

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I suppose the hon. Member does not press it.

The question is:

"That clause 1 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1 was added to the Bill.

The Enacting Formula and the long Title were added to the Bill.

Shri Nanda: I beg to move:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed."

Shri Supakar (Sambalpur): May I put one question? You made certain observations regarding the Lok Sabha itself. Am I to understand that whenever there is a vacancy in this House also, the Speaker will notify to the employment exchange?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: We are not employed by anybody, I suppose. Here, we are talking of the employees and the employers. The hon. Member should not feel like that, as if he was a servant of somebody.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): We are servants of the people.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The question is:

"That the Bill, as amended, be passed".

The motion was adopted.

14.15 hrs.

INDIAN ELECTRICITY (AMENDMENT) BILL

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The House will now take up the Indian Electricity (Amendment) Bill, as reported by the Joint Committee.

Shri Panigrahi (Puri): What is the time allotted for this?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: The clock before me indicates that it is 5 hours 50 minutes.

The Minister of Irrigation and Power (Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim): I beg to move:

"That the Bill further to amend the Indian Electricity Act, 1910, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration".

At the outset, I thank the Chairman of the Joint Committee,—that is, you, Sir,—who conducted the proceedings in an excellent manner maintaining cordiality and harmony and getting the business through within a reasonable time through his guidance. I also thank the hon. Members of the Joint Committee who devoted their time, took keen interest and tried to improve the Bill in so many respects according to their light.

As far as this Bill is concerned, I propose to explain something about its background, in order that the real import and the meaning and effect of the amendments included in the Bill, and particularly, in the report of the Joint Committee, may be very well understood. That background lies in the expansion or development which has taken place from 1910 up to this time. That expansion may be viewed through the figures which I shall presently place before this House; and these are just a few. These will enable hon. Members to have a full idea as to how far India has advanced in the matter of electricity.

In the year 1910, India had only 15 steam plants, one oil plant, and 15 hydro-plants. The total was 31; and the installed capacity of all these was 31,000 kw. As against that, in the year 1957, India had 1,597 steam plants, 328 oil plants and 1,061 hydro-plants. The total comes to 2,986. The installed capacity of these is 28,86,000 k.w. That makes a lot of difference, that is, this expansion makes a lot of difference,

and gives rise to so many new needs and considerations which could not find a place in the Act of 1910.

Therefore, certain principles were evolved, looking to the conditions prevailing at the present time in the country, on the basis of which this law might have been evolved. In order to remind the hon. Members, I might read out those principles here, because we have to remember them at the time of considering the amendments which we shall be doing some time later.

One of the principles on the basis of which this Bill was prepared was to make available to the consumers served by Government departments, the same facilities as are enjoyed by consumers served by private licensees. As far as the law is concerned, so far, the position has been that certain liabilities and duties are cast by law on the licensees who supply electricity; but at present Government, to the extent of a bit less than half, are providing electricity and dealing with the consumers. Therefore, it was considered necessary that Government should also be placed under an obligation in respect of those matters in respect of which the law obliges the licensees to provide certain facilities to the consumers. Then, as regards the facilities which are enjoyed at present their pace is narrow; that has to be widened, and more facilities have to be provided. For the sake of illustration, I may state here that the principles adopted in regard to the facilities to be given are: to enlarge and extend the facilities at present available to the consumers, and to tighten control over the operational activities of the licensees, to provide for inspection of electric works and installations of the Central Government, and to make consequential amendments thereto.

Now, I will proceed to point out which are the amendments contained in this Bill in accordance with these principles. Let us take the first principle, namely, to make available to the consumers by government depart-

ments, the same facilities as are provided by the private licensees. At present, there is no obligation on Government to supply electricity to the consumer who has applied within a particular time; on the other hand, licensees are forced by the law to provide electricity within 30 days. After the passing of this Bill into law this obligation is going to apply to Government also.

Similarly, licensees provide meters, but Government do not. They might have done so, but that was without any obligation. But in future, the same thing shall have to be done by the Government also.

In this connection, disputes which arise between the consumers and the licensees are referred to the Electrical Inspector. If there arises any dispute between the Government and the consumer in the area which is served by the Government, then the Electrical Inspector has no authority to take up that matter. But through the amendment now suggested, it will be possible for the Electrical Inspector to consider those matters where Government are concerned and give his decision according to this law.

As far as consumers are concerned, one convenience which has been provided by this Bill is this. The licensees have two sorts of areas, compulsory and non-compulsory. As far as the non-compulsory area is concerned, he will provide electricity if six persons are available to take connections in that area. Now, this number has been reduced to two. After this amendment is passed, if only two persons apply for connection, it will be incumbent upon the licensee to provide electricity to that non-compulsory area.

From the mains up to the house of the consumer the line is provided. This is done at the expense of the consumer. In regard to estimates of the cost of such lines, there arose so many cases in the past. They have to be decided by some authority; otherwise, these cases would be continuing for a long time. Therefore, it was considered necessary that provision should be made in this Bill which may set at rest

[Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim]

all those controversies, a particular amount being fixed which may be asked by the licensee from the consumer at that time. For this purpose, many such cases were examined and it was found that an average of 15 per cent., was the cost that had to be paid by the consumer. Therefore, this figure has been accepted in an amendment to this effect.

There is another thing. At present, occupiers in houses such as tenants—and lakhs and lakhs of people in India are residing as tenants in the houses of others—are not entitled to get connection, as the law stands at present, without the consent of the owner. If a tenant applies for a connection, the consent of the owner has to be taken; if the latter does not agree, the connection cannot be given to the tenant. This is very hard on the tenant, and to remove this hardship, provision has been made in this Bill to the effect that the occupier will get electricity provided he is lawfully there. A person who is not lawfully there, whose title cannot be accepted will not be given, but if he is there with the permission and authority of the owner himself, he will be given electricity without permission being asked for from the owner of the house.

Then there is the question of handing over an undertaking to the purchaser pending settlement of payment. When a licence terminates or is revoked, then provision has to be made for a new licensee. For this purpose, Government will find out someone who will take the licence for the undertaking so that he may run the show there. The person who had been there before as licensee loses interest at that moment. Because the previous licensee loses interest, does not provide facilities and does not look to the interests of the consumers, therefore Government should be able to provide a substitute who may be the purchaser of that undertaking. That person will come in. So through an amendment, Government have been authorised to bring in some one else who will be in charge at that place.

There are so many services; some services and some uses of electricity become essential under particular circumstances as also generally. At present, there is in law no provision to treat an essential service in preference to an ordinary service. Suppose 'A' requires electricity which is for an essential service. 'B' is also there, but he is asking for electricity for some ordinary purpose. Up to this time, there is no distinction between the two. But now a distinction has been made and Government are authorised to declare a particular service as essential for the sake of being given priority in connection with getting electricity from the supplier. This is one thing. At the same time, there was a provision that government establishments also would be given priority. That has been done away with at the Committee stage and it has now been decided that government departments will be at par with others, except in the case of those government departments which, for the time being, are engaged in doing some service which is an essential service.

Then, it has already been noticed so many times that whenever there arose circumstances in the country on account of which the necessity of control was felt, every time Government had to come to the Legislature to get laws passed and then impose control. In order that Government may have standing powers under the law to impose control in any area whenever the need for the same is felt as a result of circumstances arising in the country, it is proposed to authorise Government to impose such control without coming to the Legislature for taking permission.

So far as the compensation payable to the licensee is concerned, the entire plant and machinery and everything which belonged to him is assessed. So those portions of the lines also for which the consumers had paid are included at present. There remained a lacuna. In this Bill it is said that those portions should not be included

for assessment for the purposes of compensation because the licensee cannot be deemed to be entitled to the money which was spent on that by another person, the consumer.

In the licences there used to be two areas, the compulsory and the non-compulsory area. In the compulsory area, according to the licence, the licensee shall provide electricity within a specified time. It used to be specified in the terms. If he failed to do that there was nothing to be done against him before now. Now it is provided that his security in part or whole may be forfeited if he does not comply with that requirement of the licence in regard to the compulsory area in connection with the supply of electricity.

As far as amendments to the licence is concerned, at present the position is that a licensee applies and Government takes up the matter and the amendment is made. It is not open to the Government to take it up themselves; nor anybody else. But in this Bill it has been provided that Government on its own initiative or at the suggestion of any other person can also take up this question of amendment and that an amendment may be made.

In connection with the amendment, the consent of the licensee was taken. In regard to that it has been provided that if he withholds consent unreasonably in the opinion of Government, it will not be cared for—whether he has consented or not—and the amendment will be made.

As far as the period of licence is concerned, so far many licences were given for 50 years. Now the time has been reduced to 20 years. There could be an extension for 20 years, that is, in the case of 50 years. Now that has been reduced to 10 years.

Now, I come to the amendments which have been accepted by the Joint Committee. They are very few and I will not be taking much time of the House. But I should mention them. One amendment has the effect of placing the State Government under an obligation to consult the Electricity Board before amending the licence. I

have already said that the Government can amend a licence. In that case Government will have to consult the Electricity Board also in regard to that amendment. I have already said that Government on its own initiative or at the instance of somebody else can amend the licence. In the original Bill as presented to this House there was provision with regard to amendment but there was no provision in regard to the amendment which could be made by Government at the instance of someone.

Government can sell the undertaking to another when the licensee is being sent away by vacation or on account of the termination of the period. In that case the purchaser has to be found by Government and the word 'shall' has been used. That is that the person Government has found shall be given the licence. In the Committee it was considered that it was not fit that Government should be placed under an obligation compulsorily to that person if anything comes to the notice of Government that that person is not fit. It may not be given to him. Therefore, the word 'shall' has been substituted by the word 'may'. Now, Government has authority either to give or refuse to give the licence.

There is a Central Electricity Board which is provided in the Act of 1910. The function of that Board is to make rules. There are so many representatives on it. Previously, under the Constitution, there existed Part C States. Now, they are no more there, and there are Union territories. Therefore Union territories have been substituted for the Part C States by an amendment in the Joint Committee. In the numerical strength of the representation that was given to Government an addition of one has been made in order to enable Government to send a representative of Atomic Energy on that body.

Besides, there are so many Electricity Boards in India in the various States. It was desired that they too should be given representation on the Central Electricity Board which is a

[Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim]

rule-making body. They also have been given representation.

I would venture to say something about the notes of dissent and the points mentioned in those notes. After that I will finish. Each and every minute of dissent in the Report says that the rates of electricity should be fixed. It was the position before the Act of 1948 that at the time of the licence it was settled between the Government and the licensee will charge so much for this sort of consumption and so much for other sorts of consumption. These rates were mentioned in the licence.

In the year 1948, the Electricity Supply Act was passed by Parliament in which a new position was introduced. And that position is that the licensee can make a profit on his investment. Previously, it was probably 6 per cent and, afterwards, it has been substituted by bank rate plus 2 per cent. After 1948 this practice started in the country. There was also provision in the Act that the Governments will get the accounts of the licensees examined. Accordingly, the chartered accountants checked their accounts to find out whether they have made more money than they should according to the law. If it is found to be so, a committee may be set up to decide whether there should be any reduction in the rates charged. That is the practice in vogue at present in the country after the 1948 Act. Now, the question is which of these two methods is preferable? One principle is that there should be a contract between the licensee and the Government and the charge should be fixed. Another is what is contained in this Bill. In my humble opinion, I hold the view that the change is for the better. It is more scientific and is directly related to the cost of generation. The charges will be fixed on the basis of the cost of generation that a particular licensee had to incur and on that basis it will be decided as to what he should get. In the previous position, there might be consideration collaterally as to what he spent on the

under taking. It may be taken into consideration. But it was not necessarily related directly to the cost of generation. Now, there is direct relation between the two. It is generally known that the cost of generation is not one and the same in each area and the prices differ from State to State and from locality to locality because of the cost of generation. So, we do not revert to the position which was prevalent in 1910.

Then there is also the 50 per cent of which I was speaking about that being allowed to the licensee. It was said that when one asked for a new connection that should not be given. It is said so. I have not been able to follow the reason behind that. Why should he not be given? Is it because in a year there is no supply? If it happens that only two persons apply for electricity in a particular non-compulsory area, electricity should be taken to that area and in that case why should he not be given the concession he should get, as is provided here? I think the hon. Members should consider that.

In the notes of dissent they say that book value should be paid to the licensee at the time of separation or transfer. There is a principle that no class should be presumed to be dishonest. It is a principle which is generally accepted. All laws are framed on that basis. The courts also begin with this presumption that no person is to be deemed condemnable unless there is something on the basis of which one can say so. In spite of any experience in the past about these licensees which might have been condemnable, it cannot be generally said that every licensee is of that kind, because of the misdeed of a certain person in the past at a particular time or place they should not be treated like that. Suppose I want to sell my house. Only the market rate will determine the price. The purchaser will be willing to pay that price and I will be willing to take that price. In all trading

transactions, the market price is considered the basis for the price and I am not able to see the reason why in their case the market value should be abandoned and the book value should be adopted. There are licensees who have been serving for the last 40—45 years. When they set up the plant, the price of machinery must have been much less than today; the price must have been less even in those countries from which they were imported. If market price is not paid, what would that machinery fetch by way of return if it is sold? It would be rather hard on them. The machinery may be 50 years old or 20 years old or even 5 years old. But whatever price it can fetch in the market, it would be fair to give that price. Therefore, it was provided that fair market price would be given to him if the licensee is turned out.

There is also another point. There is no necessity for a provision of the kind asked for. The practice so far has been that whenever a licence has changed hands and another licensee has stepped into the place of the previous one, the entire staff and the entire establishment had been taken over by him. It may not be possible to find out any examples in which it has not been done. At least to my knowledge, there has been no such instance. So, there is no necessity now to put some curb or to force by law the licensees to take over each and everybody there. It was not necessary to introduce, anything like that in this Bill.

