

Excise

members. . . .

minute or two?

SHRI S. W. DHABE. It will not be

together.

ATION) AMENDMENT BILL, 1985

(DISTRIBUTION) AMENDMENT

AND

CISE (GOODS OF SPECIAL IMPOR-

—Contd

Madan Bhatia.

(cance) Amendment Bill, 1985.

say so, Madam, because I feel that

thirty years.

quote—the letter said.

the Centre of this additional duty.

fabric cotton fabric silk fabric and

woollen fabric and laid down the principles on which the additional excise duty would be distributed among the States so as to compensate them for the abolition of the sale-tax on these six goods of special national importance.

Thereafter this Act was enacted in 1957. The Objects and Reasons of this Act were clearly enunciated by the Parliament by enacting this particular Act and they were like this. The object of the Bill is to impose additional duties of excise in replacement of the sales taxes levied by the Union and States on sugar, tobacco and mill-made textiles and to distribute the proceeds of these taxes, except the proceeds attributable to Union Territories, to the States. This particular Act, I respectfully submit, covered these items which I have already mentioned, in which in 1957 the State Governments, and the Central Government, concluded were of special national importance. But over a period of 27 years there has been a tremendous change in the nature of the goods which were not of special or national importance in 1957 but have acquired that status during this passage of more than one generation. This question came up for consideration before the hon. Supreme Court in some other context. There one company raised the dispute that the tyre cord fabric is not subject to sales tax and it is subject to the additional excise duty. This dispute was raised with the State of Rajasthan. State of Rajasthan said that so far as tyre cord fabric is concerned, it is one of the fabrics covered by this particular Act and the second argument that was raised on behalf of the Government was that in any case so far as tyre fabric is concerned, it cannot be described as an article of special national importance. The Supreme Court considered both the arguments and rejected both the arguments for the purpose of my present submission, which is the second submission. The second argument is important and

what the Supreme Court said with regard to the second argument is very relevant. I shall just read a few lines. It said, it is pointed out that the Statement of Objects and Reasons pertinent to the Act refers to mill made textiles and the submission is that the item in the First Schedule of the Act refers to fabric which affects the common man, which finds place in a popular market and is intended for popular use and does not refer to a commodity which caters to the needs of a special category of consumers and is devoted to a particular use only. Now the tyre manufacturing industry is of growing importance and has an increasingly important role to play in every day life. That is evident from the overwhelming expansion of automobile traffic promoted by the complex needs of a constantly enlarging economy. The daily life of an average citizen is profoundly affected by the automobile, be it passenger bus or the goods truck or the ubiquitous scooter. Tyres are needed for all in rural areas. Tyres are now coming into use for bullock carts. It is futile to suggest that the tyre plays a less substantial role than other popular commodities in modern life. Therefore, it is but a short step to recognising the status of what goes into the manufacture of a tyre, the rayon, the rayon cord fabric as goods of special importance. This is my respectful submission through you, Madam Vice-Chairman, to the hon. Minister of State for Finance that over a period of 27 years there has been so much development in the daily national life of the Indian people that the goods which were not of any particular special or national importance in the daily life of the people have become almost the vital part of daily life of the people today. So it is time for the Central Government to consider in consultation with the State Governments whether this principle of additional excise duty in substitution for sales tax ought not be extended to various other articles also which have become goods of equal special and national importance in the life of the Indian people. I say so, Madam, because the

(Shri Madan Bhatia)

sales tax is one of the most controversial taxes in the country today. It has been described as cumbersome, as one which is subject to massive evasion, as one which has the ingredients of corruption and as one which to some extent, if not to a large extent, is a generator of black money. If those goods which can be placed at par with the goods which are already covered by this Act inasmuch as they can be brought within the category of goods of special and national importance, are also brought within the ambit of this Act, to that extent it will be a step forward. I know that the Central Government on its own can do nothing because sales tax is a State subject. In 1956 this step was taken after agreement with and in consultation with the State Governments. It is time for the Central Government to consider whether this principle over a period of 27 years can or cannot be extended to many more goods.

Thank you.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN DR. (SHRI-MATI) SARAJINI MAHISHI : I would request the Members to be brief as a number of speakers have to be accommodated.

