In particular, chapter 6 profiles committee activities, particularly on oversight, while 7 discusses oversight outcomes. The analysis indicates while NASS committees have not neglected the oversight function, there is room for significant improvement of performance. However, the challenges and constraints to legislative oversight outlined in Chapter 8 will need to be effectively addressed. This requires conscientious implementation of the recommendations outlined. Finally, chapter 9 provides the summary, conclusions and recommendations of the study.

Bibliography

Abati, R. (2010), "Nigeria's Parliament: A Congress for Scandal", *The Guardian*, November 14.

Africa All Party Parliamentary Group (2008), *Strengthening Parliaments in Africa: Improving Support*, A Report. London.

Barnhart, G (1999), *Parliamentary Committees: Enhancing Democratic Governance*, London: Cavendish Publishing Ltd.

Chigbo, A. (2009): Press Release, Public Communications, the Bureau of Public Enterprises.

Clem, A (1989), *The Parliamentary Committee: Enhancing Democratic Governance*, London: Cavendish Publishing Ltd.

Clem, Alan L. (1989), *Congress: Powers, Processes, and Politics*, Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Congressional Research Service (2002), *Congressional Quarterly's Guide to Congress*, Second Edition, Edited by Robert A. Diamond and Patricia Anne O'Connor.

Dabin, H and A.F Amayah (2007), "An Evaluation of the Performance of Nigeria's Legislature in Legislative Oversight Functions, 1999 – 2006", Report of a re-designed Research Presented to the Policy Analysis and Research Project (PARP), National Assembly, Abuja, October.

Davies, Jack (1986), *Legislative Law and Process in a Nutshell*. St. Paul Minn.: West.

Department of Health and Human Services, USA (1999), "Policy Information Centre: Description of the HHS Evaluation Program". <http://aspe.hhs.gov/PIC/perfimp/1999/appendixa.htm>

Dunmoye, A. Ayo, Placid Njoku and Ogoh Alubo (2007), *The National Assembly: Pillar of Democracy*, Abuja: The National Secretariat of Nigerian Legislatures, National Assembly.

Egwu, S. G. (2005), "The Legislature in Nigeria's Fourth Republic", In: A.T. Gana, Yakubu B. C. Omelle (eds.), *Democratic Rebirth in Nigeria: 1999-2003*, Vol. 1, Abuja: The African Centre for Democratic Governance, Abuja.

Ezera, K (1960), *Constitutional Development in Nigeria*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frears, John (1997), "The French Parliament: Loyal Workhorse, Poor Watchdog", In Philip Norton, ed. *Parliament in Western Europe*.

Galloway, G. B (1962), *History of the House of Representatives*, New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company

Habicht, J.P, C.G Victoria and J.P Vaughan (1999), "Evaluation Designs for Adequacy, Plausibility and Probability of Public Health programme Performance and Impact. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 28.

Oleszek, W.J, et al (2011), "Congressional Oversight Manual." www.wise-intern.org/orientation/documents/RL30240

Halchin, L.E and FM Kaiser (2012), "Congressional Oversight". Congressional Research Service 7-5700

Hamalai, L, ed. (2010), *Committees in the Nigerian National Assembly: A Study of the performance of Legislative Functions, 2003 – 2010*. (Abuja: Policy Analysis and Research Project, National Assembly)

Kdierking (2010), "Congressional Oversight". legislativeoversight-kdierking.blogspot.com, April 15.

Halligan, J., J. Power, and R. Miller, (2003), "The Three Committee Systems of the Australian Parliament - A Developmental Overview?" Available at: www.parliament.qld.gov.au/aspg/documents/aspg_11.pdf

Hampton, C and A. Tubbs (2013), "Conducting a Public Hearing". [Ctb.ku.edu/en/tablecontents/sub_section_main_1257.asp](http://ctb.ku.edu/en/tablecontents/sub_section_main_1257.asp).

Heywood, Andrew (2002), *Politics: An Introduction*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Herskovits, J. (2010), "Fifty Years of Change in Nigeria," *The Guardian*, November 21.

Johnson, J. K. (2005), *The Role of Parliament in Government*, Washington, D.C.: World Bank Institute.

Lee, Hamilton (1999), "Oversight vs. Glitzy Investigation," *The Christian Science Monitor*, 9 July.

Lees, John D. (1977), "Legislatures and Oversight: A Review Article on a Neglected Area of Research", *Legislative Studies Quarterly*, vol. 2, no. 2, (May), 193-208

McCubbin, Matthew and Thomas Schwarz (1984), 'Congressional Oversight Overlooked: Police Patrols Versus Fire Alarms', *American Journal of Political Science*, 28 (February), 165-79.

Momoh, Abubakar (2006), "Legislative Oversight: Conceptual Issues", Report on the Conference on Legislative Oversight: The Role of the National Assembly, Policy Analysis and Research Project, National Assembly.

NASS (2006), "Civil Aviation Act 2006".

National Assembly (2003), Standing Rules of the Senate of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, Abuja: NASS.

National Assembly (2007), Standing Orders of the House of Representatives, Federal Republic of Nigeria, Abuja: NASS.

National Assembly, Library, Research and Statistics Dept., and PARP (2009), *National Assembly Statistical Information*, Vol. 3. Abuja: Author.

National Democratic Institute for International Affairs (2000), "Strengthening Legislative Capacity in Legislative-Executive Relations", *Legislative Research Series*, Paper # 6, Washington, DC.

NDI (1996), "Committees in Legislatures: A Division of Labour", *Legislative Research Series*, Paper Number 2.

