

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI BENI PRASAD VARMA) : (a) Yes, Sir.

(b) The proposal for issue of commemorative stamp was received in respect of Shri C.D. Deshmukh on 29.08.95 and Shri V.S. Khandekar on 06.11.96.

(c) and (d) Proposals for special commemorative stamps are examined on the basis of existing guidelines and there is a Philatelic Advisory Committee (PAC) which advises the Government in such matters. The stipulations in the guidelines and the view of the PAC are carefully considered in deciding about issue of any stamp so as to ensure adequate value of such stamps, when issued.

The proposal for issuing a postage stamp on late Shri C.D. Deshmukh was considered by the P.A.C. in its meeting held on 15.2.96. But this proposal was not among those recommended by the P.A.C.

A commemorative postage stamp to mark the birth centenary of Shri V.S. Khandekar has been approved and will be issued on 19 January 1998.

12.01 hrs.

### ADJOURNMENT MOTION

#### Serious Situation arising out of recent developments in Bihar

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I have to inform the House that I have received three notices of Adjournment Motion regarding the political and constitutional crisis in Bihar arising from the stand-off between the Governor and the Chief Minister of the State; the total incapacity of the Central Government to address itself to this burning issue which has serious implications from the following Members :-

1. Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee
2. Shri Pramod Mahajan
3. Shri Rajiv Pratap Rudy

I give my consent to Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee to move the Motion in the following modified form :-

"Serious situation arising out of passive attitude of the Central Government over recent developments in Bihar."

Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee may ask of leave of the House.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV (Patna) : Sir, I am on a point of order.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Bolpur) : Sir, I want to say something.

MR. SPEAKER : You can speak.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I am not objecting (Interruptions)

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order. Sir, please listen to me After that I will abide by your decision. (Interruptions)

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA (Samastipur) : Mr. Speaker, I am on a point of order

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Prof. Ajit Kumar Mehta, now tell me what the rule is

PROF. AJIT KUMAR MEHTA : I want to quote from the Rules of Procedures and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, Rule 56 says :-

"Subject to the provisions of these rules, a Motion for an adjournment of the business of the House for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance may be made with the consent of the Speaker".

[Translation]

I would like to ask as to what urgent public importance it has got . . . (Interruptions)

This is being said about Bihar for one and a half year. Many times discussions has been held on the various issues related to Bihar. Thereafter, what is there of urgent public importance in it.

The other thing which I want to say is that there are many matters which are sub-judice and it has been clearly mentioned in "Kaul and Shakti" that if any matter is in Court in any part of India, then it would be considered as sub-judice and it would not be discussed in the House. Thirdly, I want to say that, it has been clearly mentioned in "Kaul and Shakti" that if any Chief Minister or

Governor of any State finds a reference in a debate, in that case there can be no discussion on their conduct. It has been clearly mentioned in the Adjournment Motion that -

[English]

'Serious situation arising out of passive attitude of the Central Government over recent developments in Bihar'.

[Translation]

Then what is there of urgent public importance in it. The Governor has given the sanction and the case is sub-judice . . . (Interruptions)

Since the case is in Court there is no point of discussing this issue and there can be no discussion in this regard in the House. Thereafter, I would like to quote from page 57 of the book of "Kaul and Shakdher" -

The situation which is going to be discussed will naturally involve the Governor of State Legislative Assembly, the Chief Minister of the State and many other things.

Therefore, I urge you not to give permission considering these points.

Thank you . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV (Patna) : How can you curtail our rights ?

[English]

"The motion should not deal with any matter which is under adjudication by a court of law having jurisdiction in any part of India."

A matter is not *sub judice* until the legal proceedings actually start, but the moment a complaint is filed or a petition is launched involving jurisdiction of any of the courts in India, the court is seized of the matter and to that extent the jurisdiction of the House to discuss the matter is barred."

[Translation]

It further reads :

[English]

"Although it may be the unanimous desire of the House

to discuss a matter which is *sub judice*, the Speaker is bound to forbid it."

[Translation]

despite that page 458 reads as :

[English]

"However, it has been held by the Speakers from time to time that the following matters could not be raised by way of an adjournment motion :

Conduct of the Governor-General (now President) or any action taken by him;

Conduct of the Governor of a State; and

Conduct of the Speaker and others"

[Translation]

Thereafter at page 458 it has further been written :

[English]

"It has been observed by the Speaker that Members should not make allegations or cast aspersions against members of statutory bodies, high dignitaries; and Governor of a State; Chief Minister or any other Minister in a State Government; and the State Legislature."

