

[Shri Datar.]

Police Service (Pay) Rules, 1954.

- (5) Notification No. S.R.O. 855, dated the 23rd March, 1957, making certain amendments to the All India Services (Provident Fund) Rules, 1955.
- (6) Notification No. S.R.O. 856, dated the 23rd March, 1957, making certain amendment to the All India Services (Conduct) Rules, 1954.
- (7) Notification No. S.R.O. 1152, dated the 13th April, 1957, making certain amendment to Schedule III-C to the Indian Police (Pay) Rules, 1954.
- (8) Notification No. S.R.O. 1370, dated the 4th May, 1957, making certain amendment to the Indian Administrative Service (Recruitment) Rules, 1954.
- (9) Notification No. S.R.O. 1371, dated 4th May, 1957, making certain amendment to the Indian Police Service (Recruitment) Rules, 1954.
- (10) Notification No. S.R.O. 1372, dated the 4th May, 1957, making certain amendments to the All India Services (Conduct) Rules, 1954.

(Placed in Library See No. S-46/57).

AMENDMENTS TO CENTRAL EXCISES RULES 1954.

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): I beg to lay on the Table, under section 38 of the Central Excises and Salt Act, 1944, a copy of each of the following Notifications making certain further amendments to the Central Excise Rules, 1944:—

- (1) Notification No. S.R.O. 1040-A, dated the 6th April, 1957.
 - (2) Notification No. S.R.O. 1040-B, dated the 8th April, 1957.
- (Placed in Library. See No. S-47/57).

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

Mr. Speaker: I have received the following message from the President:—

"I have received with great satisfaction the expression of thanks by the Members of the Lok Sabha for the Address I delivered to both the Houses of Parliament assembled together on the 13th May, 1957."

STATEMENT RE. FINANCE (NO. 2) BILL

The Minister of Finance (Shri T. T. Krishnamachari): In the Finance (No. 2) Bill, 1957, introduced by me on the 15th May, 1957, certain increases were proposed on the Customs duty on newsprint and Customs and Excise duties on Kerosene. According to the declaration made under the provisions of the Provisional Collection of Taxes Act, 1931, these duties came into force with immediate effect.

In the case of the Customs duty on newsprint as contained in the Finance Bill which has the effect of raising the duty this was an error. In the final compilation of the Customs duties and their incorporation in the Finance Bill, the error seems to have arisen from the fact of my having stated expressly that Customs duty on newsprint should not be raised but the emphasis seems to have been lost. I have rectified this error by a notification issued under Section 23 of the Sea Customs Act on the 18th May, 1957.

In the case of the Excise duty on Kerosene, as the House will be aware, the duty was raised from 18.75 nP per Imperial Gallon to 20 nP per Imperial Gallon. The effect of this fractional increase should not have gone towards increase in the retail selling price of kerosene as this additional duty adds about one-fifth of a nP or thereabouts to a bottle of kerosene oil. However, the prices seem to have been raised and what

was in effect a fractional increase to round up a figure was being utilised for the purpose of making the retail prices go up. The consequences of such increase in the retail prices would, I am afraid, have mal-effects over a very wide field. I have, therefore, taken the liberty of restoring the status quo in regard to the duty on kerosene.

Shri Mahanty (Dhenkanal): May I make a submission, Sir? We would like to know what the country has paid for the little error committed by the Finance Minister between the date when the budget proposals were made and the date of the withdrawal. The poor consumers have had to pay....

Mr. Speaker: What is the necessity for all the explanation? A single question: what is the amount that has been gathered by this error.

Shri Mahanty: How much the country has paid for this error....

Mr. Speaker: The country alone pays none else.

Shri T. T. Krishnamachari: So far as Customs duty on newsprint is concerned, I understand—I cannot be positive—that goods have not been cleared under this new duty because, I think, everybody anticipated that it would be an error. If at all duty has been collected, it will be refunded. Nobody would pay anything because of this error. So far as increase in duty on kerosene oil, as I have said, it should not have gone toward increasing the price because it is one-fifth of a naya paisa per bottle, but if somebody had taken advantage of it, all that I can say is I am very sorry for it. I know that in the first matter it is an error and therefore I take the responsibility for it. In the second matter, naturally if I had made a change, I would have made an announcement in the House before I made a change, but it was to minimise the disadvantage for it. I know that in the first matter it is an error and therefore I take the responsibility for it. In to the public that we had to issue

the notification to restore the status quo. May be retailers charge far more than what they should as they do in many cases, but I am afraid I can only say I am sorry for it. It is not a matter in which I can trace the fault to any particular individual.

