

DEMANDS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY  
GRANTS, 1956-57 (TRAVANCORE-  
COCHIN)

The Minister of Revenue and Civil Expenditure (Shri M. C. Shah): I beg to present a statement showing Demands for Supplementary Grants for expenditure of the Travancore-Cochin State for 1956-57.

COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE MEMBERS' BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

FIFTY-EIGHT REPORT

Sardar Hukam Singh (Kapurthala-Bhatinda): I beg to present the Fifty-eighth Report of the Committee on Private Members' Bills and Resolutions.

\*CORRECTION OF ANSWER TO  
STARRED QUESTION NO. 254

STATEMENT RE MEASURES FOR  
CHECKING FOODGRAIN PRICES

The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh): It is rather a long statement running to 5½ pages.

Mr. Speaker: He need not read the whole of it. He may give an abstract of it and place the statement on the Table.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I will read about two pages. Otherwise, I will have to make it extempore.

Mr. Speaker: Instead of reading two pages, he may give a summary of it.

Dr. P. S. Deshmukh: I will place it on the Table of the House.

Mr. Speaker: All right; let it be placed on the Table of the House. Copies will be circulated to hon. Members. [See Appendix VI, annexure No. 62].

ELECTRICITY (SUPPLY) AMENDMENT BILL, 1956

The Minister of Planning and Irrigation and Power (Shri Nanda): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Shri N. C. Kasliwal, Swami Ramanand Shastri, Shri Rup Narain, Shri Bishwa Nath Roy, Dr. M. C. Jatav-vir, Shri W. S. Kirolikar, Shri A. S. Damar, Shri Ahmed Mohiuddin, Shri G. H. Deshpande, Shri S. R. Rane, Shri Debendra Nath Sarma, Shri T. Sanganna, Shri Subodh Hasda, Shri A. Ibrahim, Shri L. N. Mishra, Shri Rajeswar Patel, Shri Naval Prabhakar, Shri K. G. Wodeyar, Shri N. P. Damodaran, Shri I. Eacharan, Shri Ranbir Singh Chaudhuri, Shri S. K. Kandasamy, Shri Bijoy Chandra Das, Shri Sathan Chandra Gupta, Shri K. K. Kellappan, Shri Kandala Subrahmanyam, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, Shri Tulsidas Kilachand, Shri Benjamin Hansda and the Mover, with instructions to report on the opening day of the next session, and that the number of persons whose presence shall be necessary to constitute a meeting of the committee shall be five."

Shri U. M. Trivedi (Chittor): The hon. Minister said that the number of persons present necessary to constitute a meeting of the committee shall be 5. It must be wrong.

Shri Nanda: There is some mistake. It must be 15. But on my paper, the number mentioned is 5.

Mr. Speaker: I think the number of persons in order that there may be quorum is 5.

Shrimati Renu Chakravartty (Basirhat): Generally, I think it is one-third of the total number of Members.

Shri B. S. Murthy (Eluru): I think this is one-third.

**Mr. Speaker:** I will find out, and the correct number will be mentioned when I place the motion before the House.

**Shri Nanda:** Before I start explaining the principal clauses of this amending Bill, I think I should indicate the broad purpose of the changes which are sought to be introduced and the circumstances which are responsible for these proposals. It will be necessary for me to make a brief reference to the background of this legislation. The basic Act which is intended to be modified is the Electricity Supply Act, 1948. Before that Act was passed in 1948, the only law on the subject was the Indian Electricity Act, 1910. This is still in force. This Act deals with the issue of licences, the requirements of safety and in a limited way the regulation of relations between licencees and the consumers.

Many Members of this House are familiar with the provisions of the 1948 Act, because they themselves took part in the making of it. The object of this 1948 Act is the rationalisation and development of production and supply of electricity. For carrying out the purposes of this Act, two major agencies are created: The Central Electricity Authority and the State Electricity Boards. In addition, the State itself has been assigned certain functions. The Central Electricity Authority is set up in order to develop a sound, adequate and uniform national power policy and also in a specific way to perform the functions of arbitration between licencees and the Government or the Board as the case may be. The Board is a much more important body. It has the general duty of promoting the co-ordinated development of the generation, supply and distribution of electricity within the State in the most efficient and economical manner with particular reference to such development in areas which are not being adequately served or are not being served at all at the time,....

**Shri D. C. Sharma (Hoshiarpur):** Backward areas.

**Shri Nanda:**...that is the areas which have not had the proper benefit of power and also to prepare and carry out schemes to supply electricity. The Board is assisted by a State Electricity Council which advises the Board on major questions of policy and regarding major schemes there may also be local advisory committees. The Board discharges its obligations either by directly carrying out schemes for generation and supply or alternatively by purchasing the undertaking of licences and or by controlling and regulating the business of licencees. This control has two major aspects: power to issue directions for the achievement of maximum of economy and efficiency in the operation of the licencee stations and secondly regulating licencees' charges to consumers which may also require the constitution of a rating committee. It has also another kindred function in connection with the amortisation and tariff policies of local authorities. The Board can help to extend loans to licencees and the Board has further to co-ordinate the activities with any multi-purpose scheme in operation in the area. This is briefly the picture of the functions of the Board and how it has to operate.

The State on its part comes into the picture for several purposes. The State constitutes a State Electricity Council. The State may constitute local advisory committees and regarding any scheme estimated to result in a capital expenditure exceeding Rs. 50 lakhs, the Board must have prior consultation with the authority and if the latter's recommendations are not acceptable to the Board, then the Board must secure the consent of the State Government. The Board has to submit a financial statement to Government and the State may make subventions, advance loans, accord sanctions to borrowings by the Board and guarantee the Board's loans. This briefly is the background of the ex-

[Shri Nanda]

isting law and it will now be easier to comprehend the import of the amendments which being sought to be introduced, but before that I might explain also in a few words the working of the existing Act.

Some of the provisions of this Act are being put to good and effective use. There has been slow progress in respect of some other provisions. The Central Electricity Authority has been acting as arbitrator wherever required. The portion of the Act which regulates the licencees' charges to the consumer on the basis of the Sixth Schedule has played a very useful part in stabilising the rates and in protecting the interests of the consumers. The central purpose of the Act, however, that is the creation of semi-autonomous boards for rationalising and developing the generation of power has been fulfilled only partially. The position has remained static for a long time but substantial advance has been made during the last year and a half. The provisions relating to the constitution of State Electricity Boards and advisory committees were required to be brought into force within a period of two years of the date of the passing of the Act. This period, however, could be extended by the Central Government. As most of the States could not establish Electricity Boards due to some financial, technical and administrative difficulties, the period for the constitution of the Boards had to be extended from time to time, and now this extended period is to expire on the 31st March, 1957. So far, the States of Madhya Pradesh, Delhi, Saurashtra, Bombay and West Bengal have constituted Electricity Boards. All the remaining States except four have also agreed to set up Boards before the expiry of the extended period. The matter is being pursued with the Chief Ministers of these States and it is hoped that they would also agree to adopt this arrangement before long.

Now, how does the need for amending this Act arise? For a considerable period the question of making impro-

vements in the Act has been under consideration. The call for these changes has come from three directions. The States have been insisting upon the Central Government to introduce certain modifications in order to strengthen their hands vis-à-vis the Boards. The electricity undertakings, on the other hand, through their Federation, have been pleading for the redress of what, according to them, are their grievances in certain matters. And thirdly, the working of the Act has itself disclosed a number of anomalies and loop-holes which it is intended to remove through this Bill.

This process of consideration has taken a fairly long time. A draft Bill was prepared and circulated to all the State Governments and the Federation of Electricity Undertakings of India in 1951. Comments were received and they were examined in consultation with the Central Water and Power Commission, and fresh draft Bill was prepared in the light of the criticism received. This Bill was again circulated to all the States and to the other bodies concerned and their opinions were received, and in the light of all these suggestions fresh discussion of the provisions occurred at an inter-State conference in February, 1955. The representatives of the Federation of Electricity Undertakings of India were also given an opportunity to be heard. The Bill presented to the House is largely based on the decisions taken at this conference and in the course of these deliberations.

I have mentioned three sources from which the amendments have been derived. I shall briefly explain the proposals under each head. Firstly the State Governments. They were very keen that the Act should be amended to enable them to exercise a larger measure of control over the activities of the State Electricity Boards in matters of policy. It was recognised that such powers were desirable in the interests of smooth ad-

ministration and to enable the State Governments to discharge their responsibilities adequately. It is therefore proposed to vest the State Governments with powers analogous to those exercisable by the Central Government over the Damodar Valley Corporation. These provisions would empower the State Governments to issue directions to the Boards in matters of policy and to remove the entire Board if it refuses or fails to comply with certain directions. It is also intended to lay down that the appointment of the Secretary of the Board shall be subject to the approval of the State Government. With the same end in view provision has been made in the amending Bill requiring the Boards to consult the State Governments in the preparation of schemes costing over Rs. 10 lakhs. Hitherto such consultation was not necessary. The power to direct the amortisation and tariff policies of local authority licencees is now vested in the State Electricity Boards exclusively, but in the amending Bill it is proposed that the Boards should exercise this power subject to the approval of the State Governments.

This is one part of the amendments, and I mentioned three. The second is that which relates to the licencees themselves. The private sector of industry, since early 1951, has been persistently requesting for an increase in the standard rate of reasonable return from five per cent to six per cent, on the plea of difficulty in securing the capital required for the development of the industry. In 1948, when the principal Act was passed, the bank rate was three per cent, and the standard rate was fixed at five per cent, that is to say, there was a margin of two per cent. It has been felt that due to the increase in the bank rate from three to three and a half per cent since 1951, an increase in the standard rate by half a per cent is justifiable, and this would be in conformity with the original intentions. With a view to securing an automatic adjustment of the standard rate in response to the changes

in the money market, it is proposed to link it with the bank rate and fix it at two per cent above the latter.

There is another provision made in connection with the licencees, which I have to explain. Under the provisions of section 8 of the Finance Act, 1955, section 10 (2) of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922, was amended, to provide for a deduction called the development rebate equal to 25 per cent of the actual cost of new plant and machinery installed after the 31st March 1954, for the purpose of computation of taxable profits. The effect of the allowance is to reduce the taxable profits of an assessee. The electricity supply industry can avail of the benefits of this rebate, only if the licencees have been permitted by the amendment to the Act to pool the difference between the amount which would have been payable, if the development rebate had not been granted, and that actually paid after making allowance for the development, rebate, into a reserve, and to utilise these accumulations for development purposes. Otherwise, this will disappear in a reduction in the rates. It is, therefore, proposed to amend the Act to provide for the creation of this development reserve and permit the licencees to utilise it for expansion of their supply and distribution systems. The licencees, however, would not be permitted to increase their return, that is, to earn the reasonable return on the assets financed from the this reserve. It is also provided that the balance in the reserve as well as the assets formed out of it may be handed over to the purchaser without any compensation, in the event of the undertaking changing hands. I have dealt so far with two aspects of the amendments.

The third relates to the changes which have become necessary on account of the deficiencies that have been revealed or disclosed in the course of the working of this Act. Some of these deficiencies and loopholes relate to the regulation of the financial operations of licencees, which led to abuses by certain licencees to

[Shri Nanda]

the detriment of the interests of the consumers in the past. I shall enumerate in the order of importance, the relevant provisions, which, at the moment, give rise to this sort of abuse or exploitation, and to the enlarging of the profits of the licensees at the expense of the consumers.

The first is the charging by the licensees of managing agent's remuneration and office allowance, in addition to the pay of a managing director or manager employed. The second is charging interest on loans and debentures, as an item of operating expenditure, in addition to earning reasonable return thereon, resulting in a double return for the licensees on this investment. Similarly, they are earning reasonable return on amounts invested out of the depreciation reserve, outside the business of electricity supply, in addition to the earning of interest or dividends thereon. This also means a double return. Further, there is an earning by the licensees of reasonable return on security deposits of the consumers and assets financed out of the tariffs and dividends control reserve, created out of the consumers' money. It is proposed to provide for reduction of rates for licensees, in case their clear profits exceed the amount of reasonable return by 15 per cent. Hitherto, if hon. Members would refer to the Act, they will find, that this figure has been 30 per cent. This 30 per cent is being reduced to 15 per cent. This provision refers to the position of the licensees in relation to the consumers.

Some amendment is also required in relation to the boards in order to improve and strengthen their positions. Under the existing provisions of the Act, interest-free loans granted to the boards by the State Governments are repayable out of the revenues. In the case, however, of electricity supply licensees, loans are not repayable out of the revenues but are redeemed by raising fresh share capital. Thus, the State Electricity

Board is burdened with heavier financial responsibility than the licensees. So, with a view to reducing the capital liabilities of the board and enabling it to supply electricity at competitive rates, it is proposed to delete the provision relating to the redemption of loans out of revenues; such loans would then be treated on the same footing as interest-bearing loans, and will not be repayable in this form. Provision is also proposed to be made to enable the State Electricity Board to repay the loans borrowed from sources other than the State Governments, out of the accumulations in the depreciation reserve, instead of out of the revenues.

Another change has been made, which is of considerable importance. The accounts of the boards, under the existing provisions, are to be audited by a person qualified to act as auditor under the Indian Companies Act. In view, however, of the fact that the bulk of the finances of the boards are provided by the State Governments, control over the financial operations of the boards is proposed to be tightened, by subjecting them to the audit of the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India.

I have now to deal with one more aspect of this amending Bill, and that is in regard to the economic consequence of these changes. I have heard hon. Members say that there is going to be an increase in the standard rate for earning the reasonable return. The question then arises as to what its implications are, so far as the consumers are concerned.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh** (Gorakhpur Distt.—South): I could not follow what the Minister said.

**Shri Nanda:** I have explained that the tariff rates or the rates for the consumers are, under the present Act, based on a certain calculation of the capital base and on that a certain reasonable return which is to be charged, say, five per cent. Rates have:

to be so framed that this does not exceed five per cent, except that there is now this change, namely the margin of 30 per cent in the old Act is now reduced to 15 per cent. If there is an excess to the extent of 15 per cent, it has been shown how it is to be used. Now, the new position that is being created is that the return of 5 per cent will become 5½ per cent. That is so, because when the Act was passed, the bank rate was at three per cent, and the reasonable return was five per cent, and there was a difference of two per cent, but now that the bank rate stands at 3½ per cent, it stands to reason that the reasonable return may be 5½ per cent. But actually, the language now used in this Bill is in different terms. It makes it a kind of automatic adjustment with any fluctuations in the bank rate; that is to say, the difference of two per cent is going to be maintained. That makes things smoother.

But as I said, the question would still arise as to what it means for the consumers of power. How much more are they going to pay, because of this increase of half a per cent? I am in a position to inform hon. Members that actually, the outcome of this change is going to be for the benefit of the consumers and not against them.

On the whole, there is going to be a substantial reduction, and not an increase. Now, the question will be asked, how, when we are giving more on the hand, it is going to lead to a reduction in the rates charged by them. The explanation is contained in what I stated earlier, namely that we are removing certain anomalies that were present, whereby the licensees were able to charge interest on debentures and loans on the one side, and at the same time include these loans in the definition of capital base and thus earn five per cent on them. This has now been discovered, and therefore, this is being taken out. Therefore, a very considerable benefit will arise to the consumer, because he will not be liable to pay this double charge, but he will have to pay only once.

There are certain other changes of the same kind which I have mentioned. I won't take the time of hon. Members to repeat them, but when we come to the clauses, it will be possible to explain them at fuller length. Since they are now being abolished and a more rational scheme is now going to be enforced, it will be possible to see what the net result of these changes is going to be, that is, half per cent increase on the side and these deductions on the other side.

With a view to ascertaining the effect of the amendments incorporated in the Bill on the rates of supply of private licencees, the statements of statutory accounts of 290 licensees were examined and it was found that the maximum profit permissible under the Bill would be lower than permissible under the Act in the case of 287 undertakings; only in the case of 3 undertakings, the maximum permissible profit would be higher under the Bill than under the Act. Further, if all the licensees were, hypothetically, to charge such rate of supply as would enable them to earn the maximum clear profit under the provisions of the Act and of the Bill, that is, comparing the two, the average rate of supply under the Bill would be 5.23 per cent lower than payable under the Act. That is the net result.

However, the scrutiny of the aforementioned 290 accounts discloses that 131 undertakings actually earned clear profits up to the maximum permissible return; 72 undertakings earned profits which were less than the permissible return and 87 undertakings worked at a loss—this was the actual picture of these 159 (72 plus 87) companies. They could not earn the maximum permissible profits even under the existing provisions of the Act.

The inference, therefore, is that their business conditions were such as would not permit them to enhance their rate of supply to secure the maximum clear profit permissible under the Act. The question of their increasing the rates of supply with a view to earning even a higher return,

[Shri Nanda]

therefore, does not arise in actual practice. The accounts of the remaining 131 undertakings indicate that to earn the permissible return of 2 per cent above the bank rate under the Bill, 7 undertakings would have to increase their rate of supply by an average of 4.25 per cent and 93 undertakings would have to reduce their rates of supply by an average of 4.86 per cent—reducing cost of the other factors which I pointed out—and finally, the rates of 31 undertakings would remain unaffected.

The overall effect of the amendments incorporated in the Bill on the rates of supply of the undertakings of the first two categories above, would be a reduction of 3.86 per cent. This is the net effect of the various changes operating on one side or the other on the interest of the consumers.

Therefore, I think hon. Members would be pleased to see that while we are making a change in an upward direction for the purpose of the reasonable return to the licensees for good reasons, we are also able, at the same time, because of having discovered certain loopholes, which we are now removing, to see to it that the consumers' interests do not suffer, but that they benefit.

This is broadly the picture of the new Bill and of the Act if these amendments are accepted. I hope that the Motion will be accepted by the House.

**Mr. Speaker:** Hereafter I would like that the names of Members of the Select Committee be given in advance so that the list may be typed and circulated to hon. Members. This is to enable any hon. Member who looks into the list to make a suggestion as to whether some Members have to be removed from list and the names of others added and so on. At any rate, at the last minute the list ought not to be handed over to me like this. I have not even got a copy with me. As regards the point raised earlier

about the number required to constitute a sitting, it is 10.

Motion moved:

"That the Bill further to amend the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Shri N. C. Kasliwal, Swami Ramanand Shastri, Shri Rup Narain, Shri Bishwa Nath Roy, Dr. M. C. Jatav-vir, Shri W. S. Kirolikar, Shri A. S. Damar, Shri Ahmed Mohiuddin, Shri G. H. Deshpande, Shri S. R. Rane, Shri Debendra Nath Sarmah, Shri T. Sanganna, Shri Subodh Hasda, Shri A. Ibrahim, Shri L. N. Mishra, Shri Rajeshwar Patel, Shri Naval Prabhakar, Shri K. G. Wodeyar, Shri N. P. Damodaran, Shri I. Eacharan, Shri Ranbir Singh Chaudhuri, Shri S. K. Kandasamy, Shri Bijoy Chandra Das, Shri Sadhan Chandra Gupta, Shri K. Kelappan, Shri Kandala Subrahmanyam, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, Shri Tulsidas Kilachand, Shri Benjamin Hansda and the Mover with instructions to report on the opening day of the next session."

The number of Members whose presence shall be necessary to constitute a meeting under the rules shall be ten.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravartiy:** Mr. Speaker, Sir, this Electricity (Supply) Amendment Bill of 1956, is very important and it has not come a day too soon. As a matter of fact, you know that Shri Sadhan Gupta and I had already moved for certain amendments to this Act affecting the workers. It is good that an all-comprehensive amending Bill has been brought forward, because electric power is one of the basic things which are necessary for the industrialisation of our country; as a matter of fact, it is needed for all development. It is needed for the small-scale and cottage industries where we are turning over more and more to the utilisation of power. Then there are our

own State projects and irrigation projects and other projects which require an increasing amount of power; so also is the general industrial development of the country.

As a matter of fact, I am also reminded of the early days when the Soviet Power came into being. At that time, Comrade Lenin had said that Communism actually meant Soviet power plus electricity. Electricity is such an important thing. Therefore, I am very glad that this Bill has made the State, that is, the State Governments and the Central Government, responsible to a large extent for shaping the policies regarding electricity and power as well as for seeing that along with industrialisation, the consumers as well as the workers get some benefit out of it.

During the last few years, the State has entered more and more into this field. As a matter of fact, there is the D.V.C., there is Bokaro which is generating power, there is Bhakra-Nangal. More and more, the State has come into its own in this important sector. Therefore, it is all in the fitness of things that the public sector must have a predominating voice in this.