[Translation]

The situation which is going to be discussed will naturally involve the Governor of state legislative Assembly, the Chief Minister of the State and many others things.

Therefore, I urge you not to give permission considering these points. Thank you . . . (Interruptions).

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : How can you curtail our rights ?

[English]

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Sir, at the outset, I wish to make it very clear lest there be any misunderstanding. I am not trying to shall any discussion on Bihar. Let it be done even today, here and now. I am only on the question of form because it may not create a precedent which is not the healthy precedent in future.

Sir, so far as the motion that you have read out is concerned, it does not refer to any failure on the part of the Government of India . . . (Interruptions). Something like 'inactivity' has been mentioned . . . (Interruptions).

[Shri Somnath Chatterjee]

This is very well established that an Adjournment Motion can be made here only with regard to some failure of the Government of India.

Sir, with your permission, I would like to quote a passage from "Practice and Procedure of Parliament" by Kaul and Shakhder on admissibility of an Adjournment Motion. I quote :

"Generally speaking, the subject-matter of an adjournment motion must have direct or indirect relation to the conduct or default on the part of the Government of India and must be in the nature of criticism of the action of the Government of India either for having done some action or for having omitted to do some action which was urgently necessary at the moment . . ." *(Interruptions)*.

If you show impatience then what will happen to other Members ? . . . *(Interruptions)*.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI (Allahabad) : We are saying what has happened.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : Do not think that you will come so easily.

DR. MURLI MANOHAR JOSHI : Do not digress the issue . . . *(Interruptions)*.

MR. SPEAKER : Let him have his say. I think, I am quite familiar with the rules. Do not worry, I can take a decision.

*(Interruptions)*

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : I further quote :

"An adjournment motion is not admissible unless there was failure on the part of the Government to perform the duties enjoined by the Constitution and the law. . ."

Sir, I would like to know with all humility as to what is the failure of the Government of India under the Constitution or under the law which enjoins them to do a particular type of action, failure of which can be the subject matter of this Motion. But nothing has been indicated. No constitutional failure has been mentioned and no legal failure is mentioned. As a humble student of history, with whatever little I know of the Constitution of India, the only thing the Central Government can do is, in an emergency it can give some direction or can impose President's rule

under Article 356 of the Constitution. Nothing has been mentioned here, because I believe the hon. Mover of the Motion, the Leader of the Opposition does not ask for any emergency or for emergency under article 356. Then, what is the failure of the Government of India ?

Sir, there are very important aspects of convention. Somebody is holding a very high position against whom a charge-sheet has been filed and serious allegations have been made and without proper investigation; whether he should continue or should not continue in that position, that is the matter which we wish to discuss here. It is a question of corruption which is eating into the vitals of not only the political, social life but also the economic life of this country. But that does not mean that any and every motion can be brought before Parliament of India and any and every motion can be discussed here, whether they are permitted by rules or not.

Therefore, let us all discuss this important issue on a proper Motion. Please do not create a precedent which will not be a good precedent in future. It is very clearly stated here that where the Government of India has no obligation to intervene in a matter, an Adjournment Motion is out of order. Now, what type of intervention is there except imposing of Article 356 of the Constitution ? If so, let them say that. Let the Motion say that the Government failed in not invoking Article 356 of the Constitution of the India. Then one can understand that even in form there may probably be an acceptable Adjournment Motion.

Therefore, Sir, I earnestly request you not to accept this Motion in this form at least, unless it is duly amended—you can amend that or unless some other Motion comes up. Even let it be treated as a Motion under Rule 184 or under Rule 183. Then we are prepared to discuss it here and now. That is my appeal to you. Let us not utilise it in the manner.

*[Translation]*

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ (South-Delhi) : Before it, I am on a point of order.

*[English]*

MR. SPEAKER : I will come to you. I have already agreed to call you.

*[Translation]*

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : He is discussing but I am on a point of order.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I will come to you. I will allow you. I am not denying the opportunity to you.

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI (Howrah) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, Articles 153 to 163 of the Constitution of India state very clearly about the roles of the Governor and the Chief Minister of a State. Before proceeding further, I would like to make it absolutely clear that I am not trying to stall the Motion which is supposed to be moved by Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee just now. We are very interested that things should be discussed in this House very clearly and openly. I have no intention to stall it.

