

sitting held on the 24th March, 1969, agreed without any amendment to the Armed Forces (Special Powers) Continuance Bill, 1969, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 3rd March, 1969.

(2)

"In accordance with the provisions of Rule 120 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha, I am directed to inform you that Lok Sabha, at its sitting held on the 24th March, 1969, agreed without any amendment to the Limitation (Amendment) Bill, 1969, which was passed by Rajya Sabha at its sitting held on the 3rd March, 1969.

STATEMENT BY MINISTER, CORRECTING REPLY GIVEN TO A SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTION ARISING OUT OF STARRED QUESTION NO. 605 ON THE 17TH DECEMBER, 1968.

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING, AND WORKS, HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT (SHRI B. S. MURTHY): Madam, the All-India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, informed on the 13th December, 1968, that Shri M. Purkayastha, Member of Parliament, wrote a letter to the Director on the 19th September, 1968, regarding a patient, named Shri Des Raj. On this basis, it was stated in the course of answering supplementaries in the Rajya Sabha on the 17th December, 1968, that the patient came to the Hospital of the Institute on the 19th September, 1968, on the recommendation of Shri Purkayastha. It was subsequently clarified by the Institute on the 18th January, 1969 that Shri Des Raj had been admitted to their Hospital on the 22nd July, 1968. The statement made on the 17th December, 1968, would stand corrected accordingly.

358 RS—6.

THE DELHI MOTOR VEHICLES TAXATION (AMENDMENT BILL, 1969

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS AND IN THE MINISTRY OF SHIPPING AND TRANSPORT (SARDAR IQBAL SINGH): Madam, I beg to move:—

"That the Bill further to amend the Delhi Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1962, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

Madam, I would like to explain the few salient features of this Bill. The Delhi Administration has proposed that the tax on motor vehicles may be increased by 25 per cent. The present taxation level in Delhi is less than in the neighbouring States. For that reason they have proposed to increase the tax level on all the motor vehicles in Delhi. This will bring an income of Rs. 30 lakhs and which income, according to them, is distributed between all the local bodies, the Delhi Municipal Corporation, the New Delhi Municipal Committee and the Delhi Cantonment Board. Whatever income will accrue will be distributed among the three municipal bodies according to the ratio in which the roads in each area exist.

The second feature of this Bill is that there used to be a rebate of 10 per cent. to the people who used to pay in lump sum. That feature is being withdrawn because in this way the Delhi Administration will have about Rs. 5 lakhs more which is included in this Rs. 30 lakhs revenue.

This Bill has been considered by the Delhi Metropolitan Council and concurred in by the Lt. Governor and also agreed to by the Chief Executive Councillor. That is why we are moving that it may be taken into consideration.

The question was proposed.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR (Delhi): Madam Deputy Chairman, the Bill

[Dr. Bhai Mahavir]

before the House seeks to increase the motor vehicles tax for the vehicles plying in Delhi. As a matter of fact the proposal came more than a year ago from the Delhi Administration and was duly passed by the Metropolitan Council, and what was expected was that the Central Government would be able to have it passed by Parliament more promptly so that the revenue last year could have been saved. But because of the delay the loss of about Rs. 28 to 30 lakhs is something which the Delhi people and the local authorities of Delhi can ill afford.

THE LEADER OF THE HOUSE (SHRI JAISUKHLAL HATHI): Let us then pass it quickly.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: As a matter of fact it is general grievance of the people that where the matters of Delhi are concerned, the Central Government takes things very leisurely and is unable to find time for meeting the requirements in Parliament or elsewhere. Only some days back I had occasion to ask the Home Minister what they were doing about the proposal which the Delhi Administration had sent regarding the permission for starting a lottery. It is a well-known fact that a number of States of the country are conducting lotteries and are collecting sizeable amounts from that source, amounts which do not pinch, which are painless taxes and, therefore, which are considered to be very attractive means of raising revenue where no other means are easily available. How much is collected I cannot make an assessment. But I know that lakhs of rupees are collected from Delhi every month by the lotteries which are being run by other States. The Delhi Administration's request has been pending with the Central Government for more than nine months now. I do not know what the Central Government is thinking about it. They say they are considering the request on certain principles. What the principles involved are I do not know. If they could tolerate States

carrying on this particular business which may have some element of gambling in it, why should they now raise this question of principle in the case of Delhi? If there is a spirit of gambling involved in it whatever loss is being talked of it is already being caused to Delhi. The only thing is that the revenue which could have come to the people of Delhi and which could have been used for the services to Delhi is now being denied to the authorities of Delhi and is now going to other States. I have no quarrel with the people of other States. Actually I am one of those who looks upon the country as one and would like the boundaries of the States disappear and have a unitary form of administration. But so long as this differentiation remains I do not think there is any justification for the Central Government to sit tight on the request of Delhi like this for such a long time. I do not know how long the Home Ministry is going to take to come to a decision.