श्री सत्य प्रकाश मालवीय (उत्तर प्रदेश) :

माननीय महोदया, आठवें वित्त आयोग की रिपोर्ट पिछली लोक सभा में 24 जुलाई को प्रस्तुत की गई थी और उसमें 5 वर्ष के लिए सन् 1984 से लेकर के 1989 तक के लिए सिफारिशें की गई थीं। लेकिन अब जो विधेयक हमारे सामने है उसके अनुसार सन् 1984 की सिफारिशें पता नहीं क्यों रोकी जा रही हैं। इसके अतिरिक्त जो एक्साइज ड्यूटी है 22 राज्यों के लिए 40 प्रतिशत भाग आवंटित किया गया था। यह जो आवंटित भाग है अब किसी भी राज्य को देने का प्रावधान इस विधेयक के हिसाब से नहीं है और राज्यों के लिए जो पांच प्रतिशत धन की व्यवस्था की गई थी वह भी लगता है कि इस विधेयक के तहत अब किसी को नहीं मिलेगी। मेरा यह सुझाव है कि जो आठवें वित्त आयोग की रिपोर्ट है उसकी

पूरी पूरी सिफारिशों को लागू किया जाए और 1984-85 के लिए जो कटौती की जा रही है उसको वापिस लिया जाए और वित्त आयोग की रिपोर्ट जैसे कि प्रस्तुत की गई है उसी रूप में स्वीकार की जाए।

श्री रामेश्वर ठाकुर (बिहार) :

उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदया, संघ उत्पाद शुल्क (वितरण) संशोधन विधेयक, एवं अतिरिक्त उत्पाद शुल्क (विशेष महत्व का माल) संशोधन विधेयक एवं सम्पदा शुल्क (वितरण) संशोधन विधेयक, 1985 के सम्बन्ध में संक्षेप में अपने कुछ विचार आपके सामने प्रस्तुत करना चाहता हूँ। वित्त आयोग की अन्तिम रिपोर्ट के अनुसार यह विधेयक सामने लाए गये हैं और मैं इन विधेयकों का सहादिक समर्थन करता हूँ।

आठवें वित्त आयोग ने 30 अप्रैल, 1984 की अन्तिम रिपोर्ट में यह सिफारिश की है कि जिन उत्पाद शुल्कों को अंशों में बांटा जा सकता है उसके शुद्ध आगम में राज्यों का अंश 45 प्रतिशत होना चाहिए। दूसरा सुझाव है कि जिन उत्पाद शुल्कों को अंशों में बांटा जा सकता है उनके शुद्ध आगम का 40 प्रतिशत आयोग द्वारा सिफारिश किये गये प्रतिशत में राज्यों के बीच वितरित किया जाना चाहिए। और उनका अन्तिम सुझाव है कि जिन उत्पाद शुल्कों को अंशों में बांटा जा सकता है उनके शुद्ध आगम का अतिशेष 5 प्रतिशत आयोग द्वारा सिफारिश किये गये प्रतिशत में कमी वाले राज्यों के बीच में वितरित किया जाना चाहिए।

यह खुशी की बात है कि केन्द्रीय सरकार ने इन सिफारिशों को स्वीकार किया है और तदनुसार 1 अप्रैल, 1984 की अन्तिम रिपोर्ट के आधार पर जो योजना चालू है उसे आगे भी चालू रखने का निर्णय लिया है तथा साथ ही साथ 30 अप्रैल, 1984 को जो अन्तिम रिपोर्ट आई है उसके आधार पर 1 अप्रैल, 1985 से आरम्भ होने वाली चार वर्ष की अवधि के लिए राशि वितरण करने का निर्णय किया है। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि आठवें

वित्त आयोग की जो सिफारिशें हैं वे प्रगतिशील हैं एवं व्यवहारिक दृष्टि से बहुत ही उपयोगी हैं इससे खासकर जो कमी वाले राज्य हैं उनके विकास के काम में निश्चित ही सहायता मिलेगी।

आयोग की सिफारिशों के अनुसार सभी संबंधित राज्यों में यथाशीघ्र वांछित राशि अगले वर्ष के प्रारम्भ में मिल जाये तो उससे सप्तम पंचवर्षीय योजना के प्रारम्भिक वर्ष में अपने कार्य को आगे बढ़ाने में सुविधा होगी।