There is one thing in the notes of dissent which is very good: the suggestion that the charges for agricultural and small industries must be less than for others. But an amendment is sought to be made in this Bill. I submit that the question of price is foreign to this Bill. There is a provision in the 1948 Act that certain things which were there in the 1910 Act were deemed to have been abrogated. This subject has been specifically dealt with in the Act of 1948. If the question of prices has to be considered it can be considered in the relevant place but

not in connection with this Bill. Besides, I may say for the information of the hon. Members that the Central Government has written to the State Governments, that they should consider this question and they should be ready to subsidise if necessary, and that a part of that subsidy will also be provided by the Central Government. So it is not that the Central Government are not aware or are negligent of the necessity of providing cheap electricity for the small-scale industry and for agriculture, but as far as licences are concerned whenever any licence is given at that time they may consider this question, and if it is possible to give some accommodation to this matter they may give, otherwise not. I can say one thing. I also will consider this question in connection with the Act of 1948. I say this, Sir, to the House, through you: but here it is quite irrelevant and it has no place. Therefore, we should not think of introducing this matter here.

Shri P. R. Patel (Mehsana): If you amend the Act of 1910 on this point of fixing the rates, how is it possible that we will be able to fix the prices under the Act of 1948?

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: I did not enlarge what I said, because I thought it not necessary to enlarge it. I will consider the whole thing as to how it can be done. If it cannot be done, then the whole thing will be considered. That is the only Act where it can be introduced, and therefore it will be introduced there. If the scheme which is sponsored by the Central Government themselves is adopted, there will be no necessity of doing anything at all.

There is one suggestion in the dissenting notes, that in the Union Territories Boards should be established. As far as I know, the development of electricity in those areas so far is not enough to introduce such a costly affair as the Board. There are very

[Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim]

small plants with very little capacity to produce electricity or power. So, let there be development. As soon as development takes place and those areas progress, they will feel the necessity of introducing Boards there also. But at the present moment it is not at all necessary and there is no harm if no Board is established there; Government can very well deal with the matter.

One thing more, and that is about supply of electricity in non-compulsory area. As I mentioned, for supply of electricity in non-compulsory area six persons were required and now only two persons will be required. In the dissenting note it has been suggested that it should be reduced to one. As to that I would say, if the compulsory area and the non-compulsory area are both placed at the same level, there must be some reason behind this division of the area into two compartments: compulsory and non-compulsory. The difference or the distinction that exist today must disappear, because the division is based only on this. In the compulsory area one is bound to get electricity within thirty days if one applies and that too without any guarantee. If a similar position is being sought to be maintained or established in an area which is non-compulsory there will be certain difficulties as far as those licenses are concerned. We have entered into contracts with certain contractors. Those contracts have their own sanctity about them. So long as those contracts exist you cannot take away the sanctity about them. They cannot be violated. They should not be violated. It is against public interest, against morality, against everything. Therefore, I do not think it would be desirable to reduce the number to one and to place that area just at the same level at which the compulsory area stands.

Here the question has been made easier. It is not the consumer who will go to find out another consumer. It is the duty of the licensee. If I, for

example, in a non-compulsory area apply for electricity, it will be incumbent upon the licensee to go out and search whether there is anyone else in need of electricity. If he finds out one then he will give me. It is through publication that this search is made. That has been the practice. Therefore, the change suggested is not a very easy thing to do, and I think it is not a desired thing at all.

Shri Supakar (Sambalpur): Sir, may I say that it also relates to compulsory area where it is suggested that "one or more" should be substituted?

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: No. Now, Sir, nationalisation is also suggested. Nationalisation, obviously, is a costly affair. I had with me—unfortunately it is not in my papers now—the number of licensees in this country who are supplying electricity to the different areas. We cannot take them over without paying compensation. Under the Constitution we cannot take away anything from anyone unless we pay. Therefore, nationalisation depends upon payment of compensation, and that compensation will amount to, in my opinion, probably, crores and crores of rupees. This question was considered recently by the Planning Commission here, and they came to the decision that unless and until on account of the bad conduct or some such thing someone has to be ousted a licensee should not be removed so that that money may be saved and spent on other purposes during the Plan period. If this policy is maintained, in that case nationalisation in respect of these licensees is not possible. Even if it is started, it cannot be done all at once; it will take years and years to be completed. It is not a thing where we can say that tomorrow we will be able to do so in respect of the entire area. This is a very difficult job, to take all the areas from the licensees and provide electricity through such agencies as the State Governments will be able to provide. So many difficulties will arise, and it is from that angle that the matter will have to be judged.

Therefore, nationalisation, in my opinion, at present is not possible. I am not discarding nationalisation. There may be essential services. I am in favour of having essential services, and as far as possible they should be done directly by the Government. But, at the same time, I see whether it is practicable or not, whether we can do so or not. Therefore, this idea is quite good, but it is not practicable.

Shri Braj Raj Singh (Ferozabad): What are the difficulties?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: He has already stated them.

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: It is not possible to put it into execution at the present time.

Shri Braj Raj Singh: If in other respects compensation for nationalisation could be given on an equitable basis, could that not be applied to this undertaking also?

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It will entail crores of rupees. That is what he said
15 hrs.

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: Compensation shall have to be given, but money is required for that

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Of course, but the figure could not be so high as the hon. Minister said.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: It is not the issue at present. It is the principle or policy of the measure which is under consideration

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: It is not a question of argument—a verbal war or a wordy war. It is a practical question. Let us see the undertakings of persons who are supplying electricity and what money we shall have to pay for them. We can get so many estimates prepared. Then you can understand the position very well.

Now, something about the federation which took the trouble of giving evidence. I think, however, that I have covered some of their points

139 LSD.—7

Shri Braj Raj Singh: Something must be said about the federation also.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Perhaps the hon. Minister wanted to say something about the evidence.

The Deputy Minister of Irrigation and Power (Shri Nathi): That has been circulated.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Then he need not say anything about the evidence.

Hafiz Mohammad Ibrahim: Thank you. I have finished. I commend the motion to the acceptance of the House.

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Motion moved:

“That the Bill further to amend the Indian Electricity Act, 1910, as reported by the Joint Committee, be taken into consideration”.

Several hon. Members rose—

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: Most of the Members who have risen are Members of the Joint Committee.

Shri Naushir Bharucha (East Khandesh): I was not a Member.

Shri Panigrahi: I was not a Member

Shri Sinhasan Singh (Gorakhpur): I was not there

Shri Braj Raj Singh: I also want to speak

Mr. Deputy-Speaker: I shall give him an opportunity

Shri Naushir Bharucha: I concede that the Bill which this House is at present considering constitutes a major effort in amending the outmoded Act of 1910. Out of the 58 sections and one schedule of that Act, as many as 34 sections have come in for amendment. The hon. Minister, while speaking, referred to the purpose of the Bill, the major purpose being the giving of facilities to the consumer, facilities by Government departments to the consumers which were hitherto denied, a stricter control over licensees and control over distribution and supply

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

having regard to the conditions that may develop and stricter inspection. Though these purposes have been partly attained by this Bill and a big advance has been scored so far as the 1910 Act is concerned, I feel that in the matter of facilities to the consumers, in spite of the Joint Committee's report, many things require to be done if the consumer is to be given a fair deal.

I appreciate the fact that some reasonable advances have been made in this direction, particularly, for instance, where the landlord does not permit his premises to be connected the consent of the occupier is enough for the purpose. But even there, my grievance is that the changes which the Joint Committee has made have very largely watered down even such concessions as had been made

There are certain important issues which require more careful consideration. It will be appreciated that in the 1910 Act, opportunity was given largely to the private entrepreneur in the matter of purchase of electrical undertakings. This order has now been reversed and the Bill provides that where a licence has been revoked the option of purchase should be given first to the State Electricity Board, secondly to the Government, thirdly to the local body, and then finally, if the authorities are not in a position or are unwilling to take up, the individual should be given such option. So far as the 1948 Act is concerned, certain undertakings could be purchased only when a scheme is prepared for a particular area and where a generating station has been designated as a controlled station. But the 1910 Act provides an opportunity for purchase whenever a licence is revoked or the licence has expired by efflux of time. It does not require as a condition precedent that there should be any scheme operating within any area. Therefore, to my mind, it is a big disappointment that the Joint Committee has not amended the Bill so as to make it obligatory on State Electri-

city Boards to purchase such undertakings.

I quite appreciate the point of view of the hon. Prime Minister that if nationalisation was suddenly decided upon various practical difficulties would arise including the huge amounts which have to be paid by way of compensation and which the States may not be in a position to pay. I can also appreciate other things which the hon. Minister said, namely, the practical difficulties. But I fail to understand why we cannot make a beginning where a licence of a licensee has been revoked either by the wilful default or for whatever reason, such as the expiry with the efflux of time, and I cannot understand why on such occasions the generating stations should not be compulsorily taken over by the State Electricity Boards. I am against giving the option to the State Boards to say that they do not want to take over an undertaking, because, they have a good opportunity, without in anyway affecting the rights of any licensee. You have an opportunity to take it over and that opportunity is not being availed of, and my reason for advocating this course is this. If such generating stations are taken over, then the co-ordination of generation and distribution of electricity becomes more feasible, there can be better load control, and transfer of power through the grid of the State Electricity Boards can be attained. Though the stage has not reached as in England where the electric supply industry has been nationalised, still, a very high degree of co-ordination can be achieved if a policy is followed, namely, of the State Electricity Boards being compulsorily required to take over those stations in respect of which the licences have expired or have been revoked. If this is done, in future there will be lesser need of having controlled stations and gradually an area will be built up which will come

under the control of the State Electricity Boards.

Perhaps the argument may be advanced that certain generating stations may be highly uneconomic and they may be running at a loss, and a station which is a losing concern should not be foisted upon the State Electricity Boards. But I am of the view that in the matter of electricity, the position should be this. Assume for a moment that in a particular town a particular undertaking is working at a loss as a result of which the service is inadequate and the licence is revoked. But the people of the town are entitled to electricity and I think if the State Electricity Board did undertake to buy up such an undertaking with the extra facilities that it will command and the less incidence of overhead and other expenses, it would be possible for the State Electricity Board to run even such a station, if not at a profit, at least not with a very great loss. The fact must remain that the people of a town are entitled to electricity, and the mere fact that an undertaking has been a losing concern is no ground for denying that facility which should be given to the people.

I am also glad that some measure of advance has been made in the matter of amending licences. The hon. Minister waxed very eloquent on the question of sanctity of licences. I am rather surprised at it. I am not one of those who is going to attach too much weight to the sanctity of licences. But without any undue encroachment upon any licensee, and in public interest, I think we live in an age when we should not permit contracts and licences to stand in the way of public welfare and public interests.

In this particular case also the Bill has taken care of this fact, and the concept of sanctity of contract has been largely modified in the Bill

itself. A very welcome amendment has been made by the Joint Committee, namely, the publication of alteration in a licence where alteration is made otherwise than on an application of the licensee. I think when the licences are altered, it is necessary that the public should have some say. I shall presently make a complaint and a grievance of the fact that so far as the consumer is concerned, he has been sadly neglected.

Coming to the question of payment of price for taking over an undertaking whose licence has been revoked or has expired, when the licence has been revoked, the 1910 Act lays down that the fair market value of land, building, plant and materials at the time of purchase should be considered as the proper price, regard being had to the conditions in which the assets are at that time. In case where the licence expires by efflux of time, in addition to the fair market value, 20 per cent solatium has to be added for compulsory acquisition. The Bill provided for fair market value less goodwill or profits. That was the correct decision to take, because in an undertaking where a monopoly position prevails, no question of goodwill can ever arise. If today I am taking electricity from the New Delhi Municipal Committee which runs its electricity branch in a very shabby and haphazard manner, it is not because I have got any goodwill for it, but because I have got no other source to turn to for supply of electricity. So, in considering market value, goodwill must essentially go. That is also in line with numerous decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court where in the matter of valuation, 'goodwill' has been compulsorily discarded as an element of value, though the U.S. Supreme Court has distinguished between 'goodwill' and the price of a going concern or 'going concern value'. So I am glad that in estimating market value, goodwill has been eliminated.

[Shri Nrusahir Bharucha]

Also, any profit considerations have been rightly eliminated, for the simple reason that the price is regulated not in competition generally or in consonance with the law of supply and demand, but by the Act. It is proper, therefore, to eliminate it also. However, I do not quite understand why the Joint Committee omitted the word 'fair' out of 'fair market value'. I have not been able to follow that.

A question arises in respect of the service lines, the cost of which has been contributed by the consumer. I am told that that amounts to a fair proportion of the assets—whether that service line cost should be excluded or not. I understand the hon. Minister has tabled an amendment. I have also tabled an amendment that in calculating the value of an enterprise, the cost of service line should not be excluded. I could have excluded it if in the case of purchase, the law had provided that the State Electricity Board should compulsorily take it over, because then the benefit of a private consumer paying for the cost of such line goes to the State. But when you leave it in law to any private entrepreneur to purchase the enterprise, I do not find any sense in excluding the cost of service lines contributed by the consumer and giving the benefit of it to another private entrepreneur. We can exclude the cost only if the State is going to benefit by it; not if any private individual is going to benefit. On that basis, I think that the cost should not be excluded. Also, after a service line has been made, it may be that an electrical undertaking has spent money on repairs and renewals. So, it may be that in practice, it may really be the ownership of the electrical undertaking itself.