About the Delhi revenues there is another indication which shows that the Central Government does not take decisions where time is of the essence. The Delhi authorities have raised the revenues to the extent of something like Rs. 3 crores of which at least Rs. one crore has been estimated by the Central Government to go to the Delhi authorities for providing extra amenities and services. But the decision to permit the use of this amount of Rs. one crore was conveyed to the Delhi authorities only a month back when they were also told that they had to use this amount by the close of the financial year which means that within a month and a half they have to draw the plan, arrange all proposals, verify them as also to see what particular utilisation would be to the best advantage, and if they cannot do it the financial year closes and the amount lapses. Later on I learnt that it has been amended to the extent that if some amount remains unutilised they would allow it to be carried forward to the next

year. If this decision had been given in time the Delhi people could have got the benefit earlier; they could have got the benefit of the expenditure before so much time had elapsed.

Madam, as you know and as the House also has been reminded by events happening in Delhi, the Corporation of Delhi is in a financial difficulty so much so that the Central Government's attitude sometimes appears to be very callous, almost heartless in their dealings with the Delhi Corporation and the Delhi Administration. What the Morarka Commission recommended in the matter of cutting the assistance is being practically implemented in effect.

They recommended that a Rs. 1-1/2 crores cut should be applied to the assistance being given to the administration and in actual effect the assistance is being cut like that. Some of the loans which were to be given to the Delhi Transport Undertaking have been withheld. Now if you do not give the assistance, which should be given to them, on the plea that interest has not been paid—of course, interest on the outstanding loans has not been paid by the Delhi Transport Undertaking—what will happen to the Undertaking? But you withhold the loan and you are not prepared to offer them moratorium facilities which you are offering to other States simply because you find that the people running the Delhi Administration and the Corporation in Delhi happen to be those who are not of your own party. Simply on this plea if you are going to deny these facilities which you offer to other States, naturally the inference would be inescapable that you are not giving them a fair deal and because of that, they are unable to do their job well and they are unable to satisfy the people, and the odium will come on them. And later on the Congress people in Delhi may be able to say that the Jan Sangh Administration has not been able to deliver the goods in Delhi . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: How much more time do you want?

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Five minutes.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Then, the House stands adjourned till 2 p.m.

The House then adjourned for lunch at one of the clock.

The House reassembled after lunch at two of the clock, THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN in the Chair.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: Dr. Mahavir.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Madam Deputy Chairman, as I was saying before we adjourned for lunch, the Central Government has adopted a step-motherly attitude to Delhi Administration so far as its financial requirements are concerned. Before the Morarka Commission was appointed . . . Madam . . .

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: No noise at this corner, please. When some Members is speaking, I think there should be silence.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: Before the Morarka Commission was appointed, there was a formula on the basis of which the Central Government used to give grants for Corporation works. The formula was 7:3, that is, if the Corporation raised Rs. 7 by its own efforts as revenue, the Central Government would give Rs. 3 as aid to them. Now that formula was suspended when the Morarka Commission was appointed, and the report of the Morarka Commission is now before the Government. It has two parts naturally, as any report would have. One part is regarding the withdrawal or the cut to be applied in the aid which was given, and the other part relates to what should be given in its place. Now the Central Government is taking the first part very promptly and is overlooking the implementation of the second part. It is almost like "Heads I win, tails you lose." No better example

[Dr. Bhai Mahavir]
of a step-motherly treatment could be imagined. For instance, Madam, I may point out that the Morarka Commission has recommended in regard to the money to be given by the Central Government on the servicing of Government properties in Delhi—because there can be no property tax charged on Government properties in Delhi—that on the rateable value of these Government properties, the Central Government should give 100 per cent and not 75 per cent as it previously used to be. Similarly, about the rural areas. In the case of the rural areas also, for the development expenditure to be incurred there, 100 per cent should be given by the Central Government. But so far as these recommendations are concerned, the Central Government is very conveniently sleeping over them. But where the question of cut being applied was to be considered, they have been very prompt in doing that. For example, they have done that in the matter of the assistance of Rs. 1½ crores which was to be cut over three years. One-third of that has already been cut this year. Similarly regarding the transferred departments, Rs. 96 lakhs used to be given per year. It has been suggested that it should be finished off in three years in three equal instalments. So the first instalment has gone already. But where the Central Government had to give something in lieu of that, that has been very easily ignored. Another instance that I can give is in the matter of schools. Middle schools are being transferred to the Delhi Administration and something like Rs 70 lakhs will have to be spent on them. Previously 50 per cent of the cost used to be given to the Corporation by the Central Government. If these schools are handed over to the Administration as they are being handed over now, should not the Central Government foot the bill, or should they not compensate the Delhi Administration for the extra expenditure that will be incurred? There again the attitude of the Central Government is not quite fair. For example,