My only submission is, we are bound to obey your ruling in this House. I am not questioning the content of the Motion. I am only submitting to you that the entire subject matter of Bihar came out of the observation and from the root of the findings of the C&AG and it led to the situation prevailing in Bihar now. On the same analogy, if the role and conduct of the Governor and the Chief Minister of a State can be discussed on this issue for which you are competent to give the ruling, then I would like to submit that my Motion under Rule 184 is lying on your desk on the PL scam of West Bengal. It is also based on a similar observation of the C&AG. This is also of a similar matter. So, if on one observation of the C&AG the conduct of the Governor and the Chief Minister of a State can be discussed in this House in one form which I fully support, then in another form, that is, under Rule 184 my Motion to discuss the conduct of the Government of West Bengal on the PL scam amounting to Rs. 2,600 crore that came to light from the observation of the C&AG can also be accepted. That is what I would like to say to be objective on the whole matter.

SHRI RAM NAIK (Mumbai North) : This is an Adjournment Motion.

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI : I gave my Motion under rule 184.

MR. SPEAKER : Shri Dasmunsi, I think you are using out of context now.

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI : Sir, I am within the framework of the Constitution. Articles 153 to 163 deal with the conduct of the Governor and the Chief Minister of a State.

If that can be taken up, then I fully support the discussion on Bihar . . . (Interruptions) But equally, my Motion under Rule 184, which is lying with you, falls within

the same ambit. Why should that be not taken up ? Sir, I want your ruling on this.

MR. SPEAKER : Please do not think like that.

SHRI P.C. CHACKO (Mukundapuram) : Sir, it is a very similar case.

[Translation]

CAG Scam was unearthed in Bihar also and this too in a case of CAG scam. So where am I wrong ?

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I am on a point of order . . . (Interruptions). He may be allowed to raise his point of order after I have raised mine. Please sit down for a moment please.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : What is the rule ?

[Translation]

SHRIMATI SUSHMA SWARAJ : Mr. Speaker, Sir, under Rule 56, I raise the point of order that the discussion on the admissibility of a Motion can be allowed till your ruling is not delivered. After you have given your ruling the point of admissibility cannot be discussed. If the Motion is under your consideration and you are to take a decision at your own discretion, the hon. Members can state their opinion as to whether a Motion should be admitted or not and whether it should be admitted in this format or some other format. You have already taken a decision in this regard and had announced it yesterday. You had stated that the discussion would be held on the subject immediately after the Question Hour. Hence discussion should be initiated. Its admissibility cannot be questioned at this stage.

Secondly, through you, I would make an appeal to Shri Somnath and CRB that if they are interested in having this discussion because the subject is important and they do not wish to stall the discussion, I would like to make an appeal very humbly that the discussion should be initiated straight away without raising any ifs and buts so that the discussion may be started on this important subject generating immense interest throughout the country without any further delay. This is my only submission.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : Sir, I would like to quote sub-section 7 of the Rule 56. The Motion will not be related to any such subject which may be subjudice in any court having jurisdiction over any part of India. Prof. Ajit Kumar

[Shri Ram Kripal Yadav]

Mehta and Shri Somnath have discussed it at length. I would not like to repeat all those points but it is true that this is not the first time, the matters pertaining to Bihar State are being discussed in Lok Sabha. Many a times, you have also spoken at length on these matters. In the last session itself, the issue was raised and the same issue is being raised here again and again. In this way, the time of the House is being wasted. They wish to raise the matter pertaining to a person, who is not even present in the House and is unable to offer his clarification . . . (Interruptions). Madam, please let me speak. I did not say anything while you were speaking. I did not interrupt you. Please allow me to put forth my views. Mr. Speaker is the final authority and we will abide by his decision.

First of all, the person who is the subject of discussion, is not present in the House. You wish to level allegations on such a person who is unable to present his case . . . (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : You have made your point.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I do not think, it is required, Shri Jain.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : As per Rule 58, since the matter is under sub-judice and not only that, Kaul and Shakhder have also stated very clearly that the conduct of a Chief Minister or a Governor cannot be discussed in the House. If you wish to violate this rule, I have nothing to add more.

Madam has just stated that you have already taken a decision in this regard without any concern . . . (Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Please do not waste your time now. It requires a serious debate. I would like to give more time to a serious debate rather than on these points.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You have made your point.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : If you listen to the

leaders, we will also express our views. Mr. Speaker, Sir, if they wish to discuss the matter, flouting the rules in such a manner and also wish to take the time of the House for this purpose, there are other important matters as well. You are not holding discussion on the situation in Mumbai where dalits were fired upon. There are other burning problems such as floods and different sorts of problems. You do not wish to discuss all those issues in the House. You are interested in discussing this issue the time of the House should not be wasted in such a manner by discussing the same issue again and again.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : You have made your point.

