

INDIAN LAW INSTITUTE, NEW DELHI  
(UNIVERSITY OF MUMBAI, MUMBAI)

Seminar

on

Indian Constitution: Trends and Developments

January 21 - 23, 1978

Tax Rental Arrangement: Replacement of Sales  
Tax by Additional Duties of Excise

by

S.N. Jain\*

and

Alice Jacob\*\*

The Constitution which has laid down an elaborate scheme for the division of financial resources between the Union and states does not, however, prohibit them from agreeing to a "tax rental agreement" by which the states rent out their exclusive powers of taxation to the Union in return for some form of compensatory payments. This tax rental agreement has been employed in India in respect of certain selected commodities whereby the states have surrendered their powers to levy sales tax on them in lieu of the share of additional duties of excise levied by the Union. The present arrangement under which the states do not levy any sales tax on sugar, tobacco, Cotton (excluding handloom), woollen and rayon or artificial silk fabrics was introduced by the Additional Duties of Excise (Goods of Special Importance) Act, 1957, which was enacted in pursuance of the decision of the National Development Council in December 1956.

Sales tax from its inception in India has been a constant source of harassment and inconvenience to businessmen. Though the incidence of the tax falls on the consumer yet it is incumbent on the dealer to comply with the law. The majority of the dealers in India are small tradesmen without much education. The difficulties of maintaining complicated accounts, assessment of liability on the basis of those accounts, understanding the statute and keeping pace with the frequent amendments of the

\*. LL.M., S.J.D. (Northwestern), Director, Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.

\*\* LL.B. (Delhi), LL.M., J.S.D. (Yale), Research Professor, Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.

statute and the rules thereunder present difficulties which are often more burdensome than the tax itself. Further, the administration of tax collection—equally with that of checking of tax evasion has been a problem for the government. From the angle of interstate trade, diversity in the tax rates on the same commodity in the central and state tax laws tends to cause unnecessary movement of goods from one state to another. The multiple taxation of the same commodity under different tax laws and diversity in the rates of tax may also give rise to the problem of interstate trade barriers. Because of the different in rates the incidence of the tax on consumers varies from place to place. Further, when there is a great divergence in rates, particularly in contiguous states, there is danger of smuggling of goods from one state to another. 1.

The mode of compensating the states for the loss of revenue was referred by the Union Government to the Second Finance Commission. The Commission recommended that the share from the levy of sales tax on these items for the financial year 1956-57 in that state. In working out the estimates of receipts of sales tax for the relevant year, the commission arrived at guaranteed shares for each state, plus different percentages for different states if the proceeds exceeded certain amount. The Commission adopted consumption as the main basis for the distribution of the proceeds but, as there was considerable margin of error in the figures of consumption, it also used population as a corrective in arriving at the figures for distribution of the proceeds among the states. 2.

The principles recommended by the Second Finance Commission were incorporated in the Additional Duties of Excise Act which was enacted by Parliament. In order to make the states amenable to the scheme, the commodities were named as "declared goods" so that the power of the states to levy tax on their sales was limited to a maximum of 3 per cent.

Silk fabrics were covered by the scheme through the Finance Act, 1961, and the item was put in the category of declared goods. However, in 1968 it was withdrawn from the category of declared goods, and in 1970 the states were left free to levy sales tax on silk fabrics without losing the payment on account of additional duties. This thus put an end of the scheme in relation to the silk fabrics. Presumably, this was because the yield from the additional excise duty on silk fabrics was small being estimated at Rs.4 lakhs annually. 3

1. Indian Law Institute, Interstate Trade Barriers and Sales Tax Laws in India 79 (1962).
2. The Report of the Finance Commission (Second) 59-63 (1957).
3. The Report of the Finance Commission (Third) 26 (1961).

The rates of excise duties are fixed on a sort of weighted average of the sales tax rates of all the states.

- All the states accented the scheme. The advantages are:
- (i) The traders welcomed the schemes as it eliminated considerable inconvenience experienced by the commercial community previously;
  - (ii) the state's share of revenue increased due to checking of tax evasion; and (iii) by doing away with sales tax the scheme was beneficial from the point of view of interstate trade and commerce.