to be precise, it is being said that since these schools will be new schools under the control of the Delhi Administration, the Central Government is seeking to treat it as new expenditure and, therefore, is trying to include it in the Plan expenditure which is to be sanctioned, whereas although technically we may say that they are new for the Administration, they are now new schools and, therefore, the money to be spent on their maintenance should not be deducted from the Plan expenditure which the Centre sanctions for Delhi. The Plan itself is very much in a nebulous state. What amount will be sanctioned by the Centre for the Plan is not clear yet. The Delhi Administration drew up a plan which was naturally rather big compared to the Central Government's own ideas. But then, there should have been some sort of a via media where at least some aspirations of the people of Delhi could have been met by the people running the Delhi Administration. The attitude of rigidity and being uncompromising, an attitude of lack of consideration, which has been adopted by the Central Government is something which is to be deplored and which cannot be appreciated under any democratic set-up. Now we happen to be the party in power in Delhi. But it is not that the position will remain as it is. In a democratic set-up, things keep on changing. Governments keep on changing. There can be a change in the Central Government also. But the important thing is that healthy conventions should be established where no element of party prejudice is allowed to influence the allocation of funds and other things. I would suggest, therefore, Madam, that in this matter the Centre should try to be more reasonable more liberal and even generous, if possible, so that the Capital of the country can be built up, can be developed, into an ideal Capital of the world. The Jan Sangh is in power and whatever people might say, we are not among those who would carry on any agitation for the sake of agitation. We do not believe

in destructive methods. We do not have any extra-territorial loyalties. We do not believe in sabotaging the Constitution. We do not want to prostitute the machinery of law and order. We want to offer full, constructive co-operation. No better attitude can be there by any party which, of course, is a non-Congress Party and which is not the party in power at the Centre. I would suggest, therefore, that the Central Government might consider the need of revising its attitude in regard to financial allocations.

So far as this Bill is concerned, of course, it has come; the needs of the Capital have to be met and if additional revenue comes, we hope it will be helping the Administration and the Corporation to give a further face-lift to the streets, to the lighting, to sanitation arrangements, to hospital services and other things. I must say that I am not quite happy at the withdrawal of the rebate. It was not a large amount. The 10 per cent rebate helped in easy and quick collection of revenue and if that had been continued, I think it would have enabled lump-sum collections to be made at the very start.

With these words, Madam, I conclude my remarks about this Bill. I would implore the Ministers concerned to take the whole question of the grants to be given to Delhi more carefully and examine it with a more considerate attitude so that the growing genuine feeling of resentment among the Delhi people of being treated in a step-motherly fashion could be removed.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA (Uttar Pradesh): Madam Deputy Chairman, I rise to support the Bill. I am tempted to speak because of certain remarks of my friend, Dr. Bhai Mahavir. He has spoken about the financial grants to be given to the Delhi Administration and has brought in a number of points which are not very relevant to the present Bill. Therefore, I do not propose to deal with any of the other matters touched by him.

I will limit my remarks to the Delhi Motor Vehicles Taxation proposals under discussion in this House.

I am sure Dr. Bhai Mahavir knows that the Delhi Metropolitan Act and the Delhi Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1962 are the two relevant Acts which are applicable as far as the present Bill is concerned. He has made out a case as if the Central Government has been sleeping over a recommendation made by the Delhi Administration with a view to denying the just collection of revenues by the Delhi Administration. I want to dispel that idea that it is not so. The Metropolitan Council is not empowered under the Act to legislate on any Act which is a Central Act. It can only make recommendations and that too after having the prior approval of the Central Government. Now in the present case what happened is this. The Delhi Administration made their recommendations without the approval of the Central Government before hand in February, 1968.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: That is a misconception, Mr. Bhargava.

SHRI M. P. BHARGAVA: It is not a misconception. I am coming to the later events also which will show whether my ideas are wrong or what you have said is not very correct. So, that was in February, 1968 that first this question came up with the Central Government. And rightly the Central Government pointed out to the Metropolitan Council authorities that this was not a correct course which they followed. For any taxation proposals they should have obtained the prior permission of the Central Government before moving it in the Metropolitan Council which they did not do. And then the negotiations started between the Delhi Administration and the Central Government. It was after the middle of 1968 that they came to certain decisions that the proposals which were being recommended by the Delhi Administration would receive consideration of the Central Government and that they would be permitted to act

[Shri M. P. Bhargava]

accordingly. Thereafter the necessary Bill was got prepared, and that was towards the end of December, 1968 that the Bill was ready for introduction. But it could be introduced in the Lok Sabha only on the 18th February, 1969. Therefore, the House will see that there has not been any delay on the part of the Central Government in getting this Bill enacted. Now, I understand they had proposed that this law should be made applicable either from the 1st October, 1968 or from the 1st April, 1969. As I have said earlier, it was not possible to enforce it by making this Act before 1st October, 1968. There were procedural difficulties. Therefore, the second date proposed by them is the earliest date by which it could be enforced, and that is 1st April, 1969. And I have no doubt that it will be done before that date, i.e., 1st April, 1969. Therefore, as far as the present Bill is concerned, it is not that the Central Government has been sitting tight over it. It has been taking all possible steps in this connection. But about other Acts if there is any delay, I am one with Dr Bhai Mahavir that nothing should be allowed to hang on and that any proposals received from the Delhi Administration should receive due consideration of the Central Government at the earliest and whatever finances can be made available to them under the rules of the Central Government, they should be made available to them so that the work of the Delhi Administration can go on smoothly.