उत्पाद शुल्क हममें से बहुत ऐसा मानते हैं कि प्रायः सरकार अपना राजस्व बढ़ाने के लिए दिनों दिन बढ़ाती जाती है और इस शुल्क को हम बड़े पैमाने पर लगा रहे हैं। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि राजस्व शुल्क आज से नहीं बल्कि प्राचीन काल से ही आ रहा है। खास तौर से प्रारम्भ में मैं एक कौटिलीय अर्थ-शास्त्रम के श्लोक को पढ़ूंगा :

“सुवर्गरजतवज्रमणिमुक्ताप्रवालाश्वहस्तिपण्याः
पंचाशत्कराः ।

सुवज्रस्त्राम्बावृतकंसगन्धभैषज्यशी ध्रुपण्याश्रवत्वा
रिशत्कराः ।

धान्यरसलोहपण्याः शकटव्यवहारिणश्व-

त्रिशत्कराः । काचव्यवहारिणो महाकारवश्रव-

विशत्किराः । क्षुद्रकारवो बन्धकीपोषकाश्रव
दशकराः ।

काष्ठवेणुपाषाणमृदभाण्डपक्वान्नहरितपण्याः
पंचकराः ।”

सबका इसमें जिक्र आया है। संक्षेप में इसका अर्थ है कि राजकर में सोना, चांदी, हीरा, मणि, मोती, मूंगा, घोड़े और हाथी आदि व्यापारिक वस्तुओं पर उनकी लागत का पचासवां हिस्सा टैक्स लिया जाये। इसी प्रकार सूत, कपड़ा, तांबा, पीतल, कासा, गंध, जड़ी, बूटी, और शराब पर चालीसवां हिस्सा, गेहूं, धान आदि अन्न, तेल, घी, लोहा और बैलगाड़ियों पर तीसवां हिस्सा, कांच के व्यापारी तथा

बड़े बड़े कारीगरों पर बीसवां हिस्सा, छोटे छोटे कारीगरों तथा कुलटा स्त्रियों को घर में रखने वालों से दसवां हिस्सा, और लकड़ी, बांस, पत्थर, मिट्टी के बर्तन, पकवान तथा हरे शाक आदि पर पांचवां हिस्सा सरकारी टैक्स लिया जाय।

मैं निवेदन कर रहा था कि यह प्राचीन समय से लेकर बाद में मुगल साम्राज्य और अंग्रेजी के साम्राज्य के समय तक चलता रहा। लेकिन हाल में उत्पादशुल्क का महत्व बढ़ गया है। यह इससे जाहिर होगा कि खासकर प्रथम और द्वितीय महायुद्ध के बाद से देश स्वतंत्र हुआ और देश में पंचवर्षीय योजनाओं का प्रारम्भ हुआ तब से इसका महत्व बढ़ गया है और इसकी राशि बढ़ गई है। सन 1920-21 में उत्पाद शुल्क केवल 2.85 करोड़ था जो 1940-41 में 9 करोड़ हुआ और 1950-51 में 69 करोड़ हो गया, 1960-61 में 416 करोड़ रुपये, 1971 में 1758 करोड़, 1979-80 में पांचवी योजना के अंत में यह राशि बढ़कर 6011 करोड़ हो गई और छठी योजना के अंत में जो अभी समाप्त कर रहे हैं 31 मार्च, 1985 तक इसमें वित्त मंत्री जी के भाषण के अनुसार जो परिवर्तित आंकड़े हैं वे 11168 करोड़ अनुमानित हैं और अगले वर्ष (1985-86) तक के लिये 12,252 करोड़ राजस्व शुल्क के रूप में प्रस्तावित है। इस प्रकार उत्पादन शुल्क का महत्व हमारे राजस्व और देश के विकास में बहुत ही है।

इस दिशा में मेरे एक दो सुझाव हैं इसका महत्व केवल राजस्व के संकलन में नहीं, उत्पादन शुल्क का महत्व हमारे उत्पादन में और देश के विकास में भी बहुत अधिक है। इसलिए आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि हम राजस्व कर को जिस समय संकलन करना चाहते हैं, देश के विकास के साथ उसका संबंध होना चाहिये और इसके लिये एक दीर्घकालीन योजना होनी चाहिये। खास तौर से यह आवश्यक हो गया है कि हर साल जो राजस्व लगाये जाते हैं, कम से कम इसका संबंध पंचवर्षीय योजना के साथ