As a matter of fact, Shri Nanda has given a sort of general idea about the 290 concerns which they have looked into. I come from the city of Calcutta where we know the working of one of the biggest monopolies in electricity, the Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation—one of the biggest British monopolies in our country. There, we have seen one of the reasons why electricity is neither cheap nor is utilised for the national good. It does not go into sectors which does not give a quick return. It is this private profit idea which has actually held back the development of electricity.

Therefore, I feel that this is a very important Bill. I hope that the Select Committee will go into every clause of this Bill very carefully to see that the objectives which we have in view are really attained, and specially

from the point of view of not allowing this important basic industry of electricity to be left as a source of private profit.

Now, coming to one very important point—I was rather disappointed that Shri Nanda did not pinpoint one of the most important ideas of computation—shall I say, novel idea—of profits in this industry. The biggest weakness in the Act which relates to this, is that it allows the computation of profits on the capital base and not on the paid-up capital. Generally, we know that profit is computed on the basis of the paid-up capital, on the assets, etc. Here, it is peculiar and it is based on capital base. The House should understand what this capital base is because if one goes into the fact as to how this capital base works out, one will understand that the amount of profit that is already given to this industry is something which is not given to any other industry.

I should have liked a differentiated approach to the big monopoly companies and to the smaller companies which are functioning under certain handicaps in smaller urban areas and in rural areas, where we want cheap electricity. Therefore, I feel that this Bill should have some sort of a differentiated approach to these various sectors to which we will have to give electric power. That is not there.

**Mr. Speaker:** Are there not different rates charged for lighting and pumping water for agricultural purposes?

**Shrimati Benu Chakravarty:** Yes, Sir. I am just trying to show that there are certain difficulties which are a great disadvantage to certain small companies. They are working in sectors where there is no possibility of quick return. In a city like Calcutta or Madras there are big units and big industries and the companies functioning there have got certain advantages. This method of computing will give them much quicker returns than the smaller companies which start working in small urban



[Shrimati Renu Chakravarty]

areas where there are not many consumers; nor are there big industrial units in large numbers. This should be looked in. I would not be able to make any specific recommendation but I feel that there should be a differentiated approach to these different sectors. Some more checks should have been put on the big monopolist concerns and certain advantages should have been given to the smaller companies which function under certain handicaps.

I now come again to the question of capital base. 'Reasonable return' under this Act is computed by the addition of the sum found by applying the standard rate—formerly five per cent but now it is increased by half per cent, which is the Reserve Bank rate—to the capital base and all investments other than from contingency and the unutilised depreciation fund which could not be used for the development of electricity undertakings plus an amount equal to half of one per cent on any loan of the board. These computations are complicated but I will show how exactly it works out in the case of the Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation.

The 'reasonable return' is five per cent of the capital base. What is the capital base? According to Schedule VI, it means the sum of the original cost on fixed assets, intangible assets, original cost of works in progress and all investments. Certain checks have been put here by this Bill and there is no doubt about it. It has limited the amount on account of working capital to the depreciated cost of the capital and several other limitations have been put. But it is very complicated. That is why it would have been better to base profit not on capital base but on paid-up capital.

'Clear profit' means the difference between the income and expenditure. The term 'income' includes rates, rentals, sale or repair of lamps, etc. Expenditure includes even such items

as income-tax and other things. 'Reasonable return' is five per cent on the capital base plus the income derived from investments other than those made under paragraph I of the Sixth Schedule plus half of one per cent on loans advanced by the board.

**Mr. Speaker:** The present Bill wants to avoid the interest and the reasonable return both.

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** I come to that; I will come to the good points in this Bill. Certain checks have been put. But the very basis of computation should have been changed.

How does this reasonable return, according to the Calcutta Electricity Supply Act, work out in the case of the Calcutta Electricity Supply Corporation? The capital base in the year 1950 was about £17 million. This was the figure submitted by that Corporation to the West Bengal Government. The paid-up capital at the close of that year was only £6 million. On a capital of £6 million, the capital base worked out to £17 million. You can now calculate on this capital base at five per cent, the standard rate. It will be rather a huge figure. That is why I feel that it is very important. In this particular case, it is three times the paid-up share capital of the company. So, this company can earn a clear profit after providing for taxation and reserves; it would be twenty per cent of the paid-up share capital invested by the shareholders. This is a most generous return. In this amendment, we should have had a much simpler formula of computation of profit, as in the case of most of the other companies. These complicated systems of calculation always enable the bigger companies to make so much more profit while the smaller ones will not make so much profit. Now the boards accounts will be coming under the Auditor-General. But, I still feel that it would have been better if we had the computation on the basis of the paid-up capital; it would have

been simpler. In the case of small companies, their capital base will be much smaller and will be almost the same as paid-up capital. I have got the views of some of the employees of bigger companies; they have sent me their views. For instance, the Salem-Erode Electricity Distribution Company Ltd. employees had sent me their views. If a company has big assets, naturally its capital base would be much bigger. In the case of small companies which have come into existence later, the capital base would be much smaller and so their returns would be much smaller. Therefore, weightage should have been given in favour of smaller companies. This is one of the biggest drawbacks of this measure. The desirability of computing profit on paid-up capital and not on capital base is one of foremost points which I wanted to emphasise.

There are certain changes and we welcome them. The Act of 1948 allowed a licensee to have a clear profit which would exceed reasonable return by thirty per cent. Now, it has been reduced to 15 per cent.

**Mr. Speaker:** It continues. 7.5 per cent of 30 per cent—that is, one-fourth is allowed. If it is 15 per cent, half of that is 7.5 per cent. How is it less?

**Shrimati Renu Chakravarty:** That was exactly what I was going to point out. I want the hon. Minister to reply to this. I do not know how far I am correct. When I went into the details of this, it looks as though the consumers are the sufferers. The upper limit of clear profit is reduced by this Bill from 30 to 15 per cent but this is done actually at the cost of the consumer. By the 1948 Act, if the clear profit is above the reasonable return, one-third of such excess would be at the disposal of the undertaking, one-third would go towards the tariffs and dividends control reserve and one-third would go towards rebate to the consumer. Now, what is happening under this Bill? The rebate question will arise only if the

clear profit is above 15 per cent of reasonable returns. It will arise only then. Even then the amount available might be found to be less than what was in the earlier Act. That is what I was feeling; I have not worked out the details.

Now the Company is also being given the right to carry it over for distribution to consumers in future it sounds innocent enough. But I would like to show its pernicious effects. What happened because of this carrying over in the case of the Calcutta Electricity Corporation? The West Bengal Government permitted the Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation to use excess profits from 1949-52 in financing capital extension programmes subject to a gradual repayment to a special reserve to be created from clear profits. The Company has a big right to keep it in reserve to repay later on. What did this Company do? In 1950, the Company made an excess profit of Rs. 255,000 over the reasonable return. The reasonable return was Rs. 888,000 or so and on top of that the excess profit was Rs. 255,000. What did this permission to use the excess profits for extension programmes mean? It meant keeping the profit which should have been used for the relief of the consumer away from benefiting them first. Then, secondly, it meant immediate inflation of the capital base; because the capital base itself became inflated, it in turn meant more clear profits for the company. The licence of the Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation is going to lapse in 1970 and there may be a chance of nationalising the company. Then, the calculations of the compensation will also be highly inflated. I say that one has to look into this thing very carefully if you allow them to keep the amount which should go as rebate to the consumers, to be repaid later on. This may be utilised for inflating capital which will mean higher clear profits which will increase the profit-motive of the big companies. That is why I felt that the whole calculation has to be

[Shrimati Renu Chakravartty]

gone into very carefully by the Select Committee.

There are certain very good points in this Bill. Certain checks and balances have been introduced in this Bill against old and big companies artificially inflating their figures. In the distribution of revenues one good thing has been introduced and that is, the intangible assets of the company like goodwill etc. have been limited to the extent of the actual value appropriated in the year for that purpose. You cannot allow that to be vague. It should be limited to the extent that is provided for that very purpose in that year. That is a good thing; and this limitation will reduce the capital base.

Then again, the question of contribution to the general reserves is reduced from 1 per cent of the original cost of the assets to  $\frac{1}{2}$  per cent of the original cost. This also, I think, is a good limitation. Depreciation reserve has also been reduced. We used to find huge amounts used as depreciation reserve by big companies like the Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation. By the 1948 Act, the depreciation reserve was allowed on the scale laid down in the table in the Seventh Schedule. It was such amount as it would be if made annually throughout the prescribed period and accumulated at compound interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum subject to a limit of 90 per cent of the original costs of assets. By the 1956 Bill, you are reducing 4 per cent to 3 per cent. These are small points.

But what is good in this. Depreciation Reserve, over and above the above calculation, is allowed at interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum on sums at the credit of the Depreciation Reserve. This overall-blank 3 per cent has been abolished. That, I think, is a good thing and it limits the amount of inflated reserves which are kept there. Otherwise, that in itself would go to increase the capital base in an unjustified manner.

Since depreciation reserve has top priority in the liabilities of the Board, this limitation is good because the rebate is made a liability on the revenues of the Board and it gives a chance to the consumer. I admit that they have specified after what point the rebate comes in. But, in any case, payment of rebate to consumers is an item of liability on the revenues of the Board and that is an important and welcome step.

I am glad that certain impetus has been given to the development of electricity. As I said before, the production of electricity has been guided by the profit motive rather than the needs of the country, especially the small-scale and village industries. Recently, I went to Ludhiana in Punjab and I was surprised and amazed at the tremendous initiative of the small-scale industrialists. They invest Rs. 5,000 or Rs. 10,000 and start making spare parts, spare motor parts, cycle parts, sewing machine parts and even machine tool machinery. But the biggest difficulty is that they do not get power. They have started industrial estates, where you have all the industries put together, but what is the good unless they are able to get electricity? It is not a very big city with a lot of people wanting this power and yet there is great shortage of power. This impetus to the development of industry without profit motive should be there and it is an important thing to note.

I think there is one thing that has to be taken into consideration. After seeing Bokaro, I think, it is important, the charges for utilising the unutilised capacity by the Board of transmission lines of licencees. Formerly, they were inflated by charging interest on the original cost. Even though these transmission lines had been put up 50 years ago, the entire capital expenditure would be taken into account in computing the charges which will be made for the utilisation of unutilised power. At

least in this Bill, the interest on the depreciated cost of the line will only be considered in future. I think the whole thing should be gone into more fully.

The other point which I want to say is this. I went to Bokharo and I say how the State is spending crores and crores of rupees on this fine electricity generating plant. I asked what was the cost of the bulk supply. I forget the figures but I was given an extraordinarily low figure for this bulk supply. I asked specifically what percentage of it is actually used by the village and decentralised industries. I put this question on the floor of the House also. I am surprised to find that the bulk of it is today used by the Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation, the Indian Iron and Steel Company, Burnpur, and even Tatas. It is these big monopolists that are taking the bulk supply. We should see that we are able to get this energy which we are generating at much expenditure to State without allowing for a large margin of profit to these middlemen, shall we say, who come in the form of big industries. We should see that at least a large portion of the energy which is produced by the State at these organisations like the Bokharo should go to the benefit of the small rural and village decentralised industries. This is what I felt and this is an aspect of the entire matter which has to be taken into consideration by the Select Committee. It is no doubt a technical matter, but I do think that our Minister and his big army of technicians will be able to explain these to the members of the Select Committee.

There is a new idea that has emerged in this Bill, the idea of a Development Fund. It is good that the development rebate which has been allowed today under the Income-tax Act is going to come as an investment for the purpose of the development of electricity itself. That is a good thing. I also appreciate that in the computation of the capital base, some change has been made. Former-

ly, all depreciation funds could be utilised for investment in any other concern, other than that of the Electricity Supply, except those of fixed or intangible assets. Beyond that, all money which was in the depreciation fund could be utilised for investment in any other concern. Now the Government or the Central Authority has to be satisfied that the needs of the development of electricity have been fulfilled, and only that which is in excess of that will go into the computation of the capital base. That, I think, is a good thing, and I hope that the State will guide the policy that has been laid down here, that the State will be the ultimate authority to guide the policy of how and where to develop, where to give certain rebates, where to give certain cheap rates, and where to give high rates, etc. If this is done, I hope that very good checks will be kept with a view to seeing that it will not allow profit to be the only motive for the development of electricity and that a good and fair share of power will be given to the village and small-scale industries to meet their needs of electricity.

1 P.M.

One or two other points and I will finish, and that is on the question of the Rating Committee. The other important factor in the electricity world is the consumer. The hon. Minister has already tried to assure us that in spite of the fact that half a per cent. has been increased in the standard rate, something like 3.86 per cent. reduction in rebate will be given. I will have to look into the details that he has given us, and I certainly hope that what he has promised us will come true. As far as the small-scale industries are concerned, the rebates should be much lower, even if it means subsidising.

The Rating Committee can change rates provided the licensee is guaranteed clear profit which together with sums in tariffs and dividends control reserve affords him a reasonable return. Again coming back to the question of reasonable return, I

[Shrimati Renu Chakravarty]

have tried to point out to the House that even now this should be gone into, that is, whether in such a basic industry as electricity we should allow the possibility of any high profits in spite of the limitations and checks, that have no doubt been put upon what existed before, in this Bill. I am glad that the tariffs and dividends reserve have been included in this clear profit, because until the clear profit exceeds 15 per cent. of reasonable return, there is no question of rebate. If in addition to the clear profit, the dividend control reserve and tariffs are included in this, the upper limit of reasonable return will be reached with lesser clear profit and there will be some chance of rebate or possibility of rebate being there.

Regarding the Rating Committee I would like to say that it is important that we have a certain definite attitude towards these Committees, Councils, towards these Boards, etc. I feel very disappointed that in the Bill nowhere do we find that the consumer's interests or the labour interests are actually represented on these Boards, nor on the Rating Committee, nor on the Councils, nor on the Advisory Committees, nor on any of the other committees that have been recommended in this Bill. I feel that this is an important thing because it is necessary for us to have the opinions of all sections who are closely connected with the use and supply of electricity. Therefore I feel that in these committees the interests of the consumer, the interests of labour, the interests of industry and the interests of Government should be represented so that an overall and comprehensive attitude towards the entire matter can be taken.

I welcome also the inclusion of bonus as an allowable item of expenditure, which was not there in the original Bill, in schedule VI. I am glad we have brought forward this particular thing as an amendment in a Private Member's Bill and the hon.

Minister has included it here. I know that after the first judgment was given by the Bombay Labour Tribunal, later on another judgment was given whereby the earlier refusal to accept bonus as an allowable item of expenditure was reversed. But it is good that here we have included it in the item of expenditure. I think this is a good beginning, and if we can also utilise the experience and knowledge of the workers in fixing not only the rates, etc., but also in the development of the policies to be undertaken for the growth of this important sector of our industrial advancement, it would be a very good thing. When I visited Bokharo, I met many fine young men who were working there enthusiastically and with patriotism and who wanted that development of electricity should advance further. They had much more working knowledge of this intricate industry than many of us sitting here and talking about it—in fact we can learn much from them because they are the people who are working there and it is for them to tell us how to advance this industry, how to work it economically, where we should be able to effect economies, where we should invest, how to develop, etc. They know where the shoe pinches and, therefore, all these things should be got from them. I feel that their representation, their guidance, their help, their co-operation and their assistance should also be found in the various Boards and Committees that are set up.

With these few words I recommend that the Select Committee should go very carefully into this rather technical and rather difficult amending Bill, which actually affects the life of millions of our people who are today expecting electricity and power and modern methods of industrialisation for the development of our country and for the nation's prosperity in general.

श्री सिहासन सिंह: यह विधेयक स्वागत योग्य है। यह ऐसे समय में आया है जब कि देश में चारों तरफ बिजली की मांग है और हमारे

जीवनस्तर का ऊंचा उठना बिजली के प्रयोग पर निर्भर है। आज हम जितनी अधिक मात्रा में बिजली का व्यवहार करेंगे उतनी ही मात्रा में हमारा जीवनस्तर ऊंचा उठने वाला है। ऐसी अवस्था में यह विधेयक, जिसका उद्देश्य यह है कि बिजली की मांग बढ़े और उसकी दर कम हो, स्वागत की चीज है। लेकिन हम मंत्री महोदय और आपके जरिये रेटिंग कमेटी (दर समिति) का ध्यान इस तरह दिलाना चाहते हैं कि आज व्यवसायों की तरफकी बिजली के अधिक उत्पादन पर अवलम्बित है। लेकिन आज जो बिजली उपलब्ध है उसका दर इतना ज्यादा है कि लोग उसे लेने से गुरेज करते हैं। आज हालत यह है कि दिल्ली में बिजली का कोई और भाव है, गोरखपुर में अन्य भाव है, बिहार में कोई अन्य भाव है, हरप्रान्त में भिन्न भिन्न भाव है, जब कि बिजली का कंट्रोल केन्द्रीय सरकार के ही हाथ में है। ऐसी अवस्था में भिन्न भिन्न स्थानों में बिजली की दर में जितना कम अन्तर होगा उतना ही देश के लिए लाभ होगा। आज दिल्ली में बिजली का दर रोषानी और पंखे के लिए साढ़े तीन आना यूनिट है और पावर के लिए ढेढ़ आना यूनिट। लेकिन गोरखपुर जैसे छोटे शहरों में और छोटे देहातों में इसका रेट आठ आना यूनिट है। कहीं ८ आने यूनिट और कहीं पर साढ़े ३ आने यूनिट। पावर का रेट वहां पर साढ़े ३ आने और ४ आने यूनिट है। आज खेती के काम के लिए जो बिजली दी जा रही है उसकी भी दर ६ आने यूनिट है। आज भी गोरखपुर के पूर्वी क्षेत्रों में सूखा पड़ा हुआ है। वहां पर नहरें हैं और बिजली के ट्यूबवैल्स (नल कूप) लगे हुए हैं लेकिन बिजली का भाव अधिक होने के कारण काश्तकार धान में पानी नहीं ले रहे हैं और बिजली इतनी महंगी पड़ती है कि पानी लेने पर धान हो भी जाये तो वह नहीं के बराबर होगा। पानी का रेट अधिक होने के कारण काश्तकार वहां पानी नहीं ले रहे हैं और पानी पड़ा हुआ है। पहले धान की खेती के लिए ४ आने यूनिट का भाव था लेकिन उसका

लेविलिंग करके सबके लिए ६ आने फी यूनिट कर दिया। पानी क़रीब मौजूद है, नहरें पास हैं और खेत बिना पानी के सूख रहे हैं लेकिन भाव इतना महंगा है कि काश्तकार पानी नहीं ले रहे हैं। एक कहावत यहां पर पूरी तरह चरितार्थ हो रही है—“आव आव कर दे दिया पर—सराहने रखा पानी” वही हालत पानी का बिजली के रेट के अधिक होने के कारण काश्तकार सूखते हुए धान में पानी नहीं दे रहा है

[Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair]

परसों १६ तारीख को शायद हमारे कृषि मंत्री महोदय पूर्वी क्षेत्रों के बारे में कोई बयान देने वाले हैं जहां कि अकाल की सी स्थिति विद्यमान है। यह जो आपने विधेयक के सम्बन्ध में अपने भाषण में कहा कि हम इसके जरिए भाव में कमी करने जा रहे हैं, तो वह चीज बड़ी ही स्वागत योग्य है और मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूं। बिजली और पानी जितने ही सस्ते रेट पर मिले, उतना ही अच्छा है। मंत्री महोदय ने अंत में अपने भाषण के दौरान बतलाया कि इस विधेयक के पास होने का कुल परिणाम यह होगा कि ३.२५ फीसदी बिजली की दर में कमी हो जायेगी जिसका कि अर्थ यह हुआ कि १०० रुपये के बजाय अब ९७ रुपये या पीने ९७ रुपये के क़रीब देने पड़ें करेंगे। अर्थात् तब तो यह था कि ३० फीसदी रीजनेबुल रेट आफ प्राफिट (लाभ की उचित दर) के ऊपर ३० फीसदी से बेसी होने पर आप उसमें कमी कर सकते थे, उसको आपने मेहरबानी करके ३० के बजाय १५ कर दिया है अर्थात् १५ परसेंट के रीजनेबुल रेट आफ प्राफिट से ऊपर हो तो कम किया जाये लेकिन कितना कम किया जाये कंज्यूमर्स (उपभोक्ता) के रूप में उसका कोई रूप इसमें नहीं दिखलाया गया है।

