

- (11) G.S.R. 199(E) dated 21st March, 2001 publishing the Foreign Exchange Management (Export of Goods and Services) (Amendment) Regulations, 2001.
- (12) G.S.R. 200(E) dated 21st March, 2001 publishing the Foreign Exchange Management (Foreign Currency Accounts by a Person Resident in India) (Amendment) Regulations, 2001.
- (13) G.S.R. 201(E) dated 21st March, 2001 publishing the Foreign Exchange Management (Export and Import of Currency) (Amendment) Regulations, 2001.
- (14) G.S.R. 157(E) dated 2nd March, 2001 publishing the Foreign Exchange Management (Transfer or Issue of any Foreign Security) (Amendment) Regulations, 2001.
- (15) G.S.R. 158(E) dated 2nd March, 2001 publishing the Foreign Exchange Management (Transfer or Issue of Security by a Person Resident outside India) (Amendment) Regulations, 2001.
- (16) G.S.R. 301(E) dated 30th March, 2001 publishing the Foreign Exchange Management (Current Account Transactions) (Amendment) Rules, 2001. [Raced in Library. For (7) to (16) *See* No. L.T. 3646/01]

II. A copy (in English and Hindi) of the Results of the Thirty First Valuation of the Life Insurance Corporation of India on 31-3-2001, under section 29 of the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956. [Placed in Library. *See* No. L.T. 3995/01]

III. A copy (in English and Hindi) of the Thirty-ninth Annual Report and Accounts of the Deposit Insurance and Credit Guarantee Corporation, Mumbai, for the year 2000-2001, together with the Auditor's Report on the Accounts, under sub-section (2) of section 32 of the Deposit Insurance and Credit Guarantee Corporation Act, 1961. [Raced in Library. *See* No. L.T. 3284/01]

MESSAGES FROM THE LOK SABHA

- (1) The Railway Companies (Substitution of Parties in Civil Proceedings) Repeal Bill, 2001.
- (2) The Indian Railway Companies (Repeal) Bill, 2001.

- (3) The Sugarcane Cess (Validation) Repeal Bill, 2001.
- (4) The Warehousing Corporations (Amendment) Bill, 2001.
- (5) The Repealing and Amending Bill, 2001.

SECRETARY-GENERAL: Sir, I have to report to the House the following messages received from the Lok Sabha, signed by the Secretary-General of the Lok Sabha:-

(1)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 120 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 20th August, 2001, agreed without any amendment to the Railway Companies (Substitution of Parties in Civil Proceedings) Repeal Bill, 2001, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 6th August, 2001."

(2)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 120 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 20th August, 2001, agreed without any amendment to the Indian Railway Companies (Repeal) Bill, 2000, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 6th August, 2001."

(3)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 120 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 20th August, 2001, agreed without any amendment to the Sugarcane Cess (Validation) Repeal Bill, 2001, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 7th August, 2001."

(4)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 120 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 20th August, 2001, agreed without any amendment to the Warehousing Corporations (Amendment) Bill, 2001, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 7th August, 2001."

(5)

"In accordance with the provisions of rule 120 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 20th August, 2001, agreed without any amendment to the Repealing and Amending Bill, 2001, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 7th August, 2001."

RE. QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE

SHRI KAPIL SIBAL (Bihar): Mr. Chairman, with your permission, under rule 188 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Council of States, I wish to raise a question of privilege in respect of a specific matter of recent occurrence which requires the intervention of the Council. The question of privilege relates to the Finance Minister, Shri Yashwant Sinha, who, during the course of his response in the Rajya Sabha, in the Short Duration discussion relating to the UTI, misled the House by, *inter alia*, stating the following on August 1, 2001, "If we had been kept in the picture, if he had come to us, we would have told him as to what exactly had to be done. After all, if we can solve the problem after the 2nd of July, why could we not have solved the problem before 2nd July. It was not because of any lack of desire or will on the part of the Ministry of Finance. It was entirely because, deliberately, we were kept in the dark..."He further says "...Secondly, on what strength does the Ministry of Finance interfere at that stage and ask the UTI to do one and not do the other? We, therefore, decided it may be an error judgment, I do not know, but, at that point of time, that was the judgment that we made in the Ministry of Finance -- to intervene only after the UTI Board had taken a decision; we intervened only after the UTI Board took the decision in its wisdom."

Now, it is learnt, through a report in the *Business Standard*, New Delhi, dated August 4-5, 2001, annexed, that the statement made by the Finance Minister on the floor of the House was contrary to the facts as stated in the newspaper report which quoted from the ba[^] application filed on behalf of Mr. P.S. Subramanyam before the Special Judge at Mumbai. In the said application, it was stated that Mr. Subramanyam had apprised the Government on May 18 and June 30 about the state of affairs in the UTI.