

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Sir, I have already replied to that point. But I might just add that the Reserve Bank by participating in the Refinance Corporation does not indulge in day to day commercial banking. It does not advance any loan. That will be the function of the State Bank.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now I will take up the second Bill, the State Bank of India (Amendment) Bill, 1957.

The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the State Bank of India Act, 1955, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Now we will take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clauses 2 to 5 were added to the Bill.

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

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Sir, I move:

"That the Bill be passed."

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, in regard to this Bill also, the hon. Deputy Minister has tried to reply to only two or three points. Here again, I beg to submit that it was not a real reply, but only an apology for a reply. The first

thing that he said was that in permitting loans to employees of the State Bank of India no discrimination is made. There is no objection to that. But the moment . . .

SHRI B. R. BHAGAT: Sir, is it relevant at the third reading stage?

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I am replying to his argument.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You cannot go on replying like that. Do not repeat the same argument. If you have anything fresh, you may do it. But you have said that you are not satisfied and you have put forward your arguments also. I think there is nothing to add. So I will put it to the House.

The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

The motion was adopted.

#### THE CENTRAL SALES TAX (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1957

THE DEPUTY MINISTER FOR FINANCE (SHRI B. R. BHAGAT): Mr. Deputy Chairman, I beg to move:

"That the Bill to amend the Central Sales Tax Act, 1956, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Sir, the Central Sales Tax Act, 1956 provides for the levy, collection and distribution of tax on the sale of goods in the course of inter-State trade or commerce. It also specifies the goods which are declared to be of special importance in inter-State commerce and lays down in section 15 the conditions to which the Sales Tax Laws of the different State Governments must conform in order to tax the goods thus declared.

The Central Sales Tax Act, with the exception of section 15, was enforced on the 5th January, 1957. The enforcement of section 15 was postponed in

order to enable the State Governments to bring their Sales Tax Acts in line with the provisions of this section. It has since been notified that this section shall also come into force with effect from 1st July, 1957.

The actual administration of the Central Sales Tax Act has been delegated to the State Governments. The State Governments have to assess, collect and enforce payment of tax under this Act in the same manner as they have to do for commodities covered by the general sales tax laws of the States. Section 8(5) of the Act, as it stands at present, empowers the Central Government to notify in the public interest and in respect of Union territories, that the tax may be exempted or levied at a lower rate on inter-State sales emanating from any Union territories. It is felt that the State Governments also should be similarly empowered in respect of inter-State sales originating from their own territories. It is accordingly proposed to enlarge the scope of section 8(5) so as to bring the State Governments in the same position as the Central Government.

In section 14, six items namely, coal, cotton, hides and skins, iron and steel, jute and oilseeds, have been declared as goods of special importance in inter-State trade or commerce. It is now considered that cotton yarn which is essentially a raw material and which is also the staple support of a very important cottage industry, viz. handloom industry, fully satisfies the criteria laid down by the Taxation Enquiry Commission for inclusion in the list of declared goods. The relevant recommendations of the Taxation Enquiry Commission run as follows:—

“Broadly speaking, no commodity should be selected in this context which does not combine the following characteristics:

(i) it should be raw material or largely in the nature of raw material;

(ii) either as raw material, or later as finished goods based on such material, it should, in terms of volume of inter-State transactions, be of special importance in inter-State trade, and

(iii) in terms of the country as a whole, it should also be of special importance from the point of view of the consumer or of industry.”

The State Governments have been consulted, and most of the replies received so far agree that cotton yarn should be included in this list. Clause 3 of the Bill, therefore, seeks to include cotton yarn in the list of “declared goods”.

The present section 15 of the Act indicates that there can be no intra-State levy under a State Sales Tax Act at more than one stage. As the law stands now, it is possible for a State which levies purchase tax or a multi-point tax within the State to impose the State tax on the declared goods even though they are intended for export outside the territories of the State. The intention has, however, always been that there should be no levy on intra-State sales tax on the declared goods which are to be despatched to another State. It is, therefore, necessary to clarify the position in this regard. The Taxation Enquiry Commission had also recommended that the stage of levy of State sales tax on declared goods should be the last stage of sale or purchase within the State. It is, therefore, proposed to replace section 15 by a new provision, as in clause 4 of the Bill, so as to restrict the point of levy of tax on declared goods at the last stage of sale or purchase within a State.