In spite of the substantial gain from the scheme, a general extension of it to other commodities does not appear to be feasible. One obvious limitation is that administratively levying excise is difficult to collect when there are innumerable producers with small units of production. When excise is levied on the mass of commodities, administrative problems are no less than under the sales tax. Excise duty has advantage over sales tax only when the production is on a large scale and concentrated in a few hands. Apart from its limited usefulness from the point of view of administration, there is the difficulty that the states will lose the advantage of flexibility which sales tax gives them. Under sales tax, the states can change the rates to suit the changing fiscal and trade conditions in their respective areas. Such adjustments are not possible when the Central Government is levying additional excise duty in lieu of sales tax, for the Central Government will need the consent of all the states, and then a change in the rate of excise will affect not only that state which desires the change but also other states. Sales tax can also be varied in relation to different grades of state, but this is not possible in the case of an excise levy by the Central Government. 4

If additional duties of excise were substituted in place of sales tax the states' dependence on the Centre for revenue would increase to a very great extent. In the course of Lok Sabha debates on the Additional Duties of Excise Bill, it was suggested that the Act be extended to other commodities. The then Finance Minister, Mr. J.T. Krishnamachari observed: "It (the Bill) detracts from the responsibility of the States to their own people to some extent, because they can always say that the Centre has done it. If tomorrow something goes wrong, say, in regard to any particular provision in this particular Bill, it is easy for the people to say, well, it is the Centre that has done it, and we are not responsible."

---

4. Supra note 1 at 81-82.

Ever in the Taxation Enquiry Commission.... I did mention this fact that the centralization of sales tax altogether would not be a correct thing because if the power of taxation is shifted to the Centre, there is no responsibility left so far as the States are concerned. So, we have also to keep the number of commodities that will come within the purview of Central taxation, however, beneficial it might be, to be restricted rather than enlarged, though, I do not, for one moment, say that there is no room for enlarging the present list." 5 Extension of additional duties of excise does not seem to be a feasible device for use on a large scale.

The States themselves seem to have reservations about continuing the scheme. By the time the Third Finance Commission was appointed, many States had felt that the amount of compensatory revenue they received as per recommendations of the Second Finance Commission was far less than what they could have raised by increasing the rates of sales tax in the growing sale and hence consumption of those commodities. Therefore, "the States urged that the guaranteed rates of sales tax effected by them after the amounts guaranteed had been determined. They also complained that as a result of the surrender of sales tax, they lost over a period of years and that they should be insulated against further future losses." But the Third Finance Commission decided that "the Second Commission had rejected the suggestion that not only the revenues currently derived but prospective revenues should also be taken into account in determining the guaranteed amounts. So must we also dismiss the suggestion that we should make an estimate of possible losses sustained and re-fix the amounts of guarantees. For one thing, such an examination would be outside the terms of reference, and for another, such a determination would be impracticable on statistical material now available." 6 Consequently, the Commission recommended the distribution of the net yield from additional union excise duties on the same basis as was recommended by the Second Finance Commission, except that it recommended that the balance (over the guaranteed amount) be distributed partly on the basis of population (proportion of state population to the total population of the country) and partly on the basis of percentage increase in the collection of sales tax in each state since 1957-58.

5. Lok Sabha Debates; 2nd series, vol.X (1957) p.6215. A meeting of the State Ministers was held in New Delhi on 29th July 1960 to consider the extension of additional duties of excise on silk fabrics, match, paper and vegetable products. Agreement could be reached only with regard to silk fabrics to be covered by the scheme. The Finance Act 1961 replaced sales tax by additional duties of excise on silk fabrics (S.15) supra note 1 at 82 f.note:7.

6. Supra note 3.

By the time the Fifth Finance Commission was constituted, the complaint of the States as regards this scheme reached a high pitch. About half the number of states urged that the scheme should be discontinued. Others wanted suitable modifications. The reasons were: First, the States received compensatory grants only to the extent of their own collection of revenue from sales tax on these commodities in 1957-58. The Finance Commissions recommended the balance to be distributed partly on population or "general need" basis and partly on the growth of sales tax yield in the states. This mode of distribution, the States felt, was unjustified because they were constitutionally entitled to the entire yield on compensation or derivation principle. The Finance Commission could not do justice because of its inability to work out the derivation basis of the net proceeds. Second, the fixing of the guaranteed amount to the rates of sales tax prevailing in 1956-57 was considered unjust because of the lower rates prevailing then in some States. Further, the Union Government increased its own basic excise duty rates on similar commodities but kept the rates of additional excise duties constant on the basis of preventing inflation. Third, the States increased their rates of sales taxes on other comparable commodities after 1957-58 whereas the rates on these rented commodities remained constant and the Finance Commissions refused to increase the guaranteed amount to the extent of actual net proceeds from these duties having regard to the growth of sales tax revenue in the States and the growth of consumption. This attitude of the Finance Commissions caused resentment among the States and some wanted to terminate the arrangement.

