

I might only submit that this matter has been made more convenient from the point of view of the persons who register and who own the property and it is an improvement upon the existing law of 1940.

With these words, I commend the motion for the acceptance of the House.

**Mr. Chairman:** The question is:

"That the Bill to provide for the registration and better protection of trade marks and for the prevention of the use of fraudulent marks on merchandise be referred to a Joint Committee of the Houses consisting of 45 members; 30 from this House, namely Shri C. R. Pattabhi Raman, Shri Radhelal Vyas, Pandit Dwarka Nath Tiwary, Shri Kailash Pati Sinha, Shri C. Bali Reddy, Shri Nibaran Chandra Laskar, Shri Tayappa Hari Sonavane, Shri Akbarbhai Chavda, Shri Shiv Datt Upadhyaya, Shri K. P. Kuttikrishnan Nair, Shri Ram Krishan, Shri Jaswantraj Mehta, Shri Bishwa Nath Roy, Shri Raghubar Dayal Misra, Shri Sunder Lal, Dr. Sushila Nayar, Shri M. Muthukrishnan, Shri K. S. Ramaswamy, Shri Jitendra Nath Lahiri, Shri M. K. Shivananjappa, Shri Chintamani Panigrahi, Chaudhary Pratap Singh Daulta, Shri J. M. Mohamed Imam, Shri Laisram Achaw Singh, Shri Balasaheb Patil, Shri Ram Chandra Majhi, Shri Badakumar Pratap Ganga Deb Bamra, Shri Motisinh Bahadursinh Thakore, Shri Nityanand Kanungo and Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri and 15 members from Rajya Sabha;

that in order to constitute a sitting of the Joint Committee the quorum shall be one-third of the total number of members of the Joint Committee;

that the Committee shall make a report to this House by the first day of the next session;

that in other respects the Rules of Procedure of this House relating to Parliamentary Committees will apply with such variations and modifications as the Speaker may make; and

that this House recommends to Rajya Sabha that Rajya Sabha do join the said Joint Committee and communicate to this House the names of members to be appointed by Rajya Sabha to the Joint Committee."

*The motion was adopted.*

### INDIAN STAMP (AMENDMENT) BILL

**The Deputy Minister of Finance**  
 (Shri B. B. Bhagat): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I beg to move:\*

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Stamp Act, 1899, be taken into consideration."

As the House is aware, the Bill was first introduced in the Lok Sabha, on the 26th April, 1958 and it was moved for consideration and also partly discussed. But, in order to provide for an important constitutional provision, it had to be withdrawn. It has been introduced again. This is a simple Bill. I have already on an earlier occasion spoken about it and I do not propose to taken any further time of the House in repeating what I said a few days back.

With these words, I move.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha** (East Khandesh): May I just invite the attention of the hon. Minister that this Bill was withdrawn because the recommendation of the President was not there. He must have, no doubt, obtained the recommendation. But such recommendation is not to be kept in the Ministers pocket. It has to be conveyed to the House. It has not been conveyed to the House.

\*Moved with the recommendation of the President.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** It has been conveyed to the House.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha:** How has it been conveyed? So far as the Bill is concerned, there is no endorsement on the Bill to show that there is the recommendation of the President. We were told that the same Bill may be taken as circulated. Still, there is no endorsement on the Bill.

**Mr. Chairman:** I find in the Bulletin—I was wondering about it—it is said:

“The Indian Stamp (Amendment) Bill, which was introduced on the 26th April, 1958 was withdrawn by the Deputy Minister of Finance by leave of the House on the 30th April, 1958.

The same Bill is being re-introduced on the 2nd May, 1958, with the recommendation of the President under articles 117(1) and 274(1) of the Constitution.”

**Shri Naushir Bharucha:** My submission is this. Such endorsement should be always on the Bill itself. Because, the Bulletin is not really part of the official communication. In the Bulletin so many other non-official things are communicated. This should be part of the Bill and it should be conveyed to the House.

**Mr. Chairman:** I find, so far as the factum is concerned, it is not questioned.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha:** It is question of procedure of communicating.

**Mr. Chairman:** I find the fact is here. I have satisfied myself. He is referring to the endorsement on the Bill itself.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha:** Proper procedure.

**Mr. Chairman:** The Bill by itself does not contain it. I find the practice seems to be to let the Members know through the Bulletin. I have satisfied myself that the hon. Minister has obtained the sanction.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** In this particular case, if we had got printed a new Bill with the sanction of the President, it would have taken some time and meant some avoidable expenditure. We followed this course to avoid that.

**Mr. Chairman:** That is precisely what he wants: to explain why you have done it without putting it on the Bill itself. I hope this satisfies the hon. Member.

**Shri Narayanankutty Menon:** (Mukandapuram): I want to ask one question. Last time also it was said that this Bill was only just to round off when the new coins have been introduced. What was the difficulty as far as the Government is concerned to conform to the computation that the Government is following in payment and receipts and why some other table is there which has no relevance to the equivalent quantum of money in both the columns? Why is this particular method adopted; in which the normal computation rates are not here?

**Mr. Chairman:** What Shri Narayanankutty Menon says, as I have understood him, is.....

**Shri Narayanankutty Menon:** He has understood well. He is just pretending that he has not.....

**Mr. Chairman:** Order, order. Let us not assume. He says, there is a very well recognised method of computation and table of variants, exchangeable categories and why is it that you are departing in this case from that and you have a new table. That is what he wants to know.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** It is not that this Bill is only for rounding off or making merely adjustments. But, it has introduced a new table. We had consulted the various States who are interested in this. The proceeds will go to them. They have agreed to these rates. It is not as if only it is some rounding off or adjustment of old rates in terms of the new coinage. Definitely a new rate is proposed.