Sir, I move.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Motion moved:

“That the Bill to amend the Central Sales Tax Act, 1956, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration.”

SHRI KISHEN CHAND (Andhra Pradesh): Mr. Deputy Chairman, we are Members of the Rajya Sabha, and we represent the States. In a federal constitution, taxation is always divided between the Centre and the States. In so far as this Bill affects the revenues of the State Governments directly or indirectly, I think it deserves very careful consideration of this House. I submit that the sales tax is a very important tax in the revenues of any State Government, and as the sales tax is replacing the excise revenue and in many States it is the sole substitute for excise revenue, we should not pass any Central laws changing the equilibrium of the income from the sales tax accruing to the States. This will create imbalance and they will have great difficulties.

There are three parts of this tax. One is about inter-State sales. That is item No. 1. The second point in this Bill is about essential commodities, the levy of sales tax on essential commodities being restricted to one point at a rate not exceeding 2 per cent. The third point is inter-State trade on essential commodities, in which case there is to be no levy. I will take up these three points one by one.

First of all, in our country the growth of industries in all States is not equal. Some States are industrially more advanced; they use raw materials from certain other States which produce them. Now, we have got to strike a balance between the different States. One State produces the raw material and the other State produces the finished article. I will give you one example. Rubber is produced only in Kerala, but the rubber manufacture is mostly in Calcutta or round about Calcutta in West Bengal. Now, rubber is not declared to be an essential commodity. The hon. Minister has given three or four conditions which must be fulfilled before a commodity is declared to be an essential commodity. Certainly rubber fulfils most of the conditions. It is manufactured and it is a very essential article. Now, rubber goes from Kerala

to West Bengal and is manufactured there. Supposing at some future date rubber is declared to be an essential commodity, the Kerala State will not be able to levy any sales tax on it, not even for internal purposes. It will be able to levy sales tax subject to a maximum of 2 per cent. at one point. But for inter-State sales, the Kerala State will not be able to levy even that 2 per cent. on its despatches of rubber to West Bengal. A factory situated in West Bengal converts that rubber into tyres. So, for inter-State trade, sales tax can be levied on that tyre, and the entire proceeds of the sales tax go to West Bengal, but you deprive the Kerala State of the sales tax. If in a country it so happens that one article goes from one area to nearly every other area, and some other article comes from some other area and is sold in all the other areas and so on, then there would not have been any objection to this. But there are only a few States producing the cash crops which are used in the manufacture of further articles.

I will give you another example. Take the case of tobacco. That also is not declared as an essential commodity at present. It is produced largely in Andhra Pradesh, and it is exported from Andhra State to almost all the other States where it is converted into cigarettes, cigars, biris, etc. All the other States get the advantage of the sales tax, but Andhra Pradesh will not be able to get any benefit of the sales tax on tobacco.

The hon. Minister has given the examples of cement and steel, and now he is adding yarn, and there are several other articles like oils and oil-seeds which are considered to be essential commodities. I submit that if there was a fair distribution of the inter-State sales tax between the various States either on the basis of population or on the basis of the production of raw material which goes into the manufacture of that article, then there would have been a justification but this type of Central Sales Tax Act—this is only an amending

Bill and this is only adding cotton yarn to the list of articles but this is an opportunity where we should really discuss the effect of Central Sales Tax Act on the various States—is really very harsh on States which are producing the raw materials and it is very favourable to States which are producing manufactured articles. Therefore, I will submit out of the levy of the inter-State sales tax, the entire proceeds from the inter-State sales tax should be pooled together and distributed by the Finance Commission which is distributing the proceeds of the excise and income-tax between the Centre and the States. You know that the sales tax on cloth is going to be shortly removed and it will be included in the excise duty and the Finance Commission is going to be entrusted with the task of dividing the proceeds of excise duty from cloth between the various States on any reasonable basis that they may recommend. I would suggest that the proceeds of all inter-State sales tax should also be put in a pool and the Finance Commission should be entrusted with the task of distributing the proceeds of the inter-State sales tax among the States by any suitable formula, either depending upon the population or on the basis of the production of raw materials.