Apart from that, coming to the question of payment of purchase price, it has been our experience that wherever Government takes over

any asset or any property of a private individual, when it comes to the question of payment of compensation, there is inordinate delay. The other day, in this House complaints were made that in the course of implementing irrigation projects, lands were taken over by the Government and for years together, the owners of the land were not given compensation. I do not desire that the same state of affairs should be repeated here. So, in the matter of payment of purchase price, there should be provision made that where a State Government requires a licensee to hand over an undertaking to the purchaser without payment, in that case it should also simultaneously refer any dispute regarding the value to arbitration, along with the notice to deliver the undertaking and it should order the admitted payment to be made immediately. When Government takes over any concern or undertaking, even where the payment is admitted and the dispute remains only as to a part, even the admitted payment is not made. So, I am of the opinion that a penal rate of interest must be imposed. It is true that the State must take over the undertaking, but the State must be equally diligent in making payment. So, there should be a provision for arbitration proceedings concluding quickly and the State paying the compensation quickly.

There is one factor in the matter of payment of purchase price, to which attention has not been drawn either of the Joint Committee or of the hon. Minister. I refer to the fact that in the matter of calculating depreciation, there is a difference in the allowance of depreciation under the Income-tax Act and under the Electric Supply Act 1948. The depreciation is calculated, so far as the Income-tax Act is concerned, and quite rightly, on an accelerated basis, so that the benefit accrues to industrial concerns and the tax which is not collected under the accelerated

depreciation is generally put into a reserve or otherwise utilised by other undertakings which are not controlled in the same way as the electricity supply industry is controlled. The depreciation under the 1948 Act is on a less generous scale. Also, under the 1948 Act, there is a ceiling prescribed on 'clear profit'. All the same, the Sixth Schedule of the 1948 Act provides for certain types of Reserves only and nothing more. Whereas in the case of other industrial concerns, the advantages derived from accelerated depreciation can be crystallised in the form of a fund, which such an industry which is not controlled is at liberty to create, in the case of electricity supply industry, no such fund can be created, with the result that this difference has got to be passed on to the consumer, which is the right thing to be done. In the electricity supply industry, as the hon. Minister pointed out, we are controlling not only reasonable return, but also clear profit. It cannot go beyond that prescribed percentage. So, whatever else is there has to be passed on to the consumer. The result of it is that the difference between the book cost of the assets on the income-tax basis and the 1948 basis arises there. Since the development and expansion in electricity supply industry continue, this difference continues to survive. As a result of this, as in the case of undertakings where the licence expires by efflux of time, a stage will be reached when the option to purchase is exercised and the licensee loses the benefit which, in the case of other industries, have been crystallised in the form of a reserve. The result will be that when the licensee comes to know that his licence is going to expire within a period of five years, he will not undertake any further development, because he knows he is not going to get any advantage out of it. I, therefore, ask whether it would not be wise to increase the value of the assets by such amount as would constitute the difference between the

advantage under the Income-tax Act and the depreciation requirements of the 1948 Act. That is a point which requires to be taken into consideration.

I now come to one major point about which I feel very strongly. In the Bill that was presented before the House, it was provided that Government departments as well as certain services essential to the community should obtain priority in the matter of electricity supply connections or delivery of supplies. The Joint Committee has done well in cutting out the Government departments. But the way it has kept the privilege to certain departments or certain establishments, which can be considered as essential is rather doubtful. It gives privilege to:

"any establishment which being in the opinion of the State Government an establishment used or intended to be used for maintaining supplies and services essential to the community, is notified by that Government in the Official Gazette in this behalf".

Such establishments are entitled to priority. Well, this is an improvement by the Select Committee on what was originally in the Bill, but that improvement does not go far enough. Because, the question that would immediately arise is: what is essential to the community? There the opinion of the Government will prevail. My fear is that the State Government will indirectly notify all such establishments as essential though they may not be essential in the sense contemplated here and though they may be carrying on only ordinary trading activity.

My submission is that the law should have laid down a very clear principle as to what should be "an essential services". In my opinion the State has two types of functions—

[Shri Naushir Bharucha]

one the ordinary normal trading function and the other, sovereign function. Any function of the State which is a sovereign function, in respect of that alone priority should be given. But where the State enters the trading ring then it must compete with the private enterprise. The State must not secure surreptitiously advantage in the matter of electricity connection or higher load or whatever it may be and then say that it is running an enterprise in a profitable manner. Therefore, I think that should have been taken into consideration. I do not know whether as a matter of administrative practice this distinction will be observed, but I am strongly of the opinion that more trading activities of the State should not be entitled to any consideration whatsoever.

The question that next comes is about the price at which electricity should be supplied to essential establishments. It may happen that there is a small town which gets its electricity supplied from a licensee. All of a sudden some industry is set up in that town which consumes energy on such a large scale that it may make a difference in the overall rates of energy supplied to the ordinary people. Normally, industrial concerns are entitled to a rate which is lower than the domestic rates. If, therefore, the bulk of the power is taken by the so-called essential industry in a town, with the result that it obtains power at a lesser rate than the domestic consumer, the outcome of it might be that there might be an overall increase in the price of electricity supply to the domestic consumer. I therefore desire that the principle must be recognized by the Government that where a big power chunk is consumed by an essential service at a lower rate because it is an industrial concern, the result of which is that the licensee cannot make his 'clear profit' unless he raises the rate, then the rates must not be raised so far as the domestic con-

sumers are concerned just for the benefit of the industry. Otherwise it would mean the domestic consumer subsidising a Government industry. I want that principle to be recognised in the matter of determining rates.

15.25 hrs.

[SHRI MOHAMMED IMAM in the Chair]

I now come to two or three more points which, though not directly connected, do arise out of the Bill and which, to my mind, are important. The first point is about the Central Electricity Board. The Joint Committee has made some changes in its constitution. It is a good thing that the State Electricity Boards have been given representation. But I find that the Central Electricity Board is rather packed heavily by Government nominees. It is packed by Government nominees and the consumer, who is the most important factor in electricity supply industry, has been sadly ignored. There is no representation so far as the consumer is concerned. Probably, the hon. Minister will say how is he to be elected. I can tell you that, surely. If he had provided that the Lok Sabha and the Rajya Sabha could send three and two members respectively as representatives of the consumers, the interests of the consumers would have been well safeguarded. Throughout I have noticed that in the matter of electricity supply industry the consumer has been sadly neglected. Perhaps the Minister will say that under the 1948 Act we have got consultative councils and we have got local committees. It has been my sad experience wherever I have served on consultative councils and such bodies that nobody wants any consultation from the members and any consultation offered is seldom accepted by person in authority. Therefore, it is necessary that when we have got a body which has got power to make rules, the

consumers' interest must be represented on that. Also, if it could possibly be helped I would like to have the Central Electricity Board's area of function extended beyond the rule-making powers. But it does appear that the Government could have made some provision for representation of consumers' interest. But they have not done that.

There is one thing to which I would like to refer, namely, the concession given to the consumer which I value very much. In Bombay city it has been our experience that in such chawls where electricity enters for the first time the landlord refuses to give permission and, as the Act stands at present, the tenant cannot have electricity unless he pays a 'pagree' to the landlord. Now it is sought to be remedied. But the provision, as it stands, will not help the consumer except in a limited way, and why it is so I shall explain. Under the Rent Restriction Act in Bombay—I am talking of Bombay—nobody can make alterations or have permanent fixtures fixed to the premises without the consent of the landlord. Since this would involve fixation of permanent fixtures the landlord will not give the consent and will say: I stand by my Rent Restriction Act. Therefore, unless this section is amended to say that "notwithstanding anything contained in any law for the time being in force, or any contract"—because certain tenancy agreements are there where they say nothing is to be fixed except with the permission of the landlord—this clause will not be an overriding clause, and the tenant will continue to find it difficult. Unfortunately, the Joint Committee, instead of improving the position, has made the position much worse. It has defined who is an occupant; an occupant must be a lawful occupant. In Bombay city in the case of small 'chawls' nearly 75 per cent of the tenancies do not stand in the name of the actual occupants. The original tenant is dead and gone. His son

wanted to change the rent bill to his name but the landlord refuses to change it. Under the Rent Act he is entitled to say that he is not going to change it. If therefore, the landlord says: you are not a lawful tenant, who decides the question whether the occupier is lawful occupier or not. For an occupier to go to a court to get his status determined in order to get electricity is very difficult. Therefore, the Select Committee by altering the position, has made the position of the occupier much worse. The clause, instead of saying "lawful occupier", should have said "occupier in fact" whosoever he may be. And if the landlord has got any difficulty, let him go to the court and have him ejected. Instead of throwing the burden of going to the court on the landlord the burden is now on the tenant.

There is another point to which I would like to refer and that is the question of complaints by consumers. It has been our sad experience that very frequently licensees make an over-charge of electricity bills and when consumers complain there is no reply. If you do not pay the service is disconnected and often it is disconnected in a very high-handed way. The other day I gave an illustration of the New Delhi Municipal Committee, its electricity branch. I deposited Rs. 50 as deposit for meter charges and other things. No receipt for the amount was forthcoming. I wrote six letters, reminders and everything; no reply to a single letter. Then I wrote to the Home Ministry that for a change the Home Ministry may write and see whether the electricity branch condescends to reply to the Home Ministry. Then a reply came to me saying, "Your files are lost and you can keep this letter as a receipt." They are supposed to give a stamped receipt and they say, "Preserve this letter instead of the receipt". This is the way things are done.

Mr. Chairman: What about the deposit of Rs. 50?

Shri Naushir Bharucha: About the deposit of Rs. 50, I will find a lot of trouble in reclaiming it when at the end of my term if I have to leave this House.

An Hon. Member: Many hon. Members have not got it.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: There is no prospect of their getting it either. In cases of this kind the Electricity Supply Act must provide a quick machinery. I do not see why, for instance, if I suspect that I am overcharged, I cannot write to the Electrical Inspector and why on payment of a nominal fee of Re. 1 he should not come and test my meter against his standard meter. Why should that not be done? It may be that the service does not pay itself. That does not matter. Government must subsidise it or compel the licensees to subsidise it. For these complaints of overcharging, failure to redress grievances and failure to reply to correspondence there is no remedy in the Act. After all, the success of an electricity supply undertaking is not judged merely by the vastness and the expansion of which some idea has been given to us by the hon. Minister. It is judged by the way in which licensees treat the consumers. There are many honourable licensees who pay prompt attention but I have come across an equal number where you find that the consumers' complaints are simply thrown into the waste paper basket. These things have got to be remedied and I think that there should have been a provision for taking over grossly mismanaged undertakings. If a notice was inserted in the papers calling people from New Delhi only, which is supposed to be an advanced city, to send complaints against the Electricity Branch of the N.D.M.C., I think you will get thousands of them. And yet no redress whatsoever! I say that the Bill must provide some machinery for that purpose.

An important question was also raised with regard to electricity supplied to agriculturists. I can appreciate

the fact that the agriculturist for his pumping sets and such appliances must have electricity at a lower rate. If it were possible I would go to the extent of saying that he should be supplied electricity at a rate lower than that for industrial undertakings. But let us appreciate the fact that the cost of generation in remote and sparsely populated areas and particularly the cost of laying cables and of maintaining supply lines is so great in those areas that it would be uneconomical to provide any electricity except at prohibitive costs. I appreciate what the hon. Minister has said, that is, that a time has come when the question of subsidising electrical undertakings to give lower rates to agriculturists has to be considered. We are wasting colossal amounts in importing foodgrains from abroad. If lift irrigation and other things were worked with electricity and a good part of it was subsidised it would still be cheaper to subsidise and grow foodgrains in India than to import them. That is a question which requires to be considered and I hope the hon. Minister, who is sympathetic in this matter and who said that the complaint made in the dissenting minute is correct, will be paying attention to it and will come out with some sort of a plan or a scheme for implementing this suggestion.

In conclusion, I will say that the Bill has made considerable advance over the Act of 1910. The Joint Committee improved the Bill but still certain things remain to be done, particularly in the interest of the consumer. Nonetheless the Bill has to be welcomed as a serious and a major effort in radically altering some of the provisions of, what I consider, the outmoded Act of 1910. It is in this spirit, Sir, that I welcome the Bill.

Shri Panigrahi: Mr. Chairman, Sir, the hon. Minister in his observations has told us about the way in which production of electricity has expanded during these last few years. He

has tried to give us an idea of it. He has said that in the year 1910 India was producing only 31,000 kilowatts of electricity and that in 1957 she was producing 28,86,000 kilowatts of electricity. He has tried to give us an idea of the real expansion of electricity production in this country. I suppose that during the last two years, that is, since 1957, if his figures are up-to-date the production of electricity has gone far ahead.

He made a catalogue of the facilities which the present amending Bill proposes to give to the consumers. He said that in the 1910 Act there was a provision to the effect that if six persons applied for taking the main the electricity supply undertaking was obliged to give the distributing main to those areas. Now that has been reduced to two or more. He tried to convince us that this is a good feature and a welcome feature of the present Bill. I do admit it and welcome it. This is a redeeming feature. But I just wanted to know from the hon. Minister as to what charm is there in the number two. Is it because Adam and Eve are connected with it? If we say one or more and if it is reduced to one or more I do not suppose it makes a heavenly difference by reducing it to one only. The hon. Minister tried to give some reasons. I listened to them but I am not convinced.

Take the case of a new area or, as the hon. Minister has tried to explain to us, of a non-compulsory area. If in that area two persons want to take the distributing main and apply for it, the electricity supply undertaking is obliged to give them the line. But if one man applies for it and the distributing main is given to that area what difference does it make? We must look to the potentialities of that area. If one man applies and the possibilities of developing that area into an economic unit, so far as electricity supply is concerned, are tremendous what difference does it make? If one man applies to take the line in that area, the line should

be given. I hope the hon. Minister will consider this suggestion.