[Translation]

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : Hence, I would like to submit that precious time of the House should not be wasted. The concerned person is not present in the House and the matter is already sub-judice so how can they be the subject of discussion in the House. It is clearly laid down in the Kaul and Shakhder's book that when a House takes a unanimous decision, you can rule it out. Since the matter is sub-judice . . . (Interruptions) I am on this very point and I request you that you should not do any such thing and you should not give any such ruling due to which the House might face certain problems in the House in future. With this request, I would like to say that it should not be discussed. You should cancel the Adjournment Motion and also should not allow discussion on all the matters and matter pertaining to Bihar in the House.

[English]

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I have got a submission to make to you. I am not interested in anyway to stall the discussion on Bihar situation. But I would request you to consider the factor that if this kind of Adjournment Motion about the internal administration of a State is taken into consideration in Parliament, what effect it would have. This Parliament will cease to be the Parliament. Then this Parliament will have to take up the issues which concern the State Legislative Assemblies. An indication has already been given by my friend Shri P.R. Dasmunsi that everything can be discussed on the floor of this House which generally and exclusively belongs to the State Assembly . . . (Interruptions) You have spoken and I have got also the right to speak.

Of course, it is your right to decide. I cannot prevent you from taking the decision. It is the rule which gives you the power to decide whether this Adjournment Motion will be accepted or not. Therefore, if you allow a discussion, it is your discretion. It is your right. But it is also my right to remind you of the implications that it might have. It will particularly lead this Parliament to become the Legislative Assembly for all the States. All the States probably may be taken into consideration here and that will not lead to strengthening of the Constitution and the strengthening of the unity of the country.

Therefore, I want that you reconsider it. You may use your discretion and a different form may be devised for the discussion.

SHRI PRAMOTHES MUKHERJEE (Berhampore) (WB): I am in favour of the discussion. But I have objection to the form of the discussion only and I shall abide by your decision. But I have a point to refer to you in regard to the admissibility of the Adjournment Motion.

These are the proceedings of the Central Legislative Assembly. This matter was also taken up earlier and the Speaker of this House once gave his decision on this particular point on admissibility of the Adjournment Motion. With your kind permission, I refer to you this matter. This is a very simple matter. Here is the definite explanation of the thing :-

"The matter may be urgent. The matter may be definite. The matter may be of public importance. Yet it is the right of the Speaker to allow the Adjournment Motion or to disallow the Adjournment Motion."

Here I quote from P. 152 of the proceedings of the Central Legislative Assembly that :-

"A matter may be urgent. It may be definite. It may be of urgent public importance and yet the Speaker may, in a proper case, disallow such a motion."

This is for your kind information.

[Translation]

SHRI BRIJ BHUSHAN TIWARI (Dumariaganj) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to raise a point of order under Rule 56. I have an objection on the text of the Adjournment Motion moved by the hon. Leader of Opposition. Debate can be held on the situation prevailing in Bihar. But in Uttar Pradesh, a constitutional crisis has been cropped up

between the Governor and the Chief Minister and the Government is committing atrocities on farmers. Babrala incident is the outcome of this situation . . . (Interruptions) It is a serious matter. . . . (Interruptions) Pressure and money power . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : The cases pertaining to Bihar and U.P. are entirely different.

(Interruptions)

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : I think it is enough. I have heard all the points of order raised by the hon. Members very carefully. Rules 56 to 63 deal with matters relating to Adjournment Motion. But what can be discussed under this Rule is not elaborated in the Rule Book. It is only about restrictions and what cannot be discussed that have been provided in Rule 58. Now, what can be discussed ? It has to be any matter which is a definite matter of urgent public importance. That is all. Now, what is the matter of urgent public importance ? Who has to decide that ? Who has to satisfy that it is a matter of urgent public importance ? Obviously, it is the Speaker's satisfaction. So, only the two conditions are that it has to be a matter of urgent public importance and the satisfaction of the Speaker and the consent of the Speaker. Therefore, on the question of *sub judice*, I know it very well. It is on this ground that I have not permitted the Adjournment Motions of Shri George Fernandes and Shri Sarpotdar because they directly refer to the scam. They refer to the CBI cases. Therefore, I straightaway disallowed those Motions. But I am quite satisfied with the formulation of the Motion and I give the consent to Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee to seek the leave of the House and the consent of the House.

[Translation]

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE (Lucknow) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I would like to seek leave of the House. . . . (Interruptions)

[English]

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI : There is much the same ground in my case also. On the same ground of your ruling, with all respect, I have to submit that my Motion concerning the West Bengal scam has to be allowed . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You can come later on on that issue.

SHRI P.R. DASMUNSI : I gave notice on that. So, this ruling will be applied to my case also . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I have all the Motions with me. I will dispose of them like this.