Then I come to the levy of sales tax on essential commodities, I mean the intra-sales tax on essential commodities. There it has been fixed that there will be only one-point sales tax and that also, not exceeding 2 per cent. I don't see any justification for it. It is, after all, the will and pleasure of the people of that State if they want to levy a sales tax at a high or low rate. They have to balance their budgets and it is a cardinal principle of taxation that the people who pay the tax must have the final voice in fixing the rate of tax. Why should we, when the article is to be consumed entirely inside the State, fix a maximum percentage and insist that it should be one-point sales tax? I don't see any justification for it. If at all there is a justification, it is only appli-

cable when it becomes an inter-State sale but as long as it is intra-state sale, the Centre should not come in, unless they think that the people of the State are going to suffer on account of that. I will give the example of sales tax on foodgrains which was levied in Uttar Pradesh. There also I don't think the Centre had a right to interfere and say that U.P. cannot levy sales tax on foodgrains. We are doing a similar thing here. We are asking the States that on commodities specified by the Central Government, they cannot levy sales tax in excess of 2 per cent. and not more than at one point. For that I don't think the Constitution gives any permission. So I oppose that.

My second point is that on inter-State sales, of essential commodities, even that 2 per cent. cannot be levied. Even that one point sales tax cannot be levied. This will be clear from a reading of 15(b) which I will read: 15(a) reads:

“the tax payable under that law in respect of any sale or purchase of such goods inside the State shall be levied only in respect of the last sale or purchase inside the State and shall not exceed two per cent. of the sale or purchase price;”.

That is for intra-State sales. Now it goes a step further in (b):

“notwithstanding anything contained in clause (a), no tax shall be levied in respect of the last sale or purchase inside the State if the declared goods purchased are intended for sale in the course of inter-State trade or commerce.”

That means if the goods are going out of the State, no sales tax at all can be levied, and the State producing the raw material is deprived of the sales tax entirely. It will adversely affect the finances of all States. I submit that it is a very proper occasion to consider levying of an overall turnover tax and doing away with all the sales taxes. Either you do away with all sales taxes and levy a turnover

[Shri Kishen Chand.] tax and distribute it among the States so that their finances are reimbursed or, if you don't follow that policy, you must permit the States to balance their budgets by the imposition of sales tax. If you don't do either of these things, the States will be in a very great financial plight which is clear from a perusal of all State finance budgets. Almost all States are showing a very big deficit. They are not able to balance their budgets. They cannot contribute anything to the Second Plan. The hon. Minister in order to help the States, levies a railway passenger fare tax and wants to distribute its proceeds between the States as a sop for depriving them of the inter-State sales tax.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU (Uttar Pradesh): There is no connection between the two.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Well, the hon. Finance Minister stated that he is levying that passenger fare tax to distribute among the States. It is a direct connection that he gave...

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: One has nothing to do with the other. Confine yourself to the Bill.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I am trying to point out how they are connected with each other; because you see that he deprives them of this sales tax and they have all an adverse balance of budget, to cover up that adverse balance of budget, he is proposing to give them something out of the passenger tax. Will it not be far better that the passenger fare tax is not levied and the States are permitted to levy sales tax?

SHRI J. S. BISHT (Uttar Pradesh): That is for a different reason.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: I know. The hon. Finance Minister is very clever and the hon. Member who is interrupting is very clear and they can always point out that the two things are different. I am only trying to show that this leads to imbalance. He is trying to help...

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: You are trying to show the effect of the two Bills.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: The result is that you are adopting an incorrect policy. For balancing the State budgets, the correct and the proper policy should be that you make alterations in the Central Sales Tax (Amendment) Bill and give permission to the States to levy a sales tax on the articles which are exported out of their States. Therefore, I don't think this Bill is going to help the States. Thank you.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH (Bombay): Sir, the intra-sales tax is an important source of revenue and this intra-sales tax operated in a way that it was difficult to differentiate between the intra-sales tax and inter-sales tax. On account of this the Central Inter-State Sales Tax Act was enacted in 1956. Now there was some lacuna and on that account, section 15 is thought fit to be amended by saying that it is only in respect of the last sale or purchase inside the State. That clarifies the whole position. The Finance Minister has however said that he is going to apply this inter-sales tax from 1st July. That is what I understand.