मंत्री महोदय ने अपने भाषण में लाइ-सेंसिब (अनुमतिधारी) के इस बिजली के हिसाब किताब में चल रहे लूपहोल्स (गुटियों) का भी जिक्र किया और किस तरह से इधर

## (श्री सिंहासन सिंह)

उधर से रुपया जुटा कर और जोड़ तोड़ करके उस रुपये पर सूद भी लेते थे और मुनाफा और डिबैंचर्स (ऋणपत्रों) पर सूद भी लेते थे। अपने भाई भतीजों से कर्जा ले लेते हैं और उस पर सूद लेते हैं और सूद पर मुनाफा लेते हैं। मंत्री महोदय इस विषयक के द्वारा इन तमाम लूपहोल्स को बंद करने की चेष्टा कर रहे हैं और जहाँ तक इस चेष्टा का सम्बन्ध है, वह स्वागत योग्य है और हमारा पूरा समर्थन उसके साथ है।

लेकिन इन छिद्रों को बंद करने के साथ ही साथ उनका नजर इस चीज पर भी जानी चाहिए कि अभी तक उन्होंने कितना मुनाफा किया है और आगे इसके बाद कितना करेंगे और स्पष्ट है कि जितना ही हम इधर ध्यान देंगे उतना ही हमारा और देश का कल्याण होगा। यह स्पष्ट बात है कि जितना ही कम बिजली का रेट होगा उतनी ही उसकी खपत ज्यादा होगी और जितनी बिजली की खपत अधिक होगी उतनी ही हमारी पैदावार ज्यादा होगी। अन्न की पैदावार हमारे देश में ४० फीसदी (प्रतिशत) बढ़ाई जाने वाली है और ४० फीसदी अन्न की पैदावार तभी बढ़ेगी जब बिजली और पानी दोनों का समुचित उपयोग करने का काश्तकारों को मौका मिलेगा और समुचित उपयोग करने का मौका तब ही मिलेगा जब उनकी पानी और बिजली की दर कम हो और बिजली और पानी की दर अधिक होने के कारण आप गोरखपुर और देवरिया में जाकर देख सकते हैं कि नलकूप होते हुए भी वहाँ काश्तकार पानी नहीं ले रहे हैं। पानी की दर भी बिजली की दर अधिक हो जाने के कारण बढ़ जाती है और जिसका कि नतीजा यह होता है कि किसान उनका उपयोग नहीं कर पाते हैं और उपज नहीं बढ़ पाती है। आप को जैसे भी हो इस दर की कम करना पड़ेगा। देश में जो बड़े बड़े डैम बन रहे थे उनसे सबको बड़ी आशा बंध चली थी कि यह जो जल के जरिए बिजली पैदा की जा रही है उसका परिणाम बिजली

की दर में कमी होगा। सन् १९४६ में उत्तर-प्रदेशीय सरकार ने रिहैन्ड डाम की स्कीम वहाँ की विधान सभा के सामने रखी और बड़ा अन्ध्र स्वरूप दिखलाया कि रिहैन्ड डाम बन जाने के बाद बिजली काफ़ी सस्ती मिलने लगेगी और बिजली २ पैसे या १ पैसे यूनिट मिलेगी। लोगों के दिलों में इसको सुन कर बड़ी खुशी हुई कि अगर बिजली १ पैसे यूनिट मिलने लगी तो फिर कहना ही क्या है, धर धर में बिजली लग जायेगी और जगह जगह बिजली के कल कारखाने चलने लगेंगे और हमारा देश भी तरक्की के रास्ते पर चल कर दुनिया के और उन्नतिशील देशों के साथ सिर उठा कर गर्व के साथ चल सकेगा। लेकिन यह बड़े खेद की बात है कि १९४६ से आज सन् १९५६ हो गया, रिहैन्ड डाम नहीं बन पाया और बिजली की दर जहाँ ४ आने भी वहाँ वह उल्टे कम होने के और बढ़ गयी और ८ आने हो गयी।

यह बड़े सन्तोष की बात है कि रिहैन्ड डाम के बारे में केन्द्रीय सरकार ने मदद की है और काम वहाँ पर शुरू हो गया है और मंत्री महोदय के कथनानुसार सन् १९६० तक वह बन कर पूरा हो जायेगा लेकिन यह मामूल्म नहीं हो सका है कि वहाँ की बिजली का रेट क्या होगा। अभी तक जितने स्थानों पर आपने बिजली के भाव दिये हैं उनसे जाहिर हो जाता है कि कहीं पर बिजली एक आने से कम नहीं हुई है। कानपुर एलेक्ट्रिक सप्लाय कम्पनी जब फोरेन हाथ में थी तो बिजली का रेट डेढ़ आने और २ आने फी यूनिट था लेकिन हमने देखा कि जब से गवर्नमेंट ने उस बिजली कम्पनी को नेशनलाइज किया तब से उसका रेट बढ़ गया। जब तक हम खर्चें को किसी उपाय से कम नहीं करेंगे तब तक सस्ती बिजली देने के हम अपने लक्ष्य में सफल नहीं हो सकेंगे। जितने ही बोर्डों की हम स्थापना करते जायेंगे उतना ही हमारा खर्चा बढ़ता जायेगा और उस हासिल में बिजली की दर कम करना उतना ही मुश्किल हो जायेगा।

जब इस रेटिंग कमेटी में २ व्यक्ति तो बोर्ड की तरफ से होंगे, १ लाइसेंसी (अनु-जतिधारी) का प्रादमी होगा लेकिन उसमें कंज्यूमर्स का भी कोई प्रादमी होगा, उनका भी कोई उसमें प्रतिनिधित्व होगा, इसका कोई जिक्र नहीं है। वह पस जो कि आपकी बिजली की लेने वाला है उसकी तरफ आपका ध्यान ही नहीं है। बोर्ड की तरफ से जो दो व्यक्ति वहां पर होंगे और जो १ व्यक्ति लाइसेंसी की तरफ से होगा अथवा चैम्बर्स आफ कामर्स की तरफ से होगा तो वह तो अपने मुनाफ़े की बात कहेगा और यह साफ बात है कि बोर्ड वालों का सम्पर्क कंज्यूमर्स (उपभोक्ताओं) से कम रहेगा और बिजली का रेट ज्यादा ऊंचा होगा। मैं यह मानता हूँ कि इस संशोधन विधेयक के जरिए ३-२५ परसेंट की कमी अवश्य की गई है लेकिन इतनी ही कमी से हमें संतोष नहीं कर लेना पड़ेगा। इस कमी से शायद बहुत कल्याण नहीं होगा और जितना हम विधेयक में बोर्ड के बनाने में खर्च करेंगे वह दोनों मिल कर बराबर सा हो जायेगा।

इसके प्रतिरिक्त मैं एक विषय भी और और भवन का ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूँ। वहाँ तो संयोग से पावर एंड इरीगेशन मिनिस्ट्री यह दोनों एक ही व्यक्ति के हाथ में हैं लेकिन हमारे प्रान्त में यह स्थिति नहीं है और यह दोनों चीजें दो मिनिस्ट्रियों के हाथ में हैं। एक बिभाग नलकूप बनवाता है और बिजली वाला बिजली पहुंचाने का काम करता है। अगर यह दोनों काम एक ही व्यक्ति के हाथ में आ जायें तो काम अधिक सुचारु रूप से चल सकता है। अब अलग अलग व्यक्तियों के हाथ में यह दोनों काम रहने के कारण हम देखते हैं कि कहीं अगर नलकूप बन कर तैयार हो गया है तो वहाँ बिजली अभी तक नहीं पहुंची है और जहाँ नलकूप नहीं बने हुए हैं वहाँ बिजली के खम्भे सड़ें हुए हैं और बिजली पहुंची हुई है। मैं समझता हूँ कि अगर यह काम एक ही प्रादमी के हाथ में हो तो खर्च भी कम होगा और काम भी अच्छा होगा। आज हम देखते

हैं कि हमारे प्रान्त में एक ही काम को देखने के लिए एक तो एलेक्ट्रिकल (विद्युत) इंजीनियर है और दूसरा हाइड्रोएलेक्ट्रिकल (जलविद्युत) इंजीनियर है जो नहर बनाने वाला है। दोनों इंजीनियर्स हैं, दोनों के ओवरसियर्स हैं और दोनों के पैट्रोल्स हैं, एक ही जमीन को दो जने नापने वाले हैं और दोनों इंजीनियर्स इक्वैली (समान रूप से) बवाल-फ़ाइड हैं, उनमें से एक एलेक्ट्रिकल इंजीनियर बनता है और एक नहर का इंजीनियर बनता है, जब कि दोनों काम एक ही इंजीनियर कर सकता है और अगर आप ध्यान दें तो खर्च में कमी कर सकते हैं और इस तरह खर्च में कमी अगर आप कर सके तब तो बिजली की दर में कमी होगी अन्यथा बिजली की दर कम नहीं हो सकती।

आज अम्बर चर्खों को कौटैज इंडस्ट्री (कुटीर उद्योग) में चलाने का बड़ा शोर है और ऐसी उम्मीद थी कि अगले ५ वर्षों के अन्दर घर घर में अम्बर चर्खा चलने लग जायेगा। अम्बर चर्खा बिजली के जरिए भी चलाया जा सकता है, वह भी किसी ने अन्वेषण किया है लेकिन लोगों की भाशाओं पर यह देख कर तुषारपात हो गया कि ५ वर्षों में जहाँ २५ लाख अम्बर चर्खें बनने वाले हैं वहाँ लोगों को इस बात में भी शक हो रहा है कि इस साल ७५ हजार भी अम्बर चर्खें बन पायेंगे कि नहीं। आज अम्बर चर्खों को लेकर लोगों के दिलों में एक गुदगुदी सी होती है कि क्या वह दिन भी आयेगा जब हम अपनी जरूरत भर का कपड़ा खुद पैदा कर सकेंगे और वह उम्मीद लगाये बैठे हैं कि बिजली आने के बाद जब अम्बर चर्खा बिजली से चलने लग जायेगा तब तो वे अवश्य इस कपड़े की आत्मनिर्भरता तक पहुंच सकेंगे लेकिन जब वह अम्बर चर्खों के सम्बन्ध में इस तरह के कम बनने की बात सुनते हैं तो वे निराश हो जाते हैं। इसकें प्रतिरिक्त यह भी बड़ा आवश्यक है कि आप गांवों में जो छोटे छोटे कल कारखानों को जो बिजली सुलभ करें उनको शहरों के बड़े बड़े कल कारखानों की प्रोपेक्षा बहुत कम रेट पर दें और मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप बिजली की इस



[श्री सिंहासन सिंह]

तरह से दो दर रखें। अगर वाकई ग्राम गांधी जी का वह स्वप्न कि गांवों में स्वराज्य हो साकार देखना चाहते हैं, तो वह स्वराज्य बिजली के ही जरिये आ सकता है। बिजली तभी वहां पर आ सकती है जब कि उस की दर कम हो और वह सुलभ हो। हर एक श्रादमी अपने घर में एक कारखाना खोल सके। आज जापान में साइकिलों की छोटी छोटी दुकाने खुली हुई हैं, उन्हीं में वे लोग साइकिल बनाने के कारखाने खोले हुए हैं जो कि बिजली से चलते हैं। आप को इस बिल में एक धारा और रखनी चाहिये कि अगर कोई काटेज इंडस्ट्री के लिये बिजली लेगा तो उस के लिये बिजली की दर बड़ी बड़ी इंडस्ट्रीज की दर से कम होगी, श्राधी होगी, तिहाई होगी या पांचवां हिस्सा होगी। इस तरह से उन की प्रोत्साहन मिलेगा।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक का स्वागत करता हूं और मंत्री महोदय से यह उम्मीद करता हूं कि विशिष्ट कमेटी में इस बिल को ठीक से सुधार कर यह धारा रखेंगे कि काटेज इंडस्ट्री (कुटीर उद्योग) और हैवी इंडस्ट्री (भारी उद्योग) की बिजली की दरों में अन्तर होगा, साथ ही जहां तक सम्भव हो बिजली का भाव कम हो और सब जगहों पर एकसा हो। सारे देश में बिजली की दर का एक स्वरूप हो। यह न हो कि कलकत्ते में तो बिजली सस्ती हो और देहातों में महंगी मिले। हमारी इकानामी (अर्थ व्यवस्था) आज कल उल्टी हो गई है। दिल्ली का जीवन सस्ता है और दिल्ली के पास के देहातों का जीवन महंगा है। हम को इस को फिर से उलट कर रखना चाहिये। देहातों का जीवन सस्ता हो और शहरों का महंगा हो। आज आप बम्बई में एक रुपये में सारा शहर घूम सकते हैं, लेकिन दिल्ली में नहीं घूम सकते, देहातों का तो कहना ही क्या है। आप को ऐसा करना चाहिये कि बिजली की दर एकसा हो, जैसा कि आप योजना में करने का प्रयत्न भी कर रहे हैं। अगर आप की योजना गांवों में चलनी है तो उसके लिये गांवों में बिजली चाहिये।

बिजली वहां पर तभी जायेगी जब वहां के श्रादमी उस को ले सकेंगे। वह कमी भी ४ प्रा० या ८ प्रा० यूनिट बिजली के लिये नहीं देंगे जब कि वह ४ प्रा० का तेल ले कर महीना भर डेबरी जला कर काम चला सकते हैं। उन में बिजली के लिये ४ प्रा० देने की क्षमता तभी होगी जब उन के पास व्यवसाय होंगे, और व्यवसाय तभी चल सकेंगे जब उन को बिजली सस्ती मिले। आप जितनी ही बिजली सस्ती करेंगे उतना ही देश का कल्याण होगा। ऐक्ट और नियम तो बनते ही रहते हैं खर्च की कमी की तरफ जैसे आप ने ध्यान दिया है और उस को कम करने का प्रयत्न किया है, यह अच्छी बात है।

दूसरी चीज जो इस विधेयक में सब से बड़ी है वह यह है कि आप ने कंट्रोलर (नियंत्रक) और श्राडिटर जनरल (महालेखा परीक्षक) को निरीक्षक रक्खा है। हम ने अब तक जितनी चीजों को नेशनलाइज (राष्ट्रीयकृत) किया है सबों में, बावजूद इस के कि भवन का तकाजा था कि वहां पर कंट्रोलर जनरल (महा नियंत्रक) ही निरीक्षक हो, सरकार ने रजिस्टर्ड कम्पनी (पंजीबद्ध सरकार) के श्राडिटर्स (लेखा परीक्षकों) को ही निरीक्षक रक्खा है। इस के लिये रजिस्टर्ड कम्पनी के श्राडिटर्स नहीं रखे जायेंगे इस के ऊपर इस विधेयक में ध्यान दिया गया है। इस में कंट्रोलर और श्राडिटर जनरल को रक्खा गया है यह हमारे लिये प्रसन्नता की बात है और मैं आप को धन्यवाद देता हूं कि आप ने इस पर ध्यान दिया। मैं तो कहता हूं कि जहां कहीं भी सरकार से सम्बद्ध कोई कार्य हो, उस में जरूरी है कि कंट्रोलर और श्राडिटर जनरल का हाथ हो। जो कंट्रोलर और श्राडिटर जनरल की हस्ती है वह हमारी चुनी हुई है और उसमें हमारा पूर्ण विश्वास है। अगर वह सही तरीके से हिसाब किताब को देखेगा तो काम ठीक से चलता रहेगा। उस के छान बीन की रिपोर्ट (प्रतिवेदन) भवन के सामने धाती है और हम उस पर धोर कर सकते हैं।

में इसके लिये सरकार को बन्धनवाद देते हुए इस विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूँ ।

**Shri T. N. Singh** (Banaras Distt.—East): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have not many points to make in regard to this Bill but I do hope that, when the Select Committee considers this very important measure, one aspect of the problem will be kept in mind. I refer to the monopolistic character of every electricity concern. Now, wherever a monopoly operates, it becomes the duty of the Government, which represents the general public and the consumers of the particular concern's products, to see that the consumer is not put at a disadvantage. That is an accepted principle. Take the instance of the Railways. The Railways are a monopoly. But the Parliament has got constant and continuous control over the administration of the Railways. The Railway Minister can be any day asked to explain his conduct or the administration's conduct in any matter whatsoever. These electricity concerns are also more or less of the same nature. Whereas there is only one concern in the case of the Railways, which is directly subject to parliamentary control—its budget and other things are all put before the Parliament—all kinds of electricity concerns are functioning in all corners of the country. Unless some method is devised which will take the place of parliamentary control, I am afraid the interests of the consumers will not be safeguarded. It is for this reason, principally, that I have got up to participate in this debate. When I looked at the provisions of this Bill, as to how the rates which principally affect the consumers, would be controlled or regulated, I found that there is provision for a rating committee which will look into any petition or representation made by an electricity concern for enhancement of rates. I naturally thought that the consumer was being protected because somebody will look to it so that the rates are not easily raised. But what about the position when the rates are already high and the consumer claims

that there is a case for reduction? There is no committee to look into such a representation if made by consumers. There is no provision for that except that the State Government concerned may step in at their own sweet will. The initiative is left in the hands of the State Government or the electricity company in the matter of reducing or enhancing the rates. I wish in this matter initiative was given to consumer himself. If the consumers were to make a representation, to whom shall they make it and who will consider their representation? There is no such provision in this Bill. I feel it is a serious lacuna and it should be remedied.

I am sure it should not be, and it will not be, the intention of the Government that monopolistic concerns spread all over the country should become semi-autocrats in this matter and go on levying their rates as they please for some length of time at least. It may be argued that the State Government is there and if the companies are earning huge profits the State Government will step in. But the State Government can step in only after it has got the audit report. If, after seeing the audit report, the State Government is convinced that exorbitant rates are being charged, there is surplus profit left and the consumer can be benefited out of the surplus profit, then only the Government will step in. This position they will know only after two years. It is common knowledge that audit starts three or four months after the conclusion of a financial year of the company, and it takes four to six months to complete the audit. Then the report goes before the directors and a meeting is held. Only after that the report is available to the State Government. Then it will take another three to six months—according to the manner in which a Government functions—for the matter to be taken up. And when the matter is taken up, the same situation may not exist and electricity concerns will resist any interference in this matter. Every business-man would like to make as much

[Shri T. N. Singh]

profit as possible. So I envisage that it may take anything from 2 to 3 years for the State Government to step in and by that time, who knows, the situation might again have changed so that the company can go to the Rating Committee saying that the whole situation has changed, and you cannot do anything on the basis of a report which is two years old.

I was thinking that in the case of other monopolistic concerns there is a system whereby the interests of the consumers are protected against monopolies.

In America, in England and in some other countries in the West, there is a system whereby the consumer is protected. In America, there is an Inter-State Commission which hears appeals from consumers against any railway administration of that country. The Commission says that a particular rate is reasonable or unreasonable and that a particular rate should be reduced. I see no such provision in this Bill. America may be dubbed as a capitalist country but there, we have got a provision which lays down that the shareholders of railways shall not get more than six per cent. as dividend. It may be less, but it cannot be more than six per cent. I also know that the provision for depreciation there is very much stricter than here.

In this Bill there is a reference to the provision of income-tax law. Our Income-tax-Act, as amended, by the Finance Act, provides a lot of facilities to concerns, especially the newer concerns, in the matter of depreciation and income-tax relief. I feel that these electricity concerns cannot be put on a par with others, because other private companies are subject to free competition. Private companies may gain or lose and they have to take risks. But under this Bill, electricity concerns are protected by the State by law and they operate freely without competition. So, the State having given this exclusive advantage, the provisions of the income-tax law which applied

to private industries which have to face open competition, cannot be applied in this case. To me, it does not appear to be common sense. Therefore, besides a Rating Committee with more powers I would also urge that Income-tax law rules regarding depreciations should not apply to these concerns.

The next point is, what should be the constitution of a rating committee. I feel that this committee should be of an independent nature. As far as I know, there is no committee of this nature where the parties to the dispute are on the committee. Take, for instance, the Railway Rates Tribunal in India. It is a tribunal consisting mainly of judicial men. I do not say that we must have men from the judiciary on the Rating Committee. There may be various ways of constituting that committee, with men of various qualification and experience. But I do feel that the committee should be an independent one. It is not a committee of any negotiation or arbitration. In the matter of arbitration, one party says that it must have representation and another party says that it must also have its own representative and thus, between them, they select their own friends. This procedure of arbitration—has been followed here Why? Is the dispute going to be decided by a kind of arbitration? We should have a committee which will apply an objective mind to the problem and see that the consumers' interests are protected and that the concern does not go to dogs. So, having all these aspects in view, I would strongly advocate that the Rating Committee should be of an independent nature and it should consist of persons who are not allied with, or who have no bias in favour of, this or that part of the organisation of electricity concerns.