Then he was referring to the question of reasonable returns which the electricity supply undertaking is required to get. That has been fixed at 15 per cent. I submit that in the original Act of 1910 there was a provision of fixing the maximum rate that a certain electricity supply undertaking can charge per unit of electricity consumed from the consumer. That provision was there. While deleting that provision, you have added that the reasonable return should be 15 per cent. The hon. Minister argued that we have fixed the reasonable return at the maximum of 15 per cent and so naturally we should not ask that the maximum rate should also be fixed.

Again, the hon. Minister has tried to convince us that previously the electricity supply undertakings were charging a net profit of 6 per cent. Now the hon. Minister has told us

Shri Naushir Bharucha: 6 per cent is net. This 15 per cent is only on the cost of distributing mains.

Shri Panigrahi: This should remain. I am coming to the net. He says that it has now been reduced. To what extent has it been reduced? He has tried to convince us that it has been reduced to the market rate of interest plus 2 per cent. If the market rate of interest is 4 per cent plus 2 per cent it actually comes to 6 per cent. If you calculate it it does come to 6 per cent. So, how have you reduced it? I think the hon. Minister has not calculated the present market rate of interest properly. So, naturally it comes to 6 per cent. You have not reduced it. (Interruption). It roughly comes to 6 per cent. That has not been reduced. That is my point.

With regard to the supply of cheap electricity to the consumers in the rural areas, the hon. Minister will surely admit that a new situation has been reached so far as the production

[Shri Panigrahi]

of electricity in this country is concerned. He told us that the production of electricity has expanded. It is true. But would he analyse how much public money they have invested in the production of electricity during the last so many years? I do not complain. I commend it that so much money has been spent in expanding the production of electricity. But with what object in view? Is it because the Government of India has decided to produce electricity, to expand its production and to distribute this bulk supply of electricity generated by power houses run with the money of the Government of India and the public? It is only to supply this electricity at cheap rates to those private electricity undertakings so that they may charge six annas per unit in a town like Cuttack whereas they get it at the rate of only 10 naye Paise per unit from Hirakud

Is it with this view that we have sanctioned so much money to you, and you say to us that it will be very difficult to take over these companies. Take the Octavius Company in Cuttack. For the last fifty years it is getting profits, and still it is charging at the rate of six annas per unit for domestic consumption. The Orissa Government has tried its best to take action and to take over that company, but the law stood in the way and it has not been able to take it over

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Was not a rating committee appointed?

Shri Panigrahi: There is no Electricity Board. So it has not been done. Of course, after the formation of the State Electricity Board the situation may improve. But, for the information of my hon. friend Shri Bharucha I may also point out that so far as the rating committees are concerned they have not proved very satisfactory. He must be knowing it very well in the case of Bombay Electricity Supply. In Bombay so far as the Tata supplies are concerned, the rating committee has tried to

bring down the rates, but they could not, because they were challenged in the High Court and other courts, and they could not effect the reduction of the rates that they wanted.

I was submitting, let us consider that while investing so much of money in the public sector by producing cheap electricity the main object of the Government has been to provide electricity cheaply to villages, not with a view only to electrify their houses but with the main object of decentralising industries in the countryside; secondly, promoting expansion of agriculture, production of foodgrains; and, thirdly, promoting the expansion of cottage industries in the villages.

It is with these objects in view that the Government is investing so much of money for the production of electricity. I think the hon. Minister will keep these things in view when we suggest that the case of nationalisation of electricity undertakings should not be thought of only from the point of view of how much you are going to pay as compensation to those who are at present running the electricity undertakings.

I would in this connection like to bring to the notice of the hon. Minister some of the practical difficulties which certain State Governments are facing today. Take the case of the hon. Minister's own State, Uttar Pradesh. You know the Martin Burn Company have a network of power houses in U.P., and recently the Government of U.P., tried to take out from their hands this power production. What was the difficulty they faced? The U.P. Government has said that under the agreement with this company the Government, on the termination of the present charter, could take over the power houses on the payment of compensation equal to the current value of the assets plus 20 per cent. And the U.P. Government has calculated—the hon. Minister's own State Government, not I—that the current value of the assets would be four times the price paid by

Martin Burn when they installed them twenty or thirty years ago. This is the difficulty of that particular State Government.

Shri Narayankutty Menon (Mukandapuram): There is a case for Central intervention!

Shri Panigrahi: This is the case of the State Government. And the arrears of the electricity duty due from the company come to about Rs. 27 lakhs and the Government of U.P. is not in a position to collect it.

Shri Naushir Bharucha: Political contribution!

Shri Panigrahi: Political contribution is there. But you just consider the situation. Twenty-seven lakhs of rupees of arrears could not be collected, and the Government of U.P. is not in a position to pay four times the price paid by the company as current value, plus 20 per cent. And then the Government of U.P. was forced to advance a loan of one crore of rupees to these Martin Burn power houses to run their power. This is the peculiar position that the State Government is facing. And the State Government has no other way out, because the Central Government is not in a position to advance money to the U.P. Government to take it over. They are not going to give the money, and the U.P. Government cannot close it down because they want expansion of industries. This is the position in which the U.P. Government is placed.

Let me cite one more instance, about my State of Orissa. What is the difficulty there? As regards the provision in the amending Bill about giving parities between a consumer who takes electricity from a private undertaking and a consumer who takes electricity from a government undertaking, I accept it and I welcome it. But I have got one apprehension, because my State is industrially very much backward. You know there are certain industrialists. I think Shri Bharucha will not con-

sider it a parochial view, but I am putting forward a practical difficulty. Certain industrialists have got their registered offices in Calcutta or, say, in Patna or other places. They want to run their industries in Orissa. But, they want to avoid the taxes. Now, the Government of Orissa has been forced, because of its financial difficulties, to pass orders that any industrial concern or consumer wishing to run an industry or business in Orissa, must have the registered office in Orissa at the time of applying or within one year after he gets electricity or power, he will have to shift his office from other parts of India to this State. So far as this Bill is concerned, it goes against it. So far as equity is concerned, I cannot say this is a good position for Orissa. You want that the State Government should subsidise for providing cheap power to the villages. Consider the financial condition of Orissa in this respect. If the companies do not have their registered offices in Orissa, the State Government could not collect its own taxes from these industrialists. If this provision is not there, you are going to deprive the State Government of the revenue that they want to get from the industrialists. This is a practical difficulty. I do not know how you can solve it. You must keep in view the varying conditions in the different States. This is the peculiar position that the Orissa Government is facing. I know, once this Bill becomes an Act, the industrialists are trying for it and they have represented to the Government of India that the State Government is harassing them—they will be very glad. But, it will be a loss to the Government of Orissa. You will have to consider how the revenues of the State Governments can be increased. These difficulties are there.

There was the question of representation in the Central Electricity Board. The hon. Minister has told us that representation has been extended to other spheres. My hon. friend Shri Naushir Bharucha has asked, where is the representation for the consumers.

Mr. Chairman: I request you to conclude your speech in two or three minutes. There are other speakers.

Shri Panigrahi: I am the only speaker on behalf of our party.

Mr. Chairman: There are other speakers on behalf of other parties.

Shri Panigrahi: I am the only speaker from our party. So I am taking this time. I will finish in two or three minutes.

So far as representation in the Central Electricity Board is concerned, I will suggest, as my hon. friend Shri Naushir Bharucha suggested, that some two or three Members from the Lok Sabha should be there. Secondly, as you have given representation to the Federation of Electricity undertakings, which is a federation of private electricity producers, similarly, please also think of giving representation to the employees working in electricity undertakings all over the country. They have their grievances, they have got their difficulties, they have to have their say. As the Central Electricity Board is representing different sections, the owners, Government and State Electricity Boards, it is proper that it should represent the employees. Their number is great: they are working in the electricity undertakings.

So far as continuation of the services of the employees are concerned, I would like to suggest that whenever any electricity undertaking is taken over, the services of the employees engaged in that particular electricity undertaking should be considered as a continuation of their services and there should be no break. I think there is no such provision in the Amending Bill.

With these words, I hope the hon. Minister will think of improving the Bill still further although it has been improved to a great extent by the Joint Committee.

श्री सिंहासन सिंह : सभापति महोदय, यह बिल एक संशोधन के रूप में हमारे सामने आया है। उचित तो यह था कि जिस प्रकार १९४८ का इलेक्ट्रिसिटी (सप्लाई) एक्ट नए रूप में लाया गया था, वैसे ही इस बिल को भी नए रूप में लाया जाता। लेकिन हम १९१० के पुराने एक्ट में तरमीम करके नया काम करना चाहते हैं। सभी हमारे मित्र भ्रूषा साहब ने बताया है कि इस बिल के द्वारा मूल कानून के २८ सेक्शन में से ३४ सेक्शन का, अर्थात् दो तिहाई धाराओं का, अमेंडमेंट किया जा रहा है। जैसा कि मैंने अभी कहा है, उचित तो यह था कि इस बिल को नए रूप में लाया जाता, लेकिन ऐसा नहीं किया गया।

मैं मंत्री महोदय का ध्यान इस ओर दिलाना चाहता हूँ कि उन्होंने अपने बक्तव्य में बेहत और खेती की तरफ और छोटे छोटे व्यवसायों का जिक्र किया है और कहा है कि उन को सस्ते भाव पर बिजली दी जाये। मैं यह निवेदन करना चाहता हूँ कि मंत्री महोदय के अपने प्रदेश में १९४६ में, जबकि वह वहाँ बिजली के मंत्री थे, रिहन्द डैम का कार्य प्रारम्भ हुआ था और वह इस विचार से प्रारम्भ हुआ था कि उस के द्वारा तैयार की गई बिजली उत्तर प्रदेश के पूर्वी क्षेत्रों को, जो कि पिछड़े हुए हैं और जिन की आबादी बहुत घनी है और जो बहुत गरीब हैं, प्रचुर मात्रा में बिजली उपलब्ध की जाये, ताकि वहाँ पर छोटे छोटे व्यवसाय पनप सकें और खेती बाड़ी में प्रगति हो सके। लेकिन जब वह रिहन्द डैम बनने के करीब आया, तो उस की बिजली गरीब किसानों और छोटे छोटे व्यवसायियों को न मिल कर के मिलने जा रही है भारत के सबसे बड़े पूँजीपति को। वहाँ पर बिजली कन्सर्म्स एक एमोनोपॉलिस्ट्री खड़ी करने जा रहे हैं, उन को वह बिजली मिलने वाली है। हम पूर्वी उत्तर प्रदेश के लोग बहुत देर से उस की आशा

लगाए थे और हम ने उसका काफ़ी प्रचार किया कि हमारे प्रदेश में बिजली आयबी, जो कि एक दो पैसा यूनिट के हिसाब से दी जायगी, घर घर में बिजली पहुंचेगी और चारों तरफ़ चांदनी हो जायेगी। लेकिन अब वह आशा मुरझा गई है। हमारे मुख्य मंत्री ने कहा है—और उनका आश्वासन सही हो सकता है—कि बिड़ला कन्सन्ड्र को बिजली देने के बाद भी ऐसा प्रबन्ध किया जायगा कि जिन जिलों को माननीय मन्त्री महोदय के समय में बिजली देने का विचार किया गया था, उन को बिजली दी जाये। हम यह नहीं समझ सकते कि जब बिजली की शक्ति सीमित है, तो उस बड़े भारी भयंकर भूत के होते हुए शरीरों को कैसे मिलेगी, जब तक कि सरकार वहां पर एक नया बिजली का कारखाना न खड़ा करे। और एक नया कारखाना खड़ा करने में देर लगेगी। हमारी शिकायत तो यह है कि जिस मूल उद्देश्य से रिहन्द डैम का काम शुरू किया गया था, वह पूरा नहीं हो रहा है। हमारी शाब्दिक सहानुभूति काश्तकारों और छोटे छोटे व्यवसायियों के प्रति भले ही हो, लेकिन कार्य में वह सहानुभूति कहीं अलग छिप जाती है। मैं मन्त्री महोदय से यह अनुरोध करूंगा कि वह फैंक्ट्री बने या न बने, लेकिन जिस उद्देश्य से रिहन्द डैम कायम किया गया था, उस में तबदीली नहीं होनी चाहिये। अगर यह होगा, तो लोगों में उस के प्रति बड़ा दुर्भाव फैलेगा और वह फँस भी रहा है। सरकार उस को रोकने का प्रयत्न करे। वह काम मन्त्री महोदय का प्रारम्भ किया हुआ है। इसलिये उन को इस और विशेष ध्यान देना चाहिये। उस फैंक्ट्री के लिए अलग से प्रबन्ध किया जा सकता है। उसमें भले ही कुछ देर लग जाय, लेकिन जिस उद्देश्य से वह काम शुरू किया गया था, वह अवश्य पूरा होना चाहिये।

जहां तक नेशनलाइजेशन का सम्बन्ध है, यह कहा गया है कि उस में दिक्कतें हैं

और अगर किसी अग्इरर्टींग को लिया जायगा, तो उस के दाम मार्केट रेट के हिसाब से देने पड़ेंगे। हमारे भाई ने कहा कि मार्टिन बर्न एण्ड कम्पनी के कारखाने की कीमत अब चार गुनी हो रही है और उस के अलावा बीस परसेंट और देना है। वह इतना है कि जिस को सरकार दे नहीं सकते। परिणाम-स्वरूप उन को एक करोड़ रुपए मरम्मत करने के लिए दिए गए, ताकि वे हम को और बिजली दे सकें। जिस को हम लेना चाहते थे, वह ले नहीं सकते, बल्कि उलटा उन को एक करोड़ रुपए दे रहे हैं कि वे मरम्मत करा सकें। मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब हम उस कारखाने को लेंगे, तो उस की मालियत में एक करोड़ रुपया और बढ़ जायगा और उस वक्त हम को लेने में दिक्कत होगी।

इस सम्बन्ध में मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हम बड़ी बड़ी एस्टेट्स को ले चुके हैं, बड़ी बड़ी जमींदारियां खत्म कर चुके हैं, लेकिन उन के बारे में हम ने मार्केट रेट की बात नहीं सोची। काश्तकार होने के नाते हमारी गवर्नमेंट से यह शिकायत है कि जब काश्तकारों से जमीन ली जाती है, तो आर्टिकल ३१ के मातहत यह निश्चित कर दिया जाता है कि जो कीमत हम तय करेंगे, उस को किसी अदालत में चैलेंज नहीं किया जा सकता है, वही कीमत लागू होगी। लेकिन जहां इन पूंजीपतियों की कोई चीज लेने की बात होती है, तो मार्केट वैल्यू की बात कही जाती है। हम ने इम्पीरियल बैंक लिया तो मार्केट वैल्यू दी और छः गुना रकम दी। जब एल० आई० सी० ने कम्पनियों को लिया, तो मार्केट वैल्यू के बाद भी रुपया दिया।

एक माननीय सदस्य : मूढ़ा।

14 hrs.