Now, there have been unanimous recommendations from many of the States that the inter-State sales tax which is operating in the whole country in different States under different methods is coming in the way of commerce and trade in all the States. The levy differs from State to State and the point at which it is levied is also different. In some States it is a single-point tax and in some others it is a multi-point tax. All these are there.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: (Bihar): All these have now been removed by this Bill.

SHRI C. P. PARIKH: Only for inter-State sales tax, not for intra-State sales tax. Mr. Sinha should understand that with regard to the essential commodities, the National Development Council has very clearly laid

down—especially in regard to textiles, sugar and tobacco—that no sales tax will be levied, I mean intra-State, and that the levy should be in the form of an excise throughout the whole of India on a uniform basis. This collection is to be distributed to the States according to the recommendations of the Finance Commission. That Bill is going to come and I think it should come as early as possible.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** Is the hon. Member talking about this Bill or about some other Bill.

**SHRI C. P. PARIKH:** I am speaking about this Bill. Mr. Sinha has perhaps not read this Bill or perhaps not understood it.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** Therefore, I am seeking clarification.

**SHRI C. P. PARIKH:** Under the new clause 15, the maximum intra-sales tax shall be 2 per cent. What I say is that the other Bill should be brought forward as early as possible. Perhaps it will be passed in the month of September or in the month of October. So, I think this Bill can very well be postponed till then. These two are also essential commodities according to intra-State acts and uniformity will help trade and commerce very greatly. Representations have been made to the Finance Ministry that both these taxes should also be taken together but I want early enactment of the measure relating to intra-State sales tax in order that this matter of sales tax which is worrying the whole trade and commerce and industry will be no more there. Government also will collect more revenue which may be of the order of ten crores. Government should bring in such a legislation as early as possible. When they are going to bring forward such a measure, I have to suggest that the application of this measure may also be postponed till September if they are sure that they can have it in September. So many formalities have to be undergone that it has become very difficult for the trade. Apart from the three commodities which have been accepted by the National

Development Council, namely, textiles, sugar and tobacco, representations have been made to the Finance Ministry that art silk and woollen textiles should also be included. I would like the hon. Minister to incorporate as many essential commodities as possible in the Central tax so that we get the maximum revenue. The Finance Commission may go into the matter for three or four months and the division of receipts may be postponed till then.

That is the suggestion that I have to make.

**SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA:** Mr. Deputy Chairman, I listened to the speech of my hon. friend, the Deputy Finance Minister, very attentively because I was worried about the import of clause 2 of the Bill. I tried to find out from the speech which he delivered as to the significance of this clause. Sir, the State Governments did not have any power under 8(5) to vary the sales tax on commodities entering into the inter-State trade but now it is sought, by clause 2 of this Bill, to give this power to the State Governments that they can, if they so like, vary the rates of taxation or, if they like, exempt the commodity from taxation altogether. This is what I understand. Now, Sir, we are very much interested in the States and the State finances. As a matter of fact, this House represents the States and we are supposed to be the guardians or the custodians of the rights of the States and their finances of this Parliament. Now, it is not very clear to me as to what could be the import and the repercussion on the various States and their finances of this clause 2. The hon. Minister ought to have explained to us as to what the views of the States were with regard to this clause that he has imported into this Act. I remember, on a different occasion when we had such a Bill which affected the interests of the States, a note was circulated to us giving the views of the State Governments on the provisions of that particular Bill. Now, it would have helped us very much, Sir, to make up our mind about clause 2

[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.]

if we were in possession of the views of the various State Governments. I would like you, Sir, to appreciate the import of this clause 2 and I would like the House to appreciate the point that I am making now. Sir, what is going to happen is this: At present, under section 8 of the Act, a tax is levied at the rate of 1 per cent. of the turnover of goods entering into inter-State commerce. This tax is collected by the Centre on the goods entering into inter-State commerce and is passed on to the States. The present Act merely gives power to the Central Government to waive this clause in respect of the tax levied in the Union Territories. The Central Government has power either to reduce this tax from 1 per cent. to  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. or  $\frac{1}{4}$  per cent. or to exempt a particular commodity from taxation altogether. That is the position. Am I correct?

Now, the hon. Minister explained to us that they have considered it right but he has not given us any reasons why they have considered it right. What has led them to reconsider this clause? He has not given any reasons at all. He has merely said that they have thought it fit to give this extra power to the State Governments themselves. What is that power? That is a power to exempt or to modify the tax which is levied on the goods entering into the inter-State commerce.