श्री बी० एन० मंडल (बिहार) :
महोदया, जो विधेयक अभी इस सदन के सामने प्रस्तुत किया गया है उसका मैं विरोध करता हूँ और इस लिये मैं विरोध करता हूँ कि इस विधेयक के जरिये जो मोटर वेहिकल्स के ऊपर टैक्स था उसको 25 प्रतिशत बढ़ाने की बात है और जो रिबेट का कन्सेशन पहले था उसको भी छीनने की बात इसमें है। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि डा० भाई महावीर भी शायद इसका विरोध करने किन्तु उन्होंने

ऐसा नहीं किया है। नहीं करने का कारण यह था कि दिल्ली एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन उनकी पार्टी के हाथ में है। उसको खर्च के लिये पैसा चाहिये और इसकी वजह से उन्होंने इस बिल को सपोर्ट किया है और इसका विरोध नहीं किया है लेकिन मैं दूसरी नजर से इस बिल को देखता हूँ।

जो मोटर वेहिकल्स की इंडस्ट्री है और जो मोटर वेहिकल्स आपरेट करने का कारोबार चलता है इन दोनों दृष्टियों से मैं समझता हूँ कि जो यह विधेयक हम लोगों के सामने आया है उसको नहीं आना चाहिये। एक टैक्सेशन इन्वायरी कमेटी रोड ट्रांसपोर्ट के लिए बनी थी और उसने कुछ रिक्मेंडेशन्स की हैं। उन रिक्मेंडेशन्स में, ट्रांसपोर्ट टैक्सेशन इन्वायरी कमेटी ने इसका जिक्र किया है कि किस तरह से आज हिन्दुस्तान में मोटर वेहिकल्स चलाने का जो कारोबार चलता है, उस पर अत्यधिक टैक्सेशन की वजह से, दिनों दिन यह कारोबार डिमिनिशिंग वाला कारोबार होता जा रहा है और एक नतीजा निकल सकता है कि मोटर चलाने का जा काम है वह काम ही रुक जाय। दूसरी तरफ जो मोटर की इंडस्ट्री अभी देश में बचपन की अवस्था में है वह इंडस्ट्री ही खत्म हो जाय। इस बात का जिक्र उस रिपोर्ट में किया गया है। तो अगर इन बातों के ऊपर ख्याल किया जाता तो मैं समझता हूँ कि इन तरह का बिल कभी गवर्नमेंट न लाती। सबसे पहले जो उस कमेटी की रिक्मेंडेशन्स थी उनको समझ बूझकर एक ऐसा लेजिस्लेशन लाती जो कि समूचे देश के लिये एक तरह का होता। जो अभी का कठिनाई है, जो अभी की बुराई है और जो अभी देश का नुकसान हो रहा है उसका देखने हुए कोई लेजिस्लेशन लाया जाता तो मैं उसका ठीक समझता लेकिन ऐसा नहीं किया गया है।

जो ट्रांसपोर्ट टैक्सेशन इन्वायरी कमेटी की रिपोर्ट है उसमें यह भी कहा गया है कि जो यहाँ मोटर वेहिकल्स पर और यहाँ की

माटर इंडस्ट्री पर टैक्सेशन का सिलसिला है वह समूचे समार पर मे सब से बढ़कर है। यह भी उसी में कहा गया है। जा टैक्सेशन इक्वायरी कमेटी कायम हुई थी वह जिस बात की इक्वायरी के लिये कायम हुई थी उसके बारे में यह कहा गया था :—

“to examine the present cost of operation for haulage of passengers and goods by Road Transport, including the element of State and Central taxes, whether it has become a disincentive to the healthy development of road transport and if so, to what extent”.

इसके जवाब में इस रिपोर्ट में जांच करने के बाद यह कहा गया है :

“On an examination of these facts, it is clear that the burden of taxation on the road transport industry has been increasing. The margin left with the transport operators after the payment of taxes is not sufficient to enable them to plough back earnings in an adequate measure for replacement, let alone expansion. The conclusion is inescapable that the tax element in the cost of operation has become a definite disincentive to the healthy development of road transport.”