की सिफारिशें हैं : मुझका दूसरी चीज में है ।

जब हम मशीनरी और बिजली की मार्केट वैल्यू देते हैं, तो जमीन की क्यों नहीं देते ? जमीन भी तो कोई खरीदता ही है । सरकार का न्याय शाहर वालों के लिये भ्रमण है और देहात वालों के लिये भ्रमण है वह हमारी समझ में नहीं आता । मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि जब सरकार किसी कम्पनी को राष्ट्र के हित में नेशनलाइज करना चाहती है, तो कोई बजह नहीं है कि उसके सम्बन्ध में मार्केट वैल्यू का जिक्र किया जाय । इस तरह तो हम कभी भी उन को नेशनलाइज नहीं कर सकेंगे । हम को मरम्मत के लिये कर्जा देना पड़ेगा और उनका मुनाफा बढ़ता जायगा । भूमि नागपुर कायम में लैंड सीलिंग का प्रस्ताव पाम किया गया । यह बड़ा अच्छा प्रस्ताव है और वह होने जा रहा है, लेकिन उन के क्रियान्वित करने में इतनी देर हुई कि थोड़ी जमीन तो बचेगी और बाक़ी तो बिक गई और बाक़ी जमीन तो बिक गई और बिक रही है । उसका कम्पेन्सेशन किस मन्त्र में दिगा जायगा ? उस में कोई मार्केट वैल्यू नहीं है । जो भी तय किया जायगा, उन को कोट में बिलेज नहीं किया जा सकता है लेकिन बिडला और टाटा के लिये मार्केट दर लगी हुई है । उन के लिये क्यों कहा जाता है कि उचित और पूरा दाम दिया जाये ? उनकी मशीन सड़ी-पली है । एक बार हमारे प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि उन को नेशनलाइज करने में घाटा है, क्योंकि उन की पुरानी मशीनों को पूरा दाम दे कर लेना पड़ेगा । मैं यह पूछना चाहता हूँ कि उन को बाजार भाव से क्यों लेना पड़ेगा । पुरानी चीज का—सैकंड हैंड माल का हर जगह कम दाम लगता है । उन को पूरा दाम क्यों देना पड़ेगा । उन की मशीनें सड़ी-पली

है, सैकंड हैंड नहीं बल्कि फ़ोर्थ हैंड हैं, उन के लिये मार्केट वैल्यू दी जाये, यह कौन सा न्याय है ? वे लोग उन मशीनों से बार गुना, घाट गुना मुनाफ़ा कमा चुके हैं । उन को थोड़ी सी, कन्सोलिडेशन प्राइस दे दी जाय । लेकिन मार्केट वैल्यू देने की बात मेरी समझ में नहीं आती । यह दिन दूर नहीं है कि जब गवर्नमेंट को इस तरह ध्यान देना पड़ेगा कि मार्केट वैल्यू की फिलासफी सिर्फ कंफिटलिस्टों के लिये नहीं चलने वाली है । देहात की जनता सोच रही है कि उस के साथ दूसरी तरह का व्यवहार क्यों किया जा रहा है ।

शहर और देहात के बिजली के दर का देखिये । दिल्ली में साठे तीन घाना यूनिट और पावर डेढ़ घाना यूनिट के हिसाब में बिजली दी जाती है । देहात में खेती के लिये जो बिजली दी जाती है, वह घाट घाना यूनिट के हिसाब में मिलती है । हमने यहाँ एक बार कहा था, जिसके बारे में फूड मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि वह गलत है और भाप को सुन कर हैरत होगी कि चार एकड़ धान के खेत को पानी देने के लिये १२० रुपया देना पडा । जब इजीनियर को इस बारे में पूछा गया कि इनने एग्जिक्यूटिवी चांजिज क्यों देने पडे, तो बताया गया कि भाप के खेत में १४ इंच पानी गया है । जिन खेत में १४ इंच पानी जायगा, वह धान खड़ा रहेगा या सड़ जायगा ? और वह भी अक्टूबर के महीने में, जब कि धान के कटने का वक़्त आता है । शाहर में डेढ़ घाना यूनिट और देहात में घाट घाने यूनिट लिया जाता है । सरकार कहती है कि काश्तकारों को पैदावार बढ़ाने के लिये सस्ती बिजली देनी चाहिये । क्या यह बिजली सस्ती है ? देहात में जो छोटे छोटे कल-कारखाने हैं, उनकी बिजली किस रेट पर मिल रही है ? घाटे की बिकियों को साठे तीन घाने यूनिट

के हिसाब से बिजली मिलती है और बिजली साह्य को वो पैसे यूनिट के हिसाब के बल्क सप्लाय दी जाती है। वह हम को देने है छ आने यूनिट के हिसाब से। सरकार साढ़े तीन आने, चार आने या पाच आने यूनिट के हिसाब से छोटे छोटे रोडगारियो को बिजली देती है, ना हम यह कैसे मान लें कि देहात की तरफ सरकार की तरफ है। वानों में बंके ही हो, वानों में नहीं है—वायों में तो साह्यो की तरफ है।

अभी मैंने कुछ सीलिंग के बारे में भी कहा है। इस में भी भेद किया जा रहा है। यह कहा गया है कि उन स्थानों के आसिक जो कि श्रृंगर मिलों के केन फार्म देहातो में चला रहे हैं उन पर यह सीड लागू नहीं होगी। इनके हक में जो दक्षीय दी गई है वह यह है कि उनको जो फार्म है वे मैकेनाइज्ड हैं, इसलिए उन पर सीलिंग के बारे में जो निर्णय लिया गया है वह लागू नहीं होगा अब मीनिंग का असर किस किस पर पड़ेगा? इसका असर जो छोटे छोटे जमींदार हैं, काश्तकार हैं तिन के दम पाच गाबो में थोड़े-थोड़े छोटे-छोटे खेत हैं, उन पर पड़ेगा। हमें सूची है कि उत्तर प्रदेश की सरकार ने प्लानिंग कमीशन की, जो कि हमारे काम की तरफकी की आधार शिला है, बान को नहीं माना है और कहा है कि वह सब की जमीन की बराबर तीर में मीनिंग करेगी और करने जा रही है। अगर आप इस तक पर चलें कि चूकि शहर का जो रहने वाला है वह बिजली पैदा करना है, इस वाम्ने उसको मोज करनी चाहिये और जो देहात में रहने वाला है, जो कि वाम्नविक सम्पनि यन्न पैदा करता है, उनको वे सुविधायें नहीं मिलनी हैं तो मैं समझता हू कि शायद बहुत दिनों तक यह चीज नहीं चलेगी और देहात का रहने वाला इसको बहुत दिनों तक टालरेट नहीं करेगा। इस वास्ते मैं प्रार्थना करता हू कि आप जो कहते हैं उसको पूरा करें। देहात में खेती के काम आने वाली बिजली को सस्ता करें, चाहे यह चीज आपकी घाटा उठा कर ही क्यों न करनी पड़े। आप चाहते हैं कि अन्न

का उत्पादन बढ़े और वह अन्न बिना पानी के नहीं पैदा हो सकता है जिसके लिए बिजली बहुत जरूरी है। आप जानते हैं कि यह बरसात के दिन है, कई स्थानों पर पानी नहीं बरस रहा है और जो काश्तकार हैं वह भगवान पर पानी की आशा लगायें पड़ा है और पड़ा रहता है। वह आपके द्वारा मप्लाय किया गया पानी नहीं लेता है। जहा पर आपका पानी जाता है, उसके बगल में जो खेत हैं वे सूख रहे हैं, वहा पर आपके टयूबवेल लगे हुए हैं लेकिन वह पानी नहीं ले रहा है और इसका कारण यही है कि उसको पानी लेना मद्दहा पड़ता है। वह नहीं समझता कि इस तरह में वह मल्ला सस्ता पैदा करके आपको द सकता है। अगर आप चाहते हैं कि वह भगवान का आसरा छोड़ कर आपके आसरे आ जाए तो आपको बिजली के रेट को सस्ता करना पड़ेगा। कई स्थानों पर टयूबवेल बनाय गये हैं, लेकिन वे चले नहीं हैं। कई बार तो गेसा होता है कि जब ये टयूबवेल चलने भी हैं तो बीच में ही बिजली बन्द हो जाती है और पानी आना बन्द हो जाता है। और जब बिजली चानू है ती टयूबवेल और नानिया खराब रहते हैं। बिजली बाने अलग है, पानी देने बाने अलग है। जब पाने देने वाले आने हैं तो बिजली वाले कह देते हैं कि कर्नल-गन टूट गया है इस वास्ते बिजली नहीं दी जा सकती है। इस तरह से वहा पर काम हो रहा है। इस और भी आपको ध्यान देना होगा।

मैं चाहता हू कि आप बिजली को सस्ता करे और यह आशा करे कि बिजली हम देखे और कोई भी टयूबवेल बिजली के अभाव में बन्द नहीं होना चाहिये। तब तो कोई लाभ होगा अन्यथा नहीं।

एक बात यह भी है कि केवल बिजली पैदा करने से ही कोई लाभ नहीं होगा, उसका उपयोग भी होना चाहिए। आप कितनी ही बिजली पैदाकर रहे हैं, लेकिन क्या आपने यह भी देखने की कोशिश की है कि उस मारी बिजली का उपयोग भी हो रहा है या नहीं, क्या उसका सदुपयोग भी हो रहा है या नहीं? और

[श्री सिंहासन सिंह]

प्रदेशों की बात तो मैं नहीं जानता हूँ लेकिन इतना जरूर जानता हूँ कि आपने गोरखपुर में एक नया पावर हाउस बनाया है जिसकी कैपेसिटी १५,००० किलोवाट की है। लोग बिजली मांगते हैं लेकिन उनको मिलती नहीं है। आप कह रहे हैं कि बिजली मांगने के एक महीने के अन्दर वह मिल जाएगी लेकिन वहाँ पर लोग बिजली मांगते हैं और उनको महीनों ही नहीं सालों तक नहीं मिलती है। कोई मूव ही नहीं करता है। १५,००० किलोवाट में से वहाँ १४०० किलोवाट ही इस्तेमाल में आती है बाकी बेकार जाती है। आप कहते हैं कि सारी बिजली इस्तेमाल होनी चाहिए और उधर वह बेकार पड़ी हुई है। इसका भी कुछ इलाज होना चाहिए।

आज आपने एक बड़ी सुन्दर बात कही है। आपने कहा है कि एक महीने के अन्दर मांगने पर बिजली मिल जाएगी। इसको भी हमें अभी अनुभव करना है कि आया एक महीने के अन्दर बिजली मिलती है या नहीं। देखना यह है कि जो बिजली देने वाले सरकारी अधिकारी हैं वे इस पर अमल करते हैं या नहीं करते हैं और अगर करते हैं तो कहां तक करते हैं। विचार इस बात पर होना चाहिये कि आदेशों पर अमल हो।

मैं यह भी कहना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहां जो नगरपालिकाएँ हैं, जो छोटे छोटे टाउन एरियाज हैं, म्युनिसिपैलिटीज हैं, वे भी अगर बिजली मांगते हैं, उनको भी कितनी ही देर तक नहीं मिलती है। इसके साथ ही साथ मैं आपको यह भी बतलाना चाहता हूँ कि हमारे यहां गोरखपुर में दो तरह से बिजली सप्लाई होती है, एक तो सरकार की तरफ से और दूसरी एक प्राइवेट कम्पनी की तरफ से। यह ठीक नहीं है। एक ही सोर्स से बिजली सप्लाई होनी चाहिये। जहां पर सरकार द्वारा बिजली सप्लाई की जाती है वहां पर अगर कोई प्राइवेट कंसर्न है, उसको आपको खरीद लेना चाहिये। अगर आप नेशनलाइज नहीं