Now, Sir, it will have different repercussions on different States. Now you know, Sir, there are States which are advanced, which are financially very strong, which have got industrial wealth and agricultural wealth and there are States which are backward, whose economy is backward, whose financial resources are very poor, and therefore I do not know how this provision will be used by the different States, and if a particular State uses this provision in a particular manner, what repercussions it will have on the other States.

Now I will explain it to you. Let us take for example the State from where my hon. friend comes, the State of West Bengal. He comes from a very rich State.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA (West Bengal): How?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Well, look at your budget. Look at your resources. Look at the vast industrial potentialities that you have got. Look at your Calcutta, a very big and rich city. Now he comes from a very rich State, represents a very rich State, and I represent a very poor State, the State of Bihar. Now let me explain to you how you will benefit, you may benefit. Now we both produce coal.

SHRI BHUPESH GUPTA: Yes, half half.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Now he can say, "I will give up the tax. I will not levy any tax on coal." I am just giving an example, Sir. In that case nobody will buy Bihar coal when the tax on coal elsewhere is one per cent less. Of course you can say that coal is in short supply; everybody will buy; don't worry.

Take some other example, some of the commodities that they are producing, an industrially advanced State . . .

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Mica.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: They may say. "We will give up the tax on these commodities." Why? In order to encourage the industries of their State, to encourage employment in their State. Now we may have to put up some industries. We are industrially backward. We have neither the finance nor the technical know-how. Now it will be very difficult for our industries to compete; nobody will buy from us if you in Mysore can get it one per cent cheaper from him than from myself. So I would like to understand the repercussions, how it is going to react upon the finances of the different States.

Now nobody would like to give up its revenue just for the sake of fun. Now if Bengal decides to modify its sales tax rates, it will do so only when it is assured of the fact that by modifying the tax on or exempting some commodities from the sales tax the State as a whole is going to gain or that Government resources may be augmented thereby. Therefore, what may happen is this. The decision of one State is going to have its repercussions on some other State. Now it may develop inter-State jealousies—I do not know.

SHRI J. S. BISHT: Would that not happen under the present law?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: That is what I explained to you in the very beginning. It would happen if another State had any power to modify the incidence of taxation. They had no right either to lower the tax or to raise it or to exempt any commodity from the tax altogether. Now that right only subsisted with the Central Government and that too in respect of certain territories known as the Union Territories coming under their control and authority. Now what happened was this, why this Bill came you must know. Hon. Members should be interested to know this. I understand that the Central Government used the powers which it has got under section 5, which had a deterrent effect, which affected very adversely the adjoining States. Therefore . . . . .

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Under section 5?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Section 5 of the original Act I am talking of, which is sought to be amended.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: Section 8.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: Section 5 is not being amended.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I am sorry. I mean sub-section 5 of section 8. Now what happens is

this. Because the Central Government took a step to give certain relief from the inter-State sales tax, the round about States started clamouring, "Nobody would buy the goods from us. They will all buy from you." Therefore, the Central Government probably thought of this. I do not know for certain; this is my inference. Though my hon. friend explained it, I am at a loss to understand why he is seeking amendment of this section, what led him to think that this section should be amended. I might not have caught him correctly; hon. Members might have understood it better, but at least I could not understand it. What has happened is this. The other States are objecting to the use of such a power by the Centre. Similarly what I maintain is this that if Bengal is using this power—Bengal is a rich State as I have told you—the State of Bihar from where I come may object to it because it will affect their revenues, their resources and the people resident in the Bihar State. It will affect them; it will affect their industries. Therefore, I ask whether the hon. Minister has taken care to consult the States and, if so, what is the advice of the different States. If that information were given to us, then, Sir, it would have been easier for us to make up our mind with regard to this provision. It is no good giving us this information—such information won't help us—that they have consulted the States and generally they are in agreement. We would like to know what is the reaction of the different State Governments. We would like to know what is the opinion of the States which have a backward economy and the States which have got an advanced economy, what is the reaction of the States which are agricultural States and the others which are industrial States, where the industries are more developed. If you refer such a matter to the State, I would not only refer casually but draw their attention to this particular aspect of the question, that this is how it is going to affect them. We would like to know their reaction. As I explained to you at



[Shri Rajendra Pratap Sinha.]  
the very beginning, we must voice the feelings and safeguard the interests of our constituencies. Which are our constituencies? The States are our constituencies. Now we would place ourselves in a very wrong box if we don't know what is the opinion on these provisions of the different States. Well, few of the States might have approached you. Two things must have happened. Either the States round about Delhi might have clamoured, "You are using this power in a wrong manner." Now to satisfy them you say, "All right, I give you that power. You can vary it in any manner you like." This thing must have happened.