Shri Tyagi (Dehra Dun) rose.

Mr. Speaker: What all hon. Members have to say can be said on the floor of the House during the budget discussion.

Shri Tyagi: I wanted to raise an issue of our procedure. While we all welcome the statement of the Finance Minister about the reduction of duties he had levied, announcements of this nature from day to day on one account or the other are, in my opinion, not very regular. What I feel is....

Mr. Speaker: Whatever the hon. Member may feel, what is the point of order?

Shri Tyagi: My point of order is, that the House already being in possession of the Bill, is it open to the Government or any Minister to change the Bill in this manner? I want to have a clarification. Suppose tomorrow there is some pressure from another section of the market, then again another change will come the next day, which means instead of Parliament changing the Bill, it is the market, the retail seller, who can effectively change the taxation measure. Will that be proper?

Mr. Speaker: There are two points. Firstly, the hon. Minister has made the statement. No point of order was raised against making the statement here. He has made the statement. The further issue is whether he could have acted independently; whether once the Bill is introduced in the House, the sponsor can change it of his own accord. I shall consider whether it is a point of order, or whether it has to be raised in some other form.

What is a point of order? A point of order when it is raised must

[Mr. Speaker]

obstruct the further proceedings of the House. He has made the statement. There is no objection to any hon. Minister making a statement, but whether the action that is embedded in the statement or which the statement explains to the House is proper or not cannot be raised by way of a point of order so far as the statement is concerned. I am not in a position to suggest what further action can be taken in this regard. I can only say that the previous Finance Minister also from time to time was yielding to the pressure of public opinion. Of course, sometimes it is appreciated. Very often it is appreciated that the Finance Minister instead of being wooden is reacting to representations made from time to time. These are all matters which can be taken up during the debate on the budget. There is no point of order.

ESTIMATES COMMITTEE

SIXTY-EIGHTH REPORT

Secretary: The Chairman, Estimates Committee (1956-57) presented to the Speaker on 29th March, 1957, the 68th Report of the Committee on the Ministry of Defence—Ordnance Factories (Stores, Plant & Machinery and Production) which was approved at their sitting held on the same day. The Committee requested the Speaker to make corrections in the Report that might become necessary as a result of factual verification by the Ministry of Defence.

The Report has since been factually verified and minor corrections have been carried out in it under Speaker's orders. The Speaker has ordered the printing, publication and circulation of this Report under Rule 280 of the Rules of Procedure.

I lay a copy of the Report on the Table of the House. A few cyclo-styled copies are being made available to Members for reference in the Library. The printed copies will be available later.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS COMMITTEE

TWENTY-FIFTH REPORT

Secretary: The Public Accounts Committee at their sitting held on the 22nd March, 1957 had authorised the Chairman to finalise their Twenty-fifth Report on the 'Import and Sale of Japanese Cloth'. He approved and signed the Report on the 3rd April, 1957, and presented it to the Speaker the same day. The Speaker ordered the printing, publication and circulation of this Report under Rule 280 of the Rules of Procedure.

I now lay a copy of the Report on the Table of the House. A limited number of cyclostyled copies are available to Members for distribution. The printed copies will be made available later on.

Shri Mohamed Imam (Chitaldrug): May I know when the Reports of the Estimates Committee will come up for consideration?

Mr. Speaker: The hon. Member is new to the House. He has to look into the rules.

Shri Mohamed Imam: When will these reports come up for consideration in the House?

Mr. Speaker: The Reports of the Estimates Committee are not taken up for consideration here, formally.

Shri Mohamed Imam: I wanted to know when these two reports will be taken up for discussion.

Mr. Speaker: They can be discussed. But the procedure is this. The practice has not been for the House to discuss the Report of the Estimates Committee here.

The Estimates Committee is a committee of the House consisting of about 25 Members. They look into the matter, examine witnesses who appear on behalf of Government, and then they make their recommendations; and before they present their reports, they send them to the Ministry concerned for factual verification; and after that, they make their report. Then, Government have to implement those