[श्री रामेश्वर ठाकुर]

होना चाहिये, पांच वर्ष के लिये निर्धारित नीति होनी चाहिये, जैसा कि आठवें वित्त आयोग ने पांच वर्ष के लिये एक निर्धारित राशि राज्यों के लिये कहा है। यदि हम राजस्व के लिये भी पांच वर्षीय योजना बनायें और विशेष परिस्थितिवश हर साल हम परिवर्तित करें, तो वह श्रेयकर रहेगा।

इसके साथ-साथ यह आवश्यक है कि जो छोटे उद्योग हैं और दूसरी आम उपभोक्ता की वस्तुएं जिसकी आवश्यकता अधिक है जिसका इलास्टिसिटी आफ डिमाण्ड जितनी ज्यादा है, ऐसी वस्तुओं में आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि शुल्क कम किये जायें और उसका उत्पादन अधिक बढ़ाने का प्रोत्साहन दिया जाय जिससे कि कम दर में ही अधिक राजस्व प्राप्त हो, जिस तरह कि प्रत्यक्ष कर में इस बार किया है प्रत्यक्ष कर में हमने कई करदाता व्यक्तियों और कंपनियों पर जो कर लगाया गया है, उसकी सीमा कम कर दी गई है इस आशा से कि उससे राजस्व यथेष्ट प्राप्त होगा। उसी तरह जो खास आम लोगों की आवश्यकता की चीजें हैं उसमें देखें कि किन-किन चीजों पर कर कम करें जिससे कि लागत बहुत अधिक नहीं हो जाय। इसके साथ-साथ यह जानकारी मिली है कि विभाग स्वयं विशेषज्ञों के द्वारा उत्पादन शुल्क के विभिन्न पहलुओं पर अध्ययन करवा रहा है। आवश्यकता इस बात की है कि अध्ययन करने के बाद इसके लिये एक बहुत ही व्यावहारिक नियम बनाया जाय और व्यवहारिकता के आधार पर एक दीर्घ कालीन योजना बनाई जाय अंत में मेरा एक सुझाव और भी है कि हमारे उत्पादन शुल्क का कानून बहुत ही पुराना है। इसमें अब तक के अनुभव के आधार पर और विशेषज्ञों की सलाह पर एक कानून सविस्तार बनाया जाय जिसमें सारी चीजों का प्रावधान किया जाय जो कानूनविद कहते हैं कि विक्रीकर की जगह उत्पादन शुल्क उत्तरोत्तर लगाया जाय तथा अन्य जो प्रगतिशील विचार हैं, जिसकी तरफ श्री मदन भाटिया जी ने इशारा किया है तथा जिसे अंग्रेजी में बैट पालिसी

कहते हैं, वैल्यू ऐडिड टैक्स, उसको भी यदि हम सभी पहलुओं पर विचार कर अधिक से अधिक लागू कर सकें तो वह उपयोगी होगा। अंत में कहूंगा कि राजस्व के संबंध में जो नीति है, वह ऐसी होनी चाहिए कि हम इतना अधिक न लगायें जिससे आम लोगों पर अधिक भार पड़े। इस संबंध में मैं एक उदाहरण देना चाहता हूं जो महाभारत में कर के संबंध में कहा गया है। यह बहुत ही महत्वपूर्ण है। महाभारत के बारहवें खंड के 88.4 के श्लोक में एक महत्व की बात यह कही गई है कि "राजकर ऐसा होना चाहिये जो प्रजा पर भारस्वरूप सिद्ध न हो। राजा को अपना आचरण उस मधुमक्खी के समान रखना चाहिये जो वृक्षों को बिना कष्ट पहुंचाये, उससे मधु एकत्रित करती है।"

हम आशा करते हैं कि हमारे वित्त मंत्री महोदय अगले वर्षों में इस दिशा में और महत्वपूर्ण कदम उठायेंगे और इस राजस्व से हमारी सप्तम योजना के क्रियान्वयन में और देश के विकास में बल मिलेगा।