जितने भी दुनिया में मुल्क हैं उनके मुकाबले में हिन्दुस्तान में सबसे ज्यादा मोटरों के उपर टैक्स लगाया जाता है। इसके बारे में टैक्सेशन इक्वायरी कमेटी ने कहा है कि इण्डिया में यह टैक्स 470 है, बर्मा में 235, सीलोन में 94, जापान में 235, फिलिपाइन में 468, फेडरल रिपब्लिक आफ जर्मनी में 240, ग्रेट ब्रिटन में 115 और युनाइटेड स्टेट्स में 470 है। यह जितनी भी संख्या है वह यू० एस० डालर के हिसाब से है। इससे मालूम पड़ता है कि समूचे समार के मुकाबले में हमारे देश में सब से ज्यादा टैक्स मोटरों पर लगाया जाता है।

जहां तक मोटर इंडस्ट्री का सवाल है, उसके बारे में उन्होंने कहा है कि उनको वजह से मोटरों के उत्पादन का खर्चा बढ़ गया है क्योंकि उसके पार्ट्स पर जो टैक्स लगाया जाता है वह बहुत ज्यादा है। उन्होंने अपनी रिपोर्ट में कहा है :

“The price of T.M.B. Chassis has risen by Rs. 11,000 over a period of 6 years. The rate of increase in the price of tyres has been still higher as it has doubled itself during the period. The consequent rise in price of vehicles has led to a slackening of demand as the small operators have not been able to secure the necessary finances.”

इसके साथ ही आपरेशन कास्ट का जो सबसे बड़ा आइटम है वह है तेल और उसके बारे में जो आंकड़े दिये गये हैं वे इस तरह के हैं :

एक्साइज ड्यूटी आन मोटर स्ट्रिट पर के-एल : 1965-66 में 539.60 सितम्बर 1957 में 636.42 इसी तरह से एक्साइज ड्यूटी आन एच०एस०डी० आरल पर के-एल. 1965-66 में 482.85 सितम्बर 1957 में 503.20। एक्साइज ड्यूटी आन मोटर वैहीकल्स 1965-66 में 2,500 या 12 परसेंट ए०भी प्लास 20 प्रतिशत ए०ई०डी० सितम्बर 1967 में 4,450 प्लास (ली लैण्ड के लिये) 20 परसेंट। इसी तरह से कास्ट आफ आपरेशन प्रति वर्ष जो 1950 में 32,308 था वह 1965 में बढ़ कर 77,225 हो गया है। इसी तरह से आरनिंग्स पर एनम 1950 में 38,654 थी वह 1965 में 83,125 हो गई। रेट आफ इन्क्रीज इन कास्ट 139 प्रतिशत और कास्ट इन्क्रीज इन रैवेन्यू 115 प्रतिशत है यानी जो कास्ट प्रतिशत है

[श्री ब० एन० मडल]

वह रेवेन्यू इन्क्रीज प्रति शत हिसाब से बढ़ा है। 139 कास्ट का प्रतिशत और जो रेवेन्यू इन्क्रीज हुआ है वह 115 प्रतिशत है। कहने का मतलब यह है कि कास्ट बढ़ता ही जा रहा है और जो मारजिन आफ प्रॉफिट है वह कम होता जा रहा है। तो ऐसी हालत में मैं नहीं समझता हूँ कि जिस ढंग से आज टैक्स बढ़ाने का यह बिल आया है उस बिल को पेश करना चाहिये। सरकार को चाहिये कि वह इस बिल को विदड़ा कर ले और टैक्सेशन इन्क्वायरो कमेटी ने जो भी रिकमेंडेशन की है उन सारी बातों पर विचार कर और उसके बाद कोई दूसरा लजिस्लेशन दिल्ली तथा अन्य दूसरी जगहों के लिए लाये।

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT (Delhi): Madam, I am not too happy that this new taxation has been brought forward by the Jan Sangh Administration in the Metropolitan Council and brought here in the House because I think 25 per cent. is very very high indeed and the argument is given that the neighbouring States have a higher taxation. There are other States in the country where the taxation is lower than in Delhi. As it is the cars are registered by and large except very few which really do not seem to belong to Delhi. Therefore the question of the people taking their cars to other States and paying their taxes there does not seem to be very relevant to me. Apart from that it is said that the taxation collected would be used for the maintenance of roads and bridges. Delhi has very heavy traffic because it happens to be the capital and if the seat of the Government is not there, so much expense will not be there, so much wear and tear of the bridges and the roads would not be there. Therefore I feel that the Government of India should make extra allowances and pay extra money to Delhi because it happens to be the seat of

the Government. There are quite a few items of expenditure connected with that. The formula is all right. Various moneys are to be paid by the Central Government and similarly by the Corporation to the Central Government but the fact remains that the Government is very keen that the city should be kept in good condition and it should look very nice, etc., make it look like the capital and give it dignity; for that, the Government of India should give a much larger allocation of money so that it can be maintained as the capital.