I will now refer to one or two points in regard to general administrative policies of our electricity concerns. Hydel power is, I think, mostly if not 100 per cent. under State control, and I take it that this Bill will operate, only with regard to those

electricity concerns which are thermal units run either by coal or by diesel oil. In a thermal plant, coal or diesel forms the principal element of recurring expenditure. As the distance of the coal mine increases, from the place where electricity is produced the cost of coal goes up. In Saurashtra, for instance, coal prices are more than double or nearly treble the cost at pit-head. To generate electricity by thermal power at such a long distance for coal mines is, I think, a very great hardship on the consumer because the rates charged are bound to be high.

Here in Delhi, the rate of electricity is about four annas for domestic purposes, the rate for power is one anna six pies. I fail to see why in nearby Rajasthan it goes up to six annas or eight annas, though the freight cost which is the main element for coal is not very much higher. I have calculated the whole thing, and I find that the freight element, because of a difference of about 200 miles, does not go to more than five or six per cent. of the total cost.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** In other places also, the same difficulty is there.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** I was coming to that. In Banaras, Groakhpur, Lucknow, Allahabad and even in Patna, where the cost of transport of coal is much less, how is it that the cost of electricity there is higher than in Delhi?

**Shri B. D. Fande (Almora Distt.-North-East):** I pay nine annas in my part of the country, and diesel is used there.

**Shri T. N. Singh:** I would like to hear the hon. Minister on this point and I would like to know what will be the policy on these matters. Electricity companies which are near the ports particularly on the western coast

should not be allowed to run on coal because coal is costly. Cheap diesel is available at the ports, and the companies near the ports should utilize diesel oil. We have got the Trombay refineries near Bombay. I am told that we have today a surplus of diesel oil which remains unutilised, even after such a short time of our starting the refineries. So, I see no reason why a rational management of electricity concerns should not be enforced. It will be possible only when the pressure of the consumer is kept at its maximum. I regret very much that there is no scope in this Bill for the consumer to make his presence felt. I do not want to go into further details neither do I wish to weary the House with the economics of electricity or go into the freight structure of coal or diesel oil. That is not necessary.

In the present context of things, when we are thinking of dispersal of industries and when the second Five Year Plan and the succeeding Plans will take the country in a certain direction, I do not know how far it will be feasible to have power costing one or one and a half annas per unit at one place and costing eight annas per unit or so in another place. Here in Delhi, power costs one anna six pies for even domestic use. In other places it costs about six annas, five annas or at least four annas. Such a position cannot be allowed to exist. I have great fears about creation and functioning of so many monopolistic concerns which will be protected by law in several matters. Parts of the original Act which are not being amended give certain protection to these concerns. It is to be seen whether in the context of all these things, this amending measure will stand the test of time and will also satisfy our needs. I have my doubts about it. I feel that probably we have not applied our mind even to the question whether it is feasible to have a uniform power rate, if not all over the country, at least in certain zones. If we have a zonal system for rate purposes the industries

[Shri T. N. Singh]

requiring power shall flourish at any place, provided they have got the necessary skill and raw material available there to start those industries. I doubt very much whether this aspect has been given full consideration. If it has been considered, I would ask the hon. Minister to give us in his reply an analysis as to how in various regions this power rate is functioning, and what is its incidence and how it affects the major industries, the consumers and the cottage industries in the villages. With all the experts that the hon. Minister must be having at his disposal, these aspects of the problem might have been considered.

The Bill has its good points and there are many useful provisions. It is but proper that the Bill should go to a Select Committee, which should go into all these details. I am sure our friends here will apply their mind to these aspects of the problem and bring back the Bill in a form which will not only be acceptable to the House, but which will really do good to the ordinary man and to the average craftsman, as also to the biggest of industries, so that all may benefit.

**Shri K. K. Basu** (Diamond Harbour): This Bill, which is being sent to a Select Committee, has received the general support of the Members who have spoken so far. Naturally, I would also like to extend my general support; but, I shall make some points of criticism, which I hope the Select Committee will consider.

We all realise the importance of electricity in the industrialisation of the country. In all countries in the world which are progressing industrially at a very fast rate, electricity plays a very important part. In the Soviet Union, when the Dneiper Dam was first constructed, it was considered an epoch-making event for the backward areas and the progress of Soviet Union. That it has led to the

rapid industrialisation of that country has been proved by subsequent events. In our country, even before the Congress came into power, when the Planning Committee was appointed in 1938, they laid emphasis on the development of the natural resources which might ultimately help in the generation of electricity, to be utilised for the industrialisation of the country. So, it should be the endeavour of this Parliament to see that the lacunae and the defects in this legislation which deals with concerns generating and supplying electricity are removed.

My friends who spoke before me dealt at great length on the aspect of the consumers' interest. Certainly I also join hands with them and I shall give a few examples to show to what extent the consumers' interest has not been taken into consideration. Since 1947, we have started many irrigation and multi-purpose projects, the main function of which is generation of electricity. The D.V.C. is possibly the most important of them. Many times questions have been asked about the supply of electricity to the rural areas and also the cities which are close to the Damodar Valley. The most important point is to what extent actually the consumers are benefited by the investment the nation has made for the construction of the plant at Bokaro and utilisation of the resources in this particular area for the generation of electricity. The Calcutta Electric Supply Corporation supplies electricity to the people in the Calcutta area. Power is also sold to the existing or newly formed supply concerns in that particular area at a very cheap rate—6 pies per unit. But when this energy is actually sold to the consumer, it is sold at a price which is equated with the cost of production of the power generated by the other firms. The Calcutta Electricity Supply Corporation takes power from the D.V.C at 6 pies, but it supplies the electric energy to the consumers in Calcutta and the suburbs proposed to be included

under the new grid system at 10 pice. In some areas, it is sold at 6 annas. Even in some areas round about and very close to the Damodar area, it is sold at 7½ annas.

The most important point which I would like the hon. Minister to take into consideration is this. Electricity is supposed to be supplied to the rural areas to help the development of the cottage industries and the small-scale industries found in the rural areas and small townships around Calcutta. There it is sold at a price which economically speaking is beyond the means of the consumers. The result is the industries in the small townships do not develop at all. The ironical part of it is that in the Calcutta industrial area, the industrialists get the electrical energy at a concession rate. Even in Delhi, the consumers have to pay different rates for consumption of electricity for lights, fans etc. The rates for the industrialists, again, are very cheap. In Calcutta, and round about though the D.V.C. itself produces electricity at a very low price, the price charged to the consumers in the rural areas or the Calcutta—whether it be a cottage industry, a small-scale industry or a foundry—is very high. Therefore, I would like the Minister to take into consideration the fact that the D.V.C. which is being run with the nation's money is allowing these private concerns to make enormous profits at the cost of the nation. In the case of the big industrialists you have a different rate and they do not suffer, but why should you not apply the same principle to the rural or urban areas where cottage and small scale industries are to be developed? I hope that in the future when licences are granted under the provisions of this Bill, Government would see that this power is utilised really for the industrialisation of the country and for the development of backward areas and those areas where cheap electricity might help in development and improvement. I know full well from my own experience that even under the grid system round

about Calcutta—it has now gone to the north by about 60 miles or so—the consumers have not benefited. They have complained to us: "We do not get any benefit from the Government's policy because we pay the same old very high rate. We do not know at what subsidised rate the Government is selling electricity to this particular electric supply concern."

There is a point which my friend Shri T. N. Singh has already dealt with. I personally feel that too small electric supply undertakings often lead to high cost of production. Of course, in some places it may be difficult and not absolutely judicious to have a big concern because it may be just one township round about the Himalayas where energy has to be supplied, or there may be an island or some small area round about which there is no habitation. But if there are small towns or big villages in the adjoining area within a limit of 15 or 20 miles, it is much better to have one centralised electric supply concern, and through the modern method of the grid system or any other method that technological improvement in the different parts of the world has given us, we can certainly see that the over-all cost of electric supply is reduced. In Darjeeling District every tea garden has got its own generating plant. There was a proposal that the entire district should be catered to by one electric supply concern. I am not an expert. The Ministry has its own experts, and can find out if this is possible. If this is done, it will reduce the cost so far as the supply of electric energy is concerned. I would like the Government to take this into consideration.

The difficulty is that the small companies often keep their cost of production at quite a high level because they have monopoly contracts and they can charge whatever rate they want commensurate with the profit that is allowed under the Act. Therefore, they do not have the inclination to reduce the cost of production. We must take into consideration human

[Shri K. K. Basu]

feelings and sentiments as they are. Therefore, I think that, when we have a plan to increase the supply of electric energy and naturally new licences have to be granted, Government should take into consideration this point that too small units should not be allowed if it is technically possible to have one combined big unit in an area without very much capital expenditure. Of course, I realise that in certain cases small units may be necessary.

I do not know whether the point that I am going to raise has been covered by the Bill and whether the necessary power is there with the Government. I know that many of the old electric supply concerns have huge money by way of deposits which have not been claimed. I was told that in the Calcutta electric supply concern, it works out to about a crore of rupees. Each consumer has to keep a security deposit of Rs. 50 or Rs. 100 in the deposit account with the company. The consumer may live in the city for some time and then may be transferred. He does not bother so much often to get back the deposit because he has to leave at short notice. He has to enter into correspondence, and there are other difficulties and technicalities which mean a good deal of botheration, and so he does not claim this. I have got information from persons who have worked in the Calcutta electric supply concern that if you calculate such unclaimed deposits, it may run up to a crore of rupees. Of course, the Minister can verify. Why under the law should this particular monopoly concern get the advantage of these deposits, why should these deposits be allowed to be utilised by the company as it chooses, and why should not the nation have a claim on them? Under the company law, in the case of the liquidation of a company, if the dividend that is payable to a person is not distributed within a certain date, that money is sent to the Reserve Bank and kept in a particular account and paid to the

gentleman whenever he claims it. That money is not kept with the private liquidator to be spent as he chooses. Similarly, I know in our part after insolvency if any money is not claimed by a creditor within a certain period, that money goes to a special fund of the Government and is not kept with the Official Assignee or the person in charge administering the estate of the insolvent. Therefore, I feel that especially in respect of the big concerns which are mostly foreign owned and which have been in our country for the last 50 or 60 years, Government should make a special provision that if within a certain period the security deposits are not claimed, they should be transferred to the Government and kept separately. If the person concerned claims it, it will be refunded, otherwise it will be utilised by Government as they choose, so that these monopoly concerns do not utilise these huge deposits as they choose without accounting for them by way of declaration of dividend to the shareholders or bonus to the workers.

Then I would like to support the point of view of the consumer regarding the rates. This rating provision is usually rather cumbersome and difficult. Government may appoint a committee to look into it. Shri T. N. Singh has given the example of the Railway Rates Advisory Council before the War which has become the Railway Rates Tribunal later on, which includes a consumer or a consumer's representative. In the new company law we have a provision that a certain number of shareholders can ask for an enquiry, but these electric supply companies are outside the purview of the company law. They are guided by a special law, the Electricity Act, and therefore it is absolutely incumbent that consumers who are vitally interested in the rates as well as the management of the company, should have some say in the matter. You may say that if every consumer is given the right of making an application there may be

an endless volume of litigation. So, I suggest you may make it a group of 50 or 100 people for a City like Calcutta and a lesser number for smaller areas who should have the right to initiate proceedings to enquire into their grievances and to find out whether the rate charged to them is too high or not. I hope the Select Committee will take this into consideration and try to improve the provisions of this Bill.

Lastly, I would like to emphasize one point both from the consumer's angle and from the workers' angle. The electricity concerns do not come under the operation of the company law and they have a special form of submitting accounts unlike the other companies. There are well-established firms working in the thickly populated or highly industrialised areas which make enormous profits. Even then they are very stingy in the matter of providing amenities for their workers or giving them bonus. The Labour Tribunals are debarred from entering into their affairs. They keep their accounts in a particular way, which is not the manner in which companies incorporated under the Companies Act should maintain them. We know that in our welfare State, especially with the new bias on socialism pattern, workers form a very important part among the productive forces. Electric energy is so important for the development of our industries that workers in it should have a fair deal, so that they may play the role expected of them in this vital branch of our means of production. Even the consumers if they are made aware of the real position of the company may raise their voice of protest against that enormous profits made by it and clamour for a reduction in the rates. We can certainly appreciate that when a new electric supply company is started the consumers are very few and it may be then necessary at that point to charge somewhat high rates, because the overhead charges remain the same. But as the supply increases the cost of production is bound to go down

and the overhead charges are bound to decrease and the company would be in a position to supply energy at a comparatively low rate. But because of the monopolistic position they hold, they do not do it. If the consumers have some opportunity to look into the real state of affairs, if accounts are kept in the usually prescribed manner, and periodical reports of the working of the company are published, they can on their own move or make the Government sit up and see that the rates are decreased.

2 P.M.

In conclusion I would like to say that whenever electric energy generated by our national undertakings, either thermal or hydel, is distributed, even through private undertakings, especially to the rural areas they must see, if they are particular of changing the face of India which everyone has at heart, that the energy is supplied at a concessional, or even at a subsidised rate, so that cottage and small scale industries may be developed. Pump irrigation is bound to play a very important part in the agricultural life of India and should receive special consideration in the matter of supply of energy at concessional rates. These factors should be taken into consideration and the Minister should see that the electric energy is supplied at a cheap rate, so that the nation may benefit.

I hope that the Select Committee in their wisdom and in the course of their deliberations will certainly improve upon the provisions of the Bill, so that electricity which is so vital to the nation may be allowed to play the role which is expected of it in the future set-up of the society which all of us have at heart.

सेठ ब्रजल सिंह (जिला भागरा—पश्चिम):  
यह जो एलक्ट्रिसिटी सप्लाई प्रमोडमेंट बिल (विद्युत संभरण संशोधन विधेयक) हमारे सामने पेश है, उसकी बड़ी आवश्यकता थी और मैं उसका स्वागत करता हूँ।



[नेठ अचल सिंह]

भाजकल संसार में जहां जहां उन्नति हुई है, बिजली के जरिए से हुई है, चाहे यूरोप में हो, अमरीका में हो, यह जितनी हम तरक्की देखते हैं और मनुष्यों की जो ग्राम इनकम (आय) आज पहले से बढ़ गई है, उसका खास कारण बिजली है। यह खूबी का मुकाम है कि जब से हम स्वाधीन हुए हैं तब से ही हमारी केन्द्रीय सरकार और स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स (राज्य सरकारें) भी इस ओर पूरा ध्यान दे रही हैं और हर स्टेट गवर्नमेंट अपने अपने वहां डैम्स तैयार करा रही है जैसे माखड़ा-नंगल, हीराकुड, दामोदर प्रोजेक्ट, तुंगभद्रा, गंगासागर, राहिन डेम आदि और उनके जरिए लाखों किलोवाट हाइड्रोएलेक्ट्रिक (जल विद्युत) करंट पैदा किया जा रहा है और जहां कोयले की इफारत (अधिकता) है वहां पर थर्मल प्लांट्स (तापीय संयंत्र) लगाये जा रहे हैं जैसे बुखारो। इस तरीके से हम देखते हैं कि तमाम देश में आज लाखों किलोवाट बिजली तैयार हो रही है। इसके अतिरिक्त बहुत सी प्राइवेट लिमिटेड कम्पनियां (गैर सरकारी लिमिटेड समवाय) भी बिजली का काम कर रही हैं लेकिन चूँकि बिजली की मांग हमारे देश में अपेक्षाकृत बहुत अधिक है और उतनी बिजली हमारे यहां अभी नहीं है जितनी कि हमको आवश्यकता है, इसलिए यह आवश्यक था कि इस तरह का कोई एक प्रबन्ध किया जाता और बिजली का कोई कन्ट्रोलिंग सेंटर बनाया जाय ताकि जितनी बिजली पैदा हो उसको ठीक से कंट्रोल किया जाय ताकि माकूल बटवारा व एक से रेट हो सके। इस काम को करने के लिए यह जो बोर्ड इस विधेयक के जरिए बनाया जा रहा है, मैं उस बोर्ड के बनाने का स्वागत करता हूँ। उस बोर्ड में सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट (केन्द्रीय सरकार) का और हर एक प्रान्तीय गवर्नमेंट का और लिमिटेड और प्राइवेट बिजली कम्पनियों का प्रतिनिधित्व होना चाहिए, साथ ही कंज्यूमर्स (उपभोक्ताओं) का भी उस बोर्ड में प्रतिनिधित्व होना चाहिए ताकि हर एक का इंटरैस्ट (हित) सेफगार्डेंस (सुरक्षित) हो सके।

भाजकल जो बहुत सी लिमिटेड और प्राइवेट बिजली कम्पनियां हैं, वे काफी मुनाफ़ा उठा रही हैं और जनता की अधिक कीमत पर बिजली दी जा रही है।

मेरा यह भी सुझाव है कि यह बोर्ड जब बन जायेगा तो वह इस बात को भी देखे कि जो छोटी छोटी इंडस्ट्रीज (उद्योग) देहातों और कस्बों में हैं और जिनको कि बिजली नहीं मिलती है उनको भी बिजली मिले और कम रेट (दर) पर मिले और वह रेट बड़े बड़े कल कारखानों के बिजली के रेट से कम हो। बोर्ड के बनने का मैं स्वागत करता हूँ और उसके बन जाने पर यह देखना चाहिए कि ऐसे बहुत से अनेक स्थान जहां बिजली बहुत कम पहुँची है वहां पर बिजली पहुँचाई जाय। आज कुछ स्टेटों में बिजली बन कर तैयार तो हुई है लेकिन देखना यह होगा कि हर जगह जहां पर बिजली की जरूरत हो, पहुँचाया जाय ताकि हमारी एग््रीकल्चर इंडस्ट्री (कृषि उद्योग) और दूसरे जो छोटे छोटे ग्रामोद्योग हैं वे पनप सकें और तरक्की कर सकें। हमारी कोशिश सब की ज्यादा से ज्यादा बिजली कम रेट पर पहुँचाने की होनी चाहिए। मैं इन चन्द शब्दों के साथ इस बिल का समर्थन करता हूँ और आशा करता हूँ कि सेलेक्ट कमेटी इन विचारों पर गौर (विचार) कर के बिल में स्थान देगी।

Shri D. C. Sharma: Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, there is a saying attributed to Lenin: electricity is God. I believe, Sir, that all sources of energy in this world are God; of course I am using the word in a non-theological sense. I believe that all sources of energy, rivers, electricity, oil, gas, all these sources of energy should be nationalised, and nothing should be left to the option of States, because I know that unless that is done India will not have that poten-

tial of energy which is needed for its agricultural development and for its industrial expansion. I, therefore, say that when I find it stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons to this Bill that they are going to vest certain supervisory powers in the State Governments I do not feel happy. It is not that I am in any way going to blame the State Governments, but I believe that ultimately, in the long run, India has got, the Centre has got to control all these sources of power and energy and the sooner we make a beginning in that direction the better it is.

Our Minister of Planning brought two Bills recently, the Inter-States Water Disputes Bill and the River Boards Bill. I was happy that he was moving in that direction. But here I find in this Bill that he is going to give supervisory powers to State Governments for this most useful source of energy which I think is not suited in the context of India today. It might have been suitable seven or eight years ago, but I do not think today it is going to work. Therefore what we need is this. The hon. Minister should bring forward a Bill which should make provision for all India control of this energy.

I have looked through this Bill and I find that it is lop-sided. It is overweighted in one direction, and it has left out of account so many other directions. It has concentrated all its attention on the financial aspect; I know the financial aspect is very important. For instance, I know, the electricity supply industry is going to have the benefits of development rebate. I welcome this. I also know that there are other things which have been put down in this Bill, which lead to financial control. For instance, the licences cannot earn a profit of more than 15 per cent. All these things are very good. Finances, I know, are the rock-bottom of any industrial undertaking. But they are not the be-all-and-end-all of all these things. There are other things, and I find that

those things have not been taken into account in this Bill.