इन्हीं शब्दों के साथ मैं पूरा इन तीनों विधेयकों का समर्थन करता हूं।

SHRI H. HANUMANTHAPPA (Karnataka): Madam Vice-Chairman, while initiating the debate on this subject, my colleague, Mr. Madam Bhatia, has given the detailed history of how the sales tax has been substituted by the additional excise duty with the concurrence of the State Governments. He also called the attention of the Minister to look into it. After 27 years, certain items have already acquired the status of national importance. It is more so when the country is not a small one. It has got about 22 States and Union Territories. We have business spread over in almost all the States. Even after 27 years of this Act, only limited number of items have been included in the Additional Duties of Excise Act. I think some more items can be added to it in view of the multiplicity of the trade as well as the complexity of the sales tax. The sales tax is a State subject. The States have got their own percentage of taxing

system. If a business house has got branches in a number of States, it has to face lot of problems with regard to the sales tax provisions. In this context, the suggestion of my hon. friend, Mr. Bhatia is a worthwhile suggestion which the Government may consider this in length at this point of time. There is every necessity of bringing in some more items under the additional duties of excise and rationalise the system by eliminating the sales tax which is a complicated one. There are a number of loopholes in the existing sales tax system in every State. With these words, I support the three Bills that have been brought forward by the Government arising out of the recommendations of the Eighth Finance Commission under article 280(1) of the Constitution.

The distribution of the revenues between the Union Government and the State Governments has been provided under article 275 of the Constitution. The founding fathers of the Constitution have deliberated on this issue and came out with a solution as to how these revenues can be shared between the States and the Union Government. Unfortunately, of late, some of our State Government have raised a hue and cry on the Centre State relations for some reason or the other.

The Eighth Finance Commission is a statutory body answerable to the President free from the Government and free from political interference. Those States have no confidence in the statutory bodies which are constituted under the Constitution.

Our own Chief Minister, Mr. Ramakrishna Hegde has started this confrontation. Unfortunately he could not find the solution within the framework of the Constitution which has been tested from the times. He has also started confrontation between the Centre and the States about the distribution

and allocation of funds. I want to put a question across the floor to my hon. Friends on that side. Did they think about all these things when they were in power? I want to emphasise this because they have no reasons behind their argument. They have just started to give pin-prick to the Centre. This is nothing but a populist approach to arouse the peoples emotions to fight with the Centre.

These non-Congress-I State Governments have started unnecessary confrontation with the Centre instead of attending to the developmental works. I may mention here that our Constitution has got ways and means to settle all these disputes. Our late Mrs. Indira Gandhi has appointed the Sarkaria Commission to consider all these issues. If any of the items are in ambiguity or doubt they can be referred to the Sarkaria Commission for finding a satisfactory solution. Still the doors are open for resolving the issues. But I am sorry to find that some State Governments are indulging in unnecessary confrontation with the Centre. These three Bills have been brought forward in accordance with the recommendations of the Eighth Finance Commission—for sharing and distribution of the basic excise duties being 40 per cent among the States and 5 per cent among the deficit States amounting to Rs. 18,920.70 crores as well as the distribution of additional excise duties levied on sugar, tobacco and textiles amounts to Rs. 3318.50 crores. Because of the repealment of the Excise Act, it has become necessary for these amendments. So I support all the three Bills brought by the Government wholeheartedly. Thank you.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE
 MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JAN-
 ARDHAN POOJARI): Madam Vice-
 Chairman, I heard the views expressed on the three Bills that have been placed before this hon. House for its consideration and passing. I am grateful to the hon. Members for the valuable suggestions that they have made before the House for the consideration of the Government of India. Madam.

[Shri Janardhan Poojari]

here I may bring to your notice that in the opening speech, I had given in detail the transfer of the shares to the States and also the increase that has taken place because of the recommendations of the Eighth Finance Commission. Madam, here again I want to bring to the notice of this august House that the Eighth Finance Commission is an independent and statutory body. There are experts here and after studying the economic condition of the country and the resources that are available, they have given their recommendations. In the debate that took place in the Constituent Assembly, the former Finance Minister, Shri T. T. Krishnamachari, who happened to be the Chairman of the Sub-Committee there, made it very clear that the Finance Commission does not create funds and that the Finance Commission only gives the modus or method of distribution of the resources to the States. Now, here the Government as an executive has to consider the recommendations and it has to accept the recommendations if they are feasible and desirable.