कर सकते हैं तो खरीद तो अवश्य सकते हैं। आप चाहें तो मार्किट प्राइस पर खरीदें चाहे सेकिड हैंड प्राइस दे कर खरीदें, लेकिन खरीद अवश्य लें। उचित तो यही होगा कि सेकिड हैंड प्राइस देकर खरीदा जाए लेकिन आप अगर मार्किट प्राइस देने पर ही तुले हुए हैं तो मार्किट प्राइस दे कर ही आप खरीद लें। लेकिन दो तरह से बिजली का दिया जाना ठीक नहीं है, प्राइवेट और सरकारी दोनों का एक ही जगह पर चलना ठीक नहीं है। गोरखपुर में बिजली सप्लाई करने वाले दो हैं। सरकारी बिजली तो छः आना यूनिट के हिसाब से मिलती है और जो प्राइवेट कम्पनी है झांसी कम्पनी वह नौ आना यूनिट पर सप्लाई करती है। एक ही शहर में एक तरफ छः आना यूनिट पर सरकार दे रही है और दूसरी तरफ प्राइवेट कम्पनी नौ आना यूनिट पर दे रही है और इस ओर देखने वाला कोई नहीं है, सुनने वाला कोई नहीं है। कहा गया है कि इसको आप अपने हाथ में लें लें लेकिन ऐसा भी नहीं किया गया है। अब पता चला है कि सरकार पांच सौ किलोवाट बिजली इसे देगी और वह कम्पनी इस को टर्न करके नौ आना यूनिट के हिसाब से लोगों को देगी। दो आना में लेगी और नौ आना में देगी। यह कहां का न्याय है? इस पर भी आपको विचार करना होगा।

मैं चाहता हूँ कि सारे भारतवर्ष में बिजली का एक ही रेट हो। कोई कारण नहीं है कि दिल्ली में शहरी आदमी को, धनी आदमी को साढ़े तीन आना के हिसाब से आप बिजली दें और गोरखपुर में गरीब आदमी को नौ आना के हिसाब से दें, यह कहां का न्याय है। आज दुःख इस बात का है कि हमारा सारा अर्थ-शास्त्र ही उल्टा हो गया है। आज शहर सस्ता हो गया है और देहात महंगा। शहर में रहें तो लाइफ की सारी कम्फर्ट्स और जीवन सस्ता देहात में रहें तो कोई चीज ही नहीं मिलती है। शहर में देहात का पैदा किया गया फल व अनाज सस्ता और देहात में महंगा। देहात

में पैदा की गई सरकारी सब्जी, फल आदि सहरों में बाकर सस्ते बिकते हैं और देहात में महंगे बिकते हैं। यहां पर गेहूँ १८ रुपया मन और हमारे यहां देहात में २८ रुपया मन मिलता है। हम ही पैदा करने वाले हैं लेकिन जब खरीदते हैं तो २८ रुपया मन खरीदते हैं और जो पैदा करने वाला नहीं है उसको वही गेहूँ १८ रुपया मन पर मिल जाता है। हमारी इकानोमी ही कुछ उल्टी हो गयी है। इस पर आपको ठंडे दिल से विचार करना होगा और सही करना होगा। पहले कहा जाता था कि देहात मस्ता, शहर महंगा। आज शहर सस्ता और देहात महंगा हो गया है। बिजली के मामले में भी यही हो रहा है। देहात में बिजली महंगी और शहर में सस्ती। कहा जाना है कि लाइन से जाने के लिए रुपया ज्यादा लगना है, काम बढ जाती है, इस वास्ते महंगी देनी पडती है। जब ऐसी बान है तो कौन आपकी बिजली देहात में लेगा और किस तरह में लेगा। आपकी हज़ार सहानुभूति देहान वाला के प्रति हो, वे ले नहीं सकते हैं क्यों महंगी पडती है और वे इतने पैसे दे नहीं सकते हैं, नौ घाने यनिट के हिसाब से दे नहीं सकते हैं। घर घर में बिजली तभी पहुँचाई जा सकती है और लोग तभी ले सकते हैं जब कि आप कोई खास रेंट बनाये और मस्ती बिजली दे। देहान का रहने वाला गरीब है और आप के शहर के रहने वाले के साथ मकाबला नहीं कर सकता है, उसके साथ नहीं चल सकता है। गांधी जी का कहना था कि हमारा भारत देहानों में बस्ता है, शहरों में नहीं। आप दिल्ली की तरफकी करते हैं और समझते हैं कि दिल्ली ही हिन्दुस्तान है। दिल्ली हिन्दुस्तान नहीं है, हिन्दुस्तान तो वह है जहा पर देहात की जनना बसी हुई है। उन देहात वालों के लिए बिजली का मिलना तो दूर रहा, दूसरी चीजे भी जो जरूरी हैं, मुहैया नहीं हो रही हैं। इस वास्ते मैं चाहता हूँ कि देहातों की तरफ आपका ध्यान जाए।

आपने कहा है कि आप खेती के लिए और छोटे छोटे उद्योग धंधों के लिए बिजली सस्ती
139 LSD.—8

देने। हमें देखना है कि इस बिल के पास हो जाने के बाद कितनी मस्ती बिजली आप उनको देते हैं और देते भी हैं या नहीं।

टैनेट को बिजली देने की बान भी इसमें कही गई है। पहले मालिक मकान की मंजूरी से ही टैनेट को बिजली मिल सकती थी और शहर मालिक इजाजत न दे तो नहीं मिल सकती थी। अब आपने यह किया है कि शहर टैनेट चाहे तो बिना उसकी इजाजत के भी बिजली लगवा सकता है लेकिन बिजली लगाने का खर्च उसको देना होगा। अब जो टैनेट है वह तो उस मकान में दो चार बरस रहगा और बिजली लगाने का खर्चा भी मालिक मकान को नहीं देना पडा, टैनेट ने खर्चा दिया और फिर चला गया और मालिक मकान को बिजली लगी लगाई मिल गई। ऐसी मूरन में कौन बैंक मालिक मकान होगा जो इजाजत न दे कि बिजली लगवा ला।

श्री नोअर भूषण पगडी नेने के लिये करेगा।

श्री सिदासन सिंह मेरा अनुरोध है कि जिन तरह से मकान मालिक जब मकान की मरम्मत नहीं करवाना है और किरायेदार को हक शामिल है कि वह मरम्मत करवा ले और हिसाब मालिक मकान को दे दे और किराये में मुजरा कर लेना है उसी तरह से शहर मालिक मकान बिजली नहीं लगवाता है और बिजली लगवाना आवश्यक है तो किरायेदार खुद लगवा ले और उसका सही हिसाब मालिक मकान को दे दे और वह रुपया किराये में से मुजरा हो जाए यह बात तो सबझ में आ सकती है। यह तो कोई न्याय की चीज हुई क्योंकि यह मकान की तरफकी है, किरायेदार का इस में क्या खाम फायदा हुआ? इस लिये इसकी तरफ ध्यान दिया जाना चाहिये। आज ऐसे हजारों लोग हिन्दुस्तान में पडे हैं जिन को इस कानून का कोई फायदा नहीं पहुँचेगा। इसका फायदा बजाये किरायेदार के मकान मालिक को मिलेगा।

[श्री सिंहासन सिंह]

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं ज्यादा समय न ले कर जिस रूप में यह बिल लाया गया है उस का स्वागत करता हूँ लेकिन अनुरोध करता हूँ कि बिल को सही मानों में ऐसा बनाया जाय कि वह देहात के गरीब लोगों के लिये हितकर हो। इसका कुल फायदा सिर्फ यहाँ के सहरो तक ही सीमित न रह जाय।

Shri P. R. Patel: I am glad that the hon. Minister has accepted the principle underlying my minute of dissent. He has accepted that electricity should be given at a cheap rate to agriculture and small industries. He has shown his sympathy for them, and I thank him for this good sympathy that he has shown towards the agriculturists and the small industries. But unless the latter get electricity at a cheap rate, what is the good of this sympathy?

The hon. Minister has said that the Central Government have asked the State Governments to give subsidies. I want to know whether any State Government have given any subsidies to the agriculturists up till now. Mere writing will not help the agriculturists.

I think electrical energy should be used, and properly used, to increase our food production and our agricultural production. We have often said that unless and until we double our agricultural production, we shall not survive, and none of our plans will be successful. I think if electricity could be supplied at a cheap rate to the agriculturists, we shall be helping to double our production.

It has been stated by the hon. Minister that Government can fix the rates for electricity used by the agriculturists and small industries. At the same time, by this amending Bill, he wants to repeal a part of that section which authorises Government to fix the rate for electricity. If we are going to amend that sub-section giving authority to Government to fix

the rates, I want to know from the hon. Minister whether there is any other section, say, in the Act of 1910 or in the Act of 1948, which would give authority to the Government to fix the rates for electricity for agriculture and small industries. I think that this sub-section should not be amended. On the contrary, I am of the opinion that there should be an addition to that sub-section, that in the case of electricity supplied for agriculture and small industries, the maximum charge per unit should not exceed 10 nP. If we do that, I think we shall be in a position to help the agriculturists and small industries.

I can tell you that big industries will not remove the poverty of the common people and the poor people. No doubt, big industries will fill the coffers of the rich, but it is only small industries and agriculture that will help the middle class people, the poor agriculturists and the small persons. So, I desire that Government may have some scheme—I would accept any scheme—which would give electricity at a cheap rate, not exceeding 10 nP per unit, for agriculture and small industries.

What is the position today? It has been said that we have made a big advance in generating electricity. I do admit that we have made a big advance. But for whom? Today I have got two cases before me. The North Gujarat Grid supplies electricity to the Kalol Electricity Company and to the Kadi Electricity Company. It supplies power in bulk to these two companies at a lower rate. Uptil now, there is no reduction in the charges of these two electricity companies. It means that we supply electricity to these companies so that they may earn more.

16.21 hrs.

[SHRI BARMAN in the Chair]

We spend a lot of money to generate electricity in our public sector. I

think it is a wrong thing if that money is used to enrich a few persons. That will be admitted by one and all. We say we have made a good advance in generating electricity. But what is the position today? I would refer to page 305 of *India* 1958. There it is mentioned that all the cities with over 1 lakh population are electrified. Of towns and villages with a population below 20,000 each, 1.42 per cent have got the advantage of electricity. In our country, there are about 5,60,522 villages and towns having a population of less than 20,000 each. Out of these, only 7,964 have upto now got the advantage of electricity. So it seems our advancement is not for small villages and towns; it is only for big industry and for big towns and cities.

As has been said by my hon. friend who preceded me, India lives not in cities but in villages. If we want to do any service to the villages, I think we should have a mind to supply electricity to villages. What is happening today? In my constituency, grid is extended to villages and this energy is supplied only for light. I suggested that it be supplied for irrigation. They say 'We cannot supply'. The power should be used to increase our wealth. If it is used to supply agriculture and small industry, there will be an increase in the wealth and prosperity of the country. But if this power is supplied for domestic purposes, for light etc., there will be no increase in wealth. So the policy should be changed. The position today is that for irrigation, our supply is 2.3 per cent, for domestic purposes, it is 77.17 per cent, for commerce, it is 16.63 per cent, for industry it is 3.86 per cent., for public lighting 0.11 per cent. It seems from this that we have not devoted proper attention to agriculture. Only if we use this energy for agriculture shall we prosper and electricity would be of benefit to our country. Otherwise, if we use it for domestic purposes, I think we do not go a step further to increase our prosperity. So my submission is that the policy should be changed.

I want to submit one thing. I give the figures of 1957-58—there are about 767 concerns generating electricity. In 1957-58, 9,877.8 million kw. of electricity were generated. Out of these, they sold 8,103.1 million kw. Out of these, they sold to irrigation 444.5 million kw. So it shows that irrigation is not given any preference.

If we look at the figures of energy generated and energy sold, it comes to this that 1,774.7 million kw. are not sold. That much is wasted. Why should there be this waste? Why should this energy not be supplied to agriculture? It is wasted—there is no earning out of it. If this energy had been supplied to agriculture at a lower rate, I think agriculturists would have taken advantage of it and would have increased production. But we have not done it; we have allowed this energy to be wasted.

The argument is put forward that by selling energy to agriculture and small industry at a low rate, the concerns may suffer some loss. How are they going to suffer any loss when there is so much waste here and the energy is not utilised? I say that if they sell it at a lower rate, they will be making more money out of it. So my submission is that the concerns should be asked to sell energy to agriculture and small industry at a cheap rate, which should not exceed 10 nP. per unit. I may be asked as to why I am suggesting 10 nP. We know that the annual *per capita* gross income of a person in agriculture in India comes to about Rs. 155. There is nobody else in this country whose income is so low. It is only those persons engaged in agriculture whose income is less.

So they deserve to be helped. I would submit that whatever help is given to such poor persons would be proper help, and if the State loses something, I think that it is no loss, because the average income of the poor agriculturist would be increased, and the prosperity of the agriculturist is the prosperity of the country. It is

[Shri P. R. Patel]

not the prosperity of a few in industry that would be considered as the prosperity of the country; real prosperity would be there if the agriculturists are prosperous. Every attempt should be made to see that the agriculturists prosper.

Then, it has been said that the costs should be considered. I do not know how that argument is advanced. I have got a book published by the Ministry of Irrigation and Power—Central Water and Power Commission. And, therein a list of different companies is given, both private sector and public sector. The generating cost is given there. You will see from this that the generating cost, except in the case of a very few companies, is about 1·06, 1·12 or 1·28 anna. The generating cost is not much. But there are few companies whose generating costs seem to be more. I think that must be due to mismanagement and they are private concerns.

What do the private concerns do? As the hon. Minister stated their accounts are audited by chartered accountants. What do the accountants see? They see the vouchers. Do they see that the sons and sons-in-law and some other relatives are paid from the concerns? After all whatever name is written and whatever function is allotted, they never attend to it but they are paid. So, the costs are high I want to say one thing. The Government should fix the rate at which the electricity company should sell energy to agriculturists and small industries. In this booklet I see that there are so many concerns that sell electricity to the agriculturists and small industries, at a cheap rate ranging from 1·5 to 2 annas. When so many companies are selling at this rate, when we fix the price at not more than 10 NP, how are the companies going to lose? In case the companies lose, why should we mind? After all they are guaranteed 2 per cent more than the bank rate. So, they are not to lose. If they are asked to sell

electricity at a cheap rate to agriculturists and small industry they are not going to lose.

