

[Shri B. S. Murthy]

copy of the Drugs and Cosmetics (Amendment) Rules, 1969, published in Notification No. S. O. 594 in Gazette of India dated the 15th February, 1969, under sub-section (3) of section 33 of the Drugs and Cosmetics Act, 1940. [Placed in Library See No. LT-260/69]

Notifications under Customs Act with an explanatory memorandum

SHRI JAGANNATH PAHADIA : On behalf of Shri P. C. Sethi, I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following Notifications under section 159 of the Customs Act, 1962 :—

- (i) G. S. R. 403 (English version) and G. S. R. 404 (Hindi version) published in Gazette of India dated the 22nd February, 1969, together with an explanatory memorandum.
- (ii) G. S. R. 443 (English version) and G. S. R. 444 (Hindi version) published in Gazette of India dated the 19th February, 1969, together with an explanatory memorandum. [Placed in Library. See No. LT-259/69]

Review on the working of Indian Oil Corporation Ltd and Annual Report of the Indian Oil Corporation Ltd.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM AND CHEMICALS AND MINES AND METALS (SHRI D. R. CHAVAN) : I beg to lay on the Table a copy each of the following papers under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956 :

- (i) Review by the Government on the working of the Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Bombay, for the year 1967-68.
- (ii) Annual Report of the Indian Oil Corporation Limited, Bombay, for the year 1967-68 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General there on. [Placed in Library See No. LT-261/69]

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS (GENERAL), 1968-69

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI) : I beg to present a statement showing Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of the Budget (General) for 1968-69.

— — —

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY GRANTS (RAILWAYS), 1968-69

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS (DR. RAM SUBHAG SINGH) : I beg to present a statement showing Supplementary Demands for Grants in respect of the Budget (Railways) for 1968-69.

— — —

12.20 hrs.

STATEMENT RE. REPORTED SEIZURE OF COUNTERFEIT TWO RUPEE NOTES

THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER AND MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI MORARJI DESAI) : Sir, the attention of the Government has been drawn to a report appearing in certain newspapers of 7th March, 1969, regarding seizure of counterfeit two rupee currency notes with a face value of over Rs. 1 Crore on 6th March, 1969, at Pugalur near Coimbatore. A full report has been called for from the State Government in this connection. According to the information obtained over the telephone by the C. B. I., from the Superintendent of Police, Economic Offences Wing, Madras, the Tamil Nadu State Police made a seizure of counterfeit two rupee currency notes in Pugalpur (near Coimbatore) and arrested six persons in this connection on the morning of 6-3-1969. According to this information, the value of the notes thus seized is rupees five Lakhs, twenty-five thousand and two hundred and eighty only. It appears that at the time of seizure the numbers had not been printed on the notes. It has also been reported that the forgeries are such as can be easily detected.

The State Police have registered a case under Section 489 (A), (B) and (C) of Indian

Penal Code read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, and further investigations are proceeding.

12.22 hrs

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

SHRI P. RAMAMURTI (Madurai) : Mr. Speaker, Sir, if you look at the Order Paper for today you will find that item No. 10 relates to a motion which says :

"That the statement made by the Minister of Home Affairs on the 6th March, 1969 regarding the Address by the Governor of West Bengal to both Houses of the State Legislature assembled together on the 6th March, 1969, be taken into consideration."

I understand that on Thursday last a substantive motion was given by my hon. friend Shri Madhu Limaye which sought to disapprove the conduct of the Governor in skipping over things from the Address. Under rule 186 that substantive motion, I believe, is quite in order because it satisfies all the conditions in order that a motion may be admissible laid down under that Rule. There is not even one condition that substantive motion does not fulfil. And, in point of time I understand that was the first motion that was given. Probably, due to inadvertence it might have escaped the notice of your office. If that be the case I believe that the discussion should take place on such a substantive motion rather than on the statement made by the Home Minister which is nothing because the Home Minister only said that he is collecting the information. What is the discussion that can take place on a statement that he is collecting the information? Let him collect the information and place it before the House. We have to wait till he has collected the information. Therefore, I think some mistake has been committed. I did not want to raise this point at 4.00 P. M. today when we take up this subject because if that mistake has been committed that may be corrected and a discussion started on a substantive motion. If Shri Vajpayee wants to move that motion I think Shri Madhu Limaye will have no objection whatsoever. It is only a question of having this discussion on a substantive motion.

MR. SPEAKER : Anybody can move an amendment to this motion also. Shri Madhu Limaye's motion was made much earlier. A number of motions came in on so many things. Therefore, I requested Shri Limaye to consult all leaders of the Opposition and give a common motion. There must be some information before the House for hon. Members to discuss. Then we got the information that some paragraphs were not read. It is very difficult for the Speaker to fix up a time and say which is the first motion that has been received. I do not blame the office for what has been put down. I take the whole responsibility. I gave instructions to them one hour before Parliament met. The statement made by the Home Minister on the floor of the House is the authoritative information for this House. Now we are considering the legality of it—whether the Governor can skip over passages, whether it is right or wrong. We are considering only that point. On this question the correct official information that this House had was the statement of the Home Minister. Therefore, I put that deadline. Further, this resolution does not prohibit any hon. Member from moving an amendment, disapproving the motion or approving it. The House has a right to do it. But since the motion has been admitted, there is no question of changing it.

As is the practice in this House, I would request every party to give the names of their representatives who will participate in this discussion. Though there are many names in this list, it does not mean that everybody from that list will be called. We are not following that practice. Each party can give one name. Also, any member can give notice of an amendment up to 2 o'Clock or 3 o'Clock, approving, disapproving or condemning anything. But now this motion has been accepted and admitted, to say that it should be changed is wrong. All the parties may give the names of their representatives who will speak on this motion. We will take it up at 4 P. M.

श्री मधु लिमये (मुंजर) : अध्यक्ष महोदय, आप ने जो निर्णय देना है, वह तो आप दे ही सकते हैं। लेकिन उससे पहले महारानी करके दो मिनट के लिए मेरी बान मुन दीजिये।

MR. SPEAKER : I have given my *Nirnay*.