Now, I take up the Motion for grant of leave.

(Interruptions)

SHRI A.C. JOS (Idukki) : Sir, I am on a point of order . . . (Interruptions)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE : So, it seems that an individual's matters may be matters of public importance. You can discuss the individual cases also . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : No. It is all right.

(Interruptions)

SHRI A.C. JOS : Sir, I am on a point of order. . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : There is no more point of order. We are completing it. Is the leave opposed by the House ? Since the leave is not opposed by anybody, the leave is granted.

(Interruptions)

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : Sir, we are opposing it. . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You did not. I asked twice. Were you sleeping ?

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : We are opposing it. This is not fair . . . (Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER : What is this ? There is no question of any point of order. I have asked twice. I have repeated it twice. But you did not say anything. The matter will be taken up immediately.

SHRI RAM KRIPAL YADAV : We are opposing it. . . (Interruptions)

SHRI P.M. SAYEED (Lakshadweep) : Sir, the mover of the Motion has to seek the leave of the House first . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : He has sought the leave of the House

already. I have put it to the House.

(Interruptions)

SHRI P.M. SAYEED : He has not sought the leave of the House . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I know of it. Why are you worried?

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I really do not know. Have you not seen it ?

(Interruptions)

SHRI SONTOSH MOHAN DEV (Silchar) : We have not seen that. He can please stand up and move his Motion . . . (Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : I thought I had seen that. He can move it once again.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down now.

(Interruptions)

SHRI A.C. JOS : I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER : There is no point of order.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Please sit down now. I am telling you to sit down. You do not listen and make unnecessary trouble for the House. When I had asked Shri Vajpayee to seek the leave of the House, I announced twice : "Is the leave opposed ?" You did not.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : Why do you not listen to me fully ? You sit down now. I am going to repeat the process.

[Translation]

I am repeating it. When Vajpayeeji will move the motion to seek leave of the House then I will ask as to whether the House has any objection to it. You can say this at that time.

(Interruptions)

MR. SPEAKER : You are not listening to me. What can I do ?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE : Mr. Speaker, Sir, I seek the leave of the House.

[English]

MR. SPEAKER : Is the leave opposed ?

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Yes.

MR. SPEAKER : Since the leave has been opposed, those in favour of the leave being granted may stand in their places.

SOME HON. MEMBERS : Rose

MR. SPEAKER : I find the number is more than the requisite number.

So, leave is granted.

The Motion will be taken up immediately after the papers are laid on the Table of the House and Matters under Rule 377 are disposed of.

12.32 hrs.

#### PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

##### Memorandum of Understanding between Power Grid Corporation of India Limited and Ministry of Power etc.

[English]

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY AND MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF POWER (SHRI YOGINDER K. ALAGH) : I beg to lay on the Table :

- (1) A copy of the Memorandum of understanding (Hindi and English versions) between the Power Grid Corporation of India Limited and the Ministry of Power for the year 1997-98.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2174/97]

- (2) A copy of the Memorandum of Understanding (Hindi and English versions) between the North Easter Electric Power Corporation Limited and the Ministry of Power for the year 1997-98.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2175/97]

- (3) (i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and

English versions) of the Energy Management Centre, New Delhi, for the year 1995-96, alongwith Audited Accounts.

- (ii) A copy of the Review (Hindi and English versions) by the Government of the working of the Energy Management Centre, New Delhi, for the year 1995-96.

- (4) Statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the papers mentioned at (3) above.

[Placed in Library. See No. LT-2176/97]

12.33 hrs.

#### ASSENT OF BILLS

[English]

SECRETARY-GENERAL : Sir, I beg to lay on the Table the following four Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament during the last session and assented to since a report was last made to the House on the 11th April, 1997 :-

- (1) The Appropriation (Railways) No. 3 Bill 1997.
- (2) The Finance Bill, 1997.
- (3) The Appropriation (No. 3) Bill, 1997.
- (4) The Vice-President's Pension Bill, 1997.

(ii) I also lay on the Table copies, duly authenticated by the Secretary-General of Rajya Sabha, of the following eight Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament during the last session and assented to by the President :-

- (1) The Special Court (Trial of Offences Relating to Transactions in Securities) Amendment Bill, 1997.
- (2) The Industrial Reconstruction Bank (Transfer of Undertakings and Repeal) Bill, 1997.
- (3) The Depositories Related Laws (Amendment) Bill, 1997.
- (4) The National Environment Appellate Authority Bill, 1997.
- (5) The Reserve Bank of India (Amendment) Bill, 1997.