An argument might be put forward that why should other persons suffer for the sake of agriculturists and small industries. Agriculturists are the soldiers in the field of growing more food. After all soldiers are paid by Government and they are given weapons. Here are the soldiers fighting the food front who are not given facilities, who are not given weapons. And, we want them to fight. (Interruption). I would submit that even if others have to pay more they pay in their own interests. If the food production is more, they get at a cheaper rate. If agricultural production is more, we export more? So there is prosperity to the country and others will get food at a lower rate. So, they are benefited. I think that argument should not be advanced.

But I have got a case before me. We give subsidy to khadi production; we give subsidy to handloom production. Wherefrom do we get that money? Have we not got the khadi tax? Taxing textile industry goods—whatever we can—we subsidise khadi. So, the principle is accepted. If that principle is accepted, what is wrong in selling electrical energy at a low rate to agriculturists and small industries? The precedent is there. So I would submit that the matter be considered.

In the end I would submit that under the Act of 1948 the Rating Committee is there. A concern is not allowed to have net profits of more than 8 per cent or 2 per cent more than the bank rate. Is there anything in the Act of 1948 which would authorise the Government to fix the rates? Nothing absolutely. We have also seen that there are some private concerns who manipulate their accounts. They pay to the near relatives and that would be the expenditure side. And the chartered accountant sees the vouchers only. Under

such circumstances is it not desirable that Government should retain the authority to fix the rate?

Where is that authority? That authority is under the old Act of 1910. And it is only one section, section 3(d). If that is removed, I would ask the hon. Minister whether under any other clause of this Act of 1910 or of the Act of 1948 Government could derive authority to fix the rate. My submission is, I do not find any section. I would be very glad if the hon. Minister is pleased to show me any section either from the 1910 Act or from the 1948 Act.

I would submit that we should not remove this clause. It may not be used because under the Act of 1948 the Rating Committee is there. Government may not fix the rate. But why should the authority which Government has today be done away with? If the authority is there Government may at any time fix the rate. If a private concern manipulates the accounts and does so many things and brings the cost to a high level, then, Government could utilise this section. Even after the Act of 1948 that section has been there and no difficulty has arisen. Then what is the reason for removing this sub-clause which authorises the Government to fix the rate? Are we going to be benefited if we do away with this authority? I do not think. So I submit that this clause may be retained.

At the same time there should be some addition that in the case of agriculture and small industry, the price that may be charged may not exceed 10 nP. per unit. I think that will be a guarantee to the agriculturists and the small industries. Supposing any company makes or incurs any loss thereby and approaches the Government then Government may be pleased to subsidise that company if there is any loss after going through their accounts etc. So, I think the proper thing is to retain this clause. I hope the hon. Minister would reconsider this.

One thing more. We say that the cities should not alone prosper and

the villages should prosper. Today our experience is that it is only the cities that prosper and the villages are suffering from some disease. The disease is one of unemployment. Today every educated and uneducated person goes to the cities for employment and the villages are exploited materially but they are exploited intellectually because all educated boys of the village go to the cities. How shall we rehabilitate these villages? Can it be done by expressions of sympathy and good words? I do not think it can be done that way. Let us have some policy that in case any industry is located in a village with a population of less than 5,000, the Government will subsidise the electric energy. Let such industries get the power at a lower price. I have not seen the foreign countries and I had not the fortune to be in some delegation and I do not think that I will get an opportunity to be in one of them being on this side but I am told that in Sweden, there is a special rate for the energy consumed in the villages but if it is consumed in the towns, the charge is more. In this way they encourage industry in the villages. So, if we want small industries in the villages, this grant, this power can help us and I humbly submit that the Government may consider this. The hon. Minister may help the country and the villages by giving electricity at a cheaper rate for the villages for the small industries and for agriculture. Let there be some discrimination because the people living in the cities are more vocal than the villagers. There are so many newspapers in the cities. There is the radio and all these things are there. But there is a larger number living in the villages but it is not so vocal. There is no newspaper representing their views or to fight for them. I say to the Minister: you be the fighter for them. I appeal to the hon. Minister to be the fighter for the villages and do something for the villages.

सरकार इकठ्ठा सिद्ध (कीरोवपुर) :
वेधरमन साहब, इस ऐक्ट को सन् १९६०

[सरकार इकबाल सिंह]

में बनाया गया था, उस के बाद सन् १९४८ में इस में पहली बफा संशोधन हुआ और आज दुबारा उस में फिर संशोधन हो रहा है। मुयासिब तो यह था कि इस ऐक्ट को मौजूदा हालात के मुताबिक ही नहीं, आने वाले हालात के मुताबिक भी बदल दिया जाता। लेकिन इसको उन के मुताबिक बदलने के बजाय इसमें कुछ तब्दीलिया ही की जा रही हैं, हालांकि मैं मानता हूँ कि यह तब्दीलियां बेहतर के लिये की गई हैं, लेकिन आज की जो मांग है, जिस ढंग की बात भागे चल कर होने वाली है उस के मुताबिक, मेरा खयाल है, यह बिल नहीं है। उस भाग को यह बिल पूरा नहीं करता क्योंकि अपनी दूसरी फाइव इंचर प्लैन के खाले तक हम ६ लाख १० हजार मिलियन किलोवाट बिजली के करीब पैदा कर सकेंगे। इसके बाद तीसरी फाइव इंचर प्लैन में जितनी बिजली हम आज पैदा कर रहे हैं उतनी ही पैदा कर सकेंगे। आज सब से ज्यादा जरूरी चीज जो बिजली के पैदा करने के बारे में है वह उस को ठीक से पैदा कर के अच्छे ढंग से कंज्यूमर को देने के मुताबिक है, उस की तकनीक का सबाल सब से ज्यादा जरूरी है। इस ऐक्ट में जिम ढंग की तब्दीलिया की जा रही है, उस से मुझे आशा नहीं कि यह ऐक्ट कंज्यूमर के लिये ज्यादा फायदेमन्द मानित होगा।

इसके साथ ही मैं एक बात और कहूंगा कि अब वक्त आ गया है कि सरकार इस बात को सोचे कि जितनी नई बिजली कम्पनियां प्राइवेट सेक्टर में है कम से कम उन को लाइसेंस न मिलें और जो कम्पनियां पहले से चल रही हैं उन का नेशनलाइजेशन कर दिया जावे, इसलिये नहीं कि उन को नेशनलाइज करना ही चाहिये बल्कि इसलिये कि अब हालात ऐसे हैं—आप दुनिया के किसी भी मुल्क को न—कि बिजली की मांग कहीं भी पूरी नहीं होती।

आपने कुछ नकसे तैयार किये। सन् १९५० में भी नकसे तैयार किये। सन् १९४४-४५ सेकेंड फाइव इंचर प्लान में वह तमाम नकसे कि कितनी बिजली पैदा करेगे, कितना कंज्युमेशन होगा या नहीं होगा, लेकिन वह तमाम नकसे गलत साबित हुए और हमने देखा कि जितनी बिजली पैदा हुई उससे तकरीबन उन लोगो का बिजली की मांग कई गुना ज्यादा बढ़ गई। इसलिये जिस ढंग में बिजली की मांग बढ़ रही है, जिस ढंग में बिजली की जरूरत इस देश में महसूस की जा रही है, गांवों में, देहातों में, बड़ी इंडस्ट्रीज में और छोटी इंडस्ट्रीज में, उसके लिये यह जरूरी है कि आप बिजली की कम्पनियों को नेशनलाइज करे क्योंकि यह मानी हुई बात है कि प्राइवेट सेक्टर उतनी तेजी के साथ काम नहीं कर सकता क्योंकि उनके दिल में एक ही इच्छा है और इनके रहने उनकी एफिशिएन्सी उतनी नहीं हो सकती जितनी कि पब्लिक सेक्टर की है योंकि उनके काम करने का ढंग ही कुछ अलग होना है और उसमें ज्यादातर उनका प्राफिट मोटिव काम करना है। जाहिर है कि जब आप देश भर में बिजली का मॉनोपॉली नौगो को बहम पहुंचाना चाहते हैं तो यह जो प्राइवेट बिजली कम्पनिया का प्राफिट मोटिव है वह पूरा नहीं किया जा सकता है। इसलिये अब मौका आ गया है जब आप इन बिल में या इस बिल के बाद आगेवादा किसी भी बिजली कम्पनी को प्राइवेट नौर पर लाइसेंस नहीं देगे क्योंकि हमने देखा कि जितनी भी प्राइवेट कम्पनियां को बिजली का लाइसेंस देते हैं, वे प्राइवेट कम्पनिया नफे को ध्यान में रख कर अपना काम करती हैं और प्राइवेट होने के नाते उनका नफे के लिये शायद जाना भी चाहिये। नफा भी आप मारण्टी करते हैं लेकिन नफे के साथ साथ वह एक मोनोपॉली हो कर रह जाती है और चूंकि उनके सामने मुख्य ध्येय ज्यादा से ज्यादा नफा कमना होता है इसलिये वह लोगो की सेवा नहीं कर पाती।

प्राइवेट सैक्टर की कम्पनियों के बिजली के रेट्स भी ग्राम तौर पर हर कहीं ज्यादा होते हैं। हमारे देश में प्राइवेट सैक्टर की बड़ी बड़ी बिजली कम्पनियाँ हैं। बम्बई की एलेक्ट्रिक सप्लाय कम्पनी है। टाटा की कंसर्न बहुत बेहमरीन कर्नल कही जाती है लेकिन उसको भी ज़ा कर्जा मिला है वह सेंट्रल गवर्नमेंट ने घाट किया है और कर्जा भी इस ढंग से बेते है कि उनको उसकी गारन्टी रहनी है और कर्जे की गारन्टी दे कर चवाने है तो ऐसी हानन में आपका यह फर्ज है कि आप यह मोखे कि इन प्राइवेट बिजली कम्पनियों को नेशनलाइज करना इस देश के हित में होगा, कम्पुर्मर्मे के हित में होगा और उस देश के लोगों के हित में होगा।

अभी यू० पी० मॉटिन वन कम्पनी को १ करोड़ रुपये का कर्ज देने लग है लेकिन यह कहना मफिकन है कि उनके प्रायजर भी वह कम्पनी कितनी एफिशियन्सी के साथ लोगों की सेवा कर सकेगी और पही चीज और प्राइवेट बिजली कम्पनियों की बावन भी कही जा सकनी है।

आपने गोरखपुर की मिमाल भी दी। बहा की प्राइवेट कम्पनी के गाम गवर्नमेंट की बिजली आ जानी है और होना यह है कि बिजली बिजली की बहुत जरूरत और माग रहनी है इसलिये वे महंगे भाव पर बिजली लेती है और महंगे भाव पर बेचती है और बिजली की महगी गेट होने से जनता में एजिटेपान होना है। गवर्नमेंट को मजबूर होकर मलेरकोटला में नेशनलाइज करना पडा। इसलिये मैं चाहता हूँ कि इन मारे हानान को देखते हुए गवर्नमेंट को कम से कम एक इस बारे में यूनियफायर गानिमी बनानी चाहिये और रेट भी जहा तक मुमकिन हो यूनियफायर रखे। धलबत्ता कुछ इनएकर्मिबल ऐरियाज के लिये जहा कि बिजली पहुचाया जाना विकस्त तलर हो वहा कुछ महगी दर बिजली की रखनी जा सकनी है लेकिन उन जगहों पर कोई प्राइवेट सैक्टर की कम्पनी

भी बिजली ले जाने के लिये तैयार नहीं होती क्योंकि प्राइवेट कम्पनी वाले तो वहीं पर जाना चाहते हैं जहाँ उन्हें काफी नफा हो। इसलिये मैं यह चाहता हूँ कि आप यह फैसला करें कि आयन्दा किमी को लाइसेंस नहीं देंगे और जिनको लाइसेंस दिये हैं उनको ग्राहिस्ता ग्राहिस्ता नेशनलाइज करेंगे।

आप हिन्दुस्तान भर की तमाम प्राइवेट सैक्टर की बिजली कम्पनियों को देख लें उन्होंने गांवों को कभी बिजली नहीं दी, गांवों को बिजली देने के मामले में हमेशा नेगलेक्ट किया, एक ट्यूबवैल को भी बिजली नहीं दी। यह ठीक है कि बड़े बड़े शहरों में यह कम्पनिया जनता के सेवा करती है और उनको बिजली माल्याई करनी है लेकिन उनमें उनका प्राफिट मोटिव होना है लेकिन यह आप क्यों भूल जाने हैं कि हमारा मुक्त गांवों का मुक्त है और इन देश में यदि एग्जीक्यूटिव प्रोडक्शन को बढ़ाना है तो आपको गांव वालों को उनकी जरूरत के बान्ने बिजली देनी होगी, उनको ट्यूबवैल चवाने के लिये बिजली देनी होगी लेकिन मैं अफसोस के साथ यह कहना पड़ता है कि प्राइवेट कम्पनियों ने १० हजार, २ हजार या ५०० ट्यूबवैलों को भी बिजली नहीं दी होगी। इसलिये भी मैं कहना हूँ कि आपको यह लाजिम है कि आप उन पुरानी प्राइवेट कम्पनियों को नेशनलाइज करे और नई कम्पनियों को लाइसेंस देना बन्द करे।

अब यह जो आपने प्राइम फार्मुला रखा है कि मार्केट वैल्यू देंगे तो उन्होंने इनमें साल तो काफी मुनाफे कमाये और उसके बाद भी आपका मार्केट वैल्यू देना और मार्केट वैल्यू के बाद २० फी सदी और देना यह कुछ समझ में नहीं आता। आप जानते हैं कि प्राइवेट सैक्टर में बैनेनशीट्स में जो नफा दिखाया जाता है उसमें ज्यादा नफा भी उठाया जा सकना है और जब यह बात हो तो मार्केट वैल्यू के ऊपर २० परसेन्ट और देना यह कोई इन्साफ की बात नहीं है।