**Shri Narayanankutty Menon:** See the Statement of Objects and Reasons.

**Shri Nath Pai (Rajapur):** Sir, I know that hon. Members have addressed themselves to this very cogent phrasing, a euphemistic way of calling rounding off. In the Statement of Objects and Reasons they state:

"Consequent on the introduction of decimal system of coinage, it is considered desirable to amend the Indian Stamp Act, 1899, so as to express the rates of stamp duty specified in the Act and Schedule I thereto in terms of decimal coinage."

The introduction of the decimal coinage is a very welcome move and we are grateful to the Government for taking this bold step. The nation has expressed its gratitude too. Having received our congratulations, why give us this kick in the form of having this very fine subtle trickery?—and I am deliberately using the word.

In clause 4 it is said, "with a duty not exceeding ten *naye paise*". In the first place, I would like to draw his attention to the vagueness. What exactly is meant by not exceeding? It should be very clearly stated what is meant

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** That is the legal phrase.

**Shri Nath Pai:** I will be completing: "with a duty of one" is substituted by "with a duty not exceeding ten *naye paise*". How much is meant where one anna is stated? That is what I want to know.

My very serious objection is this. I know that the hon. Deputy Minister and his senior colleague are very seriously concerned with augmenting the finances of the Government. They have legitimate means open and the House is prepared to give consideration to them. Wherever there is a duty of half an anna under the old Stamp Act, they are substituting it by five *naye paise* and wherever one

anna is mentioned, ten *naye paise*. By what arithmetic or by what logic this special rounding off is done, we would like to be enlightened. This is very serious thing. By a backdoor method, the nation is being taxed more and the euphemistic, cogent, sweet phrase used is rounding off. This is not rounding off. I do not like to use the word robbing;—it is not very parliamentary—so I refrain from using it. Nonetheless, I will insist on being satisfied on this point, by what calculation you round off half an anna to five *naye paise* and one anna to ten *naye paise*. If you calculate it mathematically, you will see the percentage by which you are increasing the duty. He is wanting to say something.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** After you finish.

**Shri Nath Pai:** This roughly works out like this—I would not claim to be mathematically very accurate—if we take into consideration the increase, on a rough estimate, the increase that will be passed on to the man who buys these stamps is to the tune of 60 per cent.

In clause 13 of the new Bill, it is said:

In Schedule I to the principal Act, in entries 13, 14, 27, 37, 47... etc., for the words, letters and figures "half an anna".

What does he ask us to do? Read 5 *naye paise*; for one anna ten *naye paise*. The logic of the whole thing collapses where twelve annas is mentioned. I would like to ask him to convince me. Where twelve annas stands in the old Act, we will be giving 75 *naye paise*. Work your own logic. Five *naye paise* for two old pice or half an anna and ten *naye paise* for one anna. For twelve annas, how much is it? It would work to 120 *naye paise*.

What is the logic? If twelve anna stamps are equal to 75 *naye paise*, how does half an anna become five *naye paise* and how does one anna become ten *naye paise* as you have

[Shri Nath Pai]

put in clause 13. If you proceed like that, then you will have to give 120 naye paise where twelve annas are concerned. I am afraid he will have to satisfy this House about this backdoor taxation, though they are very much in need of money for the Second Five Year Plan. He is shaking his head, but he should shake the foundation of my logic rather than shake his head. I fail to be convinced by any calculation, by any stretch of the imagination, by any jugglery that the old two pice or half an anna stands for five naye paise. Let him try to convince me.

**Shri Narayanankutty Menon:** I did not want to speak at all, but when I read the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Bill, I thought it was innocuous because it said it was rounding off, and when I read the Bill I thought it must be a printing mistake, but now the hon. Deputy Minister, while introducing the Bill has, I may use that phraseology, the audacity to say that the intention of the Bill is to have a direct measure of taxation because when he consulted the State Ministers they were agreeable only to such rounding off of figures. In cases of measures of taxation, whether we agree with them or not, at least the hon. Finance Minister used to come and say that it was a taxation measure. The new Finance Minister has got a philosophy of his own to be frank with himself, and he used to be brutally frank with and he used to be brutally frank sometimes too. But in this measure when he has stated clearly in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that it is a rounding off measure, why should the Deputy Minister come and say that this is a measure of taxation, in order to increase the revenue? I submit this is, to use very mild language, making the hon. Members of this House misinformed about the whole affair. I am using this expression because I fail to get a proper parliamentary usage for this sort of business.

I therefore appeal to the Deputy Minister that the rounding off as he

has done in this Bill is not proper because the Government has followed a certain table. When the ordinary man pays the Government or the Government pays him, there is a table already accepted. After the introduction of the decimal coinage system the country knows about the rounding off of figures, and now if by means of this Bill he is going to introduce a new or novel standard for computation, it is very unfair as far the Members of this House are concerned.

If a taxation measure is to be there, let him give the reasons for the taxation, let him justify that. The House will pass that measure of taxation, but not even one pie from the common man's pocket can be taken away without telling this House that it is a measure of taxation and that it is justifiable. I submit that this is a very unfair means of taxing the people, and Government should have taken extreme care to mention it clearly in the Statement of Objects and Reasons so that we get notice that this is a measure of taxation because the State Governments want it.