My hon. friend Shri K. K. Basu referred to the Damodar Valley Corporation. I also can refer to the Bhakra-Nangal project, because it is in my constituency. Now, what is this Bhakra-Nangal project? It has a network of canals, which fills anybody with joy. And one power-house is springing up after another. When you look at these power-houses, you feel as if they are not the products of human ingenuity but the result of some superhuman skill. All these things are there. So many kilowatts of energy are being generated, and so much water is flowing down these canals. When I go to Bhakra-Nangal, I feel very happy.

But what is the Hoshiarpur district getting out of Bhakra-Nangal? Water flows to other parts of the Punjab. It irrigates PEPSU and Rajasthan also. But only a very small modicum of the water comes to Hoshiarpur district. Big power-houses are being set-up, but only a modicum of that energy is available to the people of Hoshiarpur. I was recently in the Garhankar tehsil in my constituency. So many tube-wells are there, but the people say that they do not have electricity to run these tube-wells. Similarly, there is the Una tehsil in my constituency. It is rocky area. You cannot have any tube-wells there because the soil is very hard and rocky.

The point I am making is that while you are going to exercise control over these boards in the matter of generation of electricity, you should also exercise some control, at the same time, over the distribution of the electricity that is generated. Generation is important, but distribution is also very important. When I was a young boy, I used to hear a particular song, which I shall recite now. Since we are now in the habit of quoting couplets, I hope you would not mind if I also quote a couplet, though it is not of a very high quality.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I would not mind the quality, but it should be relevant.

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** It would be relevant. I know, while you are in the Chair, nobody can afford to be irrelevant.

The couplet is:

समन्दर में पानी बरसता रहा  
बीकानेर बिचारा तरसता रहा

There is generation of electricity, but so far as distribution is concerned, it is very uneven and inequitable. I would say that in this board, something should be said about the proper and even distribution of electricity, not only so far as big cities are concerned, but even so far as municipal towns and important towns are concerned. In Hoshiarpur, there used to be a privately run electricity supply company. That has now been taken over by the State. What is the result? Of course, when it was run privately, the charges were very high. But the electricity supply was even, and we used to get electricity throughout the night and only occasionally, there was a break. But after it has been taken over by the State Government, the rates have gone down. There is no doubt about it. But we do not know when the electricity may fail.

So, what I would say is that in this Bill, we should give some directive to the States for the proper distribution of electricity, for the proper balance between big towns, small towns and rural areas, and also for a proper balance between big industries, medium industries, small industries and cottage industries.

As you know, Sir, Japan is a highly industrialised country, and the glory of Japan, of course, is big industry, but it is also due to her small industries. These small industries have been made possible with the help of

the proper distribution of electricity in the villages. But not much is said in this Bill about this.

We are talking about the industrial and scientific management cadre. The managerial side of an undertaking is, of course, very important. But what has been said about the managerial side here? It has only been said that a man can be removed from the directorate for this reason or for that reason, and he can be punished for this reason or that reason. No specific instructions have been given for the effective management of these undertakings, over which our State boards should exercise some kind of vigilance.

Again, for the proper functioning of any industrial undertaking, you have to look not only to the managerial side, but also to the working side. Of course, I am very happy that the workers are going to get bonus. But I would tell the Minister in all humility and in all modesty, that he should have made some more provision for the effective utilisation of these workers. There is the Hindustan Shipyard, for instance, and they have made certain suggestions for enlisting and attracting the co-operation of these workers. But I find that the State Electricity Board is going to be nothing but a financial undertaking. It talks in terms of rebates, development expenses, reasonable profits and so on. But it ignores the human side of the industry, to a great extent. And I believe, the human side means much more than anything else.

I find that the consumers also have been shown the cold shoulder. Further, the rates committee is going to be a committee of experts. That is very good. We want experts in this world, and we have great regard for these experts. But the man who wears the shoe knows where it pinches, and he should also have some right to speak. Therefore, I would say that in the rates committees which are going to be constituted,

there should be some place for those persons who consume electricity. In this respect, I would point out that there would be big consumers as also small consumers. But I would say that when these things are going to be dealt with, those should be some place for the small consumers, because, if you look after the interests of the small consumers, the interests of the big consumers will be looked after automatically.

Again, I would say that it is very good that in this Bill we have made a provision for the auditing of accounts by the Comptroller and Auditor-General of India. It is a wholesome provision, though this morning I was reading, like many of my hon. friends, the second report of Dr. Appleby. When I was reading his remarks about the Comptroller and Auditor-General, I had a strange kind of feeling. I do not know what kind of feeling I had. But I felt that the Comptroller and Auditor-General was a very useful person, a very helpful functionary of the State, whose functions were very beneficial to the interests of our country. I felt like that, but I also felt that it was not all there. There might be some other method or device of looking after the financial soundness of these undertakings, but as long as we do not have those methods, I think we have to depend upon the Comptroller and Auditor-General, who is a very admirable functionary of the State.

As I have already said, the whole of this Bill is tilted in favour of financial things. We have got other kinds of audit also, and I would request the hon. Minister very humbly to make some provision for efficiency audit also. The State Electricity Boards should have some provisions, some authority, for efficiency audit. You know that we are having so many of these undertakings in our country. They make me happy; they make me proud also. But I would say that it is very necessary that we must institute the system of efficiency audit if we are going to make these undertakings run as admirably as we want.

As I said in the beginning, I welcome this Bill, as we welcome everything that comes to this House. (Interruptions).

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** Is the hon. Member speaking on his own behalf or on behalf of others also?

**Shri D. C. Sharma:** We always start by welcoming everything that is placed before us. So I welcome this Bill. But I also say that the hon. Minister should see to it that this Bill becomes more balanced. I hope the Select Committee will look into this aspect and see that this Bill becomes more rounded, that it becomes a perfect circle, that it does not remain an arc, that it does not lean towards one side too much, neglecting other things. They should make provision for efficiency audit, for workers, for consumers and for distribution. All these things should be looked into when the Bill is before the Select Committee.

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह (जिला बनारस मध्य) : यह बिल जो कि प्रस्तुत किया गया है, इसका मैं पूरा पूरा स्वागत करने में अपने आपको असमर्थ पाता हूँ। फिर भी जिस रूप में इसको यहाँ पर पेश किया गया है उसका स्वागत होना चाहिये।

बहाँ तक शक्ति का सम्बन्ध है, यह प्रकृति की देन है और शास्त्रों के अनुसार यह इन्द्र देवता का वज्र है, इन्द्र देवता का हथियार है। यदि इसका प्रयोग राजसों का क्षमन करने में किया जाये तो घञ्जा होगा। साधुओं का क्षमन इसके द्वारा नहीं होना चाहिये। अभी हाल ही में अयोध्या में साधुओं का एक सम्मेलन किया गया था लेकिन मैं समझता हूँ कि आजकल जिनको साधु माना जाना चाहिये वे गरीब लोग ही हैं। जो पूज्यपति हैं, जो अभीर लोग हैं उनको तो भगवान चारों तरफ से माया देता है लेकिन हम लोग जो गरीब जनता हैं वे अपनाय हैं उनका भी आपको ध्यान रखना

[श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

चाहिये। अभी हमारे दोस्त पांडे जी कह रहे थे कि अल्मोड़ा में बिजली का रेट नी आना फो यूनिट है और बनारस में जहां पर मैं रहता हूँ और जो कि साधुओं का गढ़ है और जहां पर सन्यासी रहते हैं, इसका रेट साढ़े पांच आना पर यूनिट है।

श्री वी० च० शर्मा : साधु समाज भी वहीं है।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : दिल्ली में इसका रेट शायद चार आना पर यूनिट है। हावड़ा और कलकत्ता में इसका भाव ढाई आना है। इसी तरह से यदि आप पावर के रेट को देखें तो कलकत्ता में इसका रेट एक आना है, दिल्ली में छः पैसा है और बनारस में तीन आना है। मैं समझता हूँ कि बम्बई में शायद इसका रेट दो पैसा है। इसके साथ ही साथ हमारे उत्तर प्रदेश में एक और विचित्र समस्या है। बिजली पर वहां सेल्स टैक्स लगा था और अब इस पर २५ परसेंट (प्रतिशत) सूरचार्ज लगा दिया गया है। इस तरह से वहां की जो गरीब जनता है उस पर बहुत अन्याय हो रहा है। इस वास्ते मैं प्रार्थना करता हूँ कि कोई ऐसा उपाय होना चाहिये जिससे हम गरीब लोगों को भी कुछ राहत मिल सके। आप जिन लोगों को पावर देते हैं उनको आप दो पैसा यूनिट के हिसाब से या छः पैसा यूनिट के हिसाब से देते हैं और इनको जो कनज्यूम (उपभोग) करते हैं वे भ्रमीर लोग ही करते हैं या जो बड़े बड़े कारखानों वाले होते हैं वे ही पावर से अपने कारखानों को चलाते हैं। दिल्ली में आप जो बिजली सप्लाई करते हैं डोमेस्टिक यूज (घरेलू प्रयोग) के लिये उसका रेट भी कम है और लोग भी भ्रमीर हैं। लेकिन बनारस, अलाहाबाद, गोरखपुर, अल्मोड़ा इत्यादि में आप जो बिजली सप्लाई करते हैं और उसका जो रेट है, एक तो वह ज्यादा है और जो उसको कनज्यूम करते हैं वे गरीब लोग हैं।

श्री उ० मू० त्रिवेदी : क्या गरीब लोग अलाहाबाद में ही हैं ?

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : अतएव मेरा यह निवेदन है कि बिजली के रेट में समता होनी चाहिये। जब ऐसा होगा तो बिजली लोगों के लिये और भी अधिक उपयोगी साबित होगी।

इस विधेयक में यह भी कहा गया है कि यदि १५ परसेंट का लाभ किसी कम्पनी को हो तो रेट को रिड्यूस (कम) करने का अधिकार उसको होगा। पहले यह अधिकार उनको तब था जब उनको ३० परसेंट लाभ हुआ करता था। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो १५ परसेंट की लिमिट रखी गई है, इसे भी आपकी ओर कम करना चाहिये।

श्री नन्दा : यह फायदा नहीं है, १५ परसेंट वेरिफेशन (अन्तर) है।

श्री रघुनाथ सिंह : मैं यह भी निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यदि आपकी कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन (उत्पादन लागत) एक पैसा हो तो आपको दो पैसा चार्ज करना चाहिये। अगर कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन तीन पैसा हो तो छः पैसा के हिसाब से आपको चार्ज (भारित) करना चाहिये। आपको चाहिये कि आप सेंट परसेंट (सौ प्रतिशत) यानी दुगुना फायदा कर लें। लेकिन आज तो यह ही रहा है कि यदि आपकी कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन एक पैसा है तो आप छः आना फो यूनिट के हिसाब से चार्ज कर रहे हैं। यह जरा अन्याय मानूँ होता है। आपको मालूम ही होगा कि जो गल्ले के व्यापारी हैं उनको एक रुपये में एक आना से भी कम मुनाफा होता है। इसी तरह से ज्यादा ज्यादा किसी चीज के व्यापारी को तीन आने रुपये से अधिक मुनाफा नहीं होता है। लेकिन इसके विपरीत जो प्राइवेट कम्पनियों (गैर सरकारी समवायों) हैं उनको तो अन्धा-बन्ध फायदा हो रहा है और जो रेट वे चाहती

हैं चार्ज कर लेती हैं। इसका नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि हम जो गरीब लोग हैं, वे पिसे जा रहे हैं। आपकी जो नीति सस्ती बिजली सप्लाई करने की है यह उसके विपरीत जाती है। आज हमारी जो पालिसी है वह डि-मैन्टेलाइजेशन (विकेन्द्रीकरण) की ओर अधिक है। लेकिन यह चीज बिल्कुल उसके खिलाफ जाती है। आज कलकत्ता में अगर पावर छः पैसे के हिसाब से सप्लाई होती है तो बनारस में वह तीन घाने के हिसाब से सप्लाई की जाती है। इसका एक नतीजा यह हो रहा है कि जहां पर पावर महंगी है वहां पर कोई कारखाना स्थापित करने का प्रयास नहीं करता है। महंगी बिजली तथा पावर के कारण अलमोड़ा में कोई बूल की मिल नहीं खोल सकता है। अगर कोई कारखाना खोलना चाहता है तो वह बम्बई तथा दूसरे बड़े शहरों में जहां पर दाम सस्ते हैं वहीं खोलना पसन्द करता है। आज जो बिजली है वह हमारे जीवन का उसी तरह से एक घंग बन गई है जिन तरह से कि पानी है या अन्न है।

आजकल हम अपने सभी कार्यों और व्यवहार में—रेडियो, फ़ोन, लाइट के लिये और उद्योगों में—इलेक्ट्रिसिटी (विद्युत) का उपयोग करते हैं। वह हमारे जीवन का एक अनिवार्य घंग हो गई है—वह हमारे लिये एक एसेन्शियल (अत्यावश्यक) चीज हो गई है। मेरा नम्र निवेदन यह है कि यह धारा महात्मा जी के डीसेन्टेलाइजेशन के सिद्धान्त—विकेन्द्रीकरण की नीति—के बिल्कुल विपरीत जा रही है। आज स्थिति यह है कि देश के सब भागों के व्यापारी बम्बई, दिल्ली और कलकत्ता जैसे बड़े शहरों में, जहां कि चीप (सस्ती) पावर मिलती है, केन्द्रित हो रहे हैं। मैं यह बताना चाहता हूँ कि मैं बड़े शहरों के पक्ष में नहीं हूँ। आज हम देख रहे हैं कि इस दिल्ली शहर को भटाइस मील के दायरे में बसाया जा रहा है और कलकत्ता चालीस मील के दायरे में बंद रहा है। इसी प्रकार बम्बई

नगर का स्वरूप भी बड़ा विशाल हो रहा है। और इस कार्य पर करोड़ों रुपये व्यय किसे जा रहे हैं। अगर युद्ध प्रारम्भ हो गया और एक एटम बम किसी बड़े नगर पर पड़ा—जो कि पड़ना नहीं चाहिये और मेरा विश्वास है कि पड़ेगा भी नहीं—तो इस नगर को करोड़ों रुपये की सम्पत्ति नष्ट हो जायेगी और यह सब व्यर्थ हो जायेगा। नागासकी और हिरोसिमा की तरह वहां कुछ भी नहीं बचेगा। इस सम्बन्ध में मेरा मत यह है कि हमको सोवियत रूस की पालिसी का अनुकरण करना चाहिए। उस ने अपनी फ़ैक्टरियां युराल में स्थापित कीं, जो कि बम्बार्डमेंट के रेंज से बिल्कुल बाहर है। इसी कारण सोवियत रूस की रक्षा हो सकी। युद्ध में उसके सब उद्योग बिल्कुल सुरक्षित रहे। लेकिन मुझे खेद है कि हमारे यहां एक बिल्कुल विपरीत धारा चल रही है। मैं बड़ी नम्रता के साथ यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि बड़े शहर हमारे लिये कदापि उपयोगी साबित नहीं हो सकते हैं। हमको यह मार्ग अपनाना चाहिये कि हमारे यहां जो इंडस्ट्रीज हैं, हम उनको सारे देश में, सब सुबों में बांट दें—उन स्थानों में स्थापित करें, जहां गरीब लोग रहते हैं। अगर हम अलमोड़ा में चीप पावर सप्लाई करे और बूल की एक फ़ैक्टरी स्टार्ट करें, तो वहां के रहने वाले अधिकांश गरीब लोगों के लिये जीविका का एक मुख्य साधन उपलब्ध हो सकता है। राजपूताना में बहुत ऊन होती है—सगभग ७० प्रतिशत ऊन वहां होती है, लेकिन वह सब बाहर एक्सपोर्ट हो जाती है। अगर हम वहां चीप पावर उपलब्ध करें, तो वहां पर कोई भी व्यापारी अपना प्लांट (संयंत्र) स्टार्ट कर सकता है। इसका लाभ यह होगा कि वहां की गरीब जनता—वहां के मजदूरों—की जेब में चार पैसे जायेंगे और उनकी ग्राम-दानी में कुछ वृद्धि होगी। लेकिन आजकल हम देखते हैं कि चूंकि चीप पावर उपलब्ध होने के कारण अधिकतर उद्योग कलकत्ता इत्यादि नगरों में स्थापित हो रहे हैं, इसलिये

### [श्री रघुनाथ सिंह]

देश के सब भागों से मजदूर वहां जा रहे हैं। इसका फल यह है कि हर एक स्थान पर लेबर प्राबलम पैदा हो रही है, हालांकि जो मजदूर बनारस में बीस रुपया पाता है, उसको कलकत्ता में साठ या अस्सी रुपये मिलते हैं।

अगर वास्तव में महात्मा गांधी के सिद्धान्त का अनुकरण आपको स्वीकार है, अगर आपको देश की उन्नति करनी है, गरीब जनता का जीवन स्तर ऊंचा उठाना है, स्माल-स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज (छोटे पैमाने के उद्योगों) को प्रोत्साहित करना है, तो आप इस बात का प्रयास करें कि गांव गांव में चीफ इलेक्ट्रिसिटी (सस्ती विद्युत) पहुंचे। पिछले बियों अम्बर चर्चों की स्कीम निकाली गई थी। वह पावर से भी चल सकता है। छोटे-छोटे पावर लूम भी हो सकते हैं। हमें उसको प्रोत्साहित करना चाहिये। हमें इस बात का भी ध्यान करना चाहिये कि बार के समय, किसी इमरजेंसी (भाषात) के समय, कहीं हमारी इंडस्ट्रीज (उद्योग) कल्पेस (ठप) न हो जायें। बल्कि हमको इस दृष्टि से काम करना है कि हमारे यहां कोई भी इमरजेंसी हो, बार हो, लेकिन हमारी इंडस्ट्रीज बाकायदा चलती रहें—जैसा कि सोवियत रूस ने किया, जैसा कि अब चाइना कर रहा है। चाइना बड़े बड़े शहर नहीं बना रहा है। वह देश भर में छोटे छोटे इंडस्ट्रियल टाउन्ज (औद्योगिक नगरियों) को फैला रहा है, ताकि अगर एक जगह का पतन हो तो भी दूसरी जगह का कार्य चलता रहे और उससे हमारी रक्षा हो सके। अगर आप भी इस बात का प्रयास करेंगे, तो आप भारतवर्ष की वास्तविक सेवा करेंगे, जनता की वास्तविक सेवा करेंगे और भारतवर्ष की एक बड़े क्षत्र से रक्षा कर सकेंगे।

अन्त में मैं फिर मंत्री महोदय से निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि वह देश भर के गांवों में चीप पावर उपलब्ध करने की व्यवस्था करें और उसके रेट्स में यनिक्रिमिटी (एकरूपता)

करें—जो रेट बम्बई या कलकत्ता में हों, वही बनारस, इलाहाबाद और अल्मोड़ा में भी हों। यह बात थोड़ी असम्भव तो प्रतीत होती है, लेकिन अगर वह प्रयास करेंगे तो यह असम्भव सम्भव में परिणत हो सकता है।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं माननीय मंत्री को फिर इस बिल को यहां पर लाने के लिये धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

Shri U. M. Trivedi: Sir, the Electricity (Supply) Act is not a very old provision of law. It came into being in 1948 and it has done tremendous mischief at various places where it has been brought into force. However, this is a welcome provision of law, inasmuch as, on the one hand, it allows the industrialists to earn something while on the other it does not allow them to fatten themselves at the cost of the public. A *via media* has been struck by the provisions of section 57 of the Act. To my mind, it appears that this amendment has not been brought with a desire to help anybody but with the desire to have greater control of the Government over the undertakings.

We have watched the working of the District Municipalities Act. According to the phraseology of the various provisions in that Act, if the Government is of the opinion that a particular member has done something which would amount to the abuse of his powers as a member of the municipality, that opinion is sufficient to make the Government order his removal. This provision of law has been universally applied wherever Members of the opposition had the misfortune of getting themselves elected to the municipalities. It happened at various places. It happened at Mathura, it happened at Ghazibad, and other places too. Similar provision has been made in clause 5 of this Bill. It reads:

“(e) in the opinion of the State Government—(1) has refused to act. ....”