Now the hon. Member from West Bengal, while making his speech, that is the opening speech from the Opposition side, said that we had not accepted the recommendation of the Eighth Finance Commission to the extent that it had not come into force from the 1st April, 1984. The reason has been given in my opening speech and the entire Eighth Finance Commission Report was discussed on the floor of the House and the former Finance Minister had given the reply. The hon. Member from the CPI(M) has made a point saying that if the Eighth Finance Commission's recommendations had been accepted from the 1st April, 1984, the States could have got Rs. 1,500 crores more. Now, Madam we have been criticised because they say that since the recommendations have not been accepted by the Government of India, the States have been

put to a loss and they have been deprived of this amount. May I bring to the notice of the hon. Member that the report of the Finance Commission was not available when the budget of the year was formulated. It was submitted only after the budget was framed. And another point I want to make about the alleged loss, national loss, to the States. Here I want to make a point. At the time of the formulation of the Central Budget we had to see the resources available and we had to take into consideration so many other factors. What were the resources available? Have they been distributed? Have they been shared? Have we been able to meet the requirements? What was the position when the Budget was presented? Have we deprived the States? No. After taking into consideration the resources available what have we done? We have stepped up the Central assistance for States' Plan. And then we have adjusted the overdrafts, overdrafts of the deficit States. What is the involvement? To the tune of Rs. 1290 crores. We have provided it. How have the States formulated their plans? The States have formulated their plan outlays in such a manner considering the resources available. What have we done? If this report had been there before us at the time of formulation of the Budget, taking into consideration the resources constraint, the resources available at that time for the Government of India, if there had been the recommendations of the Eighth Finance Commission before us, we would not have gone in for stepping up the Plan assistance. And we would not have been able to adjust the overdrafts. We would only have gone according to the recommendations of the Eighth Finance Commission. Therefore, I say you have not been deprived of the funds. The funds were made available to the State Governments after meeting the genuine requirements. We have done it. Now we have been criticised; we have been accused, saying that we have not done anything. No. That is not the correct point. I do not want to bring to the notice of the House what the per-

formance of West Bengal Government was. I do not want to enter into a controversy. Our Finance Minister has clearly stated about the performance of the West Bengal Government. What is your contribution during the Sixth Five year Plan? The Plan outlay was Rs. 3500 crores. What was the contribution made by the State Government? What resources have you collected? What were the internal resources? He has clearly stated and it has been made very clear to the House and through this House to the nation what the performance was. Now you are making an accusation that West Bengal has been affected. Your State was not a deficit State before the recommendation of the Eighth Finance Commission. Your State was a surplus State. What was the per capita income of Bihar? Rupees 755. What was the per capita income of West Bengal? Rupees 1247. After adjusting the share of the Central taxes you have become a deficit State whereas Bihar did not become deficit after getting the State's share. Other States have not become deficit States. Because you have become a deficit State you are entitled to get something from the 8th Finance Commission. Otherwise your State would not have got it. Other States would have got it. Your State is occupying the fifth position. You did not tap your resources. What was your performance? West Bengal as a State is not a poor State. It is a rich State. It has got resources. But unfortunately the management has been poor there. Because of your performance you have become a deficit State in the eyes of the 8th Finance Commission and that is why you are entitled for that. I am not saying this, but there will be somebody who will say that you have done it deliberately. A State which was occupying the 22nd position and which was at the bottom with Rs. 755 per capita income did not become a deficit State. Therefore, this is not a question of

any party. You have made a very effective point that you have commitment also. Let us not take into consideration party affiliations. Let us take into account national interest. What is happening in Calcutta? Take Calcutta city and compare it with Bombay, Delhi, Bangalore or Hyderabad. Take cleanliness and forget other things. You see the Central Government offices. You see other offices. What is the performance? Who is holding West Bengal to ransom? We must be bold. We must have the political will to tackle this problem. For that purpose the administration should be very strong. I want to make it very clear that you have to improve the performance. To improve the situation in the banking sector when I went from place to place *in cognit* and on surprise visits to see whether bank employees are coming on time, whether they are giving output, your Chief Minister, Mr. Jyoti Basu, issued a circular even when there was lot of resistance in the banking sector against my surprise visits, that all the employees should be on their seats by 10 o'clock. Even though he belongs to the CPM party he issued that circular. That should be the spirit. Whatever may be the union, so far as discipline is concerned, the administration should be strong.