I submit that in view of what is written in the Statement of Objects and Reasons of the Bill and lack of notice given to us, this measure is unfair and I hope the hon. Deputy Minister will reconsider these figures which are not in consonance with the ordinary accepted standards of computation.

**Mr. Chairman:** If I may suggest, the hon. Deputy Minister can give a rough idea as to what is likely to be the additional revenue, because I am sure it is not a taxing measure, we are not seeking to augment the revenues. If he states roughly how much it is likely to be, it might help some of the Members. He might inform the House what is likely to be the increase in income as a result of the variation.

**Shri B. E. Bhagat:** I am going to explain. There is going to be some

increase, may be Rs. 50 to Rs. 60 lakhs or even a little more.

**An Hon. Member:** That is rounding off.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** But the point is this. I am sorry I did not repeat the speech that I made while making the motion, although I explained this point fully, and if I had done so, it would not have needed the dramatic logic of the hon. Member and also the harsh words which he used, *viz.*, backdoor taxation.

**Shri Narayanankutty Menon:** I was very, very mild.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I am going to explain that it is essentially rounding off. It is not a measure of taxation, but because of the situation created by the decimal coinage, if you take the multiple at the next lower level, it means a considerable reduction in revenue, and if you take it at the next higher level, it means some increase in the amount of this taxation.

**An. Hon. Member:** Not considerable here?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I will explain. At present one anna is equivalent to 6.25 *naye paise*. It can be either five or ten *naye paise* according as you take the higher or the lower multiple. The hon. Member has suggested that one anna may be rounded off to the lower figure of five *naye paise*. That would mean that one anna is equal to five *naye paise*, two annas is equal to ten, three annas is equal to 15 and six annas is equal to 30. So, it would have meant this. What we have done is that we have taken the next multiple of five.

**Shri Nath Pai:** How? It is far off from six to ten.

**An Hon. Member:** Why?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** I want that hon. Members should have a little patience. Then they would realise the logic of the argument. We have taken the next multiple, not the lower multiple. Instead of five *naye paise* for one anna, we have taken the next multiple

of ten. It is obviously ten and not five. From that point of view, one anna is 10 *naye paise*, two annas 15, three annas 20 and six annas 40.

In this the States are interested, and we have to take the consent of the various States who would be the beneficiaries of this legislation. They were not all prepared for a reduction in revenue out of this. If we had taken the multiple of five, there would have been a consequent reduction in revenue. Rounding off can be either at five or ten, it cannot be at any other stage.

**Shri Narayanankutty Menon:** Why not at seven?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** It would have meant fraction and all consequent complications all along the line. Now we have stopped at four annas or eight annas. Even seven would have meant some increase in revenue.

**Shri Nath Pai:** Yes, something.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** So, the bottom of the logic that it is a taxation measure is knocked out. Unless we reduce the figure, any other rounding off will increase it to some extent. So, I say it is a change in the rate, because in the very nature of it, the multiple is such that if you fix it at the next point, there would be some consequent increase in the figure. Therefore, it is neither backdoor taxation, nor is it coming suddenly and surprising the House with this measure in the garb of something, but it is purely an adjustment in terms of the new coinage which we call—though the hon. Member is allergic to it—rounding off. It is really rounding off, the multiple being five and not one, two or three. So, it means a little change.

**Shri Nath Pai:** It is sixty per cent more. From six to ten *naye paise* is an increase of 60 per cent.

**Shri B. B. Bhagat:** You cannot have a multiple of one or two or three without creating other complexities. We would not solve the problem by having any other multiple.

**Shri. Narayankutty Menon:** Rounding off means making a fraction whole. That is all.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** The next stage of rounding off would be ten only. It cannot be done by six, seven, eight or nine.

**Shri Nanshir Bharucha:** Why can it not be done?

15 hrs.

**श्री सिहासम सिंह (गोरखपुर) :** समा-पति महोदय, इस इंडियन स्टाम्प (अमेंडमेंट) बिल के जो उद्देश्य हैं उनमें और विशेषक के अन्दर जो व्यवस्था की जा रही है उन दोनों में महान भेद है। उद्देश्य और विशेषक दोनों के अन्दर समानता होनी चाहिये। बिल के उद्देश्य में कहा गया है कि पुराने पैसों को नये पैसों में संतुलन करना है लेकिन मेरा जहाँ तक खयाल है जिस समय यह डिसमल क्वायनेज जारी किया गया था और इसका कानून पाम किया गया था ता उसमें तीन वर्ष की अवधि दी गई थी कि उस मियाद के अन्दर सब पुराने पैसों को हटा कर नये पैसों का स्थान ले लेंगे; उसी वक्त पुराने और नये पैसों का संतुलन किया गया था और १ आने को ६ नये पैसों के बराबर माना गया था लेकिन पॉस्ट आफिसेज ने बावजूद इसके कि गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से यह हिदायत मिलने के कि इनके पुराने पैसों इनके नये पैसों के बराबर हींसे उन्होंने ३ पैसों के पॉस्ट काट को ५ नये पैसों का कर दिया और ६ पैसों वाले लिफाफों को राउन्ड अप करके १० नये पैसों का कर दिया। इस तरह उन्होंने जहाँ हिस्से में साठे चार आता था वहाँ ५ कर दिया और जहाँ साठे ६ आता था वहाँ ६ पैसों का लिफाफा साठे ६ नये पैसों का बनता था उसको राउन्ड अप करके १० नये पैसों का कर दिया। लेकिन ६ नये पैसों का जो एक आता है उसका १० नये पैसों के राउन्ड अप हो गया? डिसमल