Four factors are mentioned here. It is merely a political game. All these four factors mentioned there, which will lead to the removal or suspension of a member, are justiciable factors. Why should it be left to the 'opinion' of the Government? This is not a law of detention where you suspect a man of having done a particular thing. Why not say: "If a person has refused to act or has become incapable of acting or so abused his position...."? Why should you say 'in the opinion of the State Government.....'? Even without having the opinion of the Government these are facts which can always be decided upon, and certainly, remove the man if he has done such a thing. But do not have the opinion of the Government which is the opinion of, probably, a district volunteer of the Congress party or a tahsil volunteer of the place. In my opinion, such provisions of law do not speak well of democracy. These are merely remnants of the British time and must be done away with. Too much of power in the hands of Government to interfere with autonomous bodies of this nature is detrimental to the progress of the country. Therefore, such provisions should be taken out of a law which is to be made for the benefit of the public.

I will say a few words with reference to the provisions contained in clause 14 which makes certain amendments in section 57 of the Indian Electricity Supply Act. On the one hand, the old Act provided that as soon as that Act came into force, notwithstanding any provision of any agreement or terms of a licence, the provisions of the Sixth and Seventh Schedules shall automatically apply and replace the other provisions. But, there was a little protection given. The Schedules will apply but all those other provisions of the licence will not automatically become void unless and until they were, in any manner, contrary to the provisions of the Schedules. I find that that provision is taken out of this Bill. So some protection that

may be found in the various agreement; or the licences in favour of the consumers goes by the board by this provision.

"The provisions of the Sixth Schedule and the Seventh Schedule shall be deemed to be incorporated in the licence of every licensee, not being a local authority...."

**Shri Nanda:** What is the clause to which reference is being made?

**Shri U. M. Trivedi:** Clause 14.

Another section is being added and that is 57A. This is the provision regarding the appointment of the rating committee. It says:

"(a) the Board or where no Board is constituted under this Act, the State Government—

(i) may, if satisfied that the licensee has failed to comply with any of the provisions of the Sixth Schedule; and

(ii) shall, when so requested by the licensee in writing or when the licensee has given notice to the State Government for the enhancement of rates for the supply of electricity under paragraph 1 of the Sixth Schedule and such enhanced rates are not approved by the State Government, constitute a rating committee....."

My contention about this is a very simple one. Every electric supply company is a sort of a manufacturing concern of consumer goods. We may take that electricity is being consumed by the people. There is no provision for the consumers to bring about the formation of the rating committee. The right of the consumers to approach the rating committee or to get a rating committee appointed for a particular locality is not envisaged in this Bill. It is a



[Shri U. M. Trivedi]

great lacuna and that lacuna ought to be removed. A licensee of a particular municipality for supplying electricity is bound to be an influential man. He has methods of exercising that influence; he has methods of welding that influence. He is supplying electricity to one and sundry; and amongst them he also supplies to Government officers. He can also please the party bosses of the locality by not charging them anything, by giving rebates, by tampering with the meter or not nothing the meter and so many other things. It is therefore that those bosses try to act in the interest of this licensee and would not allow any rating committee to come into being because the power to appoint a rating committee is either with the licensee if he feels aggrieved or with the Government or the Board if they are of that opinion. The consumer is one party and the supplier of electricity is the other party. It is a bilateral contract. Out of the two contracting parties one who has got to pay through the nose is not allowed to have a say in the matter. It is my submission, therefore, that a provision must be made that the rating committee shall also be constituted if—make it a reasonable number, 20, 30 or 50 or 5 or 10 per cent of the total—a number of consumers approach the Government for the appointment of the rating committee. This lacuna must be attended to.

There is one provision of a similar nature—I do not find much change in it—in sub-clause (d) of this 57A. It is this provision which has created great trouble at several places. The wording of this provision is:—

“within one month after the receipt of the report under the clause (c), the State Government shall cause the report to be published in the Official Gazette, and may at the same time make an order in accordance therewith fixing the licensee's charges for the supply of electricity with effect from such date....”

The word is 'may'. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, you are a lawyer of great repute and had been a Judge of a High Court. So, I appeal to you that some change should be made in the language used here. Because I have seen State Governments sitting over the reports submitted to them and not publishing them according to this provision. Then, when everything is satisfied, when some hand-to-hand things have gone on between officers and officers, one fine morning the reports get published. Then, what happens? Even after the reports get published, this word 'may' creates another difficulty. The interpretation that is generally put by the officers is that “we might, when we like, accept the recommendations of the rating committee”. It may be after a month, or two months or 4 or 5 months. Although it is not very difficult to interpret it as properly as possible, that is not feasible. That creates great difficulties for the public at large. Therefore, my humble submission is that a proper view should be taken by the Select Committee when it considers this and the word 'may' should be changed into the imperative 'shall' and that will remove so many difficulties.

2.50 P.M.

श्रीमती शिवराजबती नेहरू (जिला लखनऊ—मध्य) : मैं इस बिल का स्वागत करता हूँ। इस को लाकर सरकार ने बहुत बड़ी आवश्यकता की पूर्ति की है। बिजली की प्राइवेट कम्पनियों (गैर सरकारी समितियों) में बहुत गड़बड़ी हुआ करती थी, जिस से जनता को बड़ी तकलीफ और कठिनाइयाँ थीं और उनकी शिकायतों की सुनवाई कोई कम्पनी नहीं करती थी। वह बात आज इस बिल से दूर हो रही है। आज देश के सारे विकास की ऊर्जा बिजली पर ही निर्भर करती है। लेकिन वह विकास में तभी सहायता कर सकती है जब कि उसका रेट सस्ता हो और आसानी से वह प्राप्त हो सके। पिछले सालों में हमारे प्रान्त में बिजली का रेट बढ़ा दिया गया, साथ ही उसके ऊपर सेल्स

टेक्स (बिक्री कर) भी लिया गया। इसकी बहुत मुसालिफत हुई, काफी एजिटेशन (आंदोलन) भी हुआ, लेकिन कोई सुनवाई नहीं हुई। आज जबकि इतने दिनों बाद हमारे देश में बिजली का काफी विकास हुआ है, बिजली के पावर स्टेशन काफी बढ़ गये हैं, फिर भी बिजली का रेट उतना ही है, उसमें कोई कमी नहीं हुई है। मेरी तो सरकार से यह प्रार्थना है कि अगर किसी कारण से कहीं पर बिजली का रेट (दर) बढ़ा भी दिया गया है तो कमी उसको कम भी तो किया जाय। सरकार की यह अजीब भावना है कि जब वह स्वयम् किसी चीज का रेट बढ़ाती है, तो उसमें बहुत आसानी होती है, परन्तु वह कम कभी नहीं किया जाता है। रेट बढ़ने की वजह से प्राइवेट कंपनियों (गैर सरकारी सम-वाय) हैं वह फायदा उठाती हैं, क्योंकि अभी तक जो हमारे बिजली के कानून हैं उनमें काफी छिद्र और लूपहोल्स (त्रुटियाँ) हैं। उनकी वजह से प्राइवेट कंपनियों में काफी गड़बड़ हुआ करता था। मेरा तो सरकार को यह सुझाव है जो बड़ी-बड़ी इन्डस्ट्रीज हैं, जो बड़े बड़े कलकारखाने हैं उन के लिये रेट कुछ बढ़ भी जाये बिजली का तो कोई हानि नहीं है, परन्तु जो हमारा स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज (छोटे पैमाने के उद्योग) काटेज इण्डस्ट्रीज (कुटोर उद्योग) है या जो हमारे डोमेस्टिक परपज (घरेलू प्रयोजन) के लिये बिजली दी जाती है, उस का रेट सरकार जरूर कम करे। साथ ही सारे देश में समानता का रेट होना चाहिए, जैसा कि मेरे सभी भाइयों ने कहा है। वह न हो कि एक शहर में तो ६ पैसा यूनिट हों, दूसरे में ४ भा० यूनिट हों, तीसरे में ६ भा० या ८ भा० यूनिट हों। इस के मुताबिक भी मैं अपने भाइयों की आवाज में आवाज मिला कर कहती हूँ कि सारे देश में बिजली का रेट एक समान होना चाहिये।

यह कहा जाता है कि रेटिंग कमेटी (दर समिति) बनाई जाय—इस विधेयक में कंज्यूमर्स के इन्टरेस्ट्स (हित) को नहीं देखा गया है। मैं तो समझती हूँ कि आज सभी कंज्यूमर्स

(उपभोक्ता) हैं। कौन ऐसा है जो बिजली का इस्तेमाल नहीं करता है, विशेषकर जो हमारी सेलेक्ट कमेटी में लोग हैं वह तो सभी कंज्यूमर्स हैं, और वे कंज्यूमर्स (उपभोक्ता) के इन्टरेस्ट (हित) को जरूर देखेंगे और उनकी रक्षा करेंगे। इसलिये जो रेट लगाये जायें वे ऐसे हों जो हमारे देश के विकास के लिये फायदे-मन्द हों, और जो कंज्यूमर्स हैं वे आसानी से उनको दे सकें। साथ ही सरकार को भी उससे कुछ लाभ हो, नुकसान न हो। यदि ऐसा किया गया तो बहुत उचित होगा।

इतना ही कह कर मैं इस बिल का स्वागत करती हूँ।

श्री सुनहनुबाला (भागलपुर—मध्य) : यह जो विधेयक रक्खा गया है वह बहुत उपयोगी है और इस समय लाना ही चाहिये था। जब हम अपने देश की हर प्रकार से उन्नति कर रहे हैं, तो इसका उपाय भी जरूर सोचना चाहिये था कि हम को पावर सस्ती से सस्ती मिले। इसके लिये इस बिल में कई प्रकार की चेष्टायें की गई हैं। परन्तु जो कुछ भी चेष्टायें की गई हैं उस से नतीजा यह निकाला गया है कि इस समय बिजली की दर में जो कमी होगी वह ३.२५ परसेन्ट (प्रतिशत) होगी। उन्होंने कास्ट ग्राफ प्रोडक्शन एक तरफ रक्खा है और दूसरी तरफ नफे को निश्चित कर दिया गया है कि ५.१२ परसेन्ट से अधिक नफा कोई भी व्यापारी नहीं कर सकेगा। और इस हिसाब से बिजली का यह रेट होगा। इस बात के ऊपर मैंने यह कहना है कि सरकार ने हर एक अवसय में यह जानने की बहुत चेष्टा की कि किस को कितना नफा होता है, परन्तु सरकार इस बारे में एक दम से असफल हुई है। शकर मिलों में भी ऐसी चेष्टा की गई थी। यह कहा गया था कि शकर मिल वाले केन की प्राइस इतनी दें और उनको इतना नफा लेना चाहिये। परन्तु वे किस प्रकार से काफी नफे को बढ़ा देते हैं और किस तरह से उसको सामने दिखला देते हैं इस को पकड़ना मुश्किल हो जाता है।

**[श्री मदनमनवाला]**

हमारे मंत्री महोदय ने तीन-चार बातें बतलाई। जैसे यह कि डिबेन्चर (श्रृणपत्र) के ऊपर जो सूद लिया जाता है उसमें दोहरो इनकम मिलतो है, इस को दूर कर दिया गया, यह बहुत अच्छी बात है, परन्तु ५ ११२ परसेन्ट में भी आप के लिये यह जानना बहुत जरूरी हो जाता है कि ५ ११२ परसेन्ट ही नफा हुआ या कि उससे अधिक हुआ। लेकिन इस चीज का पकड़ना आप के लिये बहुत दुर्लभ हो जाता है। मैं तो यह सुनाव दूंगा कि आप बिजली का रेट तय कर दें कि हम तुम को लाइसेंस (भनूनाति) देते हैं, तुम को इस भाव पर बिजली देना पड़ेगा। तुम चाहे ५ परसेन्ट नफा लो चाहे १०० परसेन्ट लो या २०० परसेन्ट लो। अगर वह ज्यादा नफा करत है तो आप भागे चल कर फिर उनको पकड़ लें और कहें कि तुम इतना रेट कम करो। लेकिन अगर आप यह कहते हैं कि तुम ५ ११२ परसेन्ट नफा लो तो आप उन को पकड़ नहीं सकेंगे कि उन को ५ ११२ परसेन्ट नफा होता है या १५ और २० परसेन्ट।

यह बात हो सकती है कि आप कहेंगे कि वे लोग कम से कम खर्च करें और कम से कम कीमत में बिजली को प्रोड्यूस (उत्पादन) करें। लेकिन इसमें जो मजदूर हैं, जो काम करने वाले हैं, उनको ही व लोग कम देंगे और उनका पेट काटेंगे। मैं कभी नहीं कहूंगा कि उनका पेट काटा जाय। आप को यह भी तब कर देना चाहिये कि मजदूर को क्या मिले। जब आप लाइसेंस दें तो उसी वक्त कह दें कि लाइसेंस उसी को दिया जायेगा जो मजदूरों को इतनी दर से मजदूरी दे सकेगा? मेरी समझ में यदि आप इतना कर देंगे और उसी बेसिस (आधार) पर लाइसेंस देंगे तो आप को बिजली कम कीमत में मिलेगी। देश में बिजली से चलने वाले बहुत से कारखाने हैं। सबों में सरकार ने नेष्ठा की कि इतना तो कारखाने वाले को नफा हो और इतना उसका रेट होना चाहिये, परन्तु मेरी

समझ में किसी व्यवसाय में भी उस को सफलता नहीं मिले। आप काटने मिल को लीजिये, कोई मिल लीजिये, कहीं पर भी सरकार नहीं पकड़ सके, कोई भी नहीं पकड़ सकेगा। कोई भी आप को रेटिंग कमेटी (दर समिति) हो, उस पर कंज्यूमर्स (उपभोक्ता) का इंटेरेस्ट (हित) रिप्रेजेंटड (प्रतिनिधित्व) हो, कुछ भी हो, लेकिन कोई कुछ नहीं कर सकेगा। आप को यह तय कर देना चाहिये कि कम से कम इस भाव में तुम को बिजली देनी पड़ेगी और मजदूरों को इतनी मजदूरी देनी पड़ेगी, तुम्हारी इच्छा हो लाइसेंस लो, न इच्छा हो न जो। यदि आप इस तरह से करेंगे तो मेरी समझ में बहुत कम कीमत में बिजली मिल सकती है।

दूसरी बात जो हमारे सभी भाइयों ने कही है, और हमारी सरकार का जो उद्देश्य है, वह क्या है? वह उद्देश्य यह है कि छोटे-छोटे घंघे हमारे यहां बड़ें, गांवों में और शहरों में सभी जगह छोटे घंघे पनपें।

मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि छोटे छोटे उद्योग घंघों का जो खर्चा होगा, जो कास्ट आफ प्रोडक्शन होगा वह अधिक हो जाएगा। यह जो छोटे छोटे घंघे हैं इनके लिए पहले तो खड़ा होना ही मुश्किल होता है और जब मर मर कर उनको खड़ा कर लिया जाता है तो जिन चीजों का उन के द्वारा उत्पादन होता है, उनकी कीमत भी ज्यादा होती है। उनको आप यह कह देते हैं कि जिस चीज को तुमने उत्पादित किया है वह बेसी दाम में पड़ी है और हमें तो सस्ती चाहिये और अच्छी चीज चाहिये। आप जरा इसका भी तो क्याल कोजिये कि बम्बई में जो बड़े बड़े कारखाने हैं, उनको आप किस भाव बिजली सप्लाई करते हैं और देहातों में आप किस भाव पर सप्लाई (संभरण) करते हैं। इस भाव के आधार पर यदि आप देखें तो

भ्राप को पता चलेगा कि कुदरती तौर पर जो गांव में चीज तैयार होती है उसका कास्ट ब्राफ प्रोडक्शन ज्यादा होता है। आप शहरों को ही लीजिये। इस बात को मैं माननीय मंत्री जी के ध्यान में खास तौर से लाना चाहता हूँ। शहरों में भी जो छोटा काम करेगा, उसको उसी शहर में बिजली का खर्चा ज्यादा देना पड़ेगा और जो बड़ा काम करेगा उसको कम देना पड़ेगा। यहां पर भी एक स्कूल होता है कि यदि कोई फैक्ट्री इतनी बिजली कनज्यूम (उपयोग) करेगी तो उसको इतना खर्चा और इस हिसाब से देना होगा। अगर वह ज्यादा पावर कनज्यूम करेगी तो उसको उसी हिसाब से खर्चा भी कम देना पड़ेगा यानी पांच पैसा या चार पैसा या दो पैसा। लेकिन अगर कोई ब्रादमी हैडलूम (हथकरघा) लेकर बैठेगा और पावर लूम से काम करेगा तो चूँकि वह कम बिजली या पावर कनज्यूम कर पायेगा इस वास्ते उसे तीन आना या इससे भी ज्यादा के हिसाब से देना पड़ेगा। मैं चाहता हूँ इस और माननीय मंत्री जी खास तौर से ध्यान दें। मैं चाहता हूँ कि जो लोग कम बिजली कनज्यूम करते हैं और उनसे जिस रेट पर बिजली का खर्चा चार्ज किया जाता है, उसमें कमी होनी चाहिए। इस बात का बिजली सप्लाय करने वालों को ध्यान नहीं रखना चाहिए कि चूँकि कोई ब्रादमी ज्यादा बिजली कनज्यूम करता है इस वास्ते उससे कम चार्ज किया जाए और दूसरा ब्रादमी क्योंकि थोड़ा बिजली कनज्यूम करता है इस वास्ते उससे ज्यादा चार्ज किया जाए। आप किसी भी इंडस्ट्री को ले लीजिये, साबून की इंडस्ट्री को ही ले लीजिये। उसमें भी ऐसा ही होता है। अब जो थोड़ा माल तैयार करने वाला ब्रादमी है, चूँकि उसको ज्यादा खर्चा देना पड़ता है, इस लिए नैचुरली उसकी चीज की जो कास्ट ब्राफ प्रोडक्शन होगी वह ज्यादा होगी और उसके लिए बड़े प्रोड्यूसर (उत्पादक) सेकम्पीट (प्रतियोगिता) करना मुश्किल हो जाएगा। एक तो वैसे ही उसका जो कास्ट

ब्राफ प्रोडक्शन (उत्पादन लागत) होता है वह ज्यादा होता है, लेकिन चूँकि बिजली के दाम भी उसे ज्यादा देने पड़ते हैं, इस लिये उसका कास्ट ब्राफ प्रोडक्शन और भी बढ़ जाता है। इस वास्ते अगर आप स्माल स्केल इंडस्ट्रीज का कुछ फायदा करना चाहते हैं, तो आपको उनको उसी दाम पर बिजली देनी होगी जिस दाम पर कि आप बड़े कारखाने वालों को देते हैं और फिर चाहे यह देहात के बारे में हो, चाहे शहर के बारे में।

3 P.M.

एक और बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ वह यह है कि देहाती इलाकों में बिजली पहुंचाने का जो लाइसेंस लेगा उसको बिजली सप्लाय करने में ज्यादा खर्चा पड़ेगा। इसके लिये एक सुझाव टंडन जी ने दिया है और मैं उसे ठीक ही मानता हूँ। सुझाव यह है कि जहां पर बिजली का खर्चा अधिक पड़ता है वहां पर आप कुछ रिबेट दीजिये जिस तरह से कि आप खादी के लिये देते हैं। तो जहां पर बिजली सप्लाय करने का खर्चा अधिक पड़ता है उसको कम करने के लिये आप उन जगहों पर जहां पर खर्चा कम पड़ता है कुछ टेक्स लगा दीजिये और रेट्स को एक तरह से ईक्वलाइज कर दीजिये। जब आप इस तरह से करेगे तो मैं समझता हूँ जो देहात में चीज तय्यार होती है, वह शहर में बनी चीज के साथ अच्छी तरह से कम्पीट कर सकेगी।

यह तो मैंने उन कम्पनीज के बारे में कहा जो प्राइवेट तौर पर बिजली पैदा करती हैं। अब मैं जो सरकार द्वारा बिजली पैदा की जाती है उसके बारे में कुछ कहना चाहता हूँ। मैं चाहता हूँ सरकार के द्वारा जो बिजली पैदा की जाती है उसका खर्चा भी कम हो। मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछना चाहूंगा कि दूसरे मुल्कों में, जैसे अमरीका है, इंग्लैंड है तथा रूस है उनमें जो बिजली पैदा की जाती है उसका कितना खर्चा पड़ता है और जो यहां की जाती है उस पर क्या खर्चा पड़ता है। इस के बारे में मैं मंत्री महोदय से पूछ रहा था लेकिन उन्होंने ने कहा कि हमारे

[श्री मृगमृगवाला]