[सरदार इकबाल सिंह]

में जानता हूँ कि जालन्धर एलेक्ट्रिसिटी सप्लाय कम्पनी ने आर्बिट्रेशन करा कर ४० साल रुपया गवर्नमेंट से मुआविया लिया। उसके बाद वह फिर हाईकोर्ट में चले गये और ५६ लाख फिर ले गये। अब कहते हैं कि हम उस आर्बिट्रेशन को मानते नहीं हैं और सुप्रीम कोर्ट में मामले को ले गये हैं। आर्बिट्रेशन ऐक्ट में यह है कि उसमें एक आदमी आर्बिट्रेटर मुफरर किया जाता है जो कि ग्रामतीर पर कोई हाईकोर्ट का रिटायर्ड जज या सेशन जज रिटायर्ड होता है। अब इटैग्रीटी और बाकी बातों को आप छोड़ जी दें तो भी बहुत से ऐसे डग के क्लेम्स दिये जाते हैं जिससे कि वह बेचारे आर्बिट्रेटर मजबूर हो जाते हैं और उन क्लेम्स का बहुत ज्यादा पैसा देना पड़ जाता है। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि यह जो मार्केट बैन्चू का आपने प्राइस फार्मुला रक्खा है यह ही काफी हो जायेगा और उसके बाद यह २० परसेंट देने का कोई जस्टिफिकेशन नहीं है। यह प्राइस फार्मुला बहुत लिबरल है लेकिन चलो अब आपने फैमला कर लिया तो उसको चलने दीजिये लेकिन इसमें यह आर्बिट्रेशन वाली बात आप न जोड़िये और मैं चाहता हूँ कि ग्राम तीर पर जो गवर्नमेंट उनकी कीमत मुफरर करे वह हालात के मुताबिक देनी चाहिये। मार्केट बैन्चू आप दे लेकिन यह उसके ऊपर २० फीसदी बिलकुल नहीं दिया जाना चाहिये।

आप देश भर के बास्ते एक यूनिफार्म प्राइस फार्मुला बनाये जिसमें कि यह बतलाया जाये कि इस हिसाब से बिजली दी जायेगी। जो बिजली पैदा करने वाली कम्पनियाँ हैं और जो स्टेट अंडरटेकिंग हैं उनके लिये आप कम से कम गाइडेंस के लिये यह रखें कि आप को इस डग के बिजली देनी होगी, कंज्यूमर्स को इस रेट में बिजली देनी होगी, बड़े बड़े बल्क सप्लाय देने वाले जो एग्जीक्यूटिव्स हैं उनको इस रेट पर आपको बिजली

देनी होगी। आपको इस तरह की कोशिश करनी चाहिये और अगर सारे देश भर में यूनिफार्म बिजली की रेट आप न स्वीसफाई कर सकें तो कम से कम एक स्टेट के बास्ते तो कर ही दें। मैं जानता हूँ कि एक जगह से दूसरी जगह फर्क है। एक शहर की बिजली की दर में और दूसरे शहर की बिजली की दर में फर्क है। कहीं पर एग्जीक्यूटिव्स को ३ धाने के हिसाब से बिजली सप्लाय की जाती है तो कहीं पर ४ धाने और ५ धाने के हिसाब से सप्लाय की जाती है। और कहीं कहीं पर तो ८ धाने और १ रुपये तक की दर में बिजली सप्लाय होती है। इसलिये मैं समझता हूँ कि हिन्दुस्तान में कोई कम से कम ग्राम इंडिया रेट होना चाहिये ताकि मारे देश के लोगों को एक दर से बिजली मिले।

इसके अलावा एक बात मुझे यह कहनी है कि जहाँ तक एग्जीक्यूटिव्स का सबाल है उनको बिजली देने के लिये यह जो आपने लाइन एकोनामी वाली चीज रखी है, यह बड़ा गलत मिस्टम है। बिजली देने के बास्ते लाइन एकोनामी के हिसाब से जज करना मेरी समझ में बड़ा गलत मिस्टम है। अगर एक बिजली का कारखाना है और वह दम चीज बनाना है तो आप उसको मजबूर नहीं करने हैं कि वह प्रमुख भाव से ज्यादा पर न बचे। इसलिए यह लाइन एकोनामी और ओवरहेड लाइन के खर्च की बात सोचना मेरी समझ में ठीक नहीं है। ओवरहेड लाइन पर जहाँ तक कि एग्जीक्यूटिव्स का सबाल है १५ परसेंट के हिसाब से लगता है और ५ साल में उसकी कीमत पूरी हो जानी चाहिये। आप बिजली को प्रोडक्शन इकानमी के हिसाब में नहीं देने लेकिन लाइन इकानमी के हिसाब से देते हैं और मुस्तलिक कंज्यूमर्स से मुस्तलिक कीमत लेते हैं। इसके लिये कोई जस्टिफिकेशन नहीं है। बिजली कम्पनी को नफा होता है, उसको आप नफा गारंटी करते हैं, आपने कहा

है कि बैंक रेट से उनकी २ पर हॉट ज्यादा देने का हक होगा। आप हर किसी कंज्यूमर को एक हिसाब से बिजली नहीं देते। जब एक एथीकल्डरिस्ट बिजली अपने ट्यूब बैल के लिये मांगता है तो आप कहते हैं कि इतनी घामवनी हो तो बिजली मिले। क्लक क्लक आप डिस्पारसल का यह सिस्टम रखेंगे तब तक देहात के छोटे छोटे कंज्यूमर्स को बिजली नहीं मिल सकती और जो बल्क सप्लाय वाले हैं उनको ही फायदा होगा।

तीसरी बात मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि चाहे इलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड हो या स्टेट रन अडरटेकिंग हो या कोई बिजली का कारखाना शुरू हो, तो आपको यह प्रिंसिपल तै करना चाहिये कि कितनी बल्क सप्लाय वाले को दी जायेगी और कितनी छोटे कंज्यूमर्स को दी जायेगी। यह बात मैं ने अपनी बजट स्पीच में भी कही थी। ऐसा नहीं होना चाहिए कि किसी जगह बिजली का कारखाना लगाया जाये और वहाँ के लोगों को घावाए हो जायें कि हम को बिजली मिलेगी, लेकिन जब बिजली न्यार हो जाये तो उस इलाके के लोगों के सिर पर से बिजली निकल जाये पर वहाँ के लोगों को न मिले। जो ज्यादा बड़े कंज्यूमर्स को बिजली दे दी जाती है। उनको आप लाखों किलोवाट बिजली दे देते हैं।

हम पन्नाब के बारे में यह नक्शा बनाते हैं कि वहाँ आबरा डैम की बिजली में बहुत तरक्की होगी। लेकिन पन्नाब में जो बिजली पैदा हो रही है उसमें से बड़े नास किलोवाट तो डूबी फरटिलाइजर फैक्टरी को मिल जायेगी उसके बाद ३० हजार या ६० हजार किलोवाट बिजली दिल्ली को चली जायेगी। फिर पन्नाब वालों के लिये कहा बिजली बचती है जब यह होता है तो लोगों की आशायें किछ तरह से कायम रह सकती है। मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप इस तरह का प्रावीजन करे कि चाहे प्राइवेट कारखाना हो या पब्लिक

कारखाना हो उसके लिए जो वह बिजली पैदा करता है उसमें से एक भाग हिस्सा एथीकल्डर के लिए देना लाजिमी होना चाहिए। आन्दरेबल मिनिस्टर साहब ने कहा कि एक महीने में हो जायेगा। मैं कहता हूँ कि आप एक साल में भी दे दें तो हम अपने आप को खुशकिस्मन समझेंगे। लोग सालहा साल ट्यूब बैल के लिये बिजली पाने की कोशिश करते रहते हैं लेकिन उनको बिजली नहीं मिलती। कहते हैं कि इस लाइन से नफा नहीं हो सकता इसलिए हम नहीं दे सकते। आप सोचें कि लाइन पर एक किसान कैसे नफा दे सकता है। और जित तरह से आपके कास्ट एकाउण्ट लाइन को कीमत लगाते हैं उसको तो किसान समझ भी नहीं सकता। शहर में तो लोग एक सिस्टम बना कर इस चीज का मुकाबला कर सकते हैं। इसलिए मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप ऐसे हालात पैदा करें कि देहात में लोगों को बिजली मिले, और छोटे आदमियों को जो छोटी छोटी इन्स्ट्रुड बनाने हैं बिजली मिले। बल्क सप्लाय वाले तो इलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड बना लेते हैं। मैं उनका भी हामी हूँ। लेकिन साथ ही मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि हर केस में आप नफे का ही खयाल न रखें। जो हजार दो हजार किलोवाट बिजली लेने वाला नफा दे सकता है उतना बेचारा एक किसान कैसे दे सकता है। शहर में जो लोग बिजली लेते हैं उनको आप सस्ती बिजली देते हैं। पर जो आप किसान को बिजली देते हैं वह मंहये दामों पर देते हैं। हिन्दुस्तान में जो इनने ट्यूब बैल लगे हैं वे इकानमिकली नहीं चल रहे हैं, इनकी बड़ी बजह है कि उनको बिजली ज्यादा दामों पर दी जाती है। इसलिए लोगों ने उस पानी को लेने में इन्कार कर दिया। उनको अपनी फी फल्ल सी या ८० या ७० रुपया पानी का देना पड़ता था जो कि उनके लिए इकानमिक नहीं होता। और वह मजबूर होकर पानी लेना बन्द कर देते हैं। मोहतरिम हाकिम साहब के सूबे में भी लोगों ने ट्यूब बैल का पानी लेने से इन्कार कर दिया क्योंकि वह उनको प्राफिटबिल नहीं होता था। वे लोग बिना

[संस्कार इकायाम विद्वा]

घरों के अपनी फसमें पैदा करना पसन्द करते हैं किन्तु इस नहुने पानी के । इसलिए जरूरी है कि आप हिन्दुस्तान में एक रेट पर एबी-कल्चरिस्ट को बिजली के ताकि वह उसके लिये इकायामिक हो सके । मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप वह पालिसी बनायें कि जिस इलाके में कोई बिजली का कारखाना लगे उस इलाके के लोगों को उसका एक खास हिस्सा देने के लिये उस कारखाने को मजबूर किया जाये । आप आसरा डैम और रिहन्द डैम रोज नहीं बनायेंगे । आप अगर उन इलाकों के लोगों को इस बन्त बिजली नहीं देंगे तो उनकी आशाएं खत्म हो जायेंगी । मैं चाहता हूँ कि आप यह गारंटी करे कि इन इलाकों के लोगों को सस्ते दाम पर बिजली मिलेगी ।

इसके अलावा इलेक्ट्रिसिटी बोर्ड्स में जो रीड टेपिज्म है उनको दूर करे और उनको इस बात के लिये मजबूर करे कि हमेशा नफे की ही बात न सोचें । अगर वह अपनी इकीर्षेभी बढ़ायें तो उनको फायदा हो सकता है और उनको देहात को बिजली देने में नुकसान नहीं होगा । लेकिन आजकल जो यह लाइन इकायामी का सिस्टम है उसके मुताबिक तो उनको कभी बिजली नहीं मिल सकती चाहे आप कितनी भी कोशिश करे । चाहे मुहउरिम हाकिम साहिब कितना ही चाहें, जब तक यह लाइन इकायामी की चीज रहेगी तब तक देहात के किसानों को बिजली नहीं मिल सकती । एक कारखानेदार दस बीस तरह की चीजें बनाता है और उनको मूकलिक कंज्यूमर्स को बेचता है, किसी चीज में उसको नफा होता है और किसी में नकसान भी होता है

अगर कुल मिलाकर नफा रहता है तो उसकी नफा हुआ ही समझा जायेगा । इसी तरह से बिजली के कारखाने को भी किसी कंज्यूमर को बिजली देने में मुकदिर है कि नफा न हो लेकिन उसको कुल मिलाकर तो नफा ही होगा । उसे हर बात में नफा ही नहीं सोचना चाहिये ।

मेरे दोस्त मरुवा साहब ने कहा है कि काउंसिल में कंज्यूमर्स के भी नुमायन्दे होने चाहिए । मैं भी उनको ताईद करता हूँ । लेकिन मैं यह भी चाहता हूँ कि उन नुमायन्दों में देहात के टयब बैल वालों के भी नुमायन्दे होने चाहियें । मैं चाहता हूँ कि स्टेट काउंसिल में और सेंट्रल काउंसिल में भी देहात वालों के नुमायन्दे होने चाहिए जो कि यह आशा लगाये बैठे हैं कि हमें भी बिजली मिलेगी ताकि उनकी बात पर गौर किया जाये चाहे उनको बाद में रिजेक्ट ही क्यों न कर दिया जाये । आज तो ज्ञानत है कि उन लोगों के नुमायन्दों को नामिनेट हो नहीं किया जाना । उनको तो तसबूर ही नहीं किया जाता ।

आखिर मे मैं यह कहना चाहता हूँ कि आपने जो बिजली के डिस्तरसन का उग रखा है उससे किसानों को फायदा नहीं पहुँचा सकते । लेकिन इनके बावजूद भा उसमें कुछ ऐसी चीजें हैं जो अच्छी हैं और मैं इसलिए इसका समर्थन करता हूँ ।

17 hrs.

The Lok Sabha then adjourned till Eleven of the Clock on Wednesday, August 5, 1950/Śravaṇa 14, 1881 (Saka)