क्वायन के मानी यह हुये कि १०० नये पैसों का हमारा १ रुपया होगा तो हमारी हर एक डिजिट राउन्ड अप है। और अपने स्थान पर सही है और हर एक में दस गुने का भाग हो सकता है। अगर हम ७ पैसों लिखते हैं तो हमें १०० के अन्दर कोई दिक्कत नहीं होती। ६ पैसों का राउन्ड अप १ आना था। जो २ पैसों का टिकट है उसके लिये ३ नये पैसों दे देते हैं और उसमें कोई दिक्कत नहीं हो रही है। जब हमारा स्मॉलस्ट क्वायन एक पैसा है और १०० के अंश १ के राउन्ड अप होने में कोई दिक्कत नहीं होती थी। अब यह बिल किस कारण लाया गया है और इसका उद्देश्य क्या है अगर यह साफ हो जाय तो ज्यादा उचित होगा। मंत्री महोदय ईमानदारी से यह साफ साफ कहें कि हम इस बिल के जरिये में कुछ अधिक पैसा ग्राहकों से लेना चाहते हैं तो वह समझ में आने वाली बात है और आप जनता पर यह भार टाल सकते हैं और वह उमका बहुत कर लेंगे। लेकिन सिर्फ संतुलन के नाम पर आप कर बढ़ा देंगे यह बात कुछ जाभा नहीं दर्ता है। यह कहने में कोई दिक्कत नहीं है कि आज में १ आने का जो रमोटी टिकट हुआ करता था वह अब १ आने का न हो कर १० नये पैसों का होगा और जो २ पैसों का टिकट था वह अब ३ नये पैसों का न हो कर आज में ५ नये पैसों का होगा। जो कुछ आपकी मंशा है उसको साफ साफ कहें। जहाँ जनता आपको हजारी टैक्स देती है वहाँ आप अगर इसके लिये उमको कहें तो वह यह टैक्स भी बढ़ाकर कर लेंगी। लेकिन यह बात कुछ ठीक नहीं जचनी है कि अन्दर के फेर में बात कुछ और कहें और फल कुछ और हीं हो। इसलिये मैं ना मंत्री महोदय से अनुरोध करूंगा कि हमारी करनी और कथनी दोनों में समानता होनी चाहिये। अगर कोई आदमी इस बिल के आबजेक्ट ऐंड रीजन्स को पढ़े और उसके प्रोपोजिबल को पढ़े, दोनों को पढ़ने में मालूम होगा कि हममें कोई खास

चाँद नहीं है, कोई खास तबय्यजह देने की बात नहीं है लेकिन विधेयक के अन्दर अगर वे देखें तो उसमें बड़ा अन्तर हो जाता है और ५० या ६० परसेंट का फर्क पड़ जाता है, यह ठीक नहीं है। आप साफ़ साफ़ कहें कि हम इतना बढ़ाना चाहते हैं और नये स्टाम्प मेज़र्स को यह दर होगी और उनको हम सब पाम कर देंगे, नीचे गोंध्र डम चीज़ को कहें और राउन्ड अप के नाम पर न कहें। गोल करने के नाम पर टेढ़ा न करें। जो हमारे एग्जम्प्लेट ग्रेट रीजेंस में है जो हमारे प्री-एम्बल में है और जो हमारे विधेयक के अन्दर है उनमें भिन्नता नहीं होनी चाहिये बल्कि उनमें समानता होनी चाहिये क्योंकि इस तरह की भिन्नता रहने में हमारे प्रांत लोगों की ग्राम्था कुछ्र कम होती है और लोगों को फ्रिटिमिज़म करने और भला बुरा कहने का मौका मिलता है। हमें ऐसा मौका नहीं देना चाहिये। वम मुझे इतना ही कहना है।

**Shri Balasaheb Patil (Miraj):** Even accepting the logic of the Deputy Finance Minister.....

**Shri Nath Pai:** Was there any?

**Shri Balasaheb Patil:**.....the logic of rounding off, we find that there is a further difficulty about this, because the old coins are to remain up to 1960.

If we look at sub-clause (2) of clause 2 we find:

"It shall come into force on such date as the Central Government may, by notification in the Official Gazette, appoint."

So, this Bill is not going to be put into effect immediately. So, what is the difficulty in the way of the State Government or the Central Government rounding off at this particular time?

Therefore, I would urge the Deputy Minister to tell us at what time this will be made applicable, so that we can understand the further implications of that also.

**Shri C. K. Nair (Outer Delhi):** After our having accepted the decimal system as a fundamental principle, this rounding off of these small pies to multiples of 5 nP seems to be very reasonable and sensible. If half an anna is raised to 5 nP we may ask why not one anna reduced to 5 nP. We may certainly ask that question. If it is 4 nP instead of 3 nP or if it is 7 nP instead of one anna valuing 6 nP and some fraction, it will always create trouble and difficulties in calculation. Therefore, it is very sensible, after having accepted this decimal system, to accept multiples of 5 nP. Of course, if the difference or the increment in revenue is so great as Rs. 50 to 60 lakhs, then we can reasonably ask why one anna should not be reduced to 5 nP which is also a multiple of five and which also is rounding off. Of course, in that case, you have to calculate what the difference in revenue will be. This is a sensible argument that arises out of the principle that has been accepted, namely of having the decimal system. And this is what has been accepted here also in the DTS tickets always multiples of five. So, I think that is sensible.