Ndoma-Egba, V (2012), "Legislative Oversight and Public Accountability". A Lecture delivered at the University of Nigeria, Nsukka, October 19. Unn.edu.ng/news/legislative-oversight-and-public-accountability

Nigeria (1999), *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999*, Lagos: Federal Government Printer.

NILS (2013), *14 Years of Law Making in the Nigerian National Assembly, 1999 -2013: An Analysis of Bills Processed*, Volume 3. Abuja: National Institute for Legislative Studies.

NILS (2014), "Nigerian State Assemblies: A Study of Legislative Activities, 2011 – 2013", Vol. 5, September. In Press.

NILS (2014), "National Assembly institutional Assessment Survey" Report, August.

NISER (2003), *Review of Nigeria's Political Development*, NISER Review of Nigerian Development, 2001/2002, Ibadan: NISER.

Nwosah, C.O (2007), "Assessment and Evaluation of the Structures, Processes, Methodologies and Modalities used for carrying out Legislative Oversight Functions on the Executive arm of Government in the National Assembly between August, 1999 and August, 2006", A Research Report submitted to PARP, February.

Obadan, M.I (2009), "2008 Federal Capital Budget Implementation: Factors Affecting Performance", A Study Prepared for the Budget Office of the Federation, Federal Ministry of Finance and the World Bank, April. Obayuwana, O (2008), "Legislative oversight: The Executive Arm at Crossroads", Niger Delta. Com (unpublished).

Ogunyomi, O and Ahmadu A. R (2007) (ed.), *The National Assembly: Pillar of Democracy*, Abuja: The National Secretariat of Nigerian Legislature, National Assembly.

Ohio Legislative Service Commission (2009), *A Guide Book for Ohio Legislatures*. Eleventh Edition. 2009-2010, 128TH General Assembly Ohio, Columbus: Ohio Legislative Service Commission.

Ojo, Timothy Ibikunle (1997), *The Nigerian Legislature A Historical Survey*, Vol 1, Historical Survey of Colonial Administration in Nigeria Before Independence, Lagos Administrative Staff College of Nigeria (ASCON).

Ojagbohunmi, G. A. (1999), "The Committee System in the Legislature: Selection of Committee Chairman and Placement of Committee Members", A Paper presented at a capacity building workshop for Committee Chairmen in the House of Representatives, National Assembly, September.

Oyewo, O. (2007), "Constitutionalism and the Oversight Functions of the Legislature in Nigeria", Draft Paper presented at the African Network of Constitutional Law Conference on Fostering Constitutionalism in Africa. Nairobi.

Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe (2007): *Improving the Participation of members in Assembly Plenary Sessions and Committee meetings*, Report of the Committee on Rules of Procedure and Immunities.

PARP (2010), *10 years of Law Making in the National Assembly: An Analysis of Bills Processed*, Abuja: Policy Analysis and Research Project.

PARP, NASS (2007), *Nigerian State Assemblies: A Study of Legislative Activities, 1999-2005*, Volume 1

PARP, NASS (2009), *Nigerian State Assemblies: A Study of Legislative Activities, 2006-2007*, Volume 2.

Pelizzo Riccardo, Rick Stapenhurst, Vinod Sahgal and William Woodley (2006), "What Makes Public Accounts Committees Work? A Comparative Analysis", *Politics & Policy*, Volume 34, Issue 4, pps. 774 – 793.

Pelizzo, R. and Stapenhurst, R. (2004), *Tools for Parliamentary Oversight*, Washington, D.C., WBI. http://econ.worldbank.org/files/38161_wps3388.pdf

Pelizzo, Riccardo and Rick Stapenhurst (2004), *Legislatures and Oversight*, Washington, D.C: The World Bank Institute.

Peterside, D (2012), "Saving our Commonwealth: Some Thoughts on legislative Oversight". *The Neighbourhood Newspaper*, Friday, June 8.

Polsby, N. W. (1975), "Legislatures", In: *Handbook of Political Science: Government Institutions and Processes*, eds. Fred Greenstein and Nelson Polsby, Reading, MA: Addison Wesley).

Roberts, F. O. Nyemutu (2002), "Performance Evaluation of the New Democracy", In: D. Olu Ajakaiye and F.O.Nyemutu Roberts (eds.), *Meeting the Challenges of Sustainable Democracy in Nigeria*, Ibadan: Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research.

Rod, Hague and Martin Harrop (2001), Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Salim, Ibrahim (2001), "Appropriation Procedure – An Aspect of the Budgetary Process in Nigeria", Ouagadougou Session, September.

Stapenhurst Frederick C. and Pelizzo Riccardo (2002). "A Bigger Role for Legislatures", *Finance & Development*, A Quarterly Publication of the International Monetary Fund, vol. 39, no. 4 (December).

Umar, S.A (2006), "Brief History of the national Assembly Library – Nigeria", Mimeograph, October 28.

U.S Congress (2003), Committee Types and Roles, *Congressional Research Service*, April 1.

Wikipedia (2008), "Resource" (Last modified: 12 October, 2010). Available at: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Resource (Accessed: 25 October, 2010)

Wilson, Woodrow (1900), *Congressional Government: A Study in American Politics*, 15th ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin, Reprinted with a new introduction by William F. Connelly. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers, 2002.

Woodrow Wilson (1997), cited in: Keefe, W.J and M.S Ogul (1997), *The American Legislative Process*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Yamamoto, H (2007), *Tools for Parliamentary Oversight: A Comparative Study of 88 National Parliaments*. (Switzerland: Inter-Parliamentary Union)

Zimbabwe Parliament, Department of Research, Committees...Public relations (2003), "Public Hearings Guidelines" [www.parl.zim.gov.zw/attachments/article/.../Public hearing _guidelines](http://www.parl.zim.gov.zw/attachments/article/.../Public%20hearing_guidelines)