Secondly, as far as the roads and bridges are concerned, wherever the trouble is, we do not really cure that trouble. We do not find the remedy for that trouble. If the tender is very much inflated, if the supervision and execution of the contract is very poor and the roads after being repaired again give way after every two or three months in Delhi and they have to be repaired sometimes two or three times a year, and also when the very first rain comes the roads are in very bad shape, that shows a very poor job done for which I think the contractor should be taken to task and the PWD should be taken to task instead of taxing the motor owners of the city and those who use motor vehicles. The reason is poor maintenance for which the contractors are primarily responsible as well as the PWD. We find some other absolutely unrelated way of remedying this problem. Consequently the tax-payer has to pay more. This 25 per cent. increase is not a small amount. I think the remedy lies in having a better standardisation of these roads repairs and maintenance, better execution of that job, examination of the tenders properly rather than allowing any kind of tender. It seems that sometimes for a particular building the tender will be for Rs. 80,000, after two months it becomes Rs. 1,20,000, after six months it becomes Rs. 2 lakhs and by the time the work has to start it becomes

Rs 3 lakhs so that it is a disgraceful state of affairs that for the same job almost every month the price goes up by 20 to 40 per cent. and again the burden falls on the tax-payer. This is a very poor arrangement of things. If these works are better controlled, supervised and examined and the supervision staff, the engineers and so on and the Government take more interest in this, if there is less of corruption in the PWD—unfortunately this Department is always very notorious for corruption and therefore the prices for construction go up—then things can improve; otherwise again the burden will fall on the ordinary people. Therefore, to remove these disparities and inequalities, the Government should immediately remedy the situation where the trouble lies rather than tackle A instead of B or C instead of D. They should find what is wrong and where. Madam, our friend, Dr. Bhai Mahavir said something about the Central Government giving a very step-motherly treatment to Delhi. I am sorry that this is what the Delhi Administration has been constantly saying and repeating all the time, that they are being given a very step-motherly treatment. But I suppose even the Congress Governments, where they are in power in the States, could say that they are not too happy with the allocation of funds. The reason is that the Government of India has only a certain amount of money from which they have to find all their allocations for the various States.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: All the same you pleaded that they should give more money.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: You should thank me for that. You cannot blame that they are giving a step-motherly treatment to the Delhi administration. In other places, in other States where Congress Governments are there, they also feel that more money should be given to them. I think the money should be given because . . .

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: You are contradicting yourself again.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Well, I will say what is right; I am not going to say what you want me to say. Your charge that the Central Government is giving a step-motherly treatment is absolutely wrong; that is wrong and the fact that this happens to be the capital of India is there. If you want to deny that this is the capital of India, there again I am not agreeing with you, unless you want to get up and deny this. Except removing the *jhuggis* and *ghonpris* and putting them far away, where the conditions are again the same conditions, where the quality of the water is bad, where the sanitary conditions are very bad indeed, you are accusing the Government of India in season and out of season that it is giving a step-motherly treatment.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: That also is a Central scheme.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: It is being done by you. Don't try to find a scape-goat in the Government of India. Why don't they talk of some other problems of Delhi rather than go on harping on the theme that the Government of India is giving them a step-motherly treatment? This is not very fair because if results have to be shown they can be shown in various ways and in various directions instead of going on putting the blame on the Government of India that because it is the Jan Sang administration in Delhi, therefore Central assistance is not given to it. Therefore I feel, Madam, that this charge is not very good and this is not fair because all States have to share whatever money is there with the Government of India.

I feel that this taxation is very high and I cannot really appreciate it. When the Government of India was thinking of revising it, our friends were saying that they would not

[Kumari Shanta Vasisht]

resort to agitation for the sake of agitation to attain this end. When their party does not want to take to an agitational approach as they say, I was wondering as to why only two days back they had a *dharna* in front of the Finance Minister's house. Earlier on they carried on the Hindi agitation with great gusto. Then they carried on the cow agitation also, the cow very conveniently forgotten now; after the elections were over the poor cow has been very conveniently forgotten. I do not know where such great Hindu sentiments have gone.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: You say we should not agitate and we are not agitating. Now you are reminding us, are saying, "Why don't you agitate?"

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: Only two days back your people went and had *dharna* in front of the Finance Minister's house.

DR. BHAI MAHAVIR: That is protest; there is difference between protest and *dharna*.

KUMARI SHANTA VASISHT: As far as our cow agitation went, if your bona fide intention was there to look after the cow, you would have looked after the cow even today. But that was only an instrument to work up the religious sentiments of people before the elections came, and now you have all conveniently forgotten all about the cow. Now they will do it in the early 1972 or late 1971. Then they will begin their agitation and they will cook up a lot of grievances also for the purpose. Therefore I feel, Madam, that many things they say are not really genuine when you examine them. It is just a little patriotic service they want to show to the people they do.

I feel that this taxation is rather high and I am sorry about it, but I think these charges against the Government of India are not very fair.

Thank you, Madam.