**Shri Narayanankutty Menon:** It is not so much in DTS.

**Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri (Nabadwip):** I have also given notice of an amendment on the lines of what the hon Member has said. I think the general principle in rounding off the existing coinage into decimal coinage is to round off to the nearest figure. As far as that is applied, we have no objection to the rounding off taking place: it is always a matter of great convenience. But if we look at the provisions in the Bill, we find that the excess that will accrue to Government will be 40 per cent in the case of the rounding off of half an anna, 20 per cent in the case of 2 annas, 5 per cent in the case of 3 annas, and  $7\frac{1}{2}$  per cent in the case of 6 annas. But the nearest figure for one anna is 5 nP. Why should a 6 nP stamp not be made into a 5 nP stamp instead of its being made to a 10 nP stamp? For, that is the revenue stamp that is

[Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri]

used to the greatest extent by the common man. And any increase in this will mean a hardship to the common people. If it is made into 5 nP, the loss that may be incurred thereby will be set off by the increase in revenue that will accrue by the other increases. So, I would certainly urge Government to look into this aspect and accept my amendment, which they never seem to do anywhere. By rounding off the 6 nP stamp to a 5 nP stamp, they can bring some relief to the common man, because that is the revenue stamp that is used on the Rs. 250 deeds or whatever it is.

Another point that I would like to urge is in regard to the period of six months that has been given within which one can convert the old stamps into new stamps. I would submit that six months is too small a period, because it may not be possible to change the stamps during that period. As you know, much trouble is occurring every day over the old coinage and the new coinage that has been on for some time; and a tram conductor's ear has been cut off over an alteration on the taking and giving of change. So, I think a period of one year should be allowed.

In conclusion, I would repeat that the one anna stamp should be reduced to 5 nP stamp, and not increased to 10 nP stamp so as not to increase the hardship of the people. What is the difficulty in Government printing a 6 nP stamp?

**Shri C. K. Nair:** There is no difficulty at all.

**Shrimati Ila Palchoudhuri:** There is no difficulty at all. Why should they not do so? Instead of its being increased, let it even remain the same; there will be no objection, and even that would be better. But, certainly, it should be rounded off to 5 nP and not increased to 10 nP.

**Shri B. B. Bhagat:** I am sorry I gave the impression to the House that this measure was in the nature of a taxation measure in the garb of a

rounding-off measure. I would like to explain the position further so that this impression may go, and I hope that when I have finished my speech, that impression would go. Shri Sinhasan Singh also gave a piece of advice to Government that Government should not do this, because it creates a bad impression.

I am grateful to him for that. That is exactly my purpose. I would like to explain it a little further why the multiple of 10 instead of 5 was kept and how it is that we have no option at present but to bring forward this Bill. When I mentioned the figure of Rs. 60 lakhs, I did not mean that Rs. 60 lakhs would come out of this measure. Part of it is in the State list, like the stamp duty on agricultural property. This consists only of negotiable instruments like bills of exchange and others. It is bifurcated. Part of it is completely under State control. They have full jurisdiction over that list. Some of the States have already converted from the old coinage to the new. They have introduced this rate of 10 nP for one anna. This has been done in consultation with all the States. The major States are unwilling to have any reduction in revenue. An hon. Member asked, why not have the multiple of 5 instead of 10? I would ask her to request the State from which she comes to accept that proposition. Some of the States have already enacted legislation. If we do it differently, there will be a lot of difficulties and complexities.

So when I mentioned the figure of Rs. 60 lakhs, all that does not come from this Bill. The Centre's part would be roughly estimated at say Rs. 3 or Rs. 4 lakhs. As a result of this changeover all over India, both the State and the Central revenue would amount to Rs. 60 lakhs or a little more by way of increase. So it is not a taxation measure that we are introducing through this Bill. At the most, a few lakhs may be the figure as a result of this rounding off



measure. I hope this removes the wrong impression that has been created.

Secondly, a question was asked: why not fix 7 instead of 10? 5 is half of 10. What would be half of 7? It would be a fraction. Such a change will in any case mean withdrawing this Bill and fresh consultation with all the States. The States have already given their consent and they have already gone forward with their legislation.

So there are great practical difficulties. If the House wants that the changeover should take place from the old coinage to the decimal system, we should proceed with this now. An Hon. Member has said that the decimal coinage has created so many anomalies and we must remove them. We are doing it on all fronts. We are doing it by withdrawing all the old coins as speedily as possible. We are doing it by removing this anomaly in stamp duty also. The intention is to switch over *in toto* to the new coinage, whether it be with respect to stamp revenue or coinage.

I think the hon. lady Member referred to the period of six months prescribed and asked why such a period has been prescribed for the changeover. Another hon. Member said that under clause 2, the Bill will not take effect immediately it is passed, but sometime will be taken. I do not think in a Bill of this nature we can be so strict. The time is left flexible. No time is fixed. But the intention is to apply it as quickly as possible. Our intention was to apply it with effect from 1st April. But now 1st April is already gone. Now our intention is to apply it with effect from 1st June. We have printed the new stamps. It is our intention not to postpone it, but to apply it as quickly as possible.

So far as the six-month period is concerned, it is fixed because under the existing Act for refund in respect of any old stamps, the period prescribed is six months. We have followed that. It is not as if the stamps are

not there. The new stamps are there. The stamps are generally kept by institutions like banks who negotiate negotiable instruments or stamp vendors who keep stocks. It would be easy for them to convert old stamps into new quickly at the new rates within this period. So there would be no hardship caused. The six month period is quite reasonable.