SHRI H. N. KUNZRU: How does it injure any State?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: That is what I should like to emphasise. That is what I have been trying to explain. I would again explain it to you, Sir. There is a State 'A' which has got better financial resources, whose industries are developed. Now they want to encourage their industries or industrial products or agricultural produce, whatever they may be, by giving relief to those goods from the inter-State sales tax. You take for example the State of Uttar Pradesh my hon. friend comes from. They produce sugar. Now they can say that sugar will not come within the purview of this tax.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Will you take some more time?

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: If you will permit me I will take a few minutes more.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: You can continue tomorrow.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Thank you very much.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: But before we adjourn I have to bring to the notice of the House that we might have to sit at about 3 O'clock

tomorrow instead of in the morning, but whether we have to sit till we finish all the business or adjourn after the new Bill is placed before the House and meet on Saturday morning, that is left to the House. But it is better we sit from 3 O'clock and finish the whole business. It may be till about 7 O'clock.

SHRI AKBAR ALI KHAN (Andhra Pradesh): But can we not sit in the morning?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The House has to be in session when the new Bill will be placed on the Table of the House.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: I cannot understand, Sir. Is it the idea that we will not sit tomorrow from 11 O'clock?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Not in the morning. We will meet at 3 O'clock and go on till we finish all the business.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: This is very unfair, Sir. I would suggest that you extend the sittings by a day. We will sit on Saturday and we should sit on Saturday. There is the Private Member's Bill.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: I may inform the Members that there is only one Private Member's Bill tomorrow and that may not take more than one hour. There is another Appropriation Bill which may take about half an hour, and this Bill. Therefore...

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: May I suggest that we should be given ample time to discuss this important measure.

SHR| KISHEN CHAND: May I submit . . . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Please hear me first. I am suggesting this procedure because if we sit in the morning, since there is no likelihood of the other Bill coming up in time, we may have to close the sitting at

about 3 or 3-30. It now appears that it is likely that we shall get the other Bill round about 5 O'clock, not much earlier. That is why I am suggesting that the House has to be in session when the Bill is placed on the Table of the House. We may take it up immediately or sit on Saturday morning, say, between 9 and 11.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE (Bombay): What is the Bill that you are talking about, Sir?

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Copies have been circulated.

SHRI V. K. DHAGE: I do not think we can take into consideration the Essential Commodities (Amendment) Bill tomorrow unless we have had about one or two days' notice according to the rules.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: If the hon. Member raises that objection and wants notice we have to sit on Saturday morning.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: We will have to sit on Saturday; we cannot help that.

SHRI M. GOVINDA REDDY (Mysore): That contingency will arise only tomorrow.

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Anyhow we will sit at 3 tomorrow.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: May I have one minute? What I sug-

gest is, we meet in the morning and continue with these various Bills that we have and you may give us some extra time to speak on these Bills. They are important Bills.

SHRI KISHEN CHAND: And give us a bigger lunch interval.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: If you like, Sir . . . .

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is a Money Bill, Mr. Sinha, and the time is fixed by Chairman.

SHRI RAJENDRA PRATAP SINHA: Unless the House adopts the proceedings of the Business Advisory Committee, it is open to you, Sir, to extend the time for each Bill.

SHRI R. S. DOOGAR (West Bengal): We can sit from 2:30, if necessary.

(Interruptions.)

MR. DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: This is a Money Bill and this has to be returned. So we can meet either at 2-30 or at 3-00 P.M. (After taking the sense of the House) 3-00 P.M. would be better I think.

The House stands adjourned till 3-00 P.M. tomorrow.

The House then adjourned at three minutes past six of the clock till three of the clock on Friday, the 31st May 1957.