Therefore, unless you improve your performance I do not think anybody can help you. We have been told that during the last year of the Sixth Plan we have not been able to give you much. Why was it so? It was because of your performance. Why other States did not make similar complaints and only West Bengal complained? You exhausted all the assistance within four years and there was nothing for the fifth year. You have exhausted everything and this is the actual position. I do not want to repeat all those things. But I would only like to say that we must show dedication and commitment and we must show improvement in the administration. Then only we can come up to the expectations of the people of this country.

[Shri Janardhan Poojari]

Now, Madam, the honourable member, Shri Madan Bhatia, raised a pertinent question so far as the abolition of Sales Tax is concerned. As you know Madam, and as the House knows, the Tripathi Committee had been appointed and, afterwards, our former Finance Minister held discussions with the Chief Ministers of the various States. Unfortunately, as the honourable Member himself made it very clear, it is a State subject and we can bring about any change only in consultation with the State Governments only; otherwise, we cannot do it. We cannot impose any views on the State Governments. There also, Madam, I want to bring one thing to the notice of the honourable House. Some of the Opposition Chief Minister. Particularly from West Bengal and Karnataka, and some other States, did not agree to the abolition of this. How can we bring it then? So, even though we are in agreement with the views expressed by Shri Madan Bhatia, we are not in a position to implement that recommendation because it is a State subject and, without the consent of the State Government, we cannot do anything.

Madam, coming to the question of abolition of the Estate Duty, there was a criticism. The Estimates Committee's recommendations were there and there. Madam, all the people, Members from the various parties, honourable Members of Parliament had given their views and unanimously recommended its abolition saying that it was creating problems, that it was erratic and

that it was creating a lot of troubles and that is why we have abolished it.

Madam, I think I have covered all the points. The Eighth Finance Commission's Report also has been discussed here thoroughly. Not only that. We have accepted their recommendations. All the recommendations, except the ones I referred to, have been accepted and we are implementing those recommendations through these Bills.

Madam, I commend that the Bills be taken into consideration.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SARAJINI MAHISHI]: Now the question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Estate Duty (Distribution) Act, 1962, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SARAJINI MAHISHI]: We shall now take up the clause-by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2 and 3 were added to the Bill. Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: Madam, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SARAJINI MAHISHI]: We shall now take up the other Bill. The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Union Duties of Excise (Distri-

bution) Act, 1979, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SARAJINI MAHISHI]: We shall now take up the clause-by-clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 4 were added to the Bill

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: Madam, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SARAJINI MAHISHI]: Now, the question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Additional Duties of Excise (Goods of Special Importance) Act, 1957, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN [DR. (SHRIMATI) SARAJINI MAHISHI]: We shall now take up clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 and 3 were added to the B.E.

Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.

SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI: I beg to move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.

THE COMPULSORY DEPOSIT SCHEME (INCOME-TAX PAYERS) BILL, 1985

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF FINANCE (SHRI JANARDHAN POOJARI): Madam, I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Compulsory Deposit Scheme (Income-tax Payers) Act, 1974, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

This short and simple Bill has a limited objective. It seeks to amend the Compulsory Deposit Scheme (Income-tax Payers) Act, 1974, with a view to postponing, by one year only, the repayment of instalment and payment of interest due in the financial year 1985-86.

[The Deputy Chairman in the chair]

The Compulsory Deposit Scheme (Income-tax Payers) Act, 1974, was enacted to provide, in the interest of national economic development, for compulsory deposit by certain classes of income-tax payers. The Act, as criminally enacted, provided for the making of compulsory deposits in two financial years, namely, 1974-75 and 1975-76. The Act has been amended from time to time to provide for liability for making compulsory deposits in subsequent years, upto and including the financial year 1984-85. Under the Act, the Compulsory deposit made or recovered in a financial year is repayable in five equal annual instalments commencing from the expiry of two years from the end of that financial year together with interest.

In fulfilment of the commitment made by us in our election manifesto, the Government has decided to abolish the scheme of making compulsory deposits by income-tax payers from 1st April, 1985. There would, therefore, be no liability to make compulsory deposits in the financial year 1985-86