SHRI U. K. LAKSHAMANA GOWDA (Mysore): Madam Deputy Chairman: I rise to oppose this Bill. It is really surprising that both Dr. Mahavir and Mr. Bhargava blamed each other, and Dr. Mahavir blamed the Central Government for not giving adequate financial assistance, blamed them that they were giving the Delhi administration a step-motherly treatment by not providing them sufficient financial assistance. Mr. Bhargava justified the stand of the Central Government on administrative, legal and other grounds. But both were one in supporting the increases that have been provided in this Bill. Even though Kumari Shanta Vasisht did support the Central Government's attitude in the matter of financial assistance to the Delhi Administration, she has complained that the taxation is on the high side. Madam, I am certainly not against Dr. Mahavir attaining more financial assistance from the Centre. Let them give it. Let Dr. Mahavir start the lottery and augment the revenues of the Delhi administration and utilise them for the improvement of roads and other necessities for the metropolitan city, but not at the cost of the vehicle tax-payers. Mr. Mandal has very vividly described how in this country, even though compared to the other countries our cost of living is very much lower the taxation on vehicles is the highest. He gave examples and figures of countries ranging from Japan to the United Kingdom to show how our taxation figure seems to be the highest. And when that is the case and particularly at a time when the cost of maintaining and running vehicles is further increased by the recent levy of excise duty on motor spirit and also when there is the continuous rise in the cost of tyres and spares and when even the cost of vehicles has gone on increasing due to the rise in the excise and customs duties, this 25 per cent. flat

rise in tax on all the vehicles is not justified. Mr. Mandal said how difficult it has become for the transport industry, whose income is continuously being reduced on account of the higher running costs and also the ever increasing annual taxes on motor spirit, tyres and other components, to pull on. I would like to add here about the difficulties of the other vehicle owners also. Madam, it is no longer a luxury to own a vehicle these days. There are the vast number of people who own scooters, motor cycles and motor vehicles. Take for example doctors or office-going people. What about them? This increase in tax on their vehicles is going to hit them very hard. With all the recent increases in the tax on vehicles, spares and components without any discrimination, it is no longer taxing only the richer sections of the people, this is taxing one of the very necessities of life for the office-going people and the professional people, doctors, lawyers and others, who use some type of vehicle for transport. Now, in addition to levying this 25 per cent. flat rise, even the rebate that was available in the earlier Act, the 10 per cent. rebate on payment being made in advance, has also been withdrawn. I do not think there is any justification for it, and I cannot understand why there was the necessity to withdraw this rebate. So far as the monthly tax is concerned, it is going to be one-twelfth of the annual tax; that is the only redeeming feature in this Bill. As for the object of introduction of this Bill, in order to augment their resources, the Delhi administration should think of other measures. Let them agitate and get more funds from the Central Government; I am in favour of it, but they should not tax the people who own the vehicles, and also the motor transport. The taxation on goods vehicles with a carrying capacity of more than six tonnes is very heavy, and this is definitely going to result in an increase of the price of commodities that are brought into this city.

In view of all this I strongly oppose this Bill and I hope the Government will reconsider it.

SARDAR IQBAL SINGH: Madam Deputy Chairman, regarding this Bill, a few friends have given qualified support, a few have opposed it and a few have supported it. First, Dr. Mahavir has stated about the delay in this proposal. That was amply in one way explained by Shri Bhargava, but still I agree that this Bill came last year. But the shape in which this Bill was sent to the Central Government was not proper. We referred it back to the Metropolitan Council. We told them that they cannot pass a Bill, that they can only send their recommendation. When we referred it back, we asked them to rectify that. They have done that. After that when it was circulated to the other Ministries, the whole concept was increase in taxation. Just as Shri Mandal, an hon. Member, has stated this was against the whole spirit of the Keskar Committee Report, which was that the tax must be stabilised at a certain level. There was a strong argument that in Delhi taxes are lower. But still we asked the Delhi Administration, the Metropolitan Council and the Chief Executive Councillor, to reconsider the proposal. They were told that they can make any recommendation and we would give due consideration to their recommendation. In view of that we have introduced this Bill in this session in the Lok Sabha and this is coming. But they have agreed that the tax may be increased from 1st April, 1969. When they have agreed to this, then the Bill can only come in this session when we can find time. There is no point in saying that we have deliberately delayed it. Actually, on the Metropolitan Council's part it was not proper to send the proposal which was not concurred in by the Central Government. It was beyond their power and when we referred it to them, they agreed, and delay was due to that fact, not on our part.

[Sardar Iqbal Singh]

Secondly, Dr. Mahavir has stated that the Central Government is not helping the Delhi Administration regarding this. He has referred to other matters also, including Report of the Morarka Commission. These are wider issues. But I can say about one thing, about their roads, road maintenance, road repairs and construction of roads and bridges. The whole income which was derived out of this used to be Rs. 1 crore 20 lakhs, and now it will be Rs. 1 crore and 50 lakhs, which is being distributed to all the three local bodies the Delhi Municipal Corporation, the New Delhi Municipal Committee and the Cantonment Board, according to the ratio of the roads which they have already constructed. Last year we distributed and this year also we are distributing. But even that is not all. In addition to that we have given them assistance under the Central Road Reserve Fund, Central Road Allocation Fund and some other funds also. But where things are done for political motivation, then that is something else.