पास किंग्स नहीं हैं। अब जब मंत्री महोदय उत्तर दे तो मैं चाहता हूँ कि वह इस चीज पर भी रोशनी डाले। मैं चाहता हूँ मंत्री महोदय वह भी बतायें कि दूसरे मुल्कों में इंडस्ट्रीज को जो बिजली सप्लाई की जाती है वह किस रेट पर सप्लाई की जाती है और हमारे मुल्क में किस रेट पर सप्लाई की जाती है। अभी हमारी बहन रेणु चक्रवर्ती कह रही थी कि वह बोझारो वरीरह में गई थी और उनको पता चला कि बहुत ज्यादा खर्चा आ रहा है। आप जब प्राइवेट कम्पनियों से यह एक्सपेक्ट (आशा) करते हैं कि वे कम खर्चा कर तो आपको खुद भी देखना चाहिए कि आपके द्वारा जो बिजली उत्पादित होती है उसका खर्चा भी कम हो

आखिरी बात जो मैं कहना चाहता हूँ कि यदि आपको इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोमिस करना है तो आपको इस बात का ध्यान रखना होगा कि आप उनको बिजली सस्ते दामों पर दें। आप एल्यूमीनियम की इंडस्ट्री को ही ले लीजिए। बिजली पर ही इस इंडस्ट्री को काफी ज्यादा खर्चा देना पड़ता है और अगर आप इसको सस्ती बिजली सप्लाई करें तो आप देखेंगे कि एक तो यह सस्ती चीजें प्रोड्यूस करेंगी और दूसरे इसकी बनाई हुई चीजें विदेशों में दूसरी चीजों के मुकाबले में ठहर सकेंगी। इस वास्ते अगर आप चाहते हैं कि हमारे यहां उद्योग धंधे बढ़ें तो आपको सस्ती बिजली सप्लाई करने का प्रबन्ध करना चाहिए। इसका एक नतीजा यह भी होगा कि हमारे यहां की बनी हुई चीज दूसरे मुल्कों में बनी हुई चीजों के साथ कम्पीट कर सकेंगी।

अन्त में मैं आशा करता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय जो सुझाव मैंने दिए हैं उन पर विचार करेंगे और उन को अमल में लाने की कोशिश करेंगे।

श्री नारायण बास (दरभंगा—मध्य) : इस वाद-विवाद में जो बातें माननीय सदस्यों

ने कही हैं, उन पर मैं नहीं जाऊंगा। जो सुझाव प्रस्तुत किये गये हैं, मैं आशा करता हूँ, उनको ध्यान में रखकर प्रवर समिति इस बिल में कुछ सुधार प्रवस्य करेगी।

सब से पहली बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि इस विधेयक में यह बताया गया है कि इस विधेयक का मुख्य उद्देश्य यह है कि सन् १९४८ के विद्युत सप्लाई कानून को व्यवहार में लाने से जो कठिनाइयां अनुभव की गई हैं या जो विरोधाभास देखने में आए हैं, उनको दूर करने के लिए ही इसको पेश किया गया है। इस में यह भी कहा गया है कि एक अन्तर्राज्यीय सम्मेलन हुआ था जिस में बिजली उत्पादन करने वाली जो कम्पनियां हैं उनके प्रतिनिधि और राज्य सरकारों के प्रतिनिधि और जो राज्यों के बोर्ड्स हैं, परिषदें हैं, उनके प्रतिनिधि इसमें आये थे। उन लोगों के विचार विमर्श के बाद जो तय हुआ उसी के फलस्वरूप यह विधेयक इस सदन के सामने रखा गया है। मैं समझता हूँ यह अच्छा होता कि इस सम्मेलन के सम्मुख जो विचारार्थ विषय रखे गये थे और जो विचार विनियम उसमें हुआ, उसका सारांश इस सदन के सदस्यों को सप्लाई कर दिया गया होता। उसके आधार पर हम इस विधेयक पर विचार कर सकते थे और उससे फायदा उठाकर अपने संशोधन प्रवर समिति के विचारार्थ प्रस्तुत कर सकते थे। लेकिन सरकार की ओर से उस सम्मेलन के सम्बन्ध में केवल यही बताया गया है कि उस सम्मेलन में विचार विनियम के दौरान जो बातें सामने आईं, उन्हीं के आधार पर यह विधेयक तैयार किया गया है। अब मैं यह चाहूंगा कि जब यह विधेयक प्रवर समिति से वापस आये तो हमारी जो सेंट्रल इलेक्ट्रीसिटी आथॉरिटी है, उसका क्या अनुभव रहा है, उसका एक सारांश माननीय सदस्यों को दिया जाए ताकि उसके आधार पर हम अपने कुछ विचार बना सकें। पहला सुझाव मैं इस सदन के सम्मुख यही प्रस्तुत करना चाहता था और

में आशा करता हूँ माननीय मंत्री महोदय इस पर विचार करेंगे और उस सम्मेलन के विचार विनिमय के दौरान जो जो मुख्य बातें सामने आईं उनका एक सारांश सदस्यों को उपलब्ध करेंगे।

दूसरी बात यह है कि जहां तक मैं समझ पाया हूँ इसके जो अधिकारी हैं उनमें पहले तो जो प्रमुख हैं वह सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट है, दूसरी सेंट्रल इलेक्ट्रिसिटी प्राधिकारी (केन्द्रीय विद्युत प्राधिकारी) है, तीसरी स्टेट गवर्नमेंट्स है, चौथे स्टेट इलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड्स (राज्य विद्युत बोर्ड) हैं। उसके बाद उत्पादन करने वाली कुछ तो स्थानीय संस्थाएँ ही हैं जोकि अपने आप लाइसेंस ले लेती हैं और साथ ही साथ प्राइवेट कम्पनियों (गैर सरकारी समवाय) हैं जो कि बिजली उत्पादन का काम करती हैं। सभी माननीय सदस्यों ने कहा है कि राष्ट्र के जीवन में—विशेषकर आज की अवस्था में—बिजली का क्या स्थान है। उस का उपयोग केवल प्रकाश देने के लिए ही नहीं होता है, देश की आर्थिक और औद्योगिक उन्नति के लिए हर एक क्षेत्र और हर एक अवस्था में उस की आवश्यकता बहुत बढ़ गई है। यह अच्छा ही हुआ कि १९४८ में बिजली के उत्पादन, वितरण, व्यवहार तथा तत्सम्बन्धी नियंत्रण इत्यादि के लिए इस तरह के अधिकारियों की विभिन्न स्तरों पर स्थापना की गई, लेकिन जहां तक मैं समझ पाया हूँ, यह एक ऐसा विषय है, जिस में विकेन्द्रीयकरण का सिद्धान्त बहुत दूर तक लागू नहीं किया जा सकता है, क्योंकि बिजली एक ऐसी चीज है, जिस का सारे देश में विभिन्न कामों में उपयोग होता है। यदि केन्द्र से ही उस के उत्पादन और वितरण आदि पर नियंत्रण हो, तो अच्छा है, लेकिन साथ ही साथ हम को यह भी देखना होगा कि—और उस का उल्लेख कई माननीय सदस्यों ने किया भी है—ऊपर से ले कर नीचे तक के अधिकारियों की स्थापना के बाद भी हमारे यहां उत्पादित बिजली की कीमतें विभिन्न प्रदेशों में, विभिन्न स्थानों में, विभिन्न हैं। अभी

तक कोई ऐसा उपाय नहीं निकाला जा सका है, जिस से इस विभिन्नता को कम से कम किया जा सके। उदाहरण के तौर पर मैं बताना चाहता हूँ कि बिहार और उत्तर प्रदेश में सिंचाई के लिए पानी उपलब्ध करने के लिए नलकूपों की व्यवस्था की गई है, लेकिन उस पानी की कीमत इतनी ज्यादा है कि कृषक उस से ज्यादा फायदा नहीं उठा सकते हैं। उस पानी की प्राप्त करने में मुख्यतः बिजली का इस्तेमाल होता है और बिजली के रेट्स बहुत ऊंचे होने के कारण पानी का दाम बहुत बढ़ जाता है। जहां तक मैं समझ पाया हूँ, पानी के दाम बहुत ऊंचे होने में सब से जबर्दस्त फँक्टर उस सम्बन्ध में प्रयुक्त होने वाली बिजली का दाम है।

आज गांवों में बताया जाता है कि हम ग्रामोद्योगों को चलाने के लिए बिजली देना चाहते हैं। देहात के लोग भी अलग अलग कामों के लिए बिजली की आवश्यकता महसूस करते हैं और बिजली लेना चाहते हैं, लेकिन मुश्किल यह है कि जहां दिल्ली में प्रकाश और शक्ति के लिए क्रमशः तीन आना और डेढ़ आना प्रति यूनिट चार्ज किया जाता है, वहां, जैसा कि मुझे एक प्रश्न के उत्तर में बताया गया था, विभिन्न प्रान्तों में सिंचाई के लिये बने बिजली के कारखानों द्वारा उत्पन्न बिजली देहातों में साढ़े आठ आना, नौ आना प्रति यूनिट के हिसाब से सप्लाई की जाती है। दूसरी पंचवर्षीय योजना में हम ग्रामोद्योगों पर विशेष जोर दे रहे हैं, लेकिन यह कितने आश्चर्य की बात है कि उन उद्योगों के लिए बिजली इतने ऊंचे रेट पर दी जा रही है। आखिर इस बात का क्या कारण है कि दिल्ली में बिजली डेढ़ आने और तीन आने प्रति यूनिट की दर से उपलब्ध की जाती है और देहात में साढ़े आठ आने, नौ आने की दर से? भेरी समझ में नहीं आता कि यह कहाँ तक उचित है।

यह जो संशोधन करने वाला विषयक हमारे सामने आया है, उस के विषय से भेरा कोई विरोध नहीं है। उस का मैं अभिन्न

[श्री श्री नारायण दास]

करता हूँ। मेरा कहना केवल यह है कि १९४८ के विद्युत सप्लाई कानून को व्यवहार में लाने के बाद जो अनुभव हम को प्राप्त हुआ है, उस के आधार पर हम यह संशोधन करने जा रहे हैं। अच्छा होता कि हम इस बात पर भी विचार करते कि देश के विभिन्न प्रान्तों में बिजली का दर जो बहुत बढ़ा हुआ है, उस को हम कैसे रेशनलाइज कर सकते हैं और इस सम्बन्ध में प्रगर सभा के सामने कोई योजना रखी जाती, तो अच्छा होता। मैं उम्मीद करता हूँ कि जब यह विधेयक प्रवर समिति से वापिस आयेगा तो माननीय मंत्री जी इस सम्बन्ध में कोई योजना या सुझाव रखेंगे और इस सभा को विश्वास दिलायेंगे कि जल्द से जल्द सरकार कोई ऐसी योजना तैयार करेगी जिससे देहात के लोगों को सिंचाई, रोशनी और ग्रामोद्योगों के लिए जो बिजली दी जायेगी, उस का दाम बहुत जल्द अधिक से अधिक कम किया जायेगा, ताकि गांव के लोग इससे विशेष फायदा उठा सकें।

१९४८ के एक्ट में इस बात का जिक्र किया गया है कि अगर राज्य सरकारें चाहें, तो वे बोर्ड के अलावा एक कौंसिल की स्थापना कर सकेंगी, जिस में विभिन्न स्वार्थों के लोगों का रिप्रेजेंटेशन (प्रतिनिधित्व) होगा। मुझे मालूम नहीं है कि किन किन राज्यों में इस प्रकार की कौंसिल (परिषद्) की स्थापना हो चुकी है और उस कौंसिल की राय का उपयोग किया जाता है। जहां तक मुझे ज्ञात है, बिहार राज्य में इस प्रकार की कोई कौंसिल स्थापित नहीं की गई है। मुझे स्वयं तजुर्बा है कि मेरे निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र के बहुत से लोग बिजली का उपयोग करना चाहते हैं, लेकिन बिजली प्राप्त करने में उन को बड़ी कठिनाई का सामना करना पड़ता है। कभी अघारिटी के कारखानों में बिजली नहीं होती है—वे कहते हैं कि हमारे यहां बिजली का उत्पादन काफ़ी नहीं है कि हम लोगों को दे सकें—और कभी दूसरी कठिनाइयां सामने आती हैं। जब कभी कम्पनी देने के लिए तैयार होती है, तो बोर्ड के

अफ़िस में आने जाने में महीनों लग जाते हैं और फिर भी काम नहीं पूरा होता है। मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह बुराई केवल इसी विभाग में ही नहीं है।

श्री नन्दा : माननीय सदस्य किस जगह की बात कर रहे हैं ?

श्री श्रीनारायण दास : मैं बिहार की बात कर रहा हूँ।

श्री नन्दा : लेकिन बिहार में तो बोर्ड नहीं है।

श्री श्रीनारायण दास : वहां पर जो अघारिटी है—बिहार गवर्नमेंट का जो इलेक्ट्रिसिटी डिपार्टमेंट है, मैं उन की बात कर रहा हूँ।

श्री नन्दा : वह तो स्टेट गवर्नमेंट का डिपार्टमेंट है।

श्री श्रीनारायण दास : मैं कह रहा था कि अगर उद्योग-व्यवसाय के लिए या प्रेस के लिए बिजली की आवश्यकता हो, तो छः छः महीने तक प्रयत्न करने पर भी बिजली नहीं मिलती है। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि यह बुराई केवल इस बिजली विभाग में ही नहीं है, जो कोई काम जनता की तरफ से उठाया जाता है, उस के पूरा होने में सरकारी महकमों और अफ़सरों के यहां बहुत तरद्द का सामना करना पड़ता है।

यदि और कामों में इस प्रकार की कठिनाई हो, तो अलग बात है, लेकिन विकास के कामों में इस तरह देर होना और कठिनाइयां सामने आने पर बड़ा खेद होता है। अगर गांवों में ग्रामोद्योग चलाने में, स्कूल खोलने में, और पुस्तकालय खोलने में दिक्कत हो, तो यह उचित नहीं है। कहा जाता है कि विकास के कामों में जनता का सहयोग लेना चाहिए। जनता तो सहयोग देने के लिए तैयार है, लेकिन जो वर्तमान फ़ाइनेन्शियल रूल्स एंड रेगुलेशन हैं,

जो प्रोसीजर है, भ्रष्टारों का जो व्यवहार है, उससे विकास का काम करने वाला उत्पाहित नहीं होता है। छोटे छोटे काम के लिए उस को दफ्तर का दस पंद्रह बार चक्कर लगाना पड़ता है। इसलिए निराश हो कर वह उस काम को छोड़ देता है। इस बात का पूरा प्रयत्न करना चाहिए कि जिस काम से विकास को प्रोत्साहन मिले, उसमें कम से कम कठिनाई हो। मेरी कांस्टीट्यून्सी (निर्वाचन-क्षेत्र) के लोगों ने कहा कि बिजली के मिलने में कठिनाई का सामना करना पड़ता है। उस का क्या कारण है, उस के विवरण में मैं नहीं जाऊंगा। इस के बहुत से कारण हैं। जो बुराई सर्वत्र व्याप्त है, हो सकता है कि वह इस विभाग में भी हो।

इस बिल में एक प्राविजन (उपबंध) यह किया गया है कि राज्य सरकार को नीति-निर्धारण पर पूरा अधिकार होगा। उस को बोर्ड की कार्यवाही पर भी नियंत्रण करने का अधिकार होगा। मैं इस प्राविजन का हृदय से समर्थन करता हूँ और उम्मीद करता हूँ कि इस प्राविजन के पास हो जाने के बाद राज्य सरकारें बोर्ड के ऊपर नियंत्रण रख कर घाये बढ़ेंगी। मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि जहाँ पर बोर्ड नहीं है—जैसा कि कहा गया है कि बिहार में नहीं है—क्या वहाँ के बारे में सेंट्रल अथॉरिटी ने जानकारी हासिल करने की कोशिश की कि बोर्ड की स्थापना क्यों नहीं की गई है।

**श्री नन्दा :** उन्होंने मंजूर कर लिया है और वह बनाने वाले हैं।

**श्री श्रीनारायण दास :** मैं यह निर्बेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि सेंट्रल अथॉरिटी इस मामले में विशेष रूप से जागरूक रहे कि स्टेट का महकमा, बोर्ड वगैरह जनता के हित के लिए कार्य करे।

**श्री म० प्र० मिश्र (मुंगेर—उत्तर-पश्चिम) :** तो फिर प्राविशियल एटानोमी क्या हुई ?

**श्री श्रीनारायण दास :** माननीय सदस्य कहते हैं कि प्राविशियल एटानोमी (प्रांतीय स्वायत्त शासन) क्या हुई। मैं एटानोमी केवल प्राविशियल को ही नहीं, हर पंचायत को भी देना चाहता हूँ, लेकिन हम को सब पहलुओं को देख कर ही व्यवस्था करनी पड़ती है। अगर केन्द्र का कुछ नियंत्रण रहे, तो कोई अनुचित बात नहीं है। मैं समझता हूँ कि बिजली के उत्पादन और वितरण पर केन्द्र का नियंत्रण रहे और वह जनता की भलाई के लिए हो। मेरे विचार में इस विषय में केन्द्रीय सरकार या केन्द्रीय अधिकारी का नियंत्रण जरूरी है।

मुझे इस बात की वाकफियत नहीं है कि हमारे देश में कहां तक स्थानीय संस्थाएँ जैसे म्युनिसिपैलिटीज (नगरपालिकाएं) या कार्पोरेशन (निगम) बिजली के उत्पादन के काम को करते हैं। लेकिन मैं चाहूंगा कि सेंट्रल अथॉरिटी इस बात की जांच करे और देखे कि यह कहां तक सम्भव है कि स्थानीय संस्थाओं को, जैसे म्युनिसिपैलिटीयों को और कार्पोरेशनों को बिजली के उत्पादन का और वितरण का काम स्वयं करने को प्रोत्साहन दिया जाये। मैं समझता हूँ कि यदि ये स्थानीय संस्थाएँ इस काम को स्वयं करें तो अच्छा होगा। अभी कुछ मित्रों ने कहा कि म्युनिसिपैलिटीयां इस काम का ठेका कम्पनियों को देती हैं जो कि बहुत मुनाफा उठाती हैं। मैं देखता हूँ कि अधिक मुनाफा उठाने पर इस बिल में नियंत्रण रखा गया है। अभी तक रीजनेबिल रिटर्न से यदि ३० पर सेंट तक ज्यादा मुनाफा होता था तो कम्पनियां उसका लाभ उठा लेती थीं लेकिन अब इस में यह प्राविजन किया गया है कि अगर रीजनेबिल रिटर्न से १५ परसेंट से ज्यादा मुनाफा है तो बिजली के दाम में कमी करनी होगी। लेकिन यह अधिक वांछनीय है कि यह काम किसी कम्पनी के हाथ में होने के बजाय स्थानीय संस्थाओं के हाथ में हो, क्योंकि कम्पनी तो निजी फायदे के लिए ही इस काम को इलेगी। मैं नहीं समझता कि इस बारे में इस बिल में कोई स्कीम है। लेकिन इसकी छान बीन की जानी चाहिए और यदि स्थानीय



[श्री श्रीनारायण दास]

संस्थायें इस काम को हाथ में ले सकें तो उनको यह काम देना चाहिए।

इस विधेयक में इस बात पर बहुत जोर दिया गया है कि लाइसेंस की शेर कौटिल पर ३ परसेंट से अधिक डिबिडेण्ड देने का अधिकार नहीं होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि यह प्रावीजन स्वागत योग्य है। अगर इसको और कम किया जा सकता तो और अच्छा होता।

जैसा कि मैं कह चुका हूँ इस बिल में यह प्रावीजन है कि यदि रीजनेबिल रिटर्न से १५ परसेंट से अधिक मुनाफा होगा तो बिजली का दाम कम किया जायेगा। पहले तो यह था कि कम्पनी रीजनेबिल रिटर्न से ३० परसेंट तक मुनाफा होने पर भी दाम कम नहीं करती थी। लेकिन यह नहीं मालूम होता कि यह किस आधार पर होगा। मेरा सुझाव है कि यह दाम कम करने और बढ़ाने का अधिकार केन्द्रीय सरकार को अपने हाथ में लेना चाहिए।

यह बहुत सुधी की बात है कि इस बोर्ड के हिसाब किताब की जांच का अधिकार कंट्रोलर और आडीटर जनरल के हाथ में होगा। मैं समझता हूँ कि सभा के सभी सदस्य इस का स्वागत करेंगे।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इस विधेयक का समर्थन करता हूँ और स्वागत करता हूँ।

**Shri C. E. Narasimhan** (Krishnagiri): I confess that I speak on the spur of the moment. My only excuse for doing so is that the parent Act itself has clearly formulated the objects of this Bill. The parent Act begins as follows:

"Whereas it is expedient to provide for the rationalisation of the production and supply of electricity, for taking measures conducive to electrical development and for all matters incidental thereto,"

Further, section 3 of the parent Act speaks of a "Constitution of the Central Electricity Authority". That is in

conformity with the preamble of the Act. Section 3 of the parent Act says as follows:

"(i) develop a sound, adequate and uniform national power policy, and particularly to co-ordinate the activities of the planning agencies in relation to the control and utilisation of national power resources;"

Consistent with these objects, I want to make one or two suggestions.