With these few words, I would again request the House not to think that we have come to it for back-door taxation through this legislation. It is merely a rounding off measure, only to effect the new adjustments in view of decimal coinage. Because in the very nature of things the States are interested, we have had consultations with them. Some State legislatures have already adopted this rate. We can only adopt this multiple of 5, not 7 which will lead to a fraction. It would be either 5 or 10. If it is 5, it would mean reduction in revenue to the States. They are vitally concerned with revenue and no State is going to agree to any reduction of revenue. So it can only be 10.

Under these circumstances we have adopted this rate. I hope with this explanation, the fears that had been created in the minds of hon. Members would be removed.

**Shri Nath Pai:** They have been confirmed.

**Shri Narayanankutty Menon:** The hon. Minister had said that the total expectation of revenue under this would be Rs. 60 lakhs. Now he says that so far as the Centre is concerned, the total revenue would be Rs. 4 lakhs.

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** About Rs. 4 lakhs.

**Shri Narayanankutty Menon:** Is it not a fact that the increase in revenue, whether it is to the Centre or to the States, would come to Rs. 60 lakhs?

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** Yes, so far as the whole of India is concerned.

(Shri B. R. Bhagat)

I said that the increase so far as this measure is concerned is only with respect to the Centre's sphere, that is, the Central List. Then there are 13 or 14 States; they have their own legislation. They will pass it. The cumulative effect would be some Rs. 60 lakhs or so. To mix up that amount of Rs. 60 lakhs with the yield from this measure is not correct.

**Shri C. K. Nair:** Are the recommendations from the States sent after consulting us or after passing them in their legislatures? This is the supreme legislature which has to decide for the whole country. Are we to decide this here or are the States to decide?

**Mr. Chairman:** The Minister wanted to impress on the House that so far as the States were concerned, in regard to the subjects over which they had jurisdiction, some of them had already enacted laws declaring a one anna stamp equivalent to 10 nP and so on. Here we are falling in line with the legislation which has already come into existence. It is no doubt true that this conversion is a revenue getter, but it is not primarily a revenue getter. It is only incidentally that some more money is coming.

**Shri Sonavane (Sholapur-Reserved-Sch. Castes):** Could not one anna be rounded off to 5 nP and half anna be rounded off to 5 nP, so that what-

ever loss is incurred in the conversion of the former could be compensated by the gain in the conversion of the latter? This would mean neither gain nor loss. At the same time, the public would not have been made to pay more.

**Mr. Chairman:** I think it has been sufficiently answered. This is part of the teething trouble consequent on the changeover to the new system of coinage. You cannot really have a linking method for the Centre alone.

**Shri Sonavane:** Here is a better method, instead of raising half anna to 10 nP which is something too much.

**Shri Nath Pai:** It is very unjust, very unwarranted.

**Mr. Chairman:** I think it has been sufficiently discussed. I shall now put the motion for consideration to the vote of the House.

15:21 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Stamp Act, 1899, be taken into consideration."

*The Lok Sabha divided.* Ayes 120, Noes 29.

[15.24 hrs.]

Division No. 12]

#### AYFS

Abdul Lateef, Shri  
Ajit Singh Sarhad, Shri  
Ambalam, Shri Subbiah  
Anandh Sinha, Shri  
Arumugham, Shri R. S.  
Arumugham, Shri S. R.  
Ashanna, Shri  
Babunath Singh, Shri  
Bahadur Singh, Shri  
Banerji, Shri P. B.  
Barman, Shri  
Barupal, Shri P. L.  
Basappa, Shri  
Bhagat, Shri B. R.  
Bhagavati, Shri  
Birbal Singh, Shri  
Borooah, Shri P. C.  
Brajeshwar Prasad, Shri

Chandra Shanker, Shri  
Chaturvedi, Shri  
Choudhry, Shri C. I.  
Chunni Lal, Shri  
Damani, Shri  
Das, Shri K. K.  
Das, Shri N. T.  
Dasappa, Shri  
Desai, Shri Morari  
Dube, Shri Mulchand  
Dubliish, Shri  
Dwivedi, Shri M. L.  
Ganapathy, Shri  
Gandhi, Shri M. M.  
Ganga Devi, Shrimati  
Gounder, Shri K. Periaswami  
Govind Das, Seth  
Iqbal Singh, Sardar

Jangde, Shri  
Jhunjhunwala, Shri  
Imachandran, Shri  
Jyotsulu, Pandit J. P.  
Kalika Singh, Shri  
Kotaki, Shri Liladhar  
Kedaria, Shri C. M.  
Khan, Shri Osman Ali  
Khedkar, Dr. G. B.  
Khimji, Shri  
Kistaiya, Shri  
Krishna, Shri M. R.  
Krishna Chandra, Shri  
Kureel, Shri B. N.  
Lachhu Ram, Shri  
Laskar, Shri N. C.  
Laxmi Bai, Shrimati  
Mafida Ahmed, Shrimati

Malviya, Shri K. B.  
 Malviya, Shri Motilal  
 Mathur, Shri Harish Chandra  
 Mehta, Shrimati Krishna  
 Minimata, Shrimati  
 Mishra, Shri B. D.  
 Mohiuddin, Shri  
 Morarka, Shri  
 Murmu, Shri Paika  
 Murti, Shri M. S.  
 Naidu, Shri Govindarajulu  
 Nair, Shri C. K.  
 Nair, Shri Kuttikrishnan  
 Nehru, Shri Jawaharlal  
 Nehru, Shrimati Uma  
 Neswi, Shri  
 Padalu, Shri K. V.  
 Palchoudhuri, Shrimati Ila  
 Parmar, Shri Deen Bandhu  
 Patel, Shri Rameshwar  
 Patil, Shri S. K.  
 Pattabhi Raman, Shri