About the Road transport and road maintenance and road repair, I can say that last year the whole budget of the Delhi Administration was Rs. 2 crores and 10 lakhs. Out of that the Delhi Municipal Corporation's budget was Rs. 1.5 crores, for New Delhi Municipal Committee it was Rs. 15 lakhs. And this time the total budget of the Delhi Administration—the assistance which we are giving to the Delhi Administration—will be Rs. 5 crores and 15 lakhs. This has more than doubled, and if still hon. Members say that the Central Government is not assisting and not helping, I have no argument to rebut that. Next year, we will be helping the Delhi Municipal Corporation by Rs. 3 crores and 76 lakhs, and the New Delhi Municipal Committee by Rs. 49 lakhs; instead of Rs. 15 lakhs Rs. 49 lakhs, and instead of Rs. 1 crore and 5 lakhs, Rs. 3 crores and

76 lakhs. It has trebled practically and still if Dr. Mahavir has great grievances against the Central Government and goes on harping on them then I have no argument. But these are the facts. I can tell him that we are helping and we want that this capital city of our country should be maintained in a proper way. Roads must come up and kept in good shape and in a good way.

DR. BHAJ MAHAVIR: What about Government properties in rural areas?

SARDAR IQBAL SINGH: I do not know about that. As far as my Bill is concerned, we have given three times more and if you still grudge, I have no argument.

Regarding the second point Dr. Mahavir has made about the DTU, during this year we have provided a Budget of Rs. 1 crore and 40 lakhs for DTU. Out of that, Rs. 60 lakhs was given to them. While there is an obligation on the part of the Central Government to give money, we must also make sure that the money is utilized in a proper way. It was on 31st March last year that they had not returned Rs. 5 crores and 11 lakhs which was due from them on account of advances, interest, etc. and after that we have....

DR. BHAJ MAHAVIR: Since when?

SARDAR IQBAL SINGH: Since the last few years, I can say. I will come to that point. Even then we have asked them that certain things must be done. So we are ready to even advance Rs. 80 lakhs also. But they have not done. They had assured us that they would mortgage all the immovable property of the DTU and five or six other things. But they have not done one thing.

One other thing about the financial position of the DTU. The total loss which they are likely to suffer in 1967-68 was Rs. 1 crore and 82 lakhs. In 1969-70 it may be Rs. 2 crores and 33 lakhs. If its loss is increasing day by day then we have also to make sure where the money is being spent. It was in 1968-69 which was perhaps your year that the loss has increased tremendously, and when the loss has increased and the value of the vehicles, etc., has depreciated and it does not pay back what is due to the Government, we have to think twice. But still we are ready to give them. If they give us an undertaking, if they are ready to comply with this fact, we are ready to advance further money of Rs. 80 lakhs which is due to them. But when they do not do their part, it is not proper for them to accuse, and go on accusing the Central Government without any reason.

A few other friends have also made some points, but these are not mostly relevant ones. An hon. Member has stated about the Keskar Committee's recommendations which we have accepted. But in acceptable one point must be understood: at what point we are going to stabilise this whole taxation. One of the points was that the Bill has got less taxation on the motor vehicles. I can give them the figures. In the case of 9-tonne trucks, in Punjab the taxation is Rs. 595, in Rajasthan it is Rs. 2,200, in Uttar Pradesh Rs. 1,762, in Delhi it is Rs. 600. We cannot compare it. Even if we compare the total overall taxation on all the commercial vehicles which are plying in Delhi, it is far less. Take the case of total taxation. On each 9-tonne vehicle which is being plied, in Punjab it is Rs. 11,897, in Rajasthan it is Rs. 13,368, in U.P., it is Rs. 14,370, in Delhi it is Rs. 10,552, and so is the passenger vehicle. If we take a bus of 52 seats, in Punjab the tax is Rs. 2,750, in Rajasthan Rs. 2,600, in Uttar Pradesh Rs. 2,655, in Delhi Rs. 2,220. So if we take the total taxation on the passenger buses in

Delhi, it is far less than in other States. In Punjab it is Rs. 26,452, in Rajasthan it is Rs. 26,302, in Uttar Pradesh it is Rs. 18,000, and in Delhi it is Rs. 12,000. If we want to stabilise this taxation, we shall have to stabilise it at a certain level. Where the taxation is less, it is bound to increase. Where it is more, we are going to press the State Governments that they should reduce or give some relief in the taxation. If we go on thinking in this way, then a proper solution can be found out. If we say that there should be no increase or no decrease, then the whole spirit of the Keskar Committee to stabilise taxation on vehicles at a certain point and not to put more taxation beyond a certain point is lost. The other points which have been made were not quite relevant to this Bill and therefore I need not reply. With these words I commend the Bill to the House.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Delhi Motor Vehicles Taxation Act, 1962, as passed by the Lok Sabha, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

THE DEPUTY CHAIRMAN: We shall now take up the clause by clause consideration of the Bill.

Clause 2 and 3 were added to the Bill.

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

SARDAR IQBAL SINGH: Madam, I move:

"That the Bill be returned."

The question was put and the motion was adopted.