I want the Minister to take steps to see that the whole country is brought under one grid—a uniform grid—as soon as possible. If that is not possible, at least large sections of the country could be brought under one single grid. It is quite possible, for instance, to bring Andhra, Madras, Kerala and Orissa under one grid. In the same way, other contiguous regions of the country could be brought under a grid system. This will lead to better industrialisation and easier methods of making electricity available throughout the country.

Some of my friends were talking about the supply of electricity to the rural areas. Shri Raghunath Singh was quite passionate about it. One of the ways of making electricity available to the rural areas is to develop the windmills project. The research institutions in the country which are run by the Government of India have formally put this as one of the items of examination but nothing tangible has so far emanated. I would appeal to the Government of India and to the Planning Ministry in particular to see that the windmills programme is carried out soon and efficiently. It is quite possible for every village, on a co-operative basis, to own a windmill for the purpose of producing electricity in the village, wherever the windmill scheme is feasible. The sooner the windmills project is taken up, the better.

**Shri Biren Dutt** (Tripura West): While introducing this Bill, the Minister himself said that he wanted

electricity to spread among the backward and the rural areas. So, in this Bill, there must be some provision to see that in the backward regions, where investigations are carried on, electricity is provided soon. But there is one thing to be remembered. The information supplied by the State Electricity Departments to the Ministry about the requirements of electricity is not always complete, as for instance, in the State of Tripura. Owing to this reason, the work is delayed. 16,000 k.w. of electricity should be produced in a project in Tripura State but the work has not been taken up because the company which is run by the authorities does not know the actual requirements. The Government say that the demand for electricity is not so great there, because they do not have sufficient information from the State Government concerned.

I would like to say that the hydroelectric projects, one in Domboroo and the other in Chuckmaghat should be taken seriously by the Government. But our experience is, because the Tripura State has got displaced persons from East Bengal to the extent of two-thirds of its total population, the Rehabilitation Department is supplying some funds for starting medium-scale industries, and when some amount is given to the local authorities, they say that there is no electricity available for starting the industries. So, the scheme is delayed and sometimes the grant is also delayed. While some schemes are sanctioned to the neighbouring States, the local authorities in my State do not even know these things. During the last five years, the Rehabilitation Department has granted so many schemes and so many schemes have also been returned on the ground that there is no electricity available. There are good prospects for the production of electricity in Tripura. The Minister himself said that 64,000 k.w. of electricity could be produced from the Domboroo falls alone. But then the investigations are carried on so slowly. During the last three years,

we find that only Rs. 90,000 or s. have been spent so far on this project.

If this Bill intends to spread electricity throughout the rural and backward areas, there must be some provision through which the schemes could be started and expanded. There must be speedy development of electricity in the villages. In Manipur, there are cottage industries which must be developed at least into small-scale industries. But they do not get electricity. When we meet the Minister, we are told that the demand for electricity is small in that area and therefore, nothing can be done hurriedly. There is no question of regulation as such for controlling private companies, but wherever the Government machinery is there, the anomalies should be removed.

I would like to draw particular attention to the provision which deals with the State Electricity Council. The States Reorganisation Bill has been passed and Tripura and Manipur have been placed under the charge of the Central Government. The development of industries, commercial concerns etc., will be under the charge of the Central Government. But there the system of administration is such that the people cannot even represent their needs. We have found that if we give any representation, it is given immediate consideration by the Ministry. But, the machinery through which the whole thing is to be operated is defective and even though the assurance is given, the work does not proceed. So, in those areas which will remain under the Centre—especially Manipur and Tripura—where there are potentialities for the generation of electricity, plants should be built and the power should be utilised for the development of the cottage industries etc. The whole work should be directly administered by the Government.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Minister,

**Shri Nanda:** I thought there was more interest in the subject than I find now.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** The hon. Minister has lost it himself.

**Shri Nanda:** I was keenly listening to the debate and I was also considering a particular point.

In the first place, I shall take up the points made by Shrimati Renu Chakravartty, who is not here at the moment. She seems to have made a very close study of the provisions of this amending Bill. She expressed her gratification at the number of improvements that are being effected through this amending Bill; she has also got some apprehensions about some aspects of this legislation and she has raised some questions about financial arrangements, the basis for the reasonable return, the formula applied for the purpose of calculating the reasonable return etc. She expressed her view that this formula was complicated and she asked if we could not do something to simplify it. I have gone through the debate which took place at the time the original Act was in the form of a Bill before this House and I find that a very elaborate procedure was adopted for arriving at this formula. Experts were called and after prolonged deliberations, ultimately this formula was arrived at. Although it appears to be complicated, running to several pages, it is not so. It does not mean that, if it were simplified in the sense of compressing it into fewer words, it would actually in practice become simpler. A certain purpose has to be achieved. The purpose is, on the one side the industry should have a fair return, and on the other side, the consumer should not be exploited. For example, the hon. Member made a very simple suggestion: "Pay them on the basis of the paid-up capital, rather than adopt this complicated

formula, finding out the capital base, which includes a number of things". The result will be that it will lead to serious consequences. Suppose there is an establishment where most of the capital is derived from the shareholders. There is another undertaking where part of the capital is derived from shareholders and another part, say half, is from loans and debentures. If only the paid-up capital is taken as the basis, an undertaking which has made provision for a large amount of electricity on the basis of these loans cannot have anything at all as return in order to pay for the loans. So, we will have to make allowances for all the other elements of capital, which come from different sources; and, it ceases to be simply paid-up capital. All these things have been taken into consideration and the capital base has been evolved on the principle that we should get at the root of things, namely, what are the assets which are being employed for the purpose of generation of power, what is the capital for the use of the consumer, i.e. the capital which is engaged for the generation of power, which is really the product for which the consumer has to pay. I do not want to go into it at very great length, because all these suggestions are going to be considered in the Select Committee in detail. In a simple way, I have explained how the base is evolved. It is not possible to make it simpler and better, so far as our present experience goes.

The same Member said that if profits are higher, the part of the excess profits goes to inflate the base. We are not concerned with profits or where the money is coming from, so far as the base is concerned. We are only concerned with how much is the book value minus the depreciation and how much is the working capital; we calculate like that. Therefore, it is immaterial where the money comes from. In the particular example cited by the hon.

Member, about the Calcutta Electric Supply Company or Corporation, the figures quoted were not quite accurate. The total capital base is about Rs. 24 lakhs and not Rs. 17 lakhs as the hon. Member said against a paid-up capital of about Rs. 8 lakhs. The real position is that in this case also there is the paid-up capital, there are loans etc., and there is ploughed back investment i.e. capital derived from profits of earlier years. All that goes into the assets which are being utilised for the purpose of generation of power.

I will leave this subject. I come to the other subject which has exercised the minds of hon. Members. Several of them have laid great stress on the need for uniformity. It is certainly a very desirable thing that there should be uniformity. I am sure the hon. Members do not mean that uniformity will apply to all kinds of uses—it is not that, but uniformity in different areas. One of the objects of this legislation is rationalisation. Full rationalisation will lead to that result. There are at present a number of scattered producers with different sizes, different strengths, different conditions, different levels of efficiency and different financial structures. Therefore, the cost per unit is going to be different and so in the present conditions it will not be possible to make it uniform. There is a small diesel engine somewhere, and the cost will be eight times of what it is going to be somewhere else where it is hydro-electric energy or something else. If I ask the producer there to bring it to the level of the lowest, I am only asking him to get out of production. Nobody else can produce cheaper there because of the conditions. And, of course, to make uniformity on the basis of the highest is not the intention. So, this object can be achieved only through a process, through programmes which we have in hand. The intention is that the Electricity Boards will eliminate the small producer, the costly producer. If a large producer produces power in large quantities and has

long transmission lines, wherever the transmission lines go, the small station goes out, or it takes the power from this larger supply or gets out and hands over the thing to this Board or to the big supplier who can supply at a cheaper rate. This process cannot be applied at once. This will take time.

There are grids now also. There will be more such grids. There are grids now in Andhra, Mysore, Madras and Travancore-Cochin, and they are inter-connected, so that this direction of progress already has gone forward and I hope that as more Boards are set up, as more schemes are taken up, this process will go ahead fast and some time—I cannot predict when—there will be something like an all-India grid, something like a uniform system. As was pointed out by an hon. Member here the whole purpose of this legislation is to have a uniform, co-ordinated power policy for the country and a rational policy for the country. So, this much I have to say about uniformity.

The other question was about the rates, whether they should be lower than what they are, whether they should be lower for certain purposes; why not arrange that cottage industry, agriculture, the tube-wells are able to obtain power at much lower rates in the interests of decentralisation, in the interests of encouragement of agriculture and cottage industries. It is true that at the moment these rates are very high depending upon the area concerned. Where a Board is dealing with this matter, certainly over the whole area it would be in a position to have uniform rates—of course, the rates differ for different purposes—and therefore all places within the area will have that advantage. But, at the moment till these grids are established, it cannot be helped. The cost will vary, and therefore the cost will be higher in certain areas. The question still remains: why not enable the rural areas to have cheaper power than at present in the same circumstances.

[Shri Nanda]

and how can that be done? It is by subsidising. One process is to improve the present procedures which are really obstructing—that is, till some people in an area are able to guarantee that they will be able to take up a sufficient volume to justify all these charges of transmission etc., well, they cannot have it, otherwise the rates are too high. We have looked into this matter. It is necessary that just as there is a promotional aspect in industry, there should be a promotional aspect here also in anticipation of the load developing later on, there should be lower charges now. Then there is another aspect that even after that, on the basis of the business costs it may not be possible to give a reasonable rate. Then the question of subsidy arises. That subsidy may be through the system that when a State or a Board is charging higher rates to urban areas for certain purposes, out of those profits it should be possible to extend the availability of power and lower the rates chargeable for rural purposes and small scale industries. In the same connection about these rates, here was a suggestion that we might not fix the rate of return but fix the rates. Now, how actually will it work out? How do we fix the rates again,—because as I pointed out the costs differ in different places and therefore unless we arrive at the position that we can have a uniform rate in the whole country, the rates vary. How do we calculate?

**Shri Reghunath Singh:** Take the case of textiles.

**Shri Jhunjhunwala:** I did not say in relation to uniformity. What I said was that you find out what should be the rate at a particular place and if anybody can produce and supply at such a rate with such and such conditions of giving so much to labour etc., you give him the licence.

**Shri Nanda:** I have explained this is not practicable. It comes to the same thing. Any authority fixing

the rates will see what the costs are—costs not in the air. There is a plant there. If somebody sets it up, then we have to find out the cost of the plant. The machinery varies from time to time, the cost of fuel changes, wages change. For example, an hon. Member pointed out that in Kanpur after the State took over the rates have gone up. It is curious logic, as if because of the change the rates have increased. The rates have increased in a number of other places where no changeover has occurred. And that was because the workers were given higher wages as a result of an award. There were other causes also. These were taken into account, and then the rates were changed.

While I am on this question of rates, I may answer one question relating to the rating committees also. It was asked why they should not be asked to function in response to the demands of the consumers. At present, the provision is that either Government or the licensee can set this machinery into motion. The understanding or the assumption is that Government function on behalf of the consumers. If a considerable number of consumers have represented to Government that the rates are too high, then Government will certainly have the power to appoint a rating committee. But I am not quite sure in my mind whether this is sufficient. So, I think we might possibly consider it further in the Select Committee, whether some kind of a procedure cannot be evolved whereby Government may have to consider the question of appointing a rating committee on the basis of a substantial representation of the consumers. I leave it open, and we might consider it further in the Select Committee.

Then, there is the other question raised by Shri T. N. Singh and some others, that there should be a wider representation on the rating committee than what is provided for here. At present, in the case of the board, there are two members, plus a third

member, who is either a licensee or somebody connected with a Chamber of Commerce; and in the case of a State where there is no Board, there are three members appointed by the State, plus two others. Now, the question is whether something more could not be done, that is to say, whether some extension of this idea of representation may not be applied. I am not yet clear in my mind as to how it can be done. I think we should consider this aspect also.

About production, it was suggested that the whole business of generation of power and supply of energy in the country should be taken over by the Central Government and managed by them. Shri D. C. Sharma said, that this Bill was lopsided, because it looked only to the financial aspects, and the other important aspects had been ignored. He mentioned two points in this connection. One of them was relating to distribution.

As far as distribution is concerned, I would like to point that under section 18 of the Act, this is one of the duties of the board:

"Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Board shall be charged with the general duty of promoting the co-ordinated development of generation, supply and distribution of electricity."

The scope of the word 'distribution' has to be scrutinised. I am considering how far this question of priorities in regard to distribution has to be dealt with.

I think this is a relevant question. When there is a limited supply, and there is not enough to meet the requirements of everybody, there will have to be some kind of priorities. If large-scale industries can make it very easy and profitable for a producer to supply power, then the small-scale industries and the small rural requirements may be neglected, in fact, they have been neglected. We are not grappling with that

problem. That is true. We are considering how we can facilitate the consumption of power in rural areas and particularly, by small-scale industries and cottage industries.

We have suggested certain methods of subsidising rural supply, which I have indicated before. If there is some profit in a particular system, it may be diverted to reduce the rural rates. It might also be considered whether any more subsidy can be channelled for this purpose from other sources. For example, we have a provision for the promotion of cottage and small-scale industries. Could not some subsidy out of that source also be made available for this purpose? Or, there is provision for rural development, for helping the small-scale industries, and the agriculturists, for pumping of water and so on. Possibly, something may be done that way also. There are other things also being considered, such as that over a period of five or ten years, we might waive certain liabilities, in regard to the rate of interest. These are various ways of doing it.

Now, coming back to this question of the Central Government taking over the whole of this industry of generation, supply and distribution of power, I think it is not practicable. We are achieving this very purpose by a Central legislation, which vests the Central Government with some powers, but which enables the setting up also of boards in each State, which can function on a uniform basis. The Central Government, through the Central Electricity Authority, has some kind of power or function for developing a sound, adequate and uniform national policy, and particularly to co-ordinate the activities of the planning agencies, in relation to the control and utilisation of national power resources. So, there is an arrangement here already. I think if we utilise these provisions and these powers fully, there will be a great deal of improvement on the present position.

[Shri Nanda]

Another suggestion by the same hon. Member was about efficiency audit. I may inform him that we have got that provision already. I would not like to take up the time of the House by reading out that provision, but it is one of the functions of the board to direct the purchaser to adopt methods which will result in the most efficient and economical use of the assets and thus lead to the most economical results. So, the board has already got some power to issue directions to the licensees and those who have taken up the function of generating, supplying and distributing power.

I have dealt with the question of the rates, both the issue of the uniformity of rates, and the issue of the question of grids. I may further inform hon. Members that the information I have just got with me is that nearly 82 per cent of the power supply is already through grids. That represents a considerable progress. It is not one grid that exists. As I have explained already, there are about ten different grids in different States. The advantage of a grid is that it will enable us to progress towards the goal of uniform rates, which is not possible to achieve in the case of small stations here and there. The small stations will necessarily charge high rates, and those rates will vary very widely as well. But if we have a grid system, it is possible to have uniform rates over an area, and even to lower the rates.

**Shri K. K. Basu:** As a result of the growing introduction of the grid system, has there been a comparative lowering down of the rates?

**Shri Nanda:** Yes. There has been a reduction. When the small stations producing at a very heavy cost are eliminated, then naturally, the result is that in those areas, the power is available at lower rates.

**Shri Sinhasan Singh:** Could the Minister give us an example where

the rates were very high, but where, as a result of the introduction of the grid system, the rates have been lowered? And to what extent have the rates gone down in that place?

**Shri Nanda:** One hon. Member himself has cited an instance already, where the rates have gone down. But he had another complaint that the supply had become less dependable. There may be some special reasons, and we shall have to look into them.

**Shri Raghunath Singh:** Shri D. C. Sharma has said that.

4 P.M.

**Shri Nanda:** Now only one or two small points remain for me to answer. The hon. Member, Shri U. M. Trivedi, seemed to have read the Bill in a hurry. He thought that we were doing certain things which were possibly going to harm the interests of the consumers. That was when he referred to the incorporation of certain schedules in the licenses. It would not hurt the consumers; it is going to help, and is intended to help them.

Then he made a suggestion which I do not want to characterise. He said that the removal of the members of the Board should not be left to the discretion of Government but should be a matter for the courts to decide. If this were agreed to, then there may be no power at all available for days and months—if all these people were to be hauled up before courts. We do not want to set up these boards and corporations and various agencies in order to fetter us and in order to make us helpless. If we did so, that would be the best way of condemning all these methods of public enterprise. This is a suggestion which certainly could never be acceptable.

Then there was the question of difficulties in obtaining power in Bihar. Those difficulties are in Delhi and in many other places. As long as power is not adequate and abundant, difficulties are going to remain. Hundreds of crores of rupees are being

allocated for expanding the supply of power in this country. I hope that in course of time more of those needs will be satisfied. But my fear is that when power has become five times what it is now, these difficulties and complaints will still remain because much more power will be needed then. But we will try to match the supply with the expanding demand in the country.

**Mr. Deputy-Speaker:** I shall now put the motion to the vote of the House. It is not necessary to specify the number of Members required to constitute a sitting. It is covered by the rules.

The question is:

"That the Bill further to amend the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948, be referred to a Select Committee consisting of Shri N. C. Kasliwal, Swami Ramanand Shastri, Shri Rup Narain, Shri Bishwa Nath Roy, Dr. M. C. Jatav-vir, Shri W. S. Kirolikar, Shri A. S. Damar, Shri Ahmed Mohiuddin, Shri G. H. Deshpande, Shri S. R. Rane, Shri Debendra Nath Sarmah, Shri T. Sanganna, Shri Subodh Hasda, Shri A. Ibrahim, Shri L. N. Mishra, Shri Rajeshwar Patel, Shri Naval Prabhakar, Shri K. G. Wodeyar, Shri N. P. Damodaran, Shri I. Eacharan, Shri Ranbir Singh Chaudhuri, Shri S. K. Kandasamy, Shri Bijoy Chandra Das, Shri Sadhan Chandra Gupta, Shri K. Kelappan, Shri Kandala Subrahmanyam, Shri N. C. Chatterjee, Shri Tulsidas Kalichand, Shri Benjamin Hansda, and the mover, with instructions to report on the opening day of the next session".

*The motion was adopted.*

MULTI-UNIT CO-OPERATIVE  
SOCIETIES (AMENDMENT)  
BILL

**The Minister of Agriculture (Dr. P. S. Deshmukh):** I beg to move:

"That the Bill further amend Multi-Unit Co-operative Societies

Act, 1942, as passed by the Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration".

This is a one-line Bill. The Act was originally passed in the year 1942. It was for the purpose of incorporation, regulation and winding up of co-operative societies with objects covering more than one State. At that time, India was divided into British India and the Indian States. But now, when co-operative activities are increasing, the number of societies which we wish to operate in more than one State is also increasing. There are some 54 societies which are co-operative and which we wish to operate in more than one State. The total number of members comes to 6,79,538.

This necessitates amendment of this Act so that Part 'B' and Part 'C' States do not remain outside the scope of the Act. Therefore, this extends to the whole of India as it is understood today.

I do not think I need take up the time of the House any longer. This is a very simple Bill. It is necessary in the interest of co-operation, as I have explained.

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

"That the Bill further to amend the Multi-Unit Co-operative Societies Act, 1942, as passed by the Rajya Sabha, be taken into consideration".

**Shri Achuthan (Cranganur):** I want to know whether this is to have an apex all-India society under which there will be State societies.

**Dr. P. S. Deshmukh:** This will permit registration of societies which can operate in more than one State. At the present moment, they can do so in Part 'A' States. But so far as Part 'B' and 'C' States are concerned, they cannot so operate. This Bill will give them the authority to operate, and establish societies which have for