Assar, Shri  
 Banerjee, Shri Pramathanath  
 Banerjee, Shri S. M.  
 Bharucha, Shri Naushir  
 Braj Raj Singh, Shri  
 Brij Narayan "Brijesh", Pandit  
 Chakravarty, Shrimati Renu  
 Dige, Shri  
 Ghosal, Shri  
 Ghose, Shri Subman

Pillai, Shri Thanu  
 Prabhakar, Shri Naval  
 Raghur Sahai, Shri  
 Raghunath Singh, Shri  
 Raghuramaiah, Shri  
 Rajiah, Shri  
 Ram Saran, Shri  
 Ramaswamy, Shri K. S.  
 Rampure, Shri  
 Ranbir Singh, Ch.  
 Rane, Shri  
 Ranga Shri  
 Rangarao, Shri  
 Raut, Shri Bholu  
 Reddy, Shri Rami  
 Reddy, Shri Biswanatha  
 Roy, Shri Bishwanath  
 Rungsung Suisa, Shri  
 Sahu, Shri Rameshwar  
 Salam, Shri Abdul  
 Samantsinhar, Dr.  
 Sen, Shri ' G.

Godsora, Shri S. C.  
 Goundar, Shri Shanmuga  
 Imam, Shri Mohamed  
 Kar, Shri Prabhat  
 Katti, Shri D. A.  
 Krishnaswami, Dr.  
 Kunhan, Shri  
 Matera, Shri  
 Matin, Qazi  
 Menon, Shri Narayanankutty

Shankaraiya, Shri  
 Sharma, Shri D. C.  
 Siddananiappa, Shri  
 Siddiah, Shri  
 Singh, Shri D. N.  
 Sinha, Shri Sarangdhara  
 Sinha, Shri Satyendra Narayan  
 Sinha, Shrimati Tarkeshwari  
 Sonawane, Shri  
 Subbaravan, Dr. P.  
 Subramanyam, Shri T.  
 Sunder Lal Shri  
 Tariq, Shri A. M.  
 Tewari, Shri Dwarikanath  
 Thimmaiah, Shri  
 Tiwari, Shri R. S.  
 Tiwary, Shri D. N.  
 Upadhyaya, Shri Shiva Datu  
 Vedakumari, Kumari M.  
 Venkatasubbaiah, Shri  
 Wodeyar, Shri.

#### NOES

Nath Pai, Shri  
 Parulekar, Shri  
 Patil Shri Bala Saheb  
 Patil, Shri U. L.  
 Rai, Shri Khushwaqt  
 Ram Garib, Shri  
 Siva Raj, Shri  
 Valvi, Shri  
 Verma, Shri Ramu

*The motion was adopted.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** we will now take up clause-by-clause consideration.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha:** Sir, I rise on a point of order, this time in favour of the Government. All the amendments except 7 and 15 are out of order.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Nobody disputes it.

**Shri Naushir Bharucha:** They require the recommendation of the President under article 274 when they vary the State's share of the duty, even by reducing the share.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I entirely agree with the hon. Member. Now, the question is:

"That clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clause 2 was added to the Bill.*

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That clauses 3 to 13, clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title stand part of the Bill".

*The motion was adopted.*

*Clauses 3 to 13, Clause 1, the Enacting Formula and the Title were added to the Bill.*

**Shri B. R. Bhagat:** Sir, I beg to move:

"That the Bill be passed".

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Motion moved:

"That the Bill be passed."

श्री बजराम सिंह (फ़िरोज़ाबाद) :  
 उपाध्यक्ष महोदय. इस बिल को तो हम पास करने जा रहे हैं, परन्तु हम सम्बन्ध में एक निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ श्रीर बह  
 यह है कि हम अप्रत्यक्ष कर बहुत बढ़ाये जा

[श्री बजर्राज सिंह]

रहे हैं, जिनका ग्राम जनता पर बहुत असर पड़ता है। इस सदन में बार बार यह बात उठाई जाती है कि अप्रत्यक्ष करों में बढ़ावती रही है। जब अप्रत्यक्ष करों में वृद्धि का सवाल आता है, तो उसका विरोध विरोधी दल की तरफ से नहीं होता है, वरन् उसका विरोध होता है सरकारी पार्टी की तरफ से।

मैं यह निवेदन करूंगा कि यह कहना कि जहाँ एक ग्राम है, वहाँ पर पांच नये पैसे न रखे जायें, बल्कि दस नए पैसे रखे जायें, सिद्धान्त की बात नहीं मालूम होती है। होना यह चाहिये कि जिधर कम हो, उधर ही निश्चित कर दिया जाना चाहिये। हमारे नये कायनेज में छः नये पैसे का कोई सिक्का नहीं है—पांच नये पैसे का है और दस नये पैसे का है। जहाँ एक ग्राम था, वहाँ पांच नये पैसे रखे जा सकते थे और इस तरह में कुछ गहृत दी जा सकती थी उन लोगों को—ग्राम जनता को, जिन पर इसका असर पड़ता है। इसके बजाय एक ग्राम की जगह पर, जिसके छः नये पैसे होते हैं, दस नये पैसे रखे जा रहे हैं। ग्राम जनता पर जिस बात का असर पड़ता है, उधर सरकार कोई ध्यान देने की कोशिश नहीं करती है। ये बहुत छोटी छोटी बातें हैं, लेकिन इसका असर पड़ता है ग्राम जनता पर, छोटे छोटे व्यक्तियों पर। अगर हम आंकड़े लें, तो पता चलेगा कि समृद्ध, बड़े लोगों पर, जिनका प्रतिशत एक से अधिक नहीं होगा, इसका बहुत कम असर पड़ता है और बाकी के ९९ फी मदी लोगों पर, जिनको मध्यम वर्ग या गरीब कहा जाता है, इसका अधिक असर पड़ेगा।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Order, order. I suppose my voice does not reach the hon. Members who are so busy in their talks.