The Fifth Finance Commission was sympathetic to the views of the States. The Commission found that between 1957-58 and 1967-68 the revenue from basic and special Union excise duties on the commodities covered by the tax rental agreement increased by more than 70 per cent, whereas the revenue from additional Union excise duties on these commodities increased by only 45 per cent. The Commission also found that the rates of sales tax levied by some states on comparable commodities were generally higher than those of the additional Union excise duties. Consequently, the Commission felt that if the States were free to levy much more revenue from them than they have been receiving as compensatory payments. However, the Commission agreed with the rationale and advantages of the tax rental scheme. But in view of the opposition of the States to the scheme, the Commission felt that it would not be desirable to continue the scheme, unless the Union Government in consultation with the State Governments would arrive at a more satisfactory agreement with suitable modifications to the existing scheme. In view of this suggestion,

the Commission did not recommend the extension of the existing agreement to cover other commodities. To reduce the grievances of States the Commission recommended that the rates of duties may be made ad valorem as far as possible and may be revised periodically to keep them at par with the rates of sales tax on similar items levied by the States. As regards the principles for distribution of net proceeds, the Commission recommended that the guaranteed amount may be paid on the basis of the old method and the balance may be distributed partly on the basis of sales tax collection (excluding interstate sales tax) during 1965-66 to 1967-68 and partly on the basis of population. 10

Consequent on the recommendations of the Fifth Finance Commission that the scheme may have to be revised, some States wanted the discontinuance of the scheme. For instance, Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu submitted their memoranda to the Union Government to this effect. So the Union Government referred the issue to the National Development Council, which in turn appointed a Committee to examine the issue and to recommend the future course of action. The Committee recommended the continuation of the scheme but suggested for the increase in the incidence of the duties by 10.8 per cent within a period of two or three years. These recommendations have been reluctantly accepted by the States. The Union Government accepted these recommendations and implemented them through successive Finance Acts. 11

By the time the Sixth Finance Commission submitted its report (1973), the yield from the additional duties of excise which amounted to only Rs. 52.68 crores in 1968-69 rose to about Rs. 168.78 crores in 1973-74. Most of the States by then were satisfied with the manner of implementation of the scheme by the Union Government and did not want any material change. However, Andhra Pradesh wanted the scheme to be given up and it be allowed to levy sales tax. West Bengal also had reservations about the continuance of the scheme. Since the continuance or otherwise of the scheme was a policy decision, the Commission did not go into it. After soliciting the views of the State Governments on the manner of distribution of the net proceeds, it laid down the principles.

---

10. The report of the Finance Commission (Fifth)  
38-39 (1969).

11. The report of the Finance Commission (Sixth)  
1 (1973); See also Thimmaiah, Federal Fiscal  
Systems of Australia and India 133 (1976).

It departed from the views of the previous Commissions in that it expressed the view that there is no need to set apart any guaranteed amounts to the States because there is no risk of the share of any States in the net proceeds of such duties falling short of the revenue realised from the levy of sales tax on the commodities subject to additional duties of excise for the financial year 1956-57. The Commission while examining afresh the principles for allocation of proceeds among the States recommended that the entire yield should be distributed 70 per cent in proportion to population of each state in the total population of the country, 20 per cent in proportion to the income of each state in the total income of all states and 10 per cent in proportion to the production of each commodity in the state. <sup>12</sup> These recommendations were implemented in 1974 and the system of providing a guaranteed amount for payment to the states was done away with.

All in all it does not seem to be a feasible proposition to use the device of additional excise duties to replace sales tax on the extensive scale.

- 
12. The Report of the Finance Commission (Sixth), 18-21 (1973); see also Alice Jacob, The Finance Commission: Its Role in Adjustment of Union-State Financial Relations in Alice Jacob (Ed.) Constitutional Developments Since Independence 317 at 324 & (1965).

\*Central\*