

Министерство образования и науки
Российской Федерации
Национальный исследовательский
Томский государственный университет
Философский факультет

**INITIA:
АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ
СОЦИАЛЬНЫХ НАУК
(26–27 апреля 2019 г)**

**Материалы XXI Международной
конференции молодых ученых**

Томск
2019

PROBLEMS OF PARLIAMENTARISM AND PENSION REFORM 2018 IN RUSSIA

D.I. Gurevich

Scientific director: Doctor of Political Sciences A. I. Shcherbinin
Tomsk state University

According to P. S. Sharayev and A. I. Shcherbinin, «the place and role of the parliament in the system of state power, its character of representation, professionalism and, ultimately, the responsibility of parliamentarians to the electorates largely depend on those who choose» [4. pp. 196–205].

At the moment the State Duma of the Russian Federation consists of 448 deputies elected by the population of the country in 2016. Despite the fact that the State Duma was elected by the citizens of Russia, its level of credibility is not high. The realization of the voters' interests depends on the credibility of the state and national deputies. In 2017 trust in the State Duma was 33%, in 2018 – 23% [See: 2]. This indicator indicates low confidence of citizens in legislative bodies - one of the problems of parliamentarism in modern Russia.

The indicators for the effectiveness of parliamentary activities [3. pp. 268–269] are:

–Interests of citizens, the dominant position among which is occupied by the interests of the largest group of the population - the working people - the source of power and prosperity of the state;

–Economic opportunities to meet interests: economic support of social sphere, culture;

–Legal guarantees and implementation sanctions: provision of requirements guaranteed by regulatory acts; administrative responsibility of state employees for non-performance of duties;

–The historical experience of the struggle of workers for their own interests: the more often the authorities raise one or another acute issue, the more outraged the citizens are, as there is an opinion that their position is not taken into account;

–The unity of society in the struggle for their interests: the values that unite people, the prevention of alien moral principles and norms.

S. Magnusson identifies the following performance criteria [1. pp. 67–74] of the law:

– published not only in official publications, but also in the most widely read by ordinary citizens;

– written so that citizens can read and understand without difficulty;

– does not contradict social standards, that is, must be accepted by society.

In addition to the above criteria for the effectiveness of parliamentary activities, the following will be used: informing about the consideration of the draft law, personalization of the draft law.

The research methodology is based on a comparative approach, which was used to conduct a comparative analysis of laws for the reasons for public criticism. The study was conducted using the method of greatest differences.

To identify universal causes and indicate ways to solve the problem of citizens' distrust of authorities, the following laws were considered: the anti-terrorist «Ya-

rovaya's package» (2016) and the law on raising the retirement age (2018) as the most criticized.

On the basis of the research, it was concluded that the «Yarovaya's package» and the law on raising the retirement age coincide on a number of signs that cause public criticism:

1. Economic opportunities for the realization of interests: as a result of the adoption of both laws, citizens saw the loss of their own funds, contrary to personal interests;

2. The presence of legal guarantees and sanctions for implementation in legislation, or rather, their absence;

3. Publication in the most widely read publications, clarity of the text of the law. This gives citizens the opportunity to understand the conditions and mechanisms for the implementation of laws;

4. The unity of the people in the struggle for their interests: against both laws, mass protests were held, bringing together citizens;

5. Contradiction of law to social standards: both laws, in the opinion of Russian citizens, infringe upon their rights, they see a threat to their own interests.

6. Personalization: the considered laws are associated with specific personalities, which makes it possible to suggest a further strongest criticism of the bills of the same initiators.

Thus, it is the combination of the above factors that can lead to public dissatisfaction with the laws adopted by parliamentarians and, as a result, dissatisfaction with government bodies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. *Evaluation of laws and the effectiveness of their adoption: materials of the international seminar (Ryazan, December 16–17, 2002)*. M.: Publication of the State Duma, 2003. 152 p.

2. *Levada Center* [Electronic resource]. URL: <http://www.levada.ru> (accessed: 10.12.2018).

3. *Romanov R.M.* Russian parliamentarism. History and modernity. M., 2000. 331 p.

4. *Sharaev P.S., Scherbinin A.I.* Some problems of parliamentarism in modern Russia // *Parliamentarism in Russia: a course of lectures*. Tomsk, 2007. pp. 196–205.