**Shri Nath Pai:** That originates from one section of the House.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** It is on all sides. There is another hon. Member standing in the passage here.

**Shri Nath Pai:** Sorry, he could not see.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I did not mean him.

**श्री बजर्राज सिंह :** मैं सिर्फ यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि इस तरह के विधेयक लाने में पहले सरकार को हमेशा यह दृष्टिकोण सामने रखना चाहिये कि इसका असर ग्राम जनता पर पड़ता है या कुछ निहित स्वार्थ वाले लोगों पर पड़ता है। अगर ग्राम जनता पर पड़ता हो, तो इस बात का ध्यान रखना चाहिये कि पिछले दरवाजे में उन पर कोई ऐसा बोझ न डाल दिया जाय, जिसको वह देख नहीं सकती है। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि छः नये पैसे के बजाय दस नये पैसे देना पिछले दरवाजे में उस पर एक ऐसा बोझ डाल देना है, जिसको वह देख नहीं सकती है, लेकिन जिसका असर उस पर पड़ता है। सरकारी पार्टी को इस तरह का कोई बिल लाने में पहले हमेशा इस बात का ध्यान रखना चाहिये कि इसका असर ग्राम जनता पर पड़ता है, या कुछ लोगों पर। अगर इसका असर कुछ ही लोगों पर पड़े, तो हमारी तरफ से उसका विरोध नहीं होगा। हम चाहते हैं कि मुल्क के विकास और निर्माण के लिये ज्यादा साधन उपलब्ध हों। अभी कल ही हमने देखा कि जब मुल्क के विकास के लिये धन हासिल करने का प्रश्न सामने आया, तो उसका विरोध हम विरोधी दल के लोग नहीं कर रहे थे, बल्कि सरकारी पार्टी की तरफ से उसका विरोध हो रहा था।

सरकारी पार्टी की तरफ से कहा जाता है कि बूँक नये कायनेज में छः नये पैसे का सिक्का नहीं है, इसलिये इसको दस नये पैसे कर रहे हैं। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि दस नये पैसे के बजाय पांच नये पैसे किया

जा सकता था । यह दृष्टिकोण हमेशा सामने रखना चाहिये, जिससे आम जनता पर, जिस पर आप बार बार बोझ बढ़ाते जा रहे हैं, बोझ कम हो और जिस समाजवादी व्यवस्था की तरफ हम बढ़ना चाहते हैं, उसकी तरफ हम बाकई बढ़ सकें ।

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The question is:

"That the Bill be passed."

*The motion was adopted.*

**MOTION RE: REPORTS OF THE INDIAN AIRLINES CORPORATION AND THE AIR INDIA INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION**

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** We can take up the discussion half-an-hour earlier—we will be free half an hour earlier—and I suppose there will be no objection.

**Shri Rajendra Singh (Chapra):** Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the efficient and well-phased development of civil aviation helps to impart strength not only to our military requirements but also to our developing economy. Looking at the performance that the two corporations have so far made, I feel distressed and disappointed.

Sir, while the corporations were being brought into existence the Minister concerned had assured the House that while in keeping with the special and peculiar requirements of the international reputation we are, for the time being, having two corporations, at a certain level of development both these corporations would be amalgamated together. Four precious years have rolled by and many changes have occurred since then. From the economic view point it was imperative to bring these two organisations together so that we could cut down much of our superfluous expenditure. It seems that either the Minister has forgotten his assurance, or those who are concerned with the management and the execution of these enterprises do not feel it neces-

sary to look at the economic aspect of these enterprises.

The Estimates Committee as well as certain committees on the development of civil aviation had suggested that well-balanced development of civil aviation could not be achieved unless we have side by side a research and development section which could cater to the increasing industrial needs of the air corporations. When I look at the reports, I find that even here our performance has not been anything but distressing and disappointing.

It was agreed—and the Estimates Committee had also made a clear suggestion to that effect—that Corporations should be, as far as possible, freed from the octopus of departmental officials. It seems the Minister concerned or the men who are responsible for running these enterprises have conveniently forgotten it. So far we have not taken any measures to see to it that the men who can actually deliver the goods are put in there. Only the officials, just as a matter of customary duty, are put in there. This has retarded the growth of the corporations as well as civil aviation.

You will find, Sir, that the annual reports clearly show to what extent we are incurring losses. Only a few days before I had a talk with a very high official of one of the corporations and he told me that so far as the losses were concerned no improvement could be made unless rebate is granted on oil and fuel. Naturally, I went into the details of the reports and made anxious enquiries whether we could not make certain improvements by effecting economy in our expenditure. My enquiries have revealed certain things which could be termed scandalous, to say the least. I shall come to them later.

Sir, certain suggestions made by the Estimates Committee to